business entertainment, etc., expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.R. 6636. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to provide that marketing agencies acting in good faith shall not be liable for selling livestock mortgaged under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act until the Secretary has exhausted his civil remedies against the mortgagor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 6637. A bill authorizing the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority to impose tolls for the use of the bridge across Mount Hope Bay between the towns of Bristol and Portsmouth, in Rhode Island; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GILL:

H.R. 6638. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to clarify the areas which may be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 6639. 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.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 6640. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Company Act of the District of Columbia (48 Stat. 1145) approved June 19, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MEADER:

H.R. 6641. A bill to transfer certain functions of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library to the Administrator of General Services; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 6642. A bill to provide that the Government of the United States shall furnish no aid or assistance to any foreign nation or citizen thereof in carrying out any activity under which American citizens will be discriminated against; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 6643. A bill to amend section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 6644. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to fix the premium for the insurance of cooperative housing mortgages at the minimum permissible level (one-fourth of 1 percent per annum); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 6645. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 175th anniversary of the establishment of the customs service, and of customs employees killed in enforcing the customs laws; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 6646. A bill to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 6647. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6648. A bill authorizing the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority to impose tolls for the use of the bridge across Mount Hope Bay between the towns of Bristol and Portsmouth, in Rhode Island; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 6649. A bill to extend for one additional year certain of the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to the construction and maintenance and operation of public schools in federally impacted areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 6650. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a woman who is otherwise qualified may receive widow's insurance benefits without regard to her age if her income is less than $1,200 a year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 6651. A bill to provide for a study and report to the Congress concerning the establishment of a National Space Museum; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 6652. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to sell at prices which he determines to be reasonable direct loans made to veterans under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 6653. A bill to amend section 210 of title 23 of the United States Code to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to construct certain access roads to space facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 6654. A bill to amend section 210 of title 23 of the United States Code to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to construct access roads to space facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 6655. A bill to create four judicial districts for the State of California, to provide for the appointment of four additional district judges for the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6656. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to place an embargo on certain fish and fish products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 6657. A bill to establish the Federal Housing Administration as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 6658. A bill to amend sections 162 and 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the deductibility of certain business entertainment, etc., expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 6659. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act to extend for an additional 3 years the period during which construction funds must be received and to increase the number of general trustees; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 6660. A bill to provide that the Government of the United States shall furnish no aid or assistance to any foreign nation or citizen thereof in carrying out any activity under which American citizens will be discriminated against; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 6661. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 6662. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to children of certain seriously disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MEADER:

H.J. Res. 455. Joint resolution providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1963 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 456. Joint resolution to authorize and require the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO to submit an annual report concerning its activities, programs, and proceedings; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H. Res. 372. Resolution disapproving the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1963; to the Committee on Government Operations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. TUPPER presented a memorial of the State of Maine Legislature recommending full development of electric power potential of Passamaquoddy Bay and Upper St. John River; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 6663. A bill for the relief of Louis C. Wheeler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 6664. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Arvas Antonopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 6665. A bill for the relief of Krystyna Rytel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6666. A bill for the relief of Maria Pacini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 6667. A bill to confer authority upon the Secretary of the Army to pay certain claims of Ottinger Brothers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

143. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mrs. F. Burt Hulting, national corresponding secretary, National Society Daughters of the American-Colonists, San Francisco, Calif., relative to the ringing of Fourth of July freedom bells, etc., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 28, 1963

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

Most merciful God, Father of all who dwell upon the earth, Thou knowest our necessity before we ask, and our ignorance, limitations, and fallible judgment in asking. Have compassion, we beseech Thee, upon our infirmity; strengthen us in all noble impulses; and daily increase in us the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and true godliness. Dowered with privileges and with the stewardship of power as no other nation, may our high estate be to us as Thy call to put willing hands of help under the weak and exploited, that through the potent ministry of this Nation, where the people rule, all peoples of

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the earth may be aided in their quest for more abundant life. We ask it in the name of the One whose life is the light of men. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceeding of Monday, May 27, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 5389) to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

William J. Crockett, of Nebraska, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State; and

Robert C. Strong, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Iraq.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Capt. Albert J. Carpenter, U.S. Coast Guard, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask what the Finance Committee will be considering. The Senate has the debt-ceiling bill before it this morning, and I do not know for what the Finance Committee would be meeting. If the Finance Committee has any business which it wishes to attend to I may withdraw my objection; but I should like to know the purpose of the request.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I think I can throw some light on this matter. This morning, I was informed that the Finance Committee will meet tomorrow to hear the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles Murphy, testify about the sugar situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But the Finance Committee is not meeting today to consider the sugar situation, is it?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. The Finance Committee wishes to meet to consider the tax bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The tax bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. If the Senator from Delaware wishes to object, that is perfectly all right; but I am bound to make the request.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But the bill to increase the debt ceiling is the pending business of the Senate; and as members of the Finance Committee we shall have to be in the Senate Chamber; moreover, the Finance Committee does not have any tax bill before it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. This is a sudden development. I do not know what will come of it. I understood that the Senator would be consulted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I always like to go along with the wishes of the majority leader, but I do not know what sort of tax bill the committee would have before it at a meeting this morning. The Senate has the debt-ceiling bill before it now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, that bill is before the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Finance Committee reported that bill to the Senate. What is wrong with it?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish the Senator from Delaware would not ask me that question. If he wishes to object, that will be all right with me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I should like to know what the Finance Committee would consider at a meeting this morning. Last week our committee reported the debt-ceiling bill, which is now the pending business before the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The debt-ceiling bill would continue to be the pending business; it would not be withdrawn. I make this request, and I hope it will be agreed to. But if there is objection, that will be all right with me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the absence of knowledge of what the Finance Committee would be considering and inasmuch as the debt-ceiling bill is now before the Senate I shall have to object. I do not see how members of the Finance Committee can be in two places at the same time; this is new procedure to me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct; it is new.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. So I am puzzled by such a request.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall contact the chairman of the Finance Committee. But momentarily I register objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia may meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have been asked to interpose objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. DOMINICK subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today objection was made to the holding of a meeting, during the Senate session of the Senate today, of the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia. That objection should be withdrawn. I renew the unanimous-consent request that the subcommittee may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate in a joint subcommittee meeting, pending action by the Senate on the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works may meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee may meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask my able friend if this request has been cleared with the minority.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not know. This permission was requested by Mr. ARENDS for the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

Yes; I am informed it has been cleared by the leadership on the Republican side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

IMPROVEMENT OF ACTIVE DUTY PROMOTION OPPORTUNITY OF CERTAIN AIR FORCE OFFICERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve the active duty promotion opportunity of Air Force officers from the grade of major to the grade of lieutenant colonel (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON TRANSACTIONS UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration on the activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from January 1, 1963, through March 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 12 OF NATURAL GAS ACT

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 12 of the Natural Gas Act with respect to the issuance of securities for the construction, acquisition or operation of pipeline facilities (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF TARIFF CLASSIFICATION STUDY

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixth supplemental report on the Tariff Classification Study, dated May 23, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

AUDIT REPORT ON CUSTODIANSHIP FUNCTIONS, OFFICE OF THE TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on custodianship functions, Office of the Treasurer of the United States, Treasury Department, fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF INSTALLATION OF AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING SYSTEM AT HINES, ILL., DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' BENEFITS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of installation of automatic data processing system at Hines, Ill., Department of Veterans' Benefits, Veterans' Administration, dated May 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

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

REPORT ON AWARD OF YOUNG AMERICAN MEDALS FOR BRAVERY AND SERVICE FOR 1961

A letter from the Attorney General, reporting, pursuant to law, on the award of the Young American Medals for Bravery and Service for 1961; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER ACT, TO EXTEND THE TERMINATION DATE AND TO ENLARGE THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

A letter from the Chairman, the National Cultural Center, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Cultural Center Act to extend the termination date, contained therein, and to enlarge the Board of Trustees (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 24

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to approve the coinage of a 50-cent piece commemorative of the Gettysburg Address

"Whereas H.R. 1611 introduced January 10, 1963, in Congress by Representative George Goodling of Pennsylvania, is drafted to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the delivery of Lincoln's immortal address at Gettysburg and is now pending before the House of Representatives; and

"Whereas 100 years ago on November 19, 1863, thousands of Americans gathered at Gettysburg to witness appropriate ceremonies in connection with the dedication of a portion of a great battlefield of the American Civil War, 1861–1865, as a national cemetery to receive the remains of the gallant men who fell in battle in defense of their country and homeland; and

"Whereas President Abraham Lincoln on that date delivered a few appropriate remarks which have come down to us as a noble address revered throughout the world as one of mankind's great utterances stressing that freedom and sacrifice are eternally inseparable; and

"Whereas during the present centennial of the great American Civil War, it is entirely fitting that a coin should be minted by the United States of America to commemorate the centenary of the Gettysburg Address; and

"Whereas the California Civil War Centennial Commission is dedicated to the observance of the centennial in California of the great War Between the States and events related thereto and the commission has endorsed the subject matter of H.R. 1611, and likewise the Sacramento Civil War Round Table, a study and discussion group devoted to the history and background of the Civil War, has also endorsed the coinage of the commemorative coin above mentioned; and

"Whereas the attainment of the coinage of a 50-cent piece linked to the Gettysburg Address will further the observance in California in 1963 of the great historic significance of Gettysburg; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation approving the subject matter and contents of H.R. 1611 at the earliest possible opportunity and designed to approve the coinage of a 50-cent or other piece commemorative of the 100th anniversary of the delivery of the address at Gettysburg and the dedication of the national cemetery in that locality; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of the resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States respectively, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Governor of the State of California, the Governor of the State of Pennsylvania, the Chairman of the California Civil War Centennial Commission, the Sacramento Civil War Round Table, and the Executive Director of the United States Civil War Centennial Commission."

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

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 39

"Joint resolution relative to the food for peace program

"Whereas fishery products are one of the finest sources of healthful nutritious protein so essential to the growth and well-being of all people; and

"Whereas the United States has, through the food for peace program, undertaken to aid in the obtaining of an adequate supply of food for the hundreds of thousands of people throughout the world so vitally in need of such food; and

"Whereas the use of domestically produced fishery products for this program would, in addition to making this essential food available to these people, materially aid the food for peace program, undertaken to the U.S. fishery industry in its program of expanding its markets, which is necessary if the industry is to progress in its battle for survival against foreign competition; and

"Whereas the development and progress of our domestic fishing industry is important not only because of its beneficial effect on the economic well-being of a large number of our citizens who are connected with the industry but also because it can substantially aid in the proper conservation and utilization of the fishery resource, for although many foreign fishermen ignore sound conservation practices and are subject to no conservation laws this is not true of our fishermen, who are subject to many restrictive laws enacted to preserve and protect the fisheries involved; and

"Whereas there are presently two bills before Congress, S. 702 and H.R. 3965, which would authorize the procurement and distribution of domestically produced fishery products under the food for peace program: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Congress of the United States is requested to enact legislation, such as S. 702 or H.R. 3965, to authorize the use of domestically produced fishery products under the food for peace program; and be it further

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

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 32

"Joint resolution relative to establishment of a Federal veterans hospital in the San Diego area

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the members of the Legislature of the State of California that the Federal Government is considering the establishment of a 500-bed veterans hospital in southern California; and

"Whereas San Diego County has a climate suitable to the well-being of convalescent patients, as they are able to be out of doors in healthful sunshine throughout the year to enjoy whatever outdoor activities their health permits; and

"Whereas the desirability of San Diego County's climate and the wealth of its available spectator and participating recreational activities are attested to by the high percentage of retired military personnel who have chosen to make their homes in the area; and

"Whereas the San Diego area is one of the more progressive communities in the State, is kept at a stable and temperate climate by the bay on its west boundary; and

"Whereas San Diegans have lived amicably with the large number of military personnel stationed in the area for many years and would welcome patients and staff from a veterans hospital to the community: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for establishing a veterans hospital in the San Diego area; and be it further

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

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

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 21

"Joint resolution relative to flood control

"Whereas serious floods occurred in the vicinity of Chester, Plumas County, and elsewhere in California during October 1962 and January 1963 and at previous times; and

"Whereas these floods produced a great damage to public and private property, including roads, bridges, buildings, commercial establishments, and farms; and

"Whereas this legislature, pursuant to the recommendation of the Governor, enacted chapter 81 of the statutes of 1963 to reappropriate funds, as an emergency measure, to be used by local public agencies in the repair and rehabilitation of damage caused by said floods; and

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, has been authorized to undertake a survey of flood conditions in the vicinity of Chester, Plumas County, and the California Water Commission has recommended that an appropriation of $15,000 be sought in the current session of Congress to initiate said survey; and

"Whereas article 3 of chapter 1 of part 6, division 6, of the California Water Code declares it to be the policy of the State to participate jointly with the Federal Government in levee and channel improvement projects authorized by the Congress and the legislature to the extent of the costs of lands, easements, rights-of-way needed for such projects; and

"Whereas section 12585 of the water code, being a part of said article 3, chapter 1, part 6 of division 6, specifically provides:

" 'In the event that the Congress after September 22, 1951, authorizes and approves projects, wherein financial assistance is required of local agencies of this State by the Federal Government, similar to provisions of Public Law 534, 78th Congress, 2d session, and such projects are recommended for State assistance by the department and approved by the legislature, including all projects adopted and authorized by the State for which no appropriations or allocations have been made, it is the intention of the legislature that it will be the policy of the State to pay the costs of local cooperation required by the acts of Congress, except that such costs shall be limited to the costs of all lands, easements and rights of way necessary for the construction of such projects'; and

"Whereas the aforesaid policy has been implemented repeatedly by prior sessions of the legislature and will be implemented during the current session of the legislature with respect to levee and channel projects heretofore authorized by the Congress and the legislature; and

"Whereas there is no present reason to believe that the well established policy heretofore carried out by the State of California in regard to such projects will not continue to be followed; and

"Whereas there is an urgent need to initiate and complete at the earliest possible date a flood control survey of streams in the vicinity of Chester, Plumas County: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That this legislature urges the Congress to appropriate $15,000 for use during fiscal year 1963–64 in the initiation of the authorized survey in the vicinity of Chester, Plumas County, so that a feasible flood control plan can be developed at the earliest possible date by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers aimed at eliminating the flood problem in the vicinity of Chester, Plumas County; and be it further

"Resolved, That this legislature anticipates that in the event the Corps of Engineers recommends to the Congress the construction of economically justified levee and channel improvements in the vicinity of Chester, Plumas County, as a result of its authorized survey, such a project will be authorized for State participation under the general policies set forth in article 3, chapter 1, part 6 of division 6 of the water code and the legislature will thereafter make appropriations for the acquisition by the State of lands, easements, rights-of-way and utility relocations as in the case of similar projects in the past, provided, that in no event shall such lands, easements and rights-of-way be acquired and utilities be relocated until a local agency of government agrees to operate and maintain the project works when completed and hold and save the United States and the State of California free and harmless from any claims for damages due to the operation of the works; and be it further

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

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

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 14

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the statutes governing the jurisdiction of the Federal courts to prevent interference by such courts with the right of the States to apportion the members of the legislature

"Whereas pursuant to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Baker* v. *Carr,* 369 U.S. 186 (1962), the Federal courts have assumed jurisdiction in cases brought to determine the validity of the apportionment of members of State legislatures; and

"Whereas it is the belief of the members of the 52d session of the Legislature of the State of Nevada that the jurisdictional statute upon which the court relied, in part, in its decision was never intended by the Congress to permit Federal interference with the right of the States to apportion the members of their legislatures; and

"Whereas the right of the people of each of the States to govern themselves has been endangered by Federal intervention in this area: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of Nevada hereby respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to amend 28 U.S.C. sec. 1343(3), 28 U.S.C.A. sec. 1343(3), and any other statutes which it may find necessary, and to enact any new statutes which it may find necessary, to remove expressly the subject of apportionment of State legislatures from the jurisdiction of the Federal courts; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be prepared and transmitted forthwith by the legislative counsel to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each member of the Nevada congressional delegation.

"Passed by the senate March 18, 1963.

"———— ————,

"President of the Senate.

"LESLIE H. ARMSTRONG,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the assembly March 21, 1963.

"L. E. TYSON,

"Speaker of the Assembly.

"NATHAN T. HURST,

"Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

"GRANT SAWYER,

"Governor of the State of Nevada."

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

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 9

"Joint resolution memorializing the Federal Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of the Interior to participate in the widening of U.S. 395, in the City of Reno between Arroyo Street and Liberty Street

"Whereas there lies in Washoe County that portion of U.S. Highway 395 North, State Route 3, more familiarly known as South Virginia Street, located in the City of Reno, State of Nevada, and

"Whereas this highway is a primary route and the main north-south artery serving the City of Reno, the northwestern sector of Nevada, and is the gateway to many of the recreational and commercial areas of the western sector of the United States; and

"Whereas this highway presently carries more than its capacity of traffic and is a bottleneck for the commerce of this growing area of the Nation; and

"Whereas the reconstruction of this highway by widening it to provide four lanes and space for on-the-street parking and thereby a safer and freer flow of traffic will be of great benefit to the City of Reno, the County of Washoe, the State of Nevada, and the western section of the United States; now therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada, jointly, That the Federal Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of the Interior is hereby memorialized, because of the special and extenuating circumstances, to participate, to the fullest permissible extent, in the widening and reconstruction of that portion of U.S. Highway number 395 North, State Route 3, known as South Virginia Street, in the City of Reno, County of Washoe, State of Nevada, from present Arroyo Street north to present Liberty Street, and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be prepared and transmitted forthwith by the legislative counsel to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation, the Secretary of Commerce, and

the Federal Highway Administrator in the Bureau of Public Roads.

"Passed by the assembly March 25, 1963.

"———— ————,

"Speaker of the Assembly.

"NATHAN T. HURST,

"Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

"Passed by the senate March 29, 1963.

"PAUL LASALT,

"President of the Senate.

"LEOLA H. ARMSTRONG,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"GRANT SAWYER,

"Governor of the State of Nevada."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 15

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to incorporate or charter the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the General Assembly concurring),

"1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized to enact appropriate legislation to incorporate or charter the organization known as the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

"2. The secretary of the senate is hereby directed to cause properly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution to be forwarded to the presiding officers of each branch of the Congress and to each of the Senators and the Members of the Congress from this State.

"Attest:

"HENRY H. PATTERSON,

"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 61

"Concurrent resolution relative to the sovereignty of the United States, and to express legislative opposition to certain actions by the State Department and executive branch of the Federal Government

"Whereas publication No. 7277 of the State Department of the United States, entitled 'Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World,' and the publication of the U.S. Disarmament Agency, entitled "Blue Print for the Peace Race," both contain measures for the disarmament and surrender of the United States to a United Nations peace force; and

"Whereas the programs of these agencies outline steps to be taken to create a powerful international military force under the United Nations, capable of launching a Katanga-type action against any nation; and

"Whereas these objectives are incorporated in proposals offered by representatives of the United States at Geneva in the form of a treaty to be entered into between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas the treaty proposed in the outline 'would enter into force, upon the signature and ratification of the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and such other states as might agree'; and

"Whereas this treaty is no more enforceable against the Communists than any of the hundreds of treaties they have made cynically and have broken at will in the past; and

"Whereas this treaty does not in any way insure world disarmament but instead amounts to total surrender of the national sovereignty of the United States to the United Nations, wherein the Communists have great influence and power, they being sworn dedicated enemies of this Nation and every principle on which it was founded; and

"Whereas, the duty to provide for the defense of the United States is the direct responsibility of the U.S. Congress, as provided in article 1, section 8, clause 12 of the Constitution of the United States: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Louisiana (the Senate concurring), That the members of the Legislature of Louisiana in session assembled and acting in their capacity as the duly elected representatives of the citizens of Louisiana, do hereby express strong opposition to the threat to the people which is inherent in the publications of the State Department of the United States and the U.S. Disarmament Agency, which publications propose that authorization be granted to the President or the Federal Government to negotiate for the surrender of the sovereignty of these United States to the United Nations; be it further

"Resolved, That the Members of the Louisiana delegation in Congress are hereby urged and requested to petition the entire U.S. Congress to repudiate any proposals which have been or which may be made to compromise the sovereignty of the United States and to vigorously oppose, as unconstitutional, any such treaty, if negotiated, and if entered into, to employ every available means to provide for the defense of the citizens of this State and of the United States of America; be it further

"Resolved, That the Members of the Louisiana delegation in Congress are hereby further urged and requested to petition the U.S. Congress to launch an immediate investigation into the surrender phase of U.S. policy, including the role of the State Department in formulating that policy; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each of the two Houses of the U.S. Congress, and to each Member of the Louisiana delegation in Congress; be it further

"Resolved, That the Members of the Louisiana delegation in Congress are urged and requested to take such steps as are necessary to bring the views of the people of the State of Louisiana to the attention of the Congress and to have this resolution read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"———— ————,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"———— ————,

"Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Whereas President Dwight D. Eisenhower in his state of the Union message, January 7, 1954, called for a White House Conference on Education; and

"Whereas this unprecedented citizen study of elementary and secondary school needs, involving more than a half million American people in local, county, regional, and State conferences and 2,000 participants in the White House Conference, held November 28–December 1, 1955, demonstrated a desire and capacity to meet the major problems facing American education; and

"Whereas the traditional decennial White House Conferences on Children and Youth having played an extraordinary role in mobilizing public and professional opinion for more effective work with children and youth, there is a parallel need for a continuing process for the solving of problems in and improvement of education; and

"Whereas during these intervening years since the first White House Conference on Education in 1955, the problems of education have been multiplying with our expanding technology, the impact of automation upon employment and the intensity of the cold war; and

"Whereas there is immediate need for focus on such problems as identification of potential high school dropouts and preventative programs, noncollege-bound and nonvocational youth, community colleges, the gifted, the handicapped, the impact of instructional technology such as instructional television and programed learning, increased research for improvement in education, and the relation of education to the achievement of national goals; and

"Whereas education is a priority concern in the minds of the public who recognize that the future of our Nation depends upon how well we provide an education for all children and youth: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives, That this body respectfully request that the President of the United States consider the need for another White House Conference on Education and that he consider requesting that the Congress enact legislation providing for such a Conference on Education for 1965, the decennial anniversary of the first such conference; and be it further

"Resolved, That this body respectfully request Congress to enact the necessary legislation for such a conference; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the chief clerk of the house of representatives to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Washington.

"Attest:

"S. R. HOLCOMB,

"Chief Clerk,

"House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 66

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has passed numerous legislative measures assisting farmers in the production of specific agricultural commodities; and

"Whereas such assistance and support through programs authorized by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is necessary for the Kona coffee industry in the State of Hawaii; and

"Whereas such support would be a great stimulus to the coffee industry in the State of Hawaii and provide the stability of production which would be of great benefit to the people of Hawaii and of the entire country: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Second State Legislature of the State of Hawaii, regular session of 1963 (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation to include coffee among the basic agricultural commodities assisted and supported by programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and to authorize parity payments to coffee growers in the State of Hawaii; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Hawaii delegation in the U.S. Congress."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 73

"Whereas most of the U.S. military bases in the State of Hawaii are located on the island of Oahu; and

"Whereas it would appear to be advantageous to the defense of the United States and Hawaii for the military installations and personnel to be decentralized and relocated strategically throughout the islands; and

"Whereas one of the prime areas for such relocation is the Puunene Airport site on the island of Maui which consists of over 1,800 acres of State-owned land; and

"Whereas some of the advantages of this site are the vast vacant level stretch of land; the accessibility to modern highways, utilities and other conveniences; the availability of community facilities such as shopping centers, schools and churches; the excellent flying conditions and the proximity, less than a hundred miles, to the island of Oahu: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1963 (the Senate concurring), That the Department of Defense be and it is hereby requested to seriously consider relocating certain military installations and personnel from the island of Oahu to the Puunene Airport site or to other locations on the island of Maui; and be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, President of the U.S. Senate, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Air Force, chairmen of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, and to the Hawaii delegation to the U.S. Congress."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 27

"Whereas the geography of the islands comprising the State of Hawaii dictates that transportation between the several parts of the State be on or over water; and

"Whereas the burden of the Federal transportation tax rests much more heavily upon the residents of the State than upon the residents of the continent in that the people of the State are heavily dependent upon transportation subject to the tax in order to carry on their normal business and social lives: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, regular session of 1963 (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully requested to eliminate taxes upon passenger transportation between the several islands comprising the State of Hawaii; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegates to Congress from the State of Hawaii."

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 48

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to consider the possibility of granting tax credit and other tax incentives to employers who hire persons for the purpose of retraining them

"Whereas the problem of retraining workers is one of the most difficult of the problems relating to unemployment in the United States and in the State of Hawaii today; and

"Whereas it would be a great stimulus to the economy of the State of Hawaii and of the United States if employers were to employ persons who need training as certified by the proper agency and to provide on-the-job training and employment for such persons; and

"Whereas employers would be encouraged to employ persons who need retraining and to provide such retraining if said employers were given tax credit and other tax incentives for each such person employed for the purpose of retraining; and

"Whereas such retraining would help immeasurably to solve the problems of structural unemployment in the economy today: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Second State Legislature of the State of Hawaii, regular session of 1963 (the House concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is requested to consider the possibility of granting tax credit and other tax incentives to employers who hire persons for the purpose of retraining and making them useful members of the American economy; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this Concurrent Resolution be forwarded to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to Hawaii's delegation in the U.S. Congress."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 31

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing the Veterans' Administration to contract with any Hawaii hospital on an island where there is no Federal hospital for the hospitalization of veteran residents of the island.

"Whereas the State of Hawaii is geographically unique among the States of the Union, consisting as it does of several major populated islands; and

"Whereas Federal hospital facilities for veterans are available only on the island of Oahu; and

"Whereas veterans who are residents of Hawaii, Kauai, Lanai, Maui, and Molokai and who need and are eligible for hospitalization in a Federal Government hospital must come to the island of Oahu for such hospitalization; and

"Whereas this works a hardship on such veterans by (1) requiring the sick and injured to be transported over water; (2) causing delays in treatment; and (3) separating the patient from his attending physician and his immediate family; and

"Whereas the neighbor islands have local hospitals with sufficient beds to accommodate veterans residing on the islands; and

"Whereas the hospitalization of veterans in neighbor island hospitals would raise the average daily bed occupancy and decrease the average cost per patient-day: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, regular session of 1963 (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby requested to enact legislation authorizing the Veterans' Administration to enter into contracts with any Hawaii hospital on an island where there is no Federal hospital for the hospitalization of eligible veterans who are residents of the island; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and to Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States."

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 64

"Concurrent resolution relating to discriminatory practices in respect to employment

"Whereas the protection of the right of all persons to seek and obtain employment, or membership in a labor organization, without discrimination or abridgment on account of race, sex, age, religion, color, or ancestry is essential to the economic well-being and welfare of the public in our democratic society; and

"Whereas there is need to safeguard the public from the arbitrary actions of employers who refuse to employ or who discharge from employment certain individuals because of race, sex, age, religion, color, or ancestry and fail to select the best qualified persons for such positions in accordance with established and objective occupational qualifications applied equally to all persons: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1963 (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby requested to enact a Fair Employment Practices Act making it unlawful employment practice or unlawful discrimination:

"(a) For an employer to refuse to hire or employ or to bar or discharge from employment, any individual because of his race, sex, age, religion, color, or ancestry, provided that an employer may refuse to hire an individual for good cause relating to the ability of the individual to perform the work in question;

"(b) For an employer to discriminate against any individual in compensation or in the terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of race, sex, age, religion, color, or ancestry;

"(c) For any employer or employment agency to print, circulate, or cause to be printed or circulated any statement, advertisement or publication or to use any form of application for employment or to make any inquiry in connection with prospective employment, which expresses, directly or indirectly, any limitation, specification, or discrimination as to race, sex, religion, color, or ancestry, unless based on a bona fide occupational qualification;

"(d) For any labor organization to exclude or expel from its membership any person or to discriminate in any way against any of its members, employer or employees because of race, sex, age, religion, color, or ancestry;

"(e) For any employer, labor organization, or employment agency to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person because he has opposed any practice or because he has filed a complaint, testified, or assisted in any proceeding respecting employment practices and discrimination;

"(f) For any person whether an employer, employee or not, to aid, abet, incite, compel, or coerce the doing of any of these practices, or to attempt to do so; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Members of Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 39

"Whereas Oahu's rapidly expanding economy and population are both dependent in part upon ocean transport; and

"Whereas at present Oahu is served by only one deepwater harbor; and

"Whereas the area around Barber's Point affords an ideal location for a new deepwater harbor, which would help to intensify the economic development of the leeward area and the entire State of Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, regular session of 1963 (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully requested

to appropriate sufficient funds for the construction of a deepwater harbor near Barber's Point upon determination of its feasibility by the study now being conducted by the U.S. Army District, Honolulu, Corps of Engineers; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, and to the members of Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States."

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 46

"Concurrent resolution relating to the need for a deepwater harbor near Barber's Point, Oahu

"Whereas Oahu's rapidly expanding economy and population are both dependent in part upon ocean transport; and

"Whereas at present Oahu is served by only one deep-water harbor; and

"Whereas the area around Barber's Point affords an ideal location for a new deepwater harbor, which would help to intensify the economic development of the leeward area and the entire State of Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, regular session of 1963 (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully requested to appropriate sufficient funds for the construction of a deepwater harbor near Barber's Point upon determination of its feasibility by the study now being conducted by the U.S. Army District, Honolulu, Corps of Engineers; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, and to the members of Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; ordered to lie on the table:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 48

"Whereas the 88th Congress of the United States is presently considering enactment of legislation which would prescribe equal pay rates for equal work and proscribe discriminatory pay rates based on sex for those areas of employment within the jurisdiction of Congress; and

"Whereas the seriousness of problems created by discriminatory pay rate practices is magnified by the fact that women now constitute one-third of the entire working population of our Nation; and

"Whereas enactment of Federal equal pay legislation will serve to encourage parallel legislation by the several States and thus discourage throughout the Nation economic exploitation of women in the work force and encourage a healthy economy in which men workers will not be subject to displacement by women workers who could be employed at lower wage rates; and

"Whereas the legislature of the State of Hawaii takes great pride and satisfaction in the fact that the laws of the State have long provided for equal pay for equal work without regard to the sex, religion or race of the workers: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, regular session of 1963 (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to take all appropriate action to achieve the enactment of equal pay for equal work legislation; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this Concurrent Resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to the Members of Hawaii's delegation to the United States Congress."

JOINT RESOLUTION OF OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Honorable Howell Appelling, Jr., secretary of state of the State of Oregon has called to the attention of my colleague, Senator NEUBERGER, and myself, senate joint memorial 2 urging the Congress to enact into law S. 121.

On behalf of Senator NEUBERGER, and myself, I ask that the text of senate joint memorial 2 be set forth at this point in my remarks and that the memorial be referred to the appropriate Senate committee.

For the information of my colleagues I should point out that S. 121 of the 87th Congress is the bill under consideration in the memorial. I also ask unanimous consent that the text of S. 121 of the 87th Congress be set forth in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

The joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

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

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas a question has arisen as to what policy should govern the use of Federal water resources having recreational value; and

Whereas the waters of the coastal ports of Oregon are to a considerable extent within the Federal water resources projects; and

Whereas existing Federal policy takes into consideration industrial development only, and fails to consider recreational development; and

Whereas recreational development and the benefits thereof to the public should be evaluated and charges as an expense thereof should be distinct from other costs of the projects; and

Whereas Senate bill 121 would accomplish these objectives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact into law Senate bill 121.

2. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

The bill (S. 121) presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Water Resources Recreation Act of 1961".

POLICY AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that full consideration should be given to the recreational purposes that can be served in the formulation, design, construction, and operation of Federal water resources projects hereafter authorized insofar as use for such purpose is compatible with the major purposes for which the project is to be undertaken. Consistent with this policy (1) as an integral part of the planning of any Federal water resources project, there should be included an evaluation of the recreational benefits to be derived therefrom, (2) planning with respect to the development of the recreational potential of any such project (a) should contemplate the coordination of the use of the project area for recreational purposes with the use of existing or planned Federal, State, or local developments in such manner as to achieve maximum net public benefit, and (b) should be carried out jointly with the Secretary of Agriculture if the project is or will be situated within the exterior boundaries of a national forest, and (3) plans with respect to any such project may provide storage and facilities as may be required for recreational use.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "Federal water resources project" means any project involving the development of water resources for purposes of navigation, flood control, reclamation, irrigation, water supply, hydropower, or other purposes which is undertaken by either the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, or the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation.

(2) The term "recreational purposes" means uses from which public recreational benefits may be derived.

(3) The term "recreational benefits" means public benefits of a recreational nature.

APPLICABILITY OF SECTION 4 OF THE FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF DECEMBER 22, 1944

SEC. 4. Except as provided herein, the provisions of this Act are intended to be supplemental to and not in derogation of section 4 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460d), and the provisions of that Act are hereby made expressly applicable to Federal water resources projects of the Department of the Interior as well as the Department of the Army. With respect to any such project of the Department of the Interior, any reference in such section to the Secretary of the Army or the Chief of Engineers shall also be deemed to refer to the Secretary of the Interior.

EVALUATION OF RECREATIONAL BENEFITS

SEC. 5. (a) In addition to such other data as may be prescribed by law, or may be pertinent, there shall be included in any report required to be submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the development of any Federal water resources project, (1) an evaluation of the annual recreational benefits to be derived therefrom, (2) the annual cost of providing such benefits, including the cost of the additional facilities, if any, to be installed or provided specifically in furtherance of recreational purposes, and (3) the part of the cost of any such project that should be allocated to recreational benefits.

(b) The evaluation of recreational benefits, as provided in this section shall be made by the Secretary of the Army with respect to Corps of Engineers projects or by the Secretary of the Interior with respect to Bureau of Reclamation projects. The President is hereby authorized to prescribe regulations under which each such evaluation shall be made; and the President shall include in said regulations provisions for using in such evaluation of recreational benefits of any project a monetary value of not less than 50 cents per visitor-day of use of that project for recreation.

(c) The total recreational benefit creditable to any project under the foregoing provisions of this section shall in no event exceed the cost of providing comparable water-associated recreation by the least costly alternative means.

ALLOCATION AND FINANCING OF COSTS

SEC. 6. (a) Project costs, including the cost of minimum basic facilities provided pursuant to clause (1) of section 7(a), shall be allocated to the purpose of recreation. Of the costs so allocated not more than 10 per centum of the total cost of any Federal water resources project, including the cost of providing minimum basic facilities pursuant to clause (1) of section 7(a), may be assigned to recreational purposes, except that if the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Interior determines that the recreational benefits to be derived from any such project are needed and that such benefits will have value on a widespread national basis, he may include in any report which is submitted to the Congress with respect to such project a recommendation that a greater amount than 10 per centum of the total cost of the project be assigned to recreational purposes. That part of the total cost of any project assigned to recreational purposes which will result in benefits having value on a widespread or national basis shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable: *Provided*, That project costs not so assigned shall be allocated as provided by law.

PROJECT FACILITIES

SEC. 7. (a) In connection with any Federal water resources project, the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Interior is authorized—

(1) to construct, operate, and maintain minimum basic facilities for access to, and for the maintenance of public health and safety and the protection of public property on, lands withdrawn or acquired for the project, and to conserve scenery and natural, historic, and archeologic objects;

(2) to cooperate with interested State and local governmental agencies and others in the investigation and planning of any such project; and

(3) to permit the construction, maintenance, and operation of public park and recreational facilities on project lands.

The minimum basic facilities referred to in clause (1) of this subsection shall be limited to water supplies, sanitary facilities, boat anchorage and launching sites, access roads and parking areas, public camp and picnic sites, overlook stations, clearing of public-use water areas to a reasonable extent, and essential safety measures.

(b) In carrying out the policy and purpose of this Act, as set forth in sections 2 and 4, the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to permit the construction, maintenance, and operation by non-Federal interests, with preference given to State and local governmental agencies, of such additional facilities as may be necessary or desirable for the full development of any Federal water resources project area for recreational purposes in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460d).

FISH AND WILDLIFE COORDINATION ACT

SEC. 8. The provisions of this Act are not intended to interfere in any way with operations carried on in accordance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661–666c), and no such provision shall be construed to supersede that Act or any of its provisions.

RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

SEC. 9. The second sentence of section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, as amended (43 U.S.C. 485h(a)), is amended by striking out "together with any allocation to flood control or navigation made under subsection (b) of this section", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "together with any allocation (i) to flood control or navigation under subsection (b) of this section, or (ii) to recreational purposes made under the Water Resources Recreation Act of 1960".

PROJECT AREAS WITHIN NATIONAL FORESTS

SEC. 10. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect in any way the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to project areas which are under his jurisdiction.

(b) The authority conferred on the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior by sections 4 and 7 of this Act shall be exercised with respect to national forest lands only with the concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1623. A bill to prescribe a national policy with respect to the determination and disposition of property rights to inventions made in the course of experimental, developmental, and research work conducted under contracts or arrangements with the U.S. Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1624. A bill to amend chapter 35, relating to war orphan's educational assistance, of title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the amount of allowances paid pursuant to such chapter; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1625. A bill for the relief of Sister Nicoletta (Nicoletta Csekey); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1626. A bill for the relief of Jack C. Winn, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1627. A bill to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control of Laos (ICC) as provided in article 18 of the Protocol to the Declaration on the Neutrality of Laos; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. PROUTY (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

S. 1628. A bill to consent to an agreement between Hanover School District, New Hampshire, and Norwich Town School District, Vermont, establishing an interstate school district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1629. A bill to revise the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1630. A bill for the relief of Wah Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1631. A bill to provide for the construction of recreation facilities in the Belle Fourche Reservoir area, South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PELL (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 1632. A bill authorizing the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority to impose tolls for the use of the bridge across Mount Hope Bay between the towns of Bristol and Portsmouth, in Rhode Island; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1633. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bronislawa A. Benecka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1634. A bill for the relief of Teresa Jennie Wu Chien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 1635. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to increase to $750 the amount of each personal exemption allowed as a deduction for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1636. A bill for the relief of Catalina Vera-Pericas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1637. A bill to amend section 502(a) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 so as to provide that bonds required thereunder be for protection against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on the part of the individual bonded; and

S. 1638. A bill to make certain additional surety companies eligible, under certain circumstances, to issue surety bonds for purposes of section 502(a) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1639. A bill for the relief of Sp5. Curtis Melton, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 1640. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELL (for himself and Mr. HART):

S. 1641. A bill to provide a statute of limitations with respect to the deportation of aliens lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, and to remove certain distinctions made in the Immigration and Nationality Act between native-born and naturalized citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and Mr. MCCLELLAN):

S.J. Res. 84. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. DODD:

S.J. Res. 85. Joint resolution favoring the display of the U.S. flag at half mast on December 7 (Pearl Harbor Day) of every year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

RESOLUTION

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN FORMER EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE TO TESTIFY IN A CRIMINAL PROCEEDING

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 149) authorizing certain former employees of the Senate to testify in a criminal proceeding in the U.S. District Court for New Jersey, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. McCLELLAN, which appears under the heading "Report of a Committee.")

NATIONAL POLICY WITH RESPECT TO DETERMINATION AND DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prescribe a uniform patent policy with respect to proprietary rights in and to inventions, discoveries, and improvements realized through Government research and development contracts.

The need for legislation in this vital area is apparent. Twenty years ago, Government research and development contracts were virtually unknown. Since then, Government involvement has increased to such a degree that these contracts have become a major factor in the national economy. This is demonstrated by the fact that during the current fiscal year, the Government will obligate approximately $14.7 billion for research and development.

It is imperative that the participation of the Government in research and development conducted by private concerns be guided by express standards applicable to all departments and agencies of the Government. It is in the national interest that a defined policy exist with respect to proprietary rights arising out of these contracts. Furthermore, sound reason and logic require that these rights be determined by defined public policy considerations which give due recognition to the contributions and efforts of all parties to these contracts. It is for reasons such as these that I have introduced this bill.

The absence of a uniform government patent policy has resulted too often in confusion and uncertainty both within the Government and among private segments of the Nation's economy. A condition such as this requires remedial action. Recognition of the necessity for doing this has been given through various bills introduced in the past to establish such a policy; however, such a bill has yet to be reported out of committee.

My bill provides with certain specific exceptions, that the patent rights of the parties shall be determined at the time when research and development contracts are negotiated. Regardless of how these rights are defined, the Government will always receive an irrevocable, nonexclusive, nontransferable, royalty-free license to any invention developed. In my opinion, this bill insures in a manner consistent with our system of free enterprise the protection of the rights of parties to these contracts.

I believe my bill offers an acceptable basis for the establishment of a uniform government patent policy in the area of research and development contracts.

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

The bill (S. 1623) to prescribe a national policy with respect to the determination and disposition of property rights to inventions made in the course of experimental, developmental, and research work conducted under contracts or arrangements with the U.S. Government, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF CHAPTER 35m, TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO WAR ORPHANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, too often we take for granted the stouthearted officers and men who daily brave great dangers in the defense of freemen.

Once in a while we are dramatically reminded of their cool judgment and selfless devotion. We are reminded of them in the past days by the magnificent performance in space of Major Cooper. And we were reminded of them 7 weeks ago by the tragic loss of the nuclear-powered submarine, the U.S.S. *Thresher*.

When we first learned of this disaster, our hearts went out to the families of the brave officers and men who perished with their ship.

Now I have learned that there is something very specific we can do on behalf of these families. This first came to my attention in a letter from Mr. and Mrs. Manning Harvey, parents of Comdr. John Harvey, skipper of the *Thresher*.

They wrote:

> Thank you so much for your condolences and enclosing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 11. We feel we lost a son who made a contribution to our country. Now, do not let our country erect a monumental memorial to those 129 men; instead let our country subsidize the 100-plus children who need education, with a scholarship fund.
>
> We are thankful for America and are left at present with our faith in God and many, many memories of a wonderful son.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> ANN and MANNING HARVEY,
> *Parents of the Skipper of "Thresher."*

I was deeply moved by this letter. Commander Harvey's parents are absolutely right: We have a responsibility for the education of these children. There are 138 of them—3 over the age of 16.

What opportunities are now available to these *Thresher* children under Government programs? I investigated, and found that, in addition to social security benefits and payments made by the Veterans' Administration, there are several programs for the education of these children.

First, there is the War Orphans Education Assistance Act, which provides $110 a month for 36 months of higher education or certain specialized training.

There are also 30 scholarship programs available to dependents of the active, retired and deceased personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps. Many of these scholarships, however, benefit only one or a few students each year. One of these programs, the Dolphin Scholarship, which provides $420 every year to each of five students, is specifically limited to children of submarine service members.

The Bureau of Naval Personnel, Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C., can give more detailed information.

These benefits, and the loans available under the National Defense Education Act, provide significant help to the *Thresher* families. But after reviewing the benefits, I have come to the conclusion that there is one very important improvement that should be made.

The monthly educational benefit provided by the War Orphans Education Assistance Act was established in 1956. Since then college tuition costs have increased approximately 50 percent. Yet there has been no increase in the monthly payment.

I am therefore introducing today a bill to increase by 50 percent the monthly education allowances under the War Orphans Education Assistance Act. And I want to express my thanks to the parents of Commander Harvey for bringing to my attention the need for this legislation. I hope their eloquent plea will bring a quick response from the Congress.

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

The bill (S. 1624) to amend chapter 35, relating to war orphans educational assistance, of title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the amount of allowances paid pursuant to such chapter, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

TO ENABLE THE UNITED STATES TO CONTRIBUTE ITS SHARE OF THE EXPENSES OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SUPERVISION AND CONTROL IN LAOS—ICC—AS PROVIDED IN ARTICLE 18 OF THE PROTOCOL TO THE DECLARATION ON THE NEUTRALITY OF LAOS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos—ICC—as provided in article 18 of the protocol to the Declaration on the Neutrality of Laos.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of State, dated May 20, 1963, in regard to it.

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

The bill (S. 1627) to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos—ICC—as provided in article 18 of the protocol to the Declaration on the Neutrality of Laos, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State such sums as may be necessary from time to time for the payment by the United States of its share of the costs of the operations of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos as provided in Article 18 of the Protocol to the Declaration on the Neutrality of Laos dated July 23, 1962.

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

MAY 20, 1963.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I submit herewith a proposed bill to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos (ICC) as provided in article 18 of the protocol to the Declaration on the Neutrality of Laos. The International Control Commission for Laos was reestablished by action of the 1962 Geneva Agreements signed by the United States and 13 other nations on July 23, 1962.

The principal tasks of the International Control Commission for Laos as stated in the protocol are: (1) to supervise and control the withdrawal of foreign military personnel from Laos; (2) to supervise and control the ceasefire in Laos; (3) to investigate cases of illegal introduction of foreign military personnel into Laos; (4) to assist the Government of Laos in cases of illegal introduction of armaments into Laos; and (5) to investigate other possible violations of the provisions of the protocol and the declaration, the most important perhaps being the undertaking by the signatories not to use the territory of Laos as a corridor for interference in the internal affairs of other countries. This article was designed specifically to prohibit North Vietnamese infiltration through Laos into South Vietnam. The Commission is to report these violations to the Cochairmen of the Conference, as well as to report any other information which might assist the cochairmen in carrying out their functions under the protocol.

During the past year, the ICC has played an increasingly important role in thwarting Communist objectives in Laos. Perhaps its most significant contribution to date has been made during the past several weeks when it took a leading role in stopping Pathet Lao attempts to undermine the non-Communist military position in the Plaine des Jarres. Under the leadership of the Indian Chairman, Commission teams were established in the Plaine des Jarres. The presence of the teams undoubtedly helped restore peace and, thus, prevented the situation from deteriorating further. We believe that the Commission will continue to exercise a strongly beneficial influence in Laos and that we should support it in every way possible, and insure through our contributions that it has the means to carry out its responsibilities.

The International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos was originally established by the 1954 Geneva Accords. It consisted of representatives of three countries: Canada, Poland and India, the latter acting as Chairman.

You may perhaps recall that Laos, although not a major theater of war during the Indochina hostilities of 1946–54, was invaded in that period by Vietnamese Communist forces who allied themselves with the Communist-indoctrinated dissident Lao group known as the Pathet Lao. The Geneva Accords of 1954 provided for a cessation of hostilities in Laos and established an International Control Commission to supervise and control the execution by the parties of the provisions of the accords relating to Laos. For 3 years after the signature of the Geneva Accords of 1954, the Royal Lao Government sought to comply with the terms of the accords, by integrating the Pathet Lao into the national community. The Pathet Lao, however, entrenched in two northern provinces of the country, retained their armed forces intact, and guided and supported by North Vietnam, rejected the Government's efforts until December 1957, when agreements were concluded at Vientiane between the then Prime Minister, Prince Souvanna Phouma, and the Pathet Lao leader, Prince Souphanouvong. Under these agreements the two provinces occupied by the Pathet Lao were transferred to central government control and the Pathet Lao were permitted to form a legitimate political party. Pursuant to the Vientiane agreements Prince Souphanouvong entered the Souvanna government, and a start was made toward integrating the Pathet Lao military units into the royal army. It then appeared that the Geneva Accords as they applied to Laos were well on their way to fulfillment, and in July 1958, at the request of the Royal Lao government, the International Control Commission set up under the accords adjourned and departed from Laos.

The settlement was short-lived, however. In less than a year, the Pathet Lao once again resorted to military action. Aided by growing divisions among non-Communist elements and support from North Vietnam the Pathet Lao embarked upon full-scale civil war. By January 1961, the situation in Laos had become truly explosive and there were widespread fears in the international community that the conflict might soon spread outside Laos. It was under these circumstances that steps were taken by the British and Soviet cochairmen of the 1954 Geneva Conference calling for a ceasefire in Laos, reconvening the old ICC to supervise and control the cease-fire, and convoking the 14-Nation Conference at Geneva for the settlement of the Lao question in May 1961.

The International Control Commission was reconvened in April 1961 on instructions from the cochairmen of the Geneva Conference for the specific purpose of supervising and controlling a cease-fire in Laos. It remained on the ground in Laos for this purpose during the entire course of the negotiations at Geneva. Although its activities were limited because of its restrictive terms of reference, it exercised a generally conciliatory and moderating effect on the situation in Laos.

At the Geneva Conference, new terms of reference were worked out for the Commission. These are embodied in the so-called protocol to the Declaration on the Neutrality of Laos. They provide for the Commission to perform the various functions which are outlined above. I would, however, like to draw your attention to one important aspect of the 1962 agreements. Unlike the 1954 agreements, the Commission can now act on a majority basis in initiating and carrying out investigations. This provision, as recent events have clearly demonstrated, has markedly enhanced the effectiveness of the Commission.

For the performance of these duties, the Commission will, of course, need suitable accommodations and adequate means of communication and transport. The communication and transport equipment must be such as to guarantee the Commission's ability to move quickly around Laos, much of which is almost inaccessible.

Funds for the acquisition of necessary equipment and operating expenses of the Commission and its inspection teams are planned to be met from a central fund. All members of the Conference will contribute to this fund in the percentages specified in article 18 of the protocol. The United States along with the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, France, and Communist China are to contribute 17.6 percent to the fund. The Governments of Canada, India, and Poland will pay the personal salaries and allowances of their nationals who are members of the Commission, as well as 1 percent of the budgeted costs of the ICC's operations. The remaining members, each of whom will be assessed at the rate of 1.5 percent, are Burma, Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Laos, the Republic of Vietnam, and Thailand.

It should be noted that U.S. contributions will be required over a period of years. Article 19 of the protocol which deals with the duration of the ICC provides that not later than 3 years after the entry into force of the protocol, or at any earlier time if the Government of Laos so requests, the cochairmen are to present a report to the Conference members for their consideration, the report to contain recommendations on the question of termination of the ICC. Before making the report the cochairmen are to consult with the Government of Laos and the ICC. The final determination as to when the ICC shall terminate is thus left to the members of the Conference. For this reason, the bill has been drafted in the form of a permanent authorization.

A similar communication is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely,

DEAN RUSK.

NORWICH-HANOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, for myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the two Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON and Mr. MCINTYRE], a bill which seeks to grant the consent of Congress to the establishment of an interstate school district between two towns on the border between the States of Vermont and New Hampshire.

Subsequent to the passage of enabling legislation by the legislatures of our two States, the school boards and the people of Norwich and Hanover have worked diligently to adopt an agreement under which this school district may operate in a manner satisfactory to all.

An agreement to this end has been signed. Only consent of the Congress remains to be accomplished in order that what will be known as the Dresden School District may become a functioning unit for the welfare of the people of these two towns in Vermont and New Hampshire.

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

The bill (S. 1628) to consent to an agreement between Hanover School District, New Hampshire, and Norwich Town School District, Vermont, establishing an interstate school district, introduced by Mr. PROUTY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE BETWEEN JAMESTOWN AND NEWPORT, R.I.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, together with my senior colleague, Senator PASTORE, I take particular pleasure in introducing a bill that will pave the way toward the building of a bridge between Jamestown and my home city of Newport, R.I.

This is a project that has been very dear and close to the residents of Newport, Portsmouth, and Middletown, on Aquidneck Island, for many years. We believe such a bridge will prove a boon in helping the economic viability of our community, as well as providing great service to travelers going up and down the eastern seaboard. It will establish the necessary link between two portions of our State that will be of mutual benefit to both of them and to the rest of the State.

Bridge building is still vitally needed at some areas on our coast, where often there are no means of transportation at all, or where ferries are still in operation. If vehicle travel along the northeast coast continues to exert ever-increasing pressure, I even envision the day when "steppingstones" of bridges will span the waters between Orient Point, Long Island, and Watch Hill Point, R.I., and Stonington, Conn., areas. But if there is one place where such a bridge is critically needed today, it is across the Jamestown Gap.

I expressly commend Mr. Francis Dwyer, chairman of the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority; State Senators Joseph Savage, of Newport, and Thomas H. Levesque, of Portsmouth; and W. Ward Harvey, Esq., of Newport, who in the last month have done an excellent job in a completely bipartisan manner in guiding the State's enabling legislation through the Rhode Island General Assembly.

It is important to note at this time that this legislation will in no way render the Federal Government liable for the expenditure of funds. It merely provides the framework for the collection of tolls on one bridge in the State and the application of these funds to other necessary construction projects. The building of this bridge will be one of these projects.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1632) authorizing the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority to impose tolls for the use of the bridge across Mount Hope Bay between the towns of Bristol and Portsmouth, in Rhode Island, introduced by Mr. PELL (for himself and Mr. PASTORE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act granting the consent of Congress to the Mount Hope Bridge Company, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Mount Hope Bay between the towns of Bristol and Portsmouth, in Rhode Island", approved March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1391), is amended by striking out section 3, and inserting in lieu thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 3. That upon title to the bridge which was constructed under the authority of this Act becoming vested in the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority, created by chapter 3390, Public Laws of Rhode Island, 1954 (chapter 12 of title 24, General Laws of Rhode Island, 1956) upon the terms and conditions provided for in said chapter 12, as heretofore amended, said authority shall be authorized to fix, charge, and collect tolls for the use of said bridge and to apply the same in accordance with the provisions of said chapter 12, as heretofore amended, and to combine said bridge for financing purposes with any other bridge financed by said authority under the provisions of said chapter 12, as heretofore amended."

AMENDMENT OF BONDING PROVISIONS OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959.

It is the purpose of these bills to conform bonding provisions of Landrum-Griffin with those in the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act amendments adopted last year.

You will recall that the Landrum-Griffin bonding provisions were drafted in the course of the debate on S. 1555. You will also recall that there were a number of parties interested in the bonding proposal and during the heat of that debate, all of them joined to produce in a single night the bonding language that eventually became a part of the law.

It was not until some months after the enactment of Landrum-Griffin that it was discovered that the form of the bond drafted under such difficult conditions during the debate was altogether unknown to the bonding business.

Let me be more precise. Landrum-Griffin specified a bond "for the faithful discharge of duties." This was a concept entirely new to the bonding business. Up to that moment the bond used by fiduciaries were honesty bonds, providing protection against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty.

This, of course, meant that the surety companies were required to develop a rate structure for the new bond without having experience to guide them. The rates were extremely high for the first year and have been reduced periodically since.

Just 14 months ago the Congress enacted the 1962 amendments to the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act which provided for the bonding of the administrators, officers, and employees of employee welfare benefit plans and of employee pension plans. The two laws overlap. A sizable number of the plans subject to bonding under Landrum-Griffin were covered by the newly enacted bonding provisions of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. However, by this time we had learned our lesson. The new bonding provisions in the 1962 bill required an honesty bond, providing protection against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty.

The 1962 law also provided that its provisions would supersede the Landrum-Griffin provisions to the extent that the two overlapped.

It is precisely for this reason that I now offer an amendment to Landrum-Griffin to make it conform to the bonding provisions of the 1962 law.

There is no reason in commonsense or in justice for continuing any distinction between these parallel laws. It is time to correct our error of 1959 by providing for the more practical and more realistic type of honesty bond described in the 1962 action.

My second amendment proposes to correct a second misfire in the bonding provisions of Landrum-Griffin.

As in the case of the amendment which I have just described, I propose to conform the Landrum-Griffin provisions to those of the recently enacted Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. Landrum-Griffin provides that all bonds which it covers must be issued by a "corporate surety company which is an acceptable surety on Federal bonds under authority granted by the Secretary of the Treasury." This is a rigid and an inflexible provision which enables the bonding companies to decide, in the final analysis, whether an officer or employee of a union may function. Arbitrary refusals by any bonding companies to issue these bonds would, under the literal language of the provision, result in an absolute disqualification of all union officers or employees and would thus have the effect of paralyzing the union.

The comparable problem was faced in the development of the bonding provisions in the Disclosure Act of 1962. The 1962 bonding provisions were made sufficiently flexible to avoid the incongruities contained in Landrum-Griffin. The Secretary of Labor was given authority to exempt any plan from the bonding requirements of the 1962 law if he found that "other bonding arrangements would provide adequate protection of the beneficiaries and participants." It is precisely this kind of flexible authority which is lacking in Landrum-Griffin and which is urgently needed. My second amend-

ment proposes to repair this deficiency by following the procedures and principles specified in the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments. As in the case of the 1962 law, the amendment would add the following to the bonding provisions of Landrum-Griffin:

Provided, however, That when in the opinion of the Secretary of Labor a labor organization has made other bonding arrangements which would provide the protection required by this section, he may exempt such labor organization from placing a bond through a surety company holding such grant of authority.

This provision would give the Secretary of Labor broad authority to carry out the objectives of the bonding provision by specifying adequate protection for the funds within the framework, of course, of the policies of the entire act.

Certainly it was never intended that these provisions be used as a basis for destroying or crippling labor unions. Under the amendment which I now offer, the Secretary would have ample power to insist upon the usual bonding arrangements with approved sureties or, in special circumstances such as arbitrary refusals to issue bonds, the Secretary could accept a cash bond or other bonding arrangements with other sureties, such as Lloyd's, which in his judgment, would provide the protection required by this section.

These reforms are long overdue, and it is my hope that they will be given immediate attention by the Senate.

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

The bills, introduced by Mr. MORSE, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

S. 1637. A bill to amend section 502(a) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 so as to provide that bonds required thereunder be for protection against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on the part of the individual bonded; and

S. 1638. A bill to make certain additional surety companies eligible, under certain circumstances, to issue surety bonds for purposes of section 502(a) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO CASES WHERE THE PRESIDENT IS UNABLE TO DISCHARGE THE POWERS AND DUTIES OF HIS OFFICE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to correct the pressing problem of Presidential disability.

It is my understanding that the distinguished chairman of the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee [Mr. KEFAUVER] intends to hold hearings in the near future on Senate Joint Resolution 28 and Senate Joint Resolution 35, which pertain to this subject. The instant joint resolution is introduced today in order that it can be considered by the subcommittee along with them.

While this joint resolution is similar to Senate Joint Resolution 35, it differs in one important respect. In delegating the power to the Congress to enact an appropriate method to determine Presidential disability, the amendment requires that whatever method is adopted adhere to the coequal character of the three branches of Government. In other words, the procedure devised by the Congress for determining the commencement and termination of a disability must be compatible with the doctrine of a separation of powers so as to prevent the domination of one branch over another

Because of the many diverse methods proposed for determining disability and the practical impossibility of agreeing upon any one at this time, the adoption of this amendment, it is believed, would be a sensible first step toward clarifying the situation which possibly itself might lead toward a solution both legally sound and politically feasible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 84) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and Mr. MCCLELLAN), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is 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. If the President dies, resigns, or is removed from office, the Vice President shall become President for the remainder of the term to which the President was elected.

"SEC. 2. If the President becomes unable for any reason to discharge the powers and duties of his office, they shall devolve upon the Vice President, who shall then act as President until the disability of the President be removed, or the term of office of the President shall expire. Congress shall have the power to establish a procedure to determine the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office; but such procedure must be compatible with the maintenance of the three distinct departments of government, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial and the preservation of the checks and balances between the coordinate branches. Congress shall provide by law, for the case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability of both the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President; and such officer shall act accordingly, until the inability be removed, or the expiration of the term for which both officers had been elected.

"SEC. 3. Article II, section 1, paragraph 6 is hereby repealed."

FLYING OF THE FLAG AT HALF STAFF ON EACH PEARL HARBOR DAY ON ALL PUBLIC PLACES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I had the good fortune to speak at the Black Rock School in Bridgeport, Conn. I was invited to speak there by one of the teachers, James J. Curiale, who has developed an approach to the teaching of history and the fostering of good citizenship that has attracted wide interest and has resulted in three awards from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

Mr. Curiale has asked me, in behalf of his students, to introduce a joint resolution providing that on each Pearl Harbor Day flags on all public places will be flown at half staff in remembrance of those who have given their lives in defense of this country and as a reminder of the many sacrifices that must be made in defense of freedom.

I think that this would be an extraordinarily appropriate way to commemorate Pearl Harbor Day and I am happy to introduce this joint resolution of the students of the Black Rock School in the hope that it will receive favorable consideration by the Senate and the House.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution be printed at this point.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 85) favoring the display of the U.S. flag at half mast on December 7 (Pearl Harbor Day) of every year, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas many American lives were lost at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941; and

Whereas this great sacrifice was made in the defense of liberty and for the protection of the free people of the United States and the world; and

Whereas in today's turbulent world, with the evil hand of communism attempting to envelope the free peoples of the world, it is necessary to keep the memory of their sacrifice ever present in the minds of all so that we may always be aware of the unending struggle to protect man's freedom: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress of the United States request the President to order the display of the U.S. flag at half staff on Pearl Harbor Day, December 7, and each year henceforward, in remembrance of those brave men who gave their lives at Pearl Harbor in defense of their country and also in recognition of the many sacrifices that must be made in the cause of freedom.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR SENATE BILLS 1590 AND 1591 TO REMAIN AT DESK FOR ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 1590, and Senate bill 1591, introduced on May 23 by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and myself, lie at

the desk until the conclusion of business on Friday, June 7, so that other Senators desiring to join in the bills may become cosponsors.

At this time, 31 Senators have become sponsors of S. 1590, which authorizes the Attorney General to initiate suits, in the name of the United States and at its expense, to enforce the equal rights of all citizens to attend public schools without discrimination. Thirty-two Senators have so far become sponsors of S. 1591, entitled the "Public Accommodations Act of 1963," which would prohibit discrimination in certain businesses licensed by the States or their subdivisions and which hold themselves out for public patronage.

Senator DODD and I are pleased that the following Senators have already joined as cosponsors of both S. 1590 and S. 1591; Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CASE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. In addition, Senator ALLOTT has joined the school desegregation bill, S. 1590, and Senators BOGGS and MORSE have joined the public accommodations bill, S. 1591.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bills will remain at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Kentucky.

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FRANK KOWALSKI TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, this is to give notice that the public hearing scheduled for Tuesday, June 4, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228 New Senate Office Building, before the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and other internal security laws, on the nomination of Frank Kowalski, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for term expiring August 9, 1966, has been postponed until further notice.

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. COOPER:

Address delivered by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, before the Conference on Cooperatives and the Future, on April 29, 1963.

By Mr. BURDICK:

Address delivered by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, before the Conference on Cooperatives and the Future, on May 8, 1963.

By Mr. BENNETT:

Address of Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, before the Third National Mortgage Conference of the American Bankers Association, Washington, D.C., on May 28, 1963.

By Mr. THURMOND:

Column entitled "Power a Dictator Would Usurp: U.S. Brief on Using Troops in Alabama Would Open up Vast Area of Coercion," written by David Lawrence, published in the Evening Star, Washington (D.C.), on May 27, 1963; and newsletter distributed by him, entitled "On Preserving Order."

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on May 28, 1918, just 45 years ago today, the Armenian nation defeated Turkey in battle and proclaimed itself an independent republic. The Armenians had been threatened with total extermination, and they waged a valiant battle to defend their liberty and independence. That victory was highly beneficial to the Allied cause, and provided the opportunity for the establishment of the first democratic government in the eastern Asia Minor region.

The people of Armenia were faced with many problems in their attempt to rebuild their nation following the war. The political situation was chaotic, and the outlook for the establishment of a lasting government did not seem promising. Poverty, famine, and disease were rampant. The fighting had left destruction and ruin in its wake. The Armenians made remarkable strides, however; and within 1 short year they had set up efficient administrative machinery to govern the state, and, with assistance from other nations, in large measure the United States, they were moving rapidly toward the solution of their economic and social problems.

By 1920, however, Armenia had succumbed to Russian military aggression, and became the first nation to fall under the domination of the Soviet regime. For one brief period in 1921 the Armenians fought back, and reestablished their independence. However, a feat of such magnitude needed more than the will and determination of the Armenian people; it required outside assistance. Such assistance was not forthcoming; and by August of 1921, the Soviets had made their control and domination complete.

Throughout much of their history, the Armenian people have been subjected to oppression, slavery, and control by alien forces. Armenians who managed to escape from their native land have proved themselves worthy citizens in the nations in which they have relocated. We in Massachusetts have a notable group of these people, and they have made many fine contributions to our Commonwealth. The Armenians who remain subjected to Red tyranny still maintain their strong, innate belief in liberty and freedom. It is fitting that we join with all people of Armenian descent in looking forward to the day when their homeland may once again number itself among the free and independent states of the world.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is a pleasant yet somber experience today to join my colleagues in the Senate and the free Armenian people throughout the world in celebrating the 45th anniversary of Armenian independence.

It is a pleasant occasion, in that we rejoice in the memory of this tiny country which was once free and whose people have never lost that great spirit to regain the liberties they once enjoyed. The courageous Armenians remain silently dedicated to their lost privileges in the hope that one day they will be revived.

Yet today is a very somber and sobering occasion when one recalls that the history of freedom in Armenia was so short-lived. After centuries of rule by foreign powers—the Ottoman Turks, the Persians, and the Russians—the Armenian people established a free republic on May 28, 1918. Yet the price of freedom was a stiff one: the war had devastated Armenian property and had taken a heavy toll of Armenian lives.

After their gallant efforts to attain independence and then to retain these liberties, the Armenians once again lost their freedom after a bitter clash with the Turkish state and Soviet Russia. Now the dark cloud of Soviet tyranny looms low over this small country. Armenian property is being exploited by Soviet imperialists and the people are silenced and subject wholly to the dictates of the Kremlin.

Mr. President, the Armenians have never lost sight of their national goal. On this independence day, let us as Americans join with the free Armenians throughout the world in their pledge to the liberty of their kinsmen in this captive nation. National independence for all people now suffering under the yoke of Communist oppression must not merely be an ideal but a goal that will and must be recognized if the cause of freedom is to survive in this world.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the 45th anniversary of Armenian Independence Day which is being celebrated this year on May 28 commemorates the establishment of the Republic of Armenia in 1918. After 500 years of servitude and persecution, the Armenian people established for the first time in the eastern Asia Minor region a stable democratic government allied to the West, and it was quickly recognized by the United States and the other Western Powers.

Armenian independence from Turkey and Russia, however, was shortlived. In 1920 the Armenian Republic became the first victim of Soviet military aggression, the Red armies quickly overrunning the country in the same manner that they conquered the Baltic countries later that year.

I feel privileged to be able to join Armenian Americans throughout the Nation who are celebrating this memorable anniversary in order to keep fresh the memory of the heroism of the Armenian fighters of World War I, and to help bring hope and comfort to their compatriots today who are keeping alive the flame of liberty in spite of Soviet tyranny and harsh restrictions.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today marks the 45th anniversary of Armenian independence. On this date 45 years ago the Armenian National Council declared Armenia an independent nation. This infant republic was soon aided by free nations the world over. In May of 1920 the first American ship loaded with 2,000 tons of flour arrived in Batum followed a week later by another ship bearing 10,000 more tons.

American Armenians raised $2 million to aid in the rebuilding of their fatherland. Presently, there was a homecoming of Armenians from every part of the globe bringing with them the materials and knowhow to transform their country's industrial, agricultural and intellectual climate.

The life of the burgeoning nation was cruelly terminated by the Communists when the Red Army invaded Armenia and made her subject to the U.S.S.R. Despite a revolt in December of 1920, which constituted the only instance in Soviet history when an outraged people rebelled and restored its independence until the Hungarian uprising, the return of overwhelming Communist forces resulted in the final Sovietization of Armenia.

Today we join with Armenian Americans in celebrating this anniversary as a reminder to the world of the heroism of this small nation in her struggle against the tyranny of her Communist oppressors. We can be proud of such Armenian Americans as playwright and author, William Saroyan, football coach Ara Parseghian, movie producer Rouben Mamoulian, and restaurateur George Mardikian who has resettled so many of his countrymen from the Middle East in Western democratic countries. We can also reaffirm to all Armenians suffering under the bonds of Red oppression our belief in the traditions which they so courageously established in their homeland in 1918 and our determination that some day in the not too distant future Democracy will triumph over totalitarianism in Armenia. I am sure that when this day arrives Armenians will participate in a second homecoming which will dwarf the first and once again establish Armenia as a bastion of democratic ideals.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today marks the 45th anniversary of the establishment of the independent Republic of Armenia. This day in 1918 was a momentous event in the history of the Armenian people.

The freedom-loving Armenian people have a tradition of independence extending back to the earliest pages of recorded history, and their fiercely independent nature is legendary. After many years of foreign domination, the Republic of Armenia was established in 1918, fulfilling the aspirations of all Armenians for freedom.

On December 2, 1920, this free state became one of the first victims of Communist aggression. Even then, the Armenian people rose up against the Communist tyranny. In the February Revolt of 1921, these brave citizens not only drove the Communists out of their country but reestablished their Republic. Finally, however, this rejection of Communist rule was suppressed by the overwhelming weight of Soviet military forces.

The meaning of Armenian Independence Day has not been forgotten. Americans know the significance of the birthday of a free nation, and the birth and tragic death of the Republic of Armenia has a special significance. I am confident that all Americans join in the hope for liberty for Armenia, and I believe that the observance of this occasion will keep that hope alive and strong.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the late President Wilson is remembered for many of his lofty and noble ideals. He is also honored for his statesmanlike utterances and solemn declarations. Even today he occupies a warm place in the hearts of suppressed and downtrodden peoples, who, in the uneven course of their history, have lost their freedom and live under the abominable regimes of hated alien conquerors. When these people heard Wilson's declaration of the inalienable right of national self-determination during World War I, they all found in him the true champion of their national cause. The Armenian people in particular consider Wilson as a kind of patron saint of their national cause, for they attained their freedom in 1918 only after Wilson's unmistakably clear declarations on elemental human rights.

Armenians lost their national political independence many centuries ago. To be exact, from the year 1071 to 1918 Armenia was under its conquerors, and of course freedom and national independence were denied to the Armenian people during all that time. Yet during these centuries, whether suffering under cruel tyrannies at home or enduring many hardships in dispersion, Armenians never lost sight of their national goal. Through the sustained efforts of their persevering leaders this goal was kept before their eyes. And the lesson they mastered in the school of adversity was not forgotten. They learned to appreciate the real value of national freedom and therefore worked more fervently for its attainment.

It is unfortunate that the eventual attainment of this freedom had to be accomplished at the stunning cost of more than 1 million Armenian dead in the Turkish massacres and deportations of the First World War. Yet so sweet seemed the reward, and so noble the ideal behind that reward that even such terrifying sacrifices were not made grudgingly. And on May 28 of 1918, when Armenians proclaimed their national independence and founded the Armenian Republic in the northeastern part of historic Armenia, all past miseries and sufferings seemed, for the moment, to have vanished. Such was the joy and gladness evoked by that memorable and historic event.

Today in celebrating the 45th anniversary of that event we think of the electrifying days of November 1918, followed by the disturbing sequel of interwar years. Armenian independence, regained after the lapse of some 800 years, was lost again in the fall of 1920. In December of that year it was crushed by the combination of Turkish nationalist and Russian Communist forces.

Since then Armenia has been under Soviet rule and of course the Armenian people are not allowed to celebrate their independence day there. But we in the free world and particularly in this great Republic can celebrate that anniversary, joining the people of Armenia in spirit, in the firm belief that the forces of darkness and tyranny cannot permanently choke off the spirit of freedom among the Armenian people.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today is the 45th anniversary of Armenian Independence Day. It was on May 28, 1918, that that valiant people, after 500 years of servitude, turned on their oppressors and created the independent Republic of Armenia.

Their success, unfortunately, was short-lived, for in 1920 Armenia became the first victim of Soviet military aggression.

All of us should join with our many fellow Americans of Armenian descent in commemorating this day, not only to honor the heroes of 1918, but to bring hope to those now suffering the brutal bonds of Red tyranny.

CIVIL DEFENSE IN PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it was startling to read in today's newspapers that, following the decision of the city council of Portland, Oreg., by a vote of 4 to 1, to abolish that city's civil defense program as of next July 1, on the ground that the civil defense shelter program would be useless in a nuclear war. Federal Civil Defense officials now seek to win Portland back into the national civil defense program from which the city last week withdrew. The vote in the city council was almost unanimous. The mayor of that city cast the one vote to the contrary.

Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Defense Steuart L. Pittman telegraphed the city council of Portland, Oreg., that he would come to Portland, if necessary, to state the case for civil defense. In other words, he desires to use his persuasive powers to interfere with home rule and local self-government in an effort to persuade the city council of Portland, Oreg., to readopt a defeatist attitude—and it is a defeatist attitude to continue to vote millions and millions of dollars of taxpayers' money for holes in the ground called fallout shelters. Gen. John Medaris has said that he thought such a program was useless and "would convert our people into a horde of rabbits scurrying for warrens where they would cower helplessly while awaiting the coming of a conqueror." I recall that the same persuasive tactics now proposed for Portland by Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Defense Pittman were once tried upon me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Defense Pittman has had excellent training in the art of persuasion. He was a successful attorney at law in Washington, D.C., before he was made an authority on civil defense matters. Also he has been connected with the AID program, where he presumably acquired the necessary training, skill, and experience in giving away millions of dollars of our tax money.

I recall that when Frank Ellis was named Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization the same process of argumentation and persuasion was undertaken. I was entertained by Mr. Ellis, a very fine gentleman who is now a judge of the U.S. courts. At that time two lieutenant generals, with charts and other information, spent almost 2 hours in what is called a briefing, trying to convince me that there should be a fallout shelter program and that millions of dollars should be spent upon it.

In order to have an effective shelter program it was estimated that the expenditure required would be $20 to $200 billion. They tried to persuade me that we ought to have such a program, even though our allies, England and France, had no such program.

I assure Senators that it was not too difficult for a humble person like myself—one who has been a private in our Armed Forces and never rose higher than lieutenant colonel—to be persuaded by lieutenant generals with charts, until I found, upon questioning them, that they really did not know as much about the shelter program as I did, and that they did not realize that the advance of science would make utterly useless next year a fallout shelter program that might be of some effect this year.

I am sure that the withdrawal of Portland from the civil defense program will be the first of many withdrawals as State and local officials throughout the country come to learn that civil defense has been a huge boondoggle, already costing the taxpayers of our country over $1,300 million. As properly stated by Portland City Commissioner Stanley W. Earl, the civil defense shelter program would create a sense of false security. There is no falling back on a fallout shelter.

He is an elected official. It seems to me that appointive Federal officials are presumptuous in trying to persuade Portland officials against their will and against their judgment to reverse a decision which they in their wisdom have adopted.

Mr. President, we in America believe, or should believe, in home rule and local self-government. The city council of Portland, Oreg., led by City Commissioner Stanley Earl, has decreed that civil defense with 11 full-time employees sitting around waiting for the bomb to drop is futile, wasteful, and worthless. The city council action will definitely end the federally financed fallout shelter program on next July 1. I pay tribute to those city fathers for their wisdom and commonsense. They deserve praise for their action to end a program that would be utterly useless in a nuclear war were one to be waged against us by the Soviet Union. Such a war seems remote indeed so long as we maintain our tremendous air and missile power and capability.

We have the power, as Khrushchev and other Communist leaders know, to annihilate and utterly destroy by our almost instant retaliation every airfield within the Soviet Union, every missile base with such missiles as have not already been fired, and 100 Russian cities. The facts are, we could not only sustain a surprise attack, although we suffered heavily, but we could sustain any attacks immediately following and still send our missiles of death and destruction and our air power to hit on target all missile and airbases, industrial complexes, and cities, in the Soviet Union.

Communist dictators respect and fear our strength. The power of our Armed Forces is and has been our best defense. Surely the defense of our civilians is a major factor in the defense of our country. Let us, however, follow the example of the city fathers of Portland, Oreg. The commonsense and intelligence of Americans in all walks of life call for an end to the defeatist psychology engendered and promulgated by those political appointees occupying civil defense offices in our cities, States, and in the Nation.

Commissioner Earl stated most intelligently and truthfully that "the civil defense shelter program creates a sense of false security." He said, "since the hydrogen bomb has been developed, civil defense shelters are useless."

It is noteworthy that at the height of the Cuban crisis last year the people of Portland voted down a $75,000 a year tax to support the city's civil defense agency.

Assistant Secretary of Defense Pittman has been placed in an awkward position. The fact is that he is scheduled today to go before the Armed Services Subcommittee of the other body and plead for another $175 million appropriation, which he will claim is necessary to meet shelter, ventilation, and other deficiencies.

I want the people of my country to know the facts—the truth. I want them to know that a civil defense fallout shelter program to be at all effective and to provide real protection would cost our taxpayers at least $100 billion. It would seem such a vast expenditure is unthinkable. If such a program of fallout shelters is really thought to be insurance, then the premium of so many billions of dollars is so outrageously exorbitant that serious-minded, thoughtful persons not intent on holding down jobs and feeding at the public trough would repudiate such an expenditure. Furthermore, who knows, in view of the rapid advance of science, that there would be any justification for such an expenditure in 1, 2, or 3 years.

As an example of squandering of taxpayers' money in one city alone, I refer to the statement made at the council meeting at Portland, Oreg., that the local civil defense agency there has $1 million in equipment on hand. Much of this equipment is obsolete. Much of it should not have been purchased in the first place. Furthermore, the 11 full-time officials and employees occupy a $650,000 headquarters and spend money taken from local taxpayers—$110,000 was requested this year—in addition to Federal money handed over under authority of Assistant Secretary for Civil Defense Pittman.

Again congratulating the city officials of Portland, I commend them also for the proposal sponsored by Commissioner Earl. Following the time Portland citizens rejected a $75,000 special levy for the civil defense agency, he said he was proposing a disaster relief program whereby but a fraction of approximately $110,000 sought for civil defense for the coming year would be appropriated and that police, fire, health, and other regular city departments would furnish leadership as they always have when some disaster of nature such as windstorm destruction, fires, and floods threaten communities. Furthermore, various media such as newspapers, radio, and television are available to be used for instruction on emergency procedures.

Mr. President, the actions of authorities in Portland, Oreg., is merely another indication that the patience of American citizens has been exhausted and that there is a feeling of outrage throughout the country over communities' squandering of huge sums of taxpayers' money on civil defense. Civil defense officials in the Federal Government in Washington are in the forefront of those making these expenditures. Let us hope that Assistant Secretary for Civil Defense Pittman meets a rebuff in Portland, and that commonsense prevails over persuasion, scare words, and the dangling of Federal funds held in front of city and State officials for useless civil defense shelter programs.

DEATH OF LOUIS LIPSKY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday the American Zionist movement lost one of its most distinguished elder statemen and foremost leaders with the death of Louis Lipsky.

Mr. Lipsky was born in my home city of Rochester, and those of us who have followed his career have developed through the years an ever-increasing respect and admiration for him as an individual and for the magnificent job he did in furthering a cause he held so dear to his heart. He gave of his vast energy and wonderful talent unstintingly to help his fellow men, and his death is a great loss to his State and his Nation.

He served at various times as president of the Zionist Organization of America; as chairman of the Palestine Foundation Fund, of the United Palestine Appeal, of the American Zionist Conference, of the American Zionist Council, and of the Central Committee of the World Jewish Congress; and as vice president of the American Jewish Congress.

I extend my most sincere condolences to his bereaved loved ones and join in the thousands of his friends who mourn his death.

ISRAEL'S 15TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on April 29 the people of Israel celebrated their 15th birthday. On that day, people throughout the country, in fact the world, paused and reflected upon the amazing growth of this dynamic and young Republic.

Israel's heritage has contributed significantly to the progress of mankind. Her varied and numerous contributions in the fields of education, science, art, literature, and music have increased

and enriched the knowledge and culture of the world. But perhaps more important is the spectacular example Israel has set as a showcase for representative government. Since her aspirations for liberty and justice were realized only a little more than 15 years ago, Israel's growth and progress have been magnificent in the eyes of the free world. For the very reasons that a spirit of freedom pervades the land and that Israel's ultimate aspirations and ideals are so intertwined with our own, the United States must not adopt a shortsighted policy and neglect the very trying problems facing this young Republic today. The United States must continue to make every effort to sustain the security Israel has so valiantly sought—security now threatened by new outbursts of Arab militarism and belligerence.

Mr. President, on the occasion of her 15th anniversary, a very sensitive and wonderful tribute was paid to Israel by Rabbi Julius Kerman of Temple Hesed Abraham in Jamestown, N.Y. Rabbi Kerman's address expresses both the hope and the confidence Israel has for her future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks the text of this address be printed in the RECORD.

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

ISRAEL'S 15TH BIRTHDAY AND THE WORLD'S MORAL NATURE

Monday, April 29, was Israel's 15th birthday. Again we review Israel's accomplishments in the various fields of endeavor. Its most outstanding achievement is in the field of statecraft. Israel is an outpost of democracy in the Near East, an area ruled by unstable totalitarian governments.

Israel's progress in the 15 years of its existence is amazing. Beginning with a population of 650,000, it now exceeds 2 million. In 15 years small Israel absorbed more than a million immigrants. More than half of these newcomers came from Arab lands in Asia and in North Africa; there were almost as many of them as the number of Arabs who fled Palestine when the six Arab states attacked newly-born Israel. The Jews from the Arab lands came to Israel destitute; they had been robbed of all their possessions; some had even been stripped of clothing. Israel rehabilitated them, taught them trades, and made useful citizens of them. The several Arab states with vast, unpopulated areas and huge oil income, could have easily and profitably absorbed the Arab refugees.

The truth is that the underpopulated Arab states, Syria and Iraq, treated the Palestinian refugees as inferior Arabs, as undesirables, and barred them from their countries. Egypt likewise, fed them hate-propaganda instead of bread. The refugees in the Gaza Strip were—and still are—kept out of Egypt proper. The Arab world is not in the least interested in the welfare of their brother refugees; they only exploit the refugee situation, which they created and which they perpetuate, as a weapon against Israel. Their representatives at the U.N. shed crocodile tears over the Arab property left behind in Israel, for which the Israeli Government offered payment, but they never mention the property which the Jews were compelled to leave behind in Arab lands. Their mentality is similar to that of the proverbial Hottentot: "If I steal your cow, that is good; if you steal my cow, that is bad." It is a serious question calling for serious, unbiased study as to who lost more property, the Jews or the Arabs?

Israel's progress in the 15 years is the result of hard work and careful planning. Of all the changes one sees in Israel, the people themselves are the most interesting. Former city dwellers who were barred from contact with the soil by centuries of discrimination, have become successful farmers. Fifteen years ago Israel did not have enough food for its small population. Now, with its population more than trebled, Israel has an overabundance of food, even a surplus for export. Hard work and scientific skill have yielded these results.

Israel's cooperative villages are now objects of study and imitation by many nations, Asian, African, and even European. Indian groups have been living in Israeli kibbutzim, learning their methods of agriculture, yet Prime Minister Nehru, intimidated by the Arabs, refuses to recognize Israel diplomatically.

A linguistic miracle was performed in Israel. The immigrants came from 80 different countries, bringing 80 different languages, and dialects, but the revival of Hebrew enabled the fusing of the heterogeneous elements into one nation. India similarly suffers from a multiplicity of languages and dialects, creating political difficulties and complications, and even strife. India, therefore, is very much interested in Israel's linguistic experience. A professor from the Hebrew University was invited to lecture in Indian universities on the revival of Hebrew; but Nehru still behaves as if Israel were nonexistent.

Israeli educators, technicians, and advisers can be met in many lands, new and old. All this is done modestly, quietly, and without fanfare. Israel has neither money nor skills to spare, but, when a new nation, or even an old one, asks for help, Israel does its best to oblige.

Israel looks into the future with hope and confidence. Success has not turned the heads of its leaders. They crave no power. They cherish no expansionist dreams. They plot no aggressive moves against their neighbors. They want peace. There is much work to be done in their small land; there is much wasteland to be reclaimed, on which many more Jews in need of homes and freedom, can be settled. Israel and its leaders prefer the book to the sword.

But they are aware of grave dangers ahead. Their offer of peace has been steadfastly refused by their Arab neighbors. They have heard Nasser of Egypt threaten again and again that he would destroy Israel, wipe it off the face of the earth, drive it into the sea.

Israel's leaders understand Col. Nasser's hysterical vindictiveness: their small novice army had defeated him twice. The memory of those defeats is very bitter to a military person who nourishes grandiose ambitions of uniting all Arab nations, of becoming a modern Saladin, and of heading the world's third great power. Israel is watching with alarm how the paper-hero of the Nile is being built up for his dream role by the great powers. The U.S. showers money and surplus food on him. That money helps Nasser pay foreign scientists, particularly Germans, to build rockets and manufacture atomic bombs for him. Soviet Russia has been stocking Egypt and all other Arab lands for a long time with modern weapons.

It is a moot question whether Nasser is using German scientists and technicians, or West Germany is using Nasser for its own ends. West Germany may be experimenting in Egypt with weapons it is not allowed to build at home. The German Government's claim that it cannot legally restrain its scientists from working for a foreign government, is a hypocritical posture. West German factories supply parts to Egyptian factories. Germany has in that manner evaded treaty obligations after the First World War, and may now be doing it again.

Israel's alarm at these German-built rockets, bombs, and planes in the hands of trigger-happy Nasser, does not disturb the Germans who have not yet been de-Hitlerized. Hitler is dead, but Hitlerism is still alive.

Thousands and thousands of Israel's citizens have vivid recollections of German brutality of the Hitler era; they know that many former Nazis fill high offices in present-day Germany; they know also that many Nazi criminals—officers of the army, physicians, and scientists—have found refuge in Egypt. Their presence and activities in Egypt should disturb the whole world.

There is a quadruple race to win Nasser's favor. The United States and Soviet Russia wish to keep each other out of the Middle East. Germany is pursuing its own dark ends. Switzerland, too, is in this race. Its role and objective are not so clear. It may be that it wishes to hold on to the many millions of dollars in its banks, whose owners perished in the Nazi crematoria. There is a Swiss law against revealing the names of depositors. But it is immoral for the Swiss bankers to hold on to that money. There may be heirs. But, if there are no heirs, surely Jewish philanthropic institutions and the State of Israel are entitled to those funds: they cared—and are still caring—for Nazi victims. Switzerland's role in the dark days of Hitlerism was far from commendable: it turned many fugitives back to Germany. Now it is not in a hurry to change or amend the law against revealing the names of the dead depositors. The motives are not noble. One suspects that greed places Switzerland in Nasser's camp.

Mr. Averell Harriman's rationalization for the State Department, that it is useless to pressure the German Government to recall its scientists, because they would be replaced immediately by Soviet scientists, is as lacking candor as the German Government's argument that it has no control over the activities of its citizens. But should the United States help Nasser pay the salaries of the foreign scientists? The arming of Egypt may lead to more disastrous results even than the Cuban affair.

We cannot argue with Soviet Russia. Like the Nazis, they would not hesitate to help destroy Israel to win the Arabs' favor. Such bourgeois words as pity, humanitarianism, and morality, are not to be found in the Communist dictionary. Anything that promotes their end, is just and good. The Kremlin hates Israel because it is a successful democracy and also because it influences the new nations toward democracy. But the State Department has not repudiated religion, morality, humanitarianism, and democracy. These are the very ideals to which our State Department pays homage. From time to time we denounce atheism and totalitarianism. We have a right to ask on what moral grounds does our State Department help Nasser spread his brand of totalitarianism? In Egypt we are not competing with Russia, but cooperating with Russia to build up Nasser. I hope that my fears will prove unfounded, but it may come to pass that the efforts of the several rival powers will help Nasser become the ruler of all Araby; then he will thumb his nose at all his backers, and a new Hitler will emerge.

Our statesmen should be reminded of the biblical proverb: "The wise man's eyes are in his head." (Ecclesiastes 2: 14.) The meaning, no doubt, is that the wise man foresees all possible results of the act he undertakes. Surely Neville Chamberlain did not foresee all the results of the Munich Pact which he signed in 1938. Stalin and Molotov did not foresee all the possible results of the nonaggression pact they signed

with Nazi Germany in August 1939. Recent catastrophic experience should teach our American policymakers to be very cautious.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two fine editorials—one from the New York Times and one from the Washington Post and Times-Herald—urging that the Civil Rights Commission be made a permanent agency rather than having its life extended for relatively short periods of time.

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

[From the New York Times, May 27, 1963]

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

The Civil Rights Commission has served as "a national civil rights clearinghouse providing information, advice, and technical assistance to any requesting agency, private or public." The definition of its task is President Kennedy's.

For more than 5 years the Commission has fulfilled its statutory mandate, investigating deprivations of voting rights and denials of equal protection of the laws in education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice. Now the administration asks that the Commission's life be extended 4 years. We agree with some Republicans who would make it a permanent agency.

The Civil Rights Commission deserves a separate, and at least equal, standing in the Federal Government with the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department. One is engaged in major and continuing studies with valid powers of investigation and persuasion; the other is charged with enforcement of the law. Both can and should work hand-in-hand to carry out the decisions of the courts. Both are essential in the struggles, moral and legal, that still lie ahead in the field of civil rights.

[From the Washington Post, May 28, 1963]

CIVIL RIGHTS PILOT

It is a testimonial to the forthrightness and efficacy with which the Civil Rights Commission has carried forward its different mission that there are those on Capitol Hill who would like to demolish it. They would also, for the most part, like to demolish civil rights. The Commission has operated in this area as an indefatigable jogger of the national conscience and as a trail blazer for those who would completely eradicate from American life every form of discrimination based upon race or ancestry.

The Commission's lease on life comes to an end on September 30. It has been a short lease because Congress has been unwilling to grant it extensions for more than 2 years at a time since it was established in 1957. President Kennedy has now asked for an extension of at least 4 years. It is perfectly plain that the Commission will be needed for a great deal longer than this; it ought to be given permanent status to help it hold a staff together and do its work efficiently.

Under extremely tough-minded and realistic Commissioners and a staff director, Berl Bernhard, of exceptional drive and devotion, the Civil Rights Commission has won the confidence of Negro leaders and has rendered invaluable public service in exposing the inequities to which Negroes are subjected. It has a vital job to perform in coordinating the civil rights efforts of all organizations, public and private, Federal and local, and in focusing attention on dangerous trouble spots. The most important work of this valuable agency lies ahead of it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this proposal is embodied in a bill which has been introduced by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and cosponsored by a number of his colleagues in the Senate.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary has been holding hearings on this subject. In those hearings the viewpoint has been presented that the Commission should be made permanent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New York may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, making the Commission a permanent agency will prevent the harassment and obstruction with which it is confronted after every request for its extension. It is clear that problems of race relations will be with us for a long time, and that they must be dealt with on a continuous basis. Terminating the life of the Commission will not eliminate the problems with which it has been dealing. These problems cannot be ducked. The rational processes of factfinding, followed by legislation, is certainly the manner in which responsible Members of Congress, I am sure, feel the problems should be handled. Factfinding, as an adjunct of the legislative process, is an arduous and difficult task, as every Senator knows. An agency such as the Civil Rights Commission can render in the future, as it has in the past, the expert guidance needed to cope with these issues. Of course the Commission could be terminated at any time we no longer have the problem of discrimination. So long as we have this problem, however, it would be a grave mistake to require the Commission to labor in an atmosphere of uncertainty as to its future life.

DIMINISHING SUPPLY OF PETROLEUM

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, all of us are aware of the vital importance of the oil and gas industry to the future economic and military security of our country and of the free world.

We have all been impressed in recent months with the growing importance of oil as a major factor in the cold war. The rapid growth of Soviet oil production is a stern and menacing reality. We can no more avoid this new threat to our national economic and military welfare than could Major Cooper ignore the warning light that his automatic controls had failed. We have to face up to ominous statistics which show that the crude oil reserves of the United States, in relationship to consumption, have declined for the past 10 years. Discovery of petroleum to maintain reserves is placed at $70 billion.

These facts and figures were summarized last week in the monthly newsletter on petroleum from the Chase Manhattan Bank. This is a reliable and authoritative review and commentary on a very serious situation, and merits our closest study. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

NO TIME TO LET UP

There was recently an announcement which ought to have been a matter of widespread interest, for it related importantly to this Nation's future well-being. But it's a reasonably safe assumption that the news went virtually unnoticed outside the petroleum industry. We are referring to the report which once each year provides the latest official measurement of the Nation's underground petroleum reserves.

Contained in the report is the information that our crude oil reserve position suffered a sharp decline in 1962. The ratio of reserves to consumption fell by 6 percent, and for the tenth year in a row we consumed more oil than we found. The rate at which the Nation's consumption of liquid petroleum is growing requires that additions to crude oil reserves each year must exceed consumption by 20 percent if we are to maintain a constant ratio of reserves to consumption. But in 1962 we failed to find that much—indeed we found little more than half as much as we consumed. The results in 1962 are sobering enough but when they are added to the postwar trend there is cause for greater concern. Not since 1949 have we found enough oil to prevent a decline in the reserves to consumption ratio.

There is evidence that a great deal of unwarranted complacency has been generated in recent years by an apparent oversupply of oil. But the oversupply is in producibility and deliverability—not in reserves. A city, despite a shortage of water in its reservoir, could create a temporary oversupply by providing water mains and related facilities in excess of actual needs. But the only truly meaningful measurement, for the longer term, is the actual amount of water in the reservoir. And so it is with petroleum. We should guard against being lulled into a false sense of security by our excess capacity to produce and deliver oil to market.

Almost from the beginning of the domestic petroleum industry's 104-year history there have been predictions of an impending shortage of oil. Fortunately, they did not come to pass, largely because of technological progress. The earlier estimates were authoritative and soundly based when they were made; they reflected the technical knowledge of the time. To cite only one example, it is now possible to drill to a depth of almost 5 miles, but in earlier times a few hundred feet was the limit. Had the means of exceeding that depth not been developed, a major portion of our reserves would never have been found, and we would indeed have run short of oil long ago.

Today, concern about the Nation's future supply of petroleum—both oil and gas—is based not upon the industry's physical ability to find it, but rather upon its financial ability to conduct an adequate search. Between 1950 and 1960 the industry spent for the purpose of finding and developing petroleum hydrocarbon reserves in this country a total of $44 billion. Yet, despite this mighty effort, the reserves to consumption ratio fell steadily. A financial incentive sufficient to achieve better results apparently did not exist. And we might well wonder if the incentive will be great enough in the future. The costs of finding new reserves have risen substantially and there are many indications that they will continue to mount. Our domestic requirements for all petroleum hydrocarbons seem likely to increase at an average

rate of 4 percent a year between 1960 and 1970. To meet these requirements, and prevent any further erosion of the reserves to consumption ratio, the industry would have to find 50 percent more crude oil than it discovered in the preceding decade. And the same is true for natural gas. The indicated cost of such an undertaking is staggering—probably as much as $70 billion.

The earlier predictions of shortage served a useful purpose in that they alerted both the industry and the U.S. Government to the need for a broadened search, in foreign countries as well as at home. Following the First World War the Government encouraged the industry to extend its operations to foreign areas in both hemispheres, and lent its active support where necessary. The gradually evolving system of financial regulations under which the industry was allowed to operate contributed importantly to the incentive to internationalize the search for petroleum. And the Government's far-sighted attitude in this respect helped the industry to achieve the necessary capital formation. Had the regulations been more restrictive, the industry's efforts necessarily would have been limited and, as a consequence, so would this Nation's access to reserves abroad. As it is, more than half of the reserves outside the United States have been found by, and are available to, American-owned companies—an element of great strength, not only to this country, but also to the rest of the free world. In addition to supplementing our domestic resources, the industry has brought the benefits of petroleum to the far corners of the earth, and through its operations has provided substantial revenues to the governments of developing nations—factors which have doubtless furthered our foreign trade relations, and lessened the burden of direct aid.

The industry's ability to satisfy fully the petroleum needs of this Nation and much of the rest of the world reflects to an important degree its freedom to mobilize capital. Funds generated from operations in Oklahoma, for example, could be used to finance exploration in Texas, and vice versa. The search for petroleum abroad by American companies was financed initially, and is still being financed in part, with capital generated in the United States. And the essential heavy investment in transportation, refining, and marketing facilities throughout the world has also been made possible by the industry's freedom to mobilize capital. Had the individual States, the U.S. Government, or governments abroad impeded the management of capital, the industry's growth would have been retarded—to the detriment of this Nation and others as well.

Because the overall financial incentive and political climate were sufficiently favorable for most of the past, the petroleum industry saw fit to spend huge sums of money to expand operations abroad. For the period 1950 to 1960 alone it spent as much as $38 billion. As a result, there now exists outside the United States a plentiful supply of petroleum—both in terms of reserves and deliverability. The known reserves are several times larger than this Nation's. But this condition, while favorable, is also dangerous because it gives rise to complacency—and we cannot afford such an attitude. The indicated requirements for the future are tremendous—the free world will probably consume between 1960 and 1970 alone over half of its presently reported reserves, and the task of replenishment will be formidable indeed.

But finding the reserves will be only part of the industry's task—there is also the need for dispersal. In these uneasy days of almost perpetual international conflict it is considered prudent to have industrial, transportation, and military resources as widespread as possible. For the same reason it is important that our petroleum resources also be widely dispersed. It is possible that a major producing area could be rendered completely inoperative by military action, and it is therefore vitally important that as many alternate sources as possible be available. Our defense effort is wholly dependent upon the availability of petroleum—both from a military and civilian standpoint. And in the event of another war it would be impossible to ration petroleum to the extent it was during World War II—our economy is so much more dependent upon it now.

As it has in the past, the attitude of government will play an important role in determining the adequacy and location of petroleum reserves in the future. By its record, the petroleum industry has demonstrated its ability to meet all requirements if there is a sufficient financial incentive, and if it is not hampered by actions of government. But we also have evidence of what can happen when these conditions are lacking. We have witnessed the steady decline of the reserves to consumption ratio in the United States—where the industry's rate of return on investment has been in a downtrend. Moreover, industry components exhibit a growing desire to purchase existing reserves rather than explore for more; and the interest in diversification into nonpetroleum activities has never been greater. While these developments have been taking shape, some elements of government, in contrast to the earlier encouragement and support, have hindered the industry's efforts. The normal balance of supply and demand has been upset by a steadfast refusal to allow an adequate price for natural gas. There have been persistent attacks on the depletion allowance, and most recently proposed changes in the tax laws which among other things would have the effect of discouraging the exploratory and development activities of American petroleum companies both here and abroad. All these actions impair the industry's ability to achieve adequate capital formation, and thereby its ability to satisfy our growing petroleum needs.

This Nation can ill afford to discourage in any manner the continuing search for petroleum anywhere in the free world. There is abundant evidence that we will need for ourselves and our friends abroad all that we now have and can reasonably hope to find. To take our current availability too much for granted could prove to be a grave mistake.

GEORGE TODT RECEIVES FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AWARD

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, from time to time I have noticed in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reprints of newspaper columns written for the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner by hard-hitting, clear-thinking George Todt, of Los Angeles, Calif. George Todt is an American journalist of the old school who believes in letting the chips fall where they may and who has the courage to write what his convictions dictate.

It is good to know, therefore, that at the annual Freedoms Awards ceremonies this year, George Todt was singled out for a special award known as the Special Freedom Leadership Award. It was conveyed upon Mr. Todt not for any single column or speech but because of the cumulative impact of his steady output of columns devoted to defending our American heritage against Marxist socialism in any form and to the preservation of our free enterprise system which has brought greater opportunities to more people than any other political-economic system in the history of the world. Both in 1959 and in 1960 George Todt received from Freedoms Foundation awards for columns which he had written but the 1963 Special Freedom Leadership Award was bestowed upon him for the consistency and the effectiveness of his strident voice and pen in support of our cherished American constitutional concepts.

I ask, Mr. President, that newspaper stories of this award, together with some typical columns written by George Todt, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

HERALD-EXAMINER STAFFERS WIN FREEDOM FOUNDATION AWARDS

Three Los Angeles Herald-Examiner staff members were named recipients of honors and awards today by Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa.

George Todt, columnist, was honored with a Special Freedom Leadership Award "for his continuing fight against deceit and dullness of socialistic communism and for his continued teaching, through editorials, of the spirit and greatness of our spiritually based constitutional Republic with its democratic methods."

Karl Hubenthal, Herald-Examiner cartoonist, won $100 and the Distinguished Service Award for his cartoon, "Blazed Trail."

Herald-Examiner art director John P. Maloney was given the George Washington Honor Medal Award for his cartoon, "Freedom's Arsenal."

Freedoms Foundation announced these among the more than 900 citizens, organizations and schools throughout the United States to be honored in the foundation's annual national and school awards.

DISNEY CITED

Walt Disney, movie and TV producer, was named winner of the Foundation's highest award for "his educational wisdom, patriotic dedication and creative leadership in communicating the hope and aspirations of our free society."

Todt was presented as one of the Nation's top five "patriots whose deeds merit the applause of all who cherish the highest standards of patriotic citizenship for God and country."

Other top winners include Arch N. Booth, executive director of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Dr. Walter Kerr of Tyler, Tex., director of the Youth Crusade for God and Freedom; Christian Sanderson, violinist, of Chadds Ford, Pa., and Dr. Perry E. Gresham, president of Bethany (W. Va.) College.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur was honored for an address on "duty, honor, and country."

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, Feb. 14, 1963]

SAR NAMES GEORGE TODT TO POSITION

Herald-Examiner Columnist George Todt has just been appointed a member of the Independence Day Observance Committee of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution according to Harry F. Morse, chairman, in Washington, D.C.

Todt has accepted the post occupied last year by Harold Schutte, 1961 California SAR president, who was State chairman of the Independence Day observance committee.

The columnist was local chairman of the patriotic event and named many prominent members of the mass communications media to his committee here.

The newsman was also named recently to the important Americanism and National Sovereignty Committee of the National Society of the SAR after the death of Attorney

Aaron Sargent, of San Francisco, former State president and national chancellor general of the patriotic organization.

Todt is presently serving on the State SAR board of managers and is a former president of the Pasadena chapter of Los Angeles County.

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, Feb. 17, 1963]

LEGION HONORS TODT OF HERALD-EXAMINER

La Canada Post No. 606, American Legion, recently presented the American Legion Citation for Meritorious Service to Herald-Examiner columnist George Todt.

The award read:

"For meritorious service and loyal cooperation, George Todt, of the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, is awarded this citation in recognition thereof by La Canada Post 606, Department of California, the American Legion."

Post Commander James B. Hoge commended the columnist for his long service to the cause of freedom in his activities as a columnist, speaker, and television commentator.

"This was the first time the La Canada Post has made this type of award," Hoge said.

"We consider Todt's column one of the most effective weapons used by an American to fight tyranny and the Communist attacks on human freedom.

"It is with special pride that we award this honor to a fellow American Legionnaire, since Todt is a member of of Hollywood Post 43."

In response, Todt thanked the veterans and accepted the citation on behalf of the entire staff of the Herald-Examiner.

"It's a good patriotic newspaper," said the columnist. "We're all in this fight together. Let's win it."

[From column of July 4, 1962]

BE GRATEFUL TO HIM

(By George Todt)

"Oh! say, does that star-spangled banner yet wave,
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave." (Francis Scott Key, "The Star-Spangled Banner.")

The American Declaration of Independence from Great Britain was signed by 55 patriots 186 years ago today.

"And for the support of this Declaration," stated its concluding words, "with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor."

The Declaration of Independence was one of the great documents of human liberty which has enabled mankind to progress increasingly from the darkness of bondage into freedom.

It must be read in entirety to catch a glimpse of its deeper meaning and true significance. But there are four or five lines near the opening which have always thrilled me:

LIFE—LIBERTY

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. * * *"

The simple nobility of such immortal truths should not be lost upon us. Genius is simplicity. These words, just quoted, might well serve as a correct yardstick of measurement for the entire human race in any truly enlightened period of time upon our planet.

GOD THE FATHER

We may note the striking identification of the signers of the Declaration of Independence with Almighty God, referred to as Divine Providence and the Creator in the document.

Included among these 55 American patriots were such luminaries as Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Samuel Adams, Robert Morris, Richard Henry Lee, Benjamin Harrison, Edward Rutledge, Button Gwinnett, George Ross, Samuel Chase, Roger Sherman, George Clymer, James Wilson and George Read.

A half dozen of these men—Franklin, Sherman, Morris, Clymer, Wilson and Read—also affixed their "Founding Father" signatures to the Constitution of the United States some 11 years later.

A serious student of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution cannot read our treasured libertarian instruments without knowing that the Americans who wrote them had a firm, deep-rooted belief in God—and spent much time in soul-searching prayer to Him.

BE GRATEFUL

Why quibble about matters such as these? Who is so benighted as to assume that man is his own supreme architect of destiny? Where is the fool who says "There is no God"?

Man is something more than merely a package of of chemicals blended together in what atheists must imagine to be the supreme accident—or joke—in our universe.

Human beings are capable of reason, can think for themselves.

Let's be proud of our heritage of freedom here in America.

Let's fly our flag today in gratitude for our Republic.

Let's be grateful to Him Who gave us these blessings for our country.

[From column of Sept. 12, 1962]

DUTY, HONOR, COUNTRY

(By George Todt)

"Duty, honor, country." (Motto of U.S. Military Academy at West Point.)

Recently General of the Army Douglas MacArthur was honored by the President of the United States. As usual the "Old Soldier" had some wonderful thoughts for us in the lengthening shadows of his twilight years. He has always been a great American.

But in my own mind, I saw him at West Point earlier in the year when he addressed the Corps of Cadets while he received the coveted Thayer Award. How definitive of patriotism were his words.

This marvelous address was given on May 12 and published in entirety on May 20 in the National Observer. It may also be found in the June 20 issue of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, commencing on page A4669. Every concerned citizen, every student should read it.

MORE THAN WORDS

Here are a few pertinent extracts from General MacArthur:

"Duty, honor, country. Those three hallowed words reverently dictate what you ought to be, what you can be, what you will be. They are your rallying point to build courage when courage seems to fail, to regain faith when there seems little cause for faith, to create hope when hope becomes forlorn. * * *

"The unbelievers will say they are but words, but a slogan, but a flamboyant phrase. Every pedant, every demagog, every cynic, every hypocrit, every troublemaker, and, I am sorry to say, some others of an entirely different character, will try to downgrade them even to the extent of mockery and ridicule.

THEY BUILD, BUILD

"But these are some of the things they build. They build your basic character. They mold you for your future roles as custodians of the Nation's defense. They make you strong enough to know when you are weak, and brave enough to face yourself when you are afraid.

"They teach you to be proud and unbending in honest failure, but humble and gentle in success; not to substitute words for actions, nor to seek the path of comfort, but to face the stress and spur of difficulty and challenge; to learn to stand up in the storm, but to have compassion on those who fall; to master yourself before you seek to master others; to have a heart that is clean, a goal that is high; to learn to laugh, yet never forget how to weep; to reach into the future, yet never neglect the past; to be serious, yet never to take yourself too seriously; to be modest so that you will remember the simplicity of true greatness; the open mind of true wisdom, the meekness of true strength.

SPRING OF LIFE

"They give you a temperate will, a quality of imagination, a vigor of the emotions, a freshness of the deep springs of life, a temperamental predominance of courage over timidity, an appetite for adventure over love of ease.

"Your guidepost stands out like a tenfold beacon in the night: Duty, honor, country."

[From column of July 8, 1962]

FREEDOM ACADEMY

(By George Todt)

"Want, the mistress of invention." Susanna Centlivre, "The Busy Body."

Aroused citizens of the Southland, centering in Orange County, have commenced a giant, bi-partisan grassroots drive to gain needed support for a proposed U.S. Freedom Academy.

It will specialize in psychopolitical warfare studies—which is a good idea.

Approximately 70 percent of the American people favor establishment of such an academy, according to a recent Gallup poll.

The Communist warlords outspend us on psychopolitical warfare and propaganda by as much as 50 to 1. Can we turn the tables on them?

"In the theater of the cold war," said Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, to his Senate colleagues recently, "we still operate with far too many amateurs who have the desire to win—but who lack completely the needed training and background with which to succeed."

MUNDT and 11 of his colleagues in the Senate—6 Democrats and 5 other Republicans of differing idealogies—have banded together to cosponsor Senate bill 822, which is badly needed.

It proposes an agency independent of the Department of State, to be known as the Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy, which will be carefully designed to accomplish five basic objectives:

To provide the public with greater understanding of communism, especially Communist conflict technique, and the nature of the global struggle.

To show the private citizen how he can participate in the global struggle in a sustained and systematic manner.

To help policymakers and cold war agency personnel at many levels to understand communism, again with special emphasis on Communist conflict technique.

To assure that policymakers and those who advise them must understand the full range of measures potentially available to us in the public and private sectors to meet the entire Communist attack—and to work systematically toward our national objectives.

To train agency personnel at all levels to implement this sophisticated strategy.

MUNDT'S cosponsors of S. 822 are: PAUL DOUGLAS, BARRY GOLDWATER, GEORGE SMATHERS, HIRAM FONG, WILLIAM PROXMIRE, JACK MILLER, THOMAS DODD, CLIFFORD P. CASE, JOHN M. BUTLER, BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER and KENNETH B. KEATING.

The wide divergence of political philosophies demonstrated by these names indicates that this is a needed area wherein we are cooperating wisely and well in the national interest.

The militant Reds are ahead of us now in psychopolitical warfare techniques.

But the construction of this proposed Freedom Academy could help turn the tide in our favor.

Its cost would be negligible compared to the possible results.

Let's get behind it.

[From Column of Sept. 18, 1962]

CALLING MR. K'S BLUFF

(By George Todt)

"Beware of Greeks bearing gifts." (Ancient proverb.)

Will Khrushchev, the rocket-rattler, go to war with us over Cuba? Can a tree dance? Shall the cow jump over the moon?

This international bully and bluff once again is pursuing the only tactics available to him on the world stage. He cannot beat us in war and he knows it. So he is using his malicious propaganda to frighten civilian populations into bringing internal pressure on their governments to accommodate the wily Reds.

I have just returned from a fresh visit to the headquarters of the Strategic Air Command of the U.S. Air Force, located at Offutt AFB, Omaha, Nebr.

The orientation and briefing I received there enables me to know considerably more about our capabilities than, say, Fabian philosophers, Nobel Prize winners in biology or even certain Hollywood TV stars.

A BIG BLUFF

Knowing what I do, the recent scare headlines via Mr. K. in Moscow did not chill my blood. Rather, they drew a smile. For him.

This clever little bluff would get clobbered if he might have the courage to pull the trigger against the United States—which he does not have today—and he gave himself away only recently.

At the very moment he was loosing his rocket-rattling statements about going to the "brink of nuclear war" with us if we attempted to get rid of his Communist worm, Castro, he carefully sent President Kennedy a gift.

As he ranted against us so belligerently, he simultaneously took out insurance by putting five cases of the best Russian wines aboard a fast jet to Washington for J.F.K. to sample at his leisure. Catch on?

Which is Moscow's way of saying, "We don't really mean it."

However, as the Red warlords utter their chauvinistic nonsense—which makes little sense to our military professionals—they manage to make hay in other areas where it counts.

By hurling their taunts, and actually going too far in the process, they score propaganda successes with weak-kneed people everywhere at our expense. The latter consider us doomed or cowards.

We are in danger of losing someday by outright default.

If we do not have the intestinal fortitude to stand up to the aggressor when we have overwhelming military might on our side, who can expect us to be brave if he might surpass us in strength someday?

STAND UP

Every time Mr. K. makes his outlandish warmongering plays against us with no proper rejoinder from our leaders—what is the end result?

It only makes stronger the appeal of the "better Red than dead" surrender clique—the most effective allies the Kremlin has today.

If our leaders do what is correct against Khrushchev, they would call his monumental bluff today. Put him quickly in his place.

He cannot fight, will not fight today over Castro's Cuba.

Why run away from him with our tail between our legs?

[From column of Sept. 9, 1962]

THE NIXON SMEAR

(By George Todt)

"I believe the first test of a truly great man is his humility" (John Ruskin).

The character assassination tactics employed against Richard Nixon by a great many ultraliberal smear artists is disgusting to large segments of voters who might not otherwise be stimulated—Democrat and Republican alike.

No man alive is perfect, neither you nor I, and Nixon likely has a fair share of routine defects.

But he is most certainly a far cry from the overzealous, overimaginative, and overdoctored reports we sometimes hear about him.

He is constantly accused of taking the "low road" in politics. As a matter of fact, it may be doubted if anyone in political life is more diligent in his pursuit of correct behavior and ethics.

Of course, his more hysterical enemies will not agree with such a statement. But I have found these supercharged with emotion types difficult to pin down for valid assessments of Nixon.

As a rule, they just don't like him and let it go at that. Is this enough?

Actually, the man must be viewed with reason and temperance. When this is done by those who are fair and know him best, he emerges as a tremendous character when judged by any honest yardstick.

This is the American who stood up to bloody Nikita Khrushchev in the shadows of the Kremlin and preached the doctrine of "free agency of man" to the ruthless murderer of millions of his own Ukrainian people.

This is the man who took an almost worthless job of Vice President of the United States and accomplished a greater amount of work therein than a fair share of actual Presidents may have done before.

This is the man who, no matter what his position—even when separated once or twice by a flickering heartbeat from the mightiest office in the world—never forgot his humility as a down to earth American citizen.

Neither did he flinch nor quail when he and his marvelous wife, Pat, were beset by Communist-inspired thugs and mobs in South America. Both Nixons demonstrated the coolest courage possible under the adverse circumstances. Characteristically, they later played it down.

Nixon is as decent, forbearing, and clean as any politician I have met. Yet his opponents hit him with everything but the kitchen sink—including guilt by association and vicious rumors.

Patently false charges are hurled against him indiscriminately with the design of confusing Joe Doakes, who may not know the truth.

The idea is to create a diversion—get our eye off the ball.

Let's judge Nixon by his outstanding record in the past.

Let's support his fight for free enterprise against Fabian socialism and the ADA.

Let's have an end to adolescent name calling and yellow politics in California. Americans judge a man by what he does—not the dirty names hurled at him by his enemies.

[From column of Oct. 18, 1962]

"STRAUSSING" A POINT

(By George Todt)

"The Soviets have undoubtedly increased their firepower." Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, "Men and Decisions."

Not long ago I was the guest of my friend, Rabbi Edgar F. Magnin, at the beautiful Wilshire Boulevard Temple in Los Angeles, having come to listen to a great American I have long admired for his vast intelligence and unassuming modesty—Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, former head of the Atomic Energy Commission during the previous administration.

This was the first lecture of the 1962 series at the temple forum, chairmaned by Dr. Magnin and moderated by Rabbi Maxwell H. Dubin. It was a masterpiece of lucidity and reason. I was thrilled.

Strauss was formerly a personal secretary to ex-President Herbert C. Hoover, Sr., with whom he has maintained a close friendship over the years, and possesses the same kind of toughminded, solid intellect.

DEVELOPED HYDROGEN

This is the man who, along with Dr. Edward Teller, realistically insisted we develop our own hydrogen weapon to deter the predatory and aggressive Soviet Union.

This great American patriot was never taken in by Red lies or fraudulent deceit. He counseled strength for us at all times, never appeasement of any kind. Had we listened to him more than his myopic critics, the United States might not be in such a precarious position now.

The admiral has recently authored a new book called "Men and Decisions" (Doubleday & Co., Garden City, N.Y., $6.95) which ought to be "must" reading for those concerned about our threatening cold war today.

In his chapter on "Nuclear Tests, Fallout, and World Opinion," Strauss points out correctly that the Soviet Union has increased her relative firepower at our gullible expense—during the so-called moratorium.

Our opponents in the Kremlin cheated on us from the beginning. Those experts who told us there was relatively little to be gained by further testing were shown to have been dreadfully wrong. For the Reds came up eventually with bigger and better bangs than we now possess.

A story in the unusually reliable U.S. News & World Report on page 52 of the October 22 issue describes how Russia presently is pushing her lead in terror weapons. She is building "statebuster" giant bombs.

Informed experts have indicated the ultimate Soviet aim is to destroy America with a single salvo of giant bombs. How shall we react to this menace?

INSURE SAFETY

As is invariably the case, we learned, to our sorrow, that the atheistic—and thereby completely amoral—Soviet leadership had taken us for a nuclear test suspension ride. What did we do?

"President Eisenhower," writes Strauss, "his patience worn thin, had reached the decision that, our freedom to test having been resumed, we should no longer delay actual testing, though not in the atmosphere. Had the result of the 1960 election been otherwise, we would have done so at once, since Mr. (Richard M.) Nixon was in accord with this policy.

"In the circumstances, however, the President did not feel it appropriate to confront his successor with a decision which would have tied his hands after he took office."

Strauss' conclusion: World opinion is nebulous; our job is to insure the safety of the United States.

FREEDOM DOCUMENTS

(By George Todt)

"For the support of this declaration, with firm reliance on the protection of the Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other, our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." (Declaration of Independence.)

Not long ago I attended an outstanding Documents of Freedom luncheon in Los Angeles that was both instructive and interesting to me.

The sponsoring organization, called Freedom Documents Foundation, is a nonprofit nonpolitical, nonsectarian group whose president is Dan R. Coletti. Founder is listed as Dr. Anthony Butkovich. Offices are located at 8693 Wilshire Boulevard in Beverly Hills.

Some of the men and women who have been outstanding in their support of this organization: George R. Hearst, Jr., Norman Chandler, Walter Knott, Samuel Goldwyn, Patrick Frawley, Y. Frank Freeman, Allen Schaak, John R. Inderrieden, George H. Rudd, Conrad Hilton, Edward S. Shattuck, Paul Williams, Vinnie Simpson, Frances Smith, Marian Buckler, Ivy Baker Priest Stevens, and Harold J. Smith.

THE OBJECTIVE

Others include five of the most prominent educators in the Southland—the Very Reverend Charles S. Casasa, S.J., president of Loyola University, Dr. Arthur Coons, president of Occidental College, Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, president of U.C.L.A., Dr. Paul S. Smith, president of Whittier College, and Dr. Norman Topping, president of U.S.C.

The objective of the F.D.F. is to place "Freedom Documents Brochure" in every requesting hand free of charge.

This handsomely embossed brochure contains the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the Monroe Doctrine, the Gettysburg Address, and the Star-Spangled Banner.

It is hoped to put 7 million of these brochures into hands that request them the first year of operation—25 million in 3 years.

SEVEN MILLION A YEAR

Those who desire a brochure may request it by writing or phoning the Freedom Documents Foundation. There is no charge.

In order to sustain this worthwhile program, contributions are asked from industry, individuals, and private sources that can afford it. Also other foundations and organizations.

Distribution of the brochures will be accomplished through industry to employees, schools to students, clubs to members, and professional people to clients. Individuals will give to friends.

In these times of dread and doubt, this wholesome drive to restore our patriotic ideals comes at a needed hour. Let's help it.

NOT HOT AIR

The master of ceremonies at the luncheon was affable George Murphy, whose quiet but effective patriotism I have long admired.

"People are worried about some of the past bad judgments of the last 15 years," said Murphy. "The United Nations has just opened in New York—and I am afraid its news is going to be as dismal as before."

After a brilliant address by Mrs. Ivy Baker Priest Stevens, George Murphy and I discussed his quotation. We agreed that the U.N. has received too much of the credit for deterring World War III—when the lion's share of the credit ought to go to the great Strategic Air Command.

It's air power—not the power of hot air—that has preserved us.

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF LAND AND WATER

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on January 16, 1963, the South Dakota Reclamation and Water Development Association held its silver anniversary conference at Pierre, S. Dak. The conference was cosponsored by the South Dakota Soil and Water Conservation Committee, the South Dakota Water Resources Commission, and the Oahe Conservancy Subdistrict, and had as its theme "Hats Off to the Past; Coats Off to the Future; Life Begins at 25."

This conference represented a high point in cooperation for resource conservation and development in South Dakota. This point was made well by Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service and a native South Dakotan, when he addressed the conference. Said Mr. Williams:

Today more and more people realize that city conservation problems and farm conservation problems are not separate and distinct problems. They are so interrelated that one can scarcely tell where a rural conservation problem leaves off and an urban conservation problem begins.

Mr. Williams also described new tools for resource development which are provided in the 1962 Food and Agriculture Act enacted by the 87th Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Administrator Williams' address be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNSCRAMBLING THE OMELET

(Address by D. A. Williams, Administrator, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at meeting of South Dakota Reclamation and Water Development Association, Pierre, S. Dak., January 16, 1963)

It's always good to come home to South Dakota. And it's a special pleasure to help you observe the silver anniversary of your organization and to share the luncheon platform with Dean Bentley, of South Dakota State College, my alma mater.

I like your theme, first called to my attention in a letter from your secretary, Ray Lund. There's a world of meaning in "Hats Off to the Past; Coats Off to the Future; Life Begins at 25." So much meaning, in fact, that it could be the subject of a series of meetings, not just one, or the text for a series of sermons. The title of this talk, "Unscrambling the Omelet," although I'm not positive what it means, was selected by the inventive Ray Lund also.

As many of you know, the year just ended was also the 25th anniversary of the soil conservation district movement, which began in 1937. Your organization and soil conservation districts have much in common. Your accomplishments during the past quarter century are many and significant. But you rightly prefer to salute the past rather than dwell on it, and to take off your coats for the much bigger and even more important job that lies ahead.

I would remind you of another anniversary in the year just ended—the 100th anniversary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Here, too, we cannot afford to dwell on the accomplishments of a century, great as they are. Rather, we must stir ourselves to cope with tremendous new challenges brought about by our magnificent technological advances, rapidly expanding population, increasing urbanization, and shifting land use patterns—all of which combine to place new and competing demands on our remaining land and water resources, which are the very foundation of our economy and our standard of living.

Our land and water resources are vital national assets. How we conserve, develop, and manage these natural resources will affect our economic growth, the strength of our Nation, and our long-run status in world affairs.

I'm pleased to note that joining your organization this year in sponsoring this meeting are the South Dakota Soil and Water Conservation Committee, the South Dakota Water Resources Commission, and the Oahe Conservancy Subdistrict. This is highly significant. It indicates you are fully aware of the fact that the basic resources of land and water serve all the people of the Nation. It indicates you thoroughly understand that land and water problems are of increasing concern to both farm and nonfarm people. It indicates you realize that carefully planned programs to satisfy both rural and urban needs are essential.

The interrelationship between farm and nonfarm interests in resource conservation, although a truism from the beginning, has come to be recognized only in recent years.

Less than 30 years ago, when our present-day soil and water conservation program began, it won public acceptance because a majority of the people believed it to be necessary and desirable.

Soil and water conservation technical and other assistance on farm and ranch lands quickly won the overwhelming support of farmers and ranchers.

The problems were problems they could see, problems that affected their operations. And corrective measures, when applied, provided visible and almost immediate tangible benefits to them.

Urban people and their legislative representatives supported the so-called farm soil and water conservation program for perhaps the same reasons they support other public programs: that they benefited a segment of our society. But the truth is, not many city people or their representatives really understood that they themselves were also beneficiaries.

By the same token, reclamation and flood control and public power projects generally found their greatest support among the city people and business and industrial leaders. They could identify themselves with these projects readily. They could see great advantages through business and industrial growth resulting from water storage, flood control, and power development. Agriculture's identification with these types of conservation projects was nowhere nearly as complete as it was with soil and water conservation activities such as those carried on through soil and water conservation districts.

Today, as you are demonstrating so well here, more and more people realize that city conservation problems and farm conservation problems are not separate and distinct problems. They are so interrelated that one can scarcely tell where a rural conservation problem leaves off and an urban conservation problem begins.

We know that just about all of our water falls on the land, for less than 2 percent of the Nation's total area is in lakes or streams, and that three-fourths of this land on which all our rain and snow falls is in private ownership and 60 percent is in farms and ranches. Management, use, manipulation, and development of our water resource, therefore, begins largely on the privately owned lands.

This is the water that grows our crops, provide much of our power. This is the water that carries away soil through surface runoff, that sweeps into streams and lakes where it creates additional conservation problems. This is the water that serves our cities and our industries. This is the water that floods our valleys and our towns and cities. This is the water that provides all our water-based recreation, our fishing, boating, and swimming. This is the water that

provides much of our power. This is the water that feeds our navigable streams.

What more evidence do we need to prove that land and water go hand in hand? That no piece of land is an island, apart from all the land? That no cloudburst or snowstorm is restricted in its effect to the area in which it occurs? Our growing awareness of the interlocking, interdependence of land and water resources and of rural and urban interests in developing and protecting those resources has come about, I think, in several almost simultaneous phases.

One of these is the greatly increasing nonagricultural use of land to provide space for our expanding population in which to live, to work, and to play. These new users of land almost immediately become involved with firsthand conservation responsibilities. The developer of a housing area, the builder of a factory, and proprietor of a golf course—in fact, every land user in city, suburb or rural area—is and must be concerned with the soils and the water behavior at his particular site.

More widespread understanding of the watershed approach is another reason for our improved attitude toward orderly development and management of our renewable natural resources.

Like every other country, the United States is physically a nation of watersheds. Our longest rivers and their tributaries drain large areas. These areas are usually called river basins or drainage basins. Each major river basin is divided into several lesser watersheds, and each of these, in turn, is subdivided progressively into smaller and smaller watersheds down to those where surface waters first begin to collect.

We have come to realize that no two watersheds are exactly alike, that each one is an intricate, complete unit of nature governed by natural principles that men can modify but never abolish or ignore.

We have learned that action taken anywhere in a watershed that affects one resource will inevitably affect other resources. The chains of cause and effect in a watershed are numerous, long, and far reaching We know that efforts to use, conserve, and develop renewable natural resources without regard for watersheds and natural principles are certain to be costly and are likely to fail.

In addition, we have come to realize that our land and water resources can serve present and future needs of all interests only through application of the principle of multiple use. When storing water, for example, wherever feasible we should provide for all possible uses of an irreplaceable site instead of only a single use. Water supply, flood control, recreation, fish and wildlife, industrial development, irrigation—these are a few of the use combinations possible under the multipurpose principle.

Perhaps most important, in the development of our present enlightened attitude, is the conviction that the ideal arrangement for resource development is a cooperative one involving the community, the State, and, where necessary, the Federal Government.

This three-way partnership has been successfully demonstrated for 25 years in soil conservation districts. Here the State provides legislation, some funds, and the guidance of a State committee. Here the local people themselves organize for conservation work, select their own unpaid leaders, develop their own program. Here the Federal Government, when asked, provides technical assistance through the Soil Conservation Service, and various other kinds of assistance, education, cost-sharing, and credit through other programs.

The soil conservation district belongs to the local people. They run the show. State and Federal agencies help them carry out their program.

These same principles are the heart of the small watershed program, which was authorized by the Congress in 1954 as the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. This provides that a watershed project must be initiated by a legally responsible local organization, which is responsible for developing a work plan, carrying it out, and operating and maintaining the project when completed. The local organization must share in the cost. The Federal Government through the Soil Conservation Service provides technical, cost-sharing and credit assistance.

I would say that today we are better prepared to tackle our renewable natural resource problems than at any time in our history. This is so because we have developed a better public understanding of how to do the job, as I have tried to outline.

This is so because we have progressive State and Federal legislative tools and programs that provide for coordinated, long-range planning involving every segment and interest of our society.

South Dakota's legislators have provided you with tools designed to fit many conservation needs and objectives, and combinations of needs and objectives.

You have a soil conservation districts law and 67 active districts operating under that law. You have provided for watershed districts, which can be organized under the wing, at the beginning, of soil conservation district supervisors but thereafter operate independently.

A more recent legislative tool is the Conservancy Act, which provides for conservancy subdistricts. These subdistricts, which can cover larger areas than other special-purpose districts, have some authorities not granted in other legislative acts—authorities that can contribute greatly to coordinated resource development programs generated by soil conservation districts, watershed districts, and irrigation and drainage districts.

A splendid example of land and water resource planning on a long-range, multiple-purpose, coordinated basis is the cooperative study just being launched in the James River Basin and the Missouri River eastern tributaries that are in the Oahe conservancy subdistrict.

This broad water resources study, which is scheduled for intensive effort in the 1963, 1964, and 1965 fiscal years, is just being launched by the U.S. Department of Agriculture cooperating with the South Dakota Water Resources Commission and the Oahe conservancy subdistrict. The Soil Conservation Service, Economic Research Service, and Forest Service are the USDA agencies involved. The planning party to conduct the study is now being set up under Mr. Steve Kortan's direction.

The objectives of the cooperative study are:

1. To inventory the problems associated with water and related resources and how these might be solved through a coordinated program for land and water resource development under existing authorities, and also point out the need for additional authorities.

2. To document information regarding multiple use of water and land resources and management that will provide a basis for a more effective means of coordinating USDA programs for watershed protection, flood prevention, agricultural water management, and national forest administration, with related activities of local, State, and other Federal agencies.

3. To prepare information that will provide a means for pursuing feasible projects under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended.

Principal features of the study will include the following:

1. Soil resources. This will include an appraisal of the hazards of soil uses under various types of management.

2. Present and future land use. This will include an inventory of the ways to improve land management, including land treatment practices and conversion of land to other uses.

3. Flood damage. This will be recorded by stream for specified watersheds as caused by overflow, ponding, sedimentation, scour and streambank erosion.

4. Drought damage. Its impact on the area.

5. Present and past use of surface water. This will include management of surface waters, stream flows, drainage from agricultural lands, water storage, and water rights.

6. Ground water conditions. As they relate to irrigation water return flow, drainage, recharge, and availability of ground water supplies.

7. Proposed use of Missouri River water for irrigation projects now planned. This will include improvements in present irrigation on individual farms and use of water for projects now planned.

8. Industrial and municipal use of water. This will include present use and availability of small watershed supplies for industries and municipalities.

9. Recreational facilities. This will include the kinds and extent of proposed recreational areas in small watersheds and on individual farms.

10. Economic effect of the possible solutions in the basin and tributary areas, the State, Missouri Basin, and the Nation.

This study can pave the way, it seems to me, for significant and far-reaching resource developments that will have tremendous impact on the future of South Dakota. It can result in improvement of water supplies for agriculture and industry. It can result in acceleration of small watershed projects and their multiple purpose benefits of flood prevention, agricultural water management, including irrigation, recreation and wildlife, and industrial and municipal water supply.

Looking ahead, it is easy to visualize that conservancy subdistricts, such as your Oahe subdistrict, with their greater authority under State law, can do contracting and carry on operations and maintenance work for several small watershed projects more efficiently and economically than each local organization could do alone. The conservancy subdistricts could well become the focal point for area redevelopment projects and rural areas development.

South Dakota has indeed been alert to its resource legislative needs, and so has the Congress of the United States.

The Department of Agriculture, in the 1962 Food and Agriculture Act, received some new authorities that will be helpful in the James River Basin study and in rural areas development and soil and water conservation work everywhere. I will mention some of them briefly.

The small watershed program, Public Law 566, was amended so it is now possible for the Soil Conservation Service to provide cost-sharing for water-based recreational developments in watershed projects. Funds can be advanced to acquire critical sites for water impoundments. Funds can be advanced to provide municipal and industrial water supply for future use, with repayment by the local organization deferred up to 10 years.

The Congress also authorized changes in the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act which will permit resource conservation and development projects. When funds are provided, such projects may be established in representative areas of the country. They would, like Public Law 566 projects, be locally initiated and sponsored. They would provide for carrying out a program of land conservation and land use in an area where acceleration of the present conservation activities plus the use of new authorities would provide additional economic opportunities to the people. SCS will have the leadership of this program.

The Congress also authorized a cropland conversion program that provides for long-range land-use adjustment programs at National, State, and county levels. It authorizes, when funds are available, agreements up to 10 years with individual landowners for developing land-use adjustment programs including conversion of presently unneeded or unsuitable croplands to other uses, such as grass or trees. Such long-term agreements with individual farmers and ranchers are to be based on conservation plans developed through soil conservation districts with SCS technical help. This program will be headed by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

Congress provided for technical, cost-sharing, and credit assistance in establishing income-producing recreation enterprises on farm and ranch land.

The other new tool provided by the Congress is a rural renewal program under which projects can be developed locally that are aimed at relieving underemployment, strengthening family farming, and developing natural resources to assure permanence of the economic gains achieved. The program will be handled by the Farmers Home Administration.

Come spring, it will be 28 years since I began my professional career in the Soil Conservation Service, almost immediately after it became a permanent agency of Government. I started as a CCC camp superintendent at Presho, S. Dak., after having worked for the State highway department and doing engineering work for a private company.

Those of us who have worked in this field together for so long have seen the concept of soil and water conservation and land use broaden many times. We have seen many improvements and changes and additions.

But the basic principles have never changed. And I do not think they ever will.

The individual farmer or rancher, in adopting a conservation plan, bases it on an inventory of his land and its capability for use. He chooses his land use by fields. He applies and maintains the treatment and practices required to make each use permanently safe and productive.

A small watershed project, or a conservancy subdistrict program, or a James River Basin study, is largely an extension of a farm or ranch conservation plan, on a larger scale, to a big area of land.

That is oversimplified, to be sure, but in principle I would stand by it. The main point is that most of us are land users in one way or another. When we all understand that each handful of soil, each raindrop, and each piece of land is intimately related one to another; when we are all armed with our present-day conservation know-how—then indeed we will have the true and lasting answers to our natural resource problems.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS FOOD RESOURCES CONFERENCE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, during the week of May 12–17, a successful, little publicized conference was held in Quito, Ecuador. Its purpose was to generate better understanding and appreciation of the role which food and agriculture can play in raising standards of life in our hemisphere.

My successor as Director of the U.S. food-for-peace program, Mr. Richard Reuter, with the cooperation of AID Director David Bell and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, arranged for the conference of U.S. agricultural attachés, food for peace, and rural development officers in Latin America and their Washington associates.

Mr. Reuter, who provided brilliant leadership as the Director of CARE for many years, is now applying his great talent effectively in directing the Nation's food-for-peace effort. The Quito Conference is an example of the kind of imaginative, forward-looking efforts he has initiated in utilizing U.S. agricultural abundance and productive know-how as instruments of development and peace.

I ask unanimous consent that the White House press release describing the purpose of the Quito Conference be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
OFFICE OF THE PRESS SECRETARY,
May 4, 1963.

The President announced today that Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman; AID Administrator David Bell; the U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress, Teodoro Moscoso; and the White House Special Assistant for Food for Peace, Richard W. Reuter, will open and attend a 6-day Alliance for Progress Food Resources Conference in Quito, Ecuador, May 12–17.

"U.S. food resources are already making a major contribution to the Alliance for Progress," the President stated. "Mr. Reuter—with the cooperation of the Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development—has arranged the Quito Conference to bring together U.S. agricultural attachés and AID Food for Peace and Rural Development officers in Latin America with their Washington counterparts to seek greater and more effective use of U.S. food resources and agricultural technology in Latin American economic and social development programs."

"Our agricultural abundance offers the United States a unique opportunity in history," the President said, "to share our food resources with the hungry of the world, and to share our agricultural productivity know-how with the farmers of the developing countries. In this sharing, U.S. agriculture can be one of the strongest weapons in the struggle of free men for prosperity and security. This is the challenge of our food-for-peace program, and the goal of the Quito Conference."

U.S. food-for-peace programs are currently contributing to the feeding of more than 8 million children of school age in Latin America. Hundreds of thousands of people in Latin America have received emergency food relief following drought or catastrophe. Food for work programs are using U.S. food as supplementary wages. U.S. firms are using Cooley loans of local currencies generated by the sale of Public Law 480 commodities to invest in the future of Latin America. In addition, U.S. food is sold for local currencies which are being used to finance schools, houses, irrigation projects, student exchange programs and a long list of economic development activities in our neighbor republics to the south.

WILL THIS CONGRESS ACT TO END THE CRISIS IN GOLD MINING?

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have discussed on several occasions in this session the very great problems facing the gold-mining industry in my State. I have joined in sponsoring new legislation to solve some of these problems. Recently I received from Mr. A. G. Roe, of Canton, S. Dak., an interesting statement bearing on these problems which he prepared with the help of Messrs. Earl and Howard Amundson. I feel that this statement commends itself to the attention of everyone concerned with the future of one of America's vital industries and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

WILL THIS CONGRESS ACT TO END THE CRISIS IN GOLD MINING?

In the Black Hills of South Dakota, near Deadwood in the Whitewood Canyon, the New Era Mining Co. is installing a floating dredge. The creek gravel will be excavated by a large dragline and will be fed to the dredge at the rate of 200 cubic yards per hour.

The gold in the gravel will be concentrated with mineral jigs installed on the dredge. The depth of the gravel deposit varies from 35 to 85 feet.

Sand and rock products will also be produced as a by-product of the dredging operations. The gold in the gravel has been concentrated by streamflow, and is the result of the disintegration of the gold-bearing mountain upstream from the canyon.

The installation of this machinery has been very costly. The price of gold at $35 per ounce is the same in 1963 as it was in 1934. Based on the 1934 cost index, the price of gold should be $105 per ounce.

No other industry in the country is compelled to sell its product at the price that prevailed on January 31, 1934. Our greatest and most cherished mineral has been plagued with horse-and-buggy prices and the cart is now before the horse. Ninety-five percent of the gold mines are closed due to low prices and our Government must enact legislation to aid our ailing mining industry. The low price of $35 per ounce is a roadblock to the progress of mining and a burden on long-range planning. Production of gold has decreased in the United States, Canada, and Alaska to the smallest amount in 70 years. Gold is a critical material used in space exploration and other vital pursuits.

It is unrealistic to expect gold miners to be able to continue in operation when they can receive only 1934 prices for their product.

Compare the prices of commodities to the present price of gold:

	1934	1962	Percent increase in price
Bread	$0.07	$0.23	201.42
Potatoes	.27	.87	223.70
Coffee	.19	.71	274.70
Chevrolet	625.00	2,700.00	284.00
Electric iron	1.95	7.77	298.45
Calf liver	.17	1.39	717.65

The above prices and percentage increases prove the imbalance.

This is another Congress. It has a new opportunity to take steps to correct the inequities which plague the mining industry.

Under our supposedly free enterprise system, gold is the only commodity compelled to sell at a price established 30 years ago, and compelled to limit its sales to one purchaser, the Government.

Gold has never been unwanted as a medium of exchange and its value is based on sound, logical considerations. Gold has a high exchange value, cannot be counterfeited, will not deteriorate, and is suited for use as a monetary unit. Historically, gold has been the king of all metals. The Government treats silver well; why not gold?

It is interesting to note that there are eight gold-producing States—California, Nevada, Colorado, Utah, Arizona, Montana, Alaska and, of course, South Dakota. In South

Dakota is located the largest gold industry; namely, the Homestake Mine.

Is it not about time the Interior Department viewed gold in the same way it does silver, by stressing its industrial aspects as well as it monetary uses? It might be well if the Treasury and the Interior Departments got together and studied the plight of the gold industry, and also the dwindling gold supply, in order that some equitable solution for our gold mining industry might be found. This is one of the most flagrant injustices of which our Government has been guilty, and the unfortunate fact is that neither the Republicans nor the Democrats have had the vision, enterprise, or interest to try to do something about gold.

The price of silver has been subject to wide fluctuations. The average price in 1915 was 49.7 cents an ounce; 4 years later it rose to $1.11. A 100 years ago silver stood at $1.35 and then began a long-term decline that reached a low of 27.9 cents in 1932. Last month the average price of silver on the New York market was $1.27 and, due to the rise in price, there has been a substantial rise in silver production. In Montana, Arizona, and Idaho, industrial consumption continues to increase and a larger quantity was used in coinage last year. The output in 1962 was estimated at $38.8 million compared with $32.8 in 1961. The Government treats silver well—why not gold?

In 1934 the Congress passed the Silver Purchase Act, directing the Treasury to buy silver until its silver stock equaled one-third the value of the gold stock or until the market price of silver reached $1.29. This provided an important subsidy to domestic silver producers.

On November 28, 1961, President Kennedy directed the Treasury to stop selling silver and to start withdrawing its $5 and $10 silver certificates for replacement by Federal Reserve notes of the same denomination. This directive released silver from a pegged price and put it on a free-market basis. Its price increased immediately.

If an equitable program is brought to the floor of Congress—whether to raise the price of gold, provide a subsidy, or a depletion allowance—it should be supported by our Senators and Representatives, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the entire country. In dealing with gold, we deal with matters that are vital to the welfare of the entire Nation and would provide a great stimulus to the economy.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF MUTUAL IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in this year marking the 175th anniversary of the Constitution's ratification, I consider it not unseemly to advert to the fact that the preamble sets forth among the major reasons for our nationhood the promotion of "the general welfare."

Congress, of course, can and has acted since its inception to implement that objective, but, in the last analysis, the efficacy of its measures always depended on the degree of cooperation received from honest, law-abiding citizens.

This is no novel doctrine. We are empowered to "provide for the common defense" and have authorized drafting men into the Armed Forces, but should those men refuse to fight, the common defense disintegrates and the power becomes an empty one. Similarly with the establishment of justice, if public support is denied the forces of law and order, how can true justice prevail.

In these halls we have been preoccupied with many matters affecting the general welfare from conservation of natural resources and concern over future water supplies to safer regulations for approving new drugs and questionable practices in food packaging.

On our doorsteps here, in our home States and communities now awaits a far more grave problem—the shocking erosion in the country's most priceless of all resources. I speak of our youth.

As my eminent colleagues are aware, the problem has many aspects—juvenile delinquency, school dropouts, inadequate educational facilities, limited job opportunities, to mention a few, but no listing can minimize the ominous character of the problem.

The Biblical prophet, Joel, wrote:

Your young men shall dream dreams.

And the men who made our Revolution a success were relatively young men who had dreamt dreams. So, too, was the case of so many men and women who added luster to our national prestige thereafter.

Let us remember, for instance, that great inventive genius, Thomas A. Edison, had the benefit of only 3 months formal schooling. He proved such a slow learner he had to be withdrawn from classes and what education he then received was at home from his mother. Henry Ford's formal schooling ended when he was 15 but the next year found him a machinist apprentice in that city linked with his name, Detroit.

One of our earliest literary lights, Washington Irving, began writing for publication at the age of 19. The noted novelist and historian, James Fenimore Cooper, was expelled from college when 15. Mark Twain began his mastery of words as a printer's apprentice at only 12. The Negro agricultural genius, George Washington Carver, was illiterate until he was 20 when the educational opportunity came his way which started him on his life's work.

At the outset, I spoke of the cooperation of law-abiding citizens as essential aid in furthering national objectives. That takes us away from Washington to State and community levels. The "common defense," for example, has had a better posture because, beside the regular forces, we had in existence the State militias, later the National Guard, composed of freely enlisted personnel. Many battle honors have these units won in the Nation's wars.

Time and again, too, citizens committees have done yeoman's service to reestablish justice by investigating on their own initiative and exposing the corrupt machinations of those who were subverting it for greedy selfish ends. As for promoting the "general welfare" of those they could reach, the work of private organizations or associations has a long and laudable history.

My expressed concern about the youth problem is on the record. Now I would speak to you about a body which has been working on it and with very tangible evidence to show for achievement.

In June there will convene in Salt Lake City some 25,000 youthful leaders of the Mutual Improvement Associations, which have a total membership of approximately 300,000 throughout the United States. The purpose of the gathering is to discuss programs aimed at bettering the lives of Mutual Improvement Association members and thus raise both their standards of citizenship and their ideals as potential future leaders on the American scene. Moral and physical fitness, talent and cultural development, as well as spiritual growth for potential future civic leadership are involved.

Although an auxiliary of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Mutual Improvement Association welcomes young people of other religious affiliations to participate in a variety of its activities.

President David O. McKay of the Latter-day Saints Church declares: "the greatest asset of a nation is its children," and he makes that statement without qualification as to the creed they may profess.

The coming Salt Lake City conference, incidentally, will mark the 50th anniversary of the church's decision to sponsor the promotion of Boy Scout membership by youngsters in its congregation. Mormon missioners in Great Britain were so impressed by the potential of the Scout movement, founded there in 1908 to inculcate the essentials of good citizenship, that their reports led church leaders to make this decision in 1913, 3 years after the first pioneer Scout troops began organizing in the United States.

Also a part of the conference will be the Golden Bee Jubilee marking the first 50 years of the famous Beehive program for girls 12 to 13 years of age—counterpart unit within Mutual Improvement Association of the Scout troops for boys.

Mutual Improvement Association may in all honesty be described as a juvenile grassroots product. It began on the initiative of young people interested in developing their own capabilities and sensible of the fact that the exchange of mutual help would facilitate that end. They appear to have been conscious, too, of the valuable stimulus which stems from healthy competition or rivalry and, being children, they provided for due recreation.

In educational terms, we have figures today which reflect some of the dividends that have accrued. In percentage of population, aged 25 years and over, with at least 4 years of high school, Utah is the Union's No. 1 State with 55.8 percent. The national average is 41.1 percent.

For the same population percentage with at least 4 years of college, Utah stands No. 2 with 10.2 percent, trailing first-place Colorado by the narrow margin of one-half of 1 percent. The national average is 7.7 percent.

As for the average number of school years completed by persons 25 or older, Utah can claim No. 1 place again with 12.2 years, as compared with 10.6 for the Nation as a whole.

There is no question in my mind that the appreciation of the worth of knowledge, so basic to the Mutual Improvement Association program, has been greatly instrumental in helping to compile these educational records. Of course, we have some extremely brilliant youngsters at

one end of the spectrum and those with very limited gifts at the other. I think being thrown together regularly in association benefits both, and probably has been responsible for enabling more than one poor scholar to keep his or her head above water, so to speak. Children are imitative and also one child may often learn from another something a teacher failed to get him to understand. I am not trying to infer that Mutual Improvement Association might have saved someone like Thomas A. Edison from being a dropout. I do say that for the imitative process to exert its best influence and for child-to-child communication to have really sustained opportunity, we benefit from a regular association of our young people in their own extracurricular programs, particularly when compared with the dubious yield which comes from their daily dispersal after school hours when they are prone to go their own ways routinely.

Among my colleagues here on Capitol Hill I know of no one yet who has regarded the receipt of well-earned commendation and praise as an excuse for flagging in his or her efforts to discharge the responsibilities of office as ably as possible. On the contrary, the reaction invariably has been an intensification of effort to do an abler job. A merited reputation, once recognized, can be a terrific driving force; a sincere individual is rarely content just to live up to it, the urge is to enhance it.

With that thought, I would suggest it would be a most laudable act on the part of this august body to salute the coming Mutual Improvement Association conference for what the organization has accomplished in the past, along with well wishes for the continuing success of its future endeavors to improve the lives of its young members mentally, morally, and physically in the interests of making them tomorrow's better citizens.

Be assured, such an act on our part will not immobilize the Mutual Improvement Association leaders into a complacent lethargy. If anything, it will fire a burning zeal to sally forth as if challenged to outdo anything Mutual Improvement Association already has done. And it may well be that the association's example will spur the formation of other such groups, seeking to emulate its work. A chain reaction of that order could be a boon for our young people across the land, and that we woud welcome.

President Kennedy, in his recent speech at Vanderbilt University, laid great stress on our crying need in these troubled times for educated, responsible citizens.

An American of this stamp—

He said at one point—

knows that only an educated and informed people will be a free people—that the ignorance of one voter in a democracy impairs the security of all—and that if we can, as Jefferson put it, "enlighten the people generally, tyranny and oppressions of mind and body will vanish, like evil spirits at the dawn of day."

Mutual Improvement Association is striving to give us such educated, responsible citizens.

Gentlemen, my appreciative thanks for your indulgence.

SOVIET OIL PIPELINE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at this time I would like to comment further on a topic which I described in some detail on May 23 of this year. At that time I underscored the need for unity among NATO members in relation to their embargo on shipments of oil pipelines to the Soviet Union. Since then, a number of newspapers and journals have carried excellent stories pointing out the importance of this embargo.

One of these articles appeared in the Sunday, May 26, edition of the New York Times. Mr. Seymour Topping, the author, makes one observation that is worth special mention. Describing the Soviet Union's utilization of oil pipelines, he says:

The plans also include the construction of oil pipelines to Baltic and Black Sea ports that would make Soviet oil more competitive with the products of Western oil companies.

Mr. President, if the embargo on oil pipe is disregarded by some Western nations, and if, as a consequence, quantities of such pipe are sold to the Soviet Union, the Western World would not only enhance the threat to its political security but would contribute to its own economic dislocation as well. These possibilities reveal that a common Western front is indeed imperative.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Topping's perceptive article be printed in the RECORD.

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

EMBARGO SLOWS DOWN SOVIET PIPELINE—MOSCOW NEEDS BIG INCH PIPE BUT KHRUSHCHEV FINDS COMFORT IN ALLIED DISSENSION OVER SALE

(By Seymour Topping)

Moscow, May 25.—The construction of a giant sytsem of oil and gas pipelines in Eastern Europe has been slowed by a Western embargo on the export of "big inch" pipe to the Soviet Union.

To expedite completion of the system, which would yield enormous economic and strategic benefits to the Soviet bloc, Moscow had been importing large diameter pipe, most of it 40 inches, from the West and Japan.

After flowing to the Soviet Union for about 3 years, the supply of this pipe abruptly was cut off last year. In November, the council of the North Atlantic Alliance at the request of the United States recommended to member nations and friendly countries that an embargo be imposed on further shipments to the Soviet Union. Large diameter pipe was classified as strategic and as capable of adding to the Soviet military potential.

About a million tons of 40-inch pipe was needed originally for the main trunks of the great pipelines.

DISSENSION CITED

While the Soviet Union still needs more pipe, the Kremlin may now feel that this embargo is not such a misfortune considering all the dissension it has stirred in the West on the question of whether the pipe should be sold to the Soviet Union. Premier Khrushchev recently told Berthold Beitz, general manager of Western Germany's Krupp industrial firms that he did not intend to make any more purchases in the West and that the Russians were content to produce their own pipe.

Sanguine as Mr. Khrushchev appears to be about the Soviet capacity to turn out large diameter pipe as needed, there is little doubt that Moscow would prefer to be able to speed construction through imports.

The issue of whether to sell or not to sell also remains a hot one among the Western Allies. A spokesman of the West German Foreign Office warned this week that if British firms sold pipe to Russians, shipments would not be permitted to pass through West Germany. The controversy has raised questions that are fundamental both to relations among the Western Powers and to future East-West commercial ties. Some of them were discussed in Ottawa this week at the ministerial meeting of the Atlantic Council.

TRADE AGREEMENT

A dispute has been smoldering for years between the United States and some other Western countries, notably Britain, about agreed lists of strategic goods embargoed for shipment to Soviet-bloc countries and Communist China. Hungry for trade, Britain has favored reducing these lists. There is considerable sentiment in business circles in many countries to have the lists confined to goods of obvious military utility.

The United States has managed to hold the line with the argument that the lists of strategic goods cannot be cut substantially as long as the Soviet Union remains dedicated to world communism and the destruction of Western institutions. In an age when the cold war is being fought out with economic and well as military, political, and propaganda weapons, the U.S. definition of "strategic" covers a broad category.

BRITISH VIEW

British officials have argued privately that the present broad nature of embargo may be doing more harm than good. The Western nations need more trade and denying the Russians industrial equipment only encourages them to manufacture it themselves.

The big diameter oil line pipe became a test case in the strategic embargo debate because it fell into a marginal category. It was declared strategic as an afterthought last November. Moscow says that the U.S. recommendation was made because it became obvious that Soviet oil was becoming more competitive on the world markets.

BRITISH COMPETITION

When West Germany, under U.S. prodding, reluctantly canceled Soviet orders for 163,000 tons of pipe, Moscow threatened to sue. The problem came up at this week's Ottawa meeting because the West Germans became concerned that Moscow was negotiating to buy the pipe from British firms. Earlier, the British Government had said that under existing legislation it could not compel British businessmen to heed the NATO recommendation.

Among the nervous onlookers were Italy and Japan, which had agreed to stand by the embargo despite protests from their businessmen who were being teased by Soviet orders.

The uproar stemmed immediately from two Soviet pipeline projects which are well advanced.

One is a 1,500-mile line from Bukhara in Central Asia which is to provide gas for heavy industries in the Ural regions.

The other system is the 2,500-mile Friendship pipeline to link the big oil field near the Volga in the Kuibyshev region with refineries in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and East Germany. The line is projected to meet much of the needs of the satellites, especially the big chemical industry under construction in East Germany.

Soviet officials say both lines will be completed in 1963. After the West Germans

canceled their contracts, Moscow began constructing new mills and converting others to the production of 40-inch pipe. The program has been spurred by an intensive propaganda campaign calling for greater efforts to defeat imperialist meddlers.

New mills that Moscow reports having put into operation since March are said to be able to produce hundreds of kilometers of pipe a year. This is an indicated capacity of at least 100,000 tons a year. It has seemed reasonably certain that, with or without foreign imports, Moscow would be able to complete the two projects next year at the latest.

FUTURE NEEDS

However, the big inch pipe issue will not be dead then. The Soviet Union has an open-end need for pipe to complete a giant, overall system of oil and gas pipelines extending to every major region of the country. Moscow hopes to convert the economy to one in which oil and natural gas would make up about two-thirds of all fuels consumed. Coal is now the dominant fuel.

The plans also include the construction of oil pipelines to Baltic and Black Sea ports that would make Soviet oil more competitive with the products of Western oil companies. Eventually, a line being constructed to Irkutsk in Siberia might be extended to Nakhodka on the Sea of Japan to provide a Far Eastern outlet.

Moscow has deliberately left unclear how far the projected capacity for the production of large diameter pipe, including the 40-inch type, will go toward meeting these huge requirements.

Soviet propagandists have rejected the U.S. contentions that some of these lines are strategic.

As regards the friendship oil pipeline specifically, U.S. officials hold that this line with its terminus near East Berlin would expedite the delivery of fuel to the Soviet divisions in East Germany, the main Communist force for any assault by conventional forces on Western Europe. It is also seen as an important step toward the economic integration of East Germany into the Soviet bloc, a development that would tend to make German reunification even more remote.

KHRUSHCHEV'S CHALLENGE

U.S. officials have described the gas line from Bukhara as strategic because it would fuel an industrial complex in the Urals that is believed to embrace an important section of the Soviet armaments industry.

Premier Khrushchev recently ridiculed the U.S. arguments by asserting that they in effect made buttons even more strategic than big inch pipe.

"A soldier would not be able to wear pants without buttons because he would have to hold them up with his hands; and what would he then do with his weapons?" Mr. Khrushchev asked.

Buttons or big inch pipe, Mr. Khrushchev left unanswered the underlying question troubling U.S. policymakers. How can you do business with a man who insists publicly that he intends to bury you?

NEBRASKA REA YOUTH TOUR

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, for some years the Nebraska Rural Electric Association has sponsored a youth tour to Washington. The group is made up of boys and girls who are the winners of essay contests sponsored by their individual Nebraska rural power systems in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

It is a privilege to ask unanimous consent that four of these winning essays be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The first is by Judy Kay Walker and is entitled "The Value of Rural Electrification in Our Home and Community." Judy is 16 years of age and a junior at Maywood Public School, Maywood, Nebr. She is sponsored by the McCook Public Power District.

The second essay is by Edwin A. Harlan and is entitled "The Development of Rural Electrification in My Area." Edwin, age 16, is a junior at Beaver City High School, Beaver City, Nebr., and is sponsored by the Twin Valleys Public Power District.

The third essay, written by Lynn C. Davison, bears the title "The Value of Rural Electrification in Our Home and Community." Lynn is sponsored by the Wheatbelt Public Power District. He is a 16-year-old junior, living at Sidney, Nebr., and attending Sunol High School.

The fourth essay likewise bears the title "The Value of Rural Electrification in Our Home and Community," and was written by Larry Pankonin. This contestant is sponsored by the Midwest Electric Membership Corp. He is 18 years old and is a junior at Madrid High School, Madrid, Nebr.

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

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Judy Kay Walker)

The value of electrification, or the fact that electricity is distributed throughout the rural areas of Nebraska, is almost priceless in the community where I live. I am a resident in the area where electricity is supplied by McCook Public Power District. This community, being a ranching and farming community, requires electricity for a wide and varied number of uses. To mention a few of these, electricity is used for irrigation, drying grain, pumping water, power for shop tools, milking machines, indoor appliances, heating, and lighting.

Lighting. I cannot help but wonder if Thomas Edison was aware of the miracle he produced when he generated the minute amount of electricity which flowed through the tungsten coil to send a small beam of light flowing from his electric light bulb. Through the advancement of electricity and the furthering of Mr. Edison's invention, electric light has become the most convenient and economical form of lighting available in the United States. During George Washington's first Presidential term a birthday party was given for him at the White House. The lighting for the ballroom was furnished by a pompous chandelier. This chandelier, consisting of thousands of candles costing over $500, was the modern form of lighting for that era. Today the same amount of lighting, by means of electricity, can be furnished by a flip of a switch for less than 30 cents.

Not only is electricity convenient and economical in the form of lighting, but it is also used to the fullest extent as a "power-generator" for scores of different appliances.

When the number of farms served by REA and the numerous miles of line in our district are considered, one is inclined to believe that the area served by electricity in the United States must be unknown. In the district where I live there are 1,772 miles of line bringing the spark of prosperity to 1,427 rural farms. This is enough to keep a hundred-watt bulb burning 24 hours every day of the month for almost 499,500 months. This is amazing, but even more so is the fact that the maximum charge for electricity is 10 cents per kilowatt-hour. This is one time in this expensive cost of living index—that the more one uses the cheaper it is—all kilowatt hours over 1,200 may be enjoyed for only 1½ cents per kilowatt hour.

Since REA is used and needed on farms in this region many people depend and rely on the prompt restoration of electricity following a power failure. McCook Public Power District has a crew of capable and reliable linemen. During an electrical storm last July, one of the dairymen of this area experienced a power failure. This occurred after the evening milking had been completed. The McCook Public Power District was notified of the failure immediately. By the following morning, the power in this area had been restored and the dairyman was able to do the morning milking right on schedule with the relied-upon convenience of electric milking machines. This is just one example of the remarkable services available to this district at all times.

Recently many farmers of this community have had new yard lights put up on their farms. These yard lights cast a wider range of light than the average bulb does. They turn on automatically at sundown and cease to burn at dawn.

This community and my home would be beyond my imagination without the conveniences made available through electricity. Electricity is applied in every possible way to make this a modern and prosperous community. As "Willie Wirehand" would say "This community goes all electric."

THE DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN MY AREA

(By Edwin A. Harlan)

On May 11, 1935, the Congress of the United States passed the Rural Electrification Administration Act, and it was shortly afterwards signed into law by the President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. Congress intended that the existing power companies would use Federal funds to build rural lines and electrify rural America.

The act was also to be a relief measure, to ease the unemployment situation. Several attempts were made to interest the power companies in this project, but they were not at all interested. Soon it was discovered that the building of powerlines and doing electrical work should not be relief work. It was then that rural groups were encouraged to organize and form their own electrical distribution districts.

The first attempt at any organization in my area was made by the McCook Public Power District in 1941. They were in the process of organizing and were planning to incorporate a large part of southern Nebraska in their district, but war came and the organization came to a stop.

In 1944 Twin Valleys had its first organization meeting at the request of the late Senator Butler. An organization, Twin Valleys Electric Membership Association, was formed. Twin Valleys Electric Membership Association was soon changed to Twin Valleys Public Power District because Nebraska's laws were unfavorable tax-wise to cooperatives.

Rural electrification, as an infant, had many problems and pitfalls. Mistakes were made nationally as well as locally. Twin Valleys certainly had its share. After much engineering, an application was made to REA for funds with which to build the first lines.

Contracts were being let and lines were being built in a normal way when a devastating flood struck the Medicine Creek watershed. The town of Cambridge was badly flooded and both the Twin Valleys' pole pile and office building went floating down the Republican River. Temporary offices were established at several different locations, before the new building on the present location was erected in 1958.

When rural electrification first came to my area, the average customer's use of electricity was for lights only. As the time passed,

the type of load for Twin Valleys changed with many farmers using power appliances.

As the use of electricity increased, the service by Twin Valleys had improved greatly. The lines have been sectionalized and two-way radios are now installed into the system. The services have increased until today very few outages occur. These are of only short duration.

Twin Valleys Public Power District buys its power from the Nebraska Public Power System, a combination of Loup River Public Power District and Platte Valley Public Power and Irrigation Districts. During the years of operation there has been much negotiation and litigation over the wholesale price of power from Nebraska Public Power System. The difference of opinions became so drastic that the 1961 legislature formulated a Nebraska Public Power Committee to make a comprehensive study of public power in Nebraska and to report to the legislature of 1963 their findings and recommendations for improving the Public Power System of Nebraska, the only public power State. To date many bills have been introduced in the 1963 Nebraska Legislature that could, if passed, affect public power in Nebraska.

Rural electrification has done much to lighten farm labor and make the farm a nice place to live. This has been done by helping the people to live better electrically.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Lynn C. Davison)

Just how valuable is rural electrification to our community? We cannot truly realize its value until we are forced to do without it. Suppose that all electric power in our community were to be cut off for a period of 24 hours. What would be the result?

The first result would be a lack of heat. The next result would be a lack of food. After a few hours food would spoil in refrigerators and freezers, endangering our food supply.

Another result would be no water, since almost all the water we use is pumped by electric pumps.

The farmer would be greatly hindered by the lack of power. His milking machines would not work, he would suffer a death loss of his livestock due to the failure of heat lamps and brooders, and the power tools in his shop would be useless. This, plus the discomforts of his urban counterpart.

Most important, how is rural electrification valuable to me personally? Since I live on a farm, I can give direct testimony of the value of rural electrification. Our farm has four electrically driven irrigation pumps. If it were not for these irrigation pumps, our farm would not produce enough to support our family.

Our farm has an electric milking machine, freeing us from the drudgery of this twice-daily chore. Besides taking less time, milking machines are easier on the cows and are more economical.

After we are through milking, we use an electric cream separator. The livestock get their water from an electric pump.

When our sows farrow, we use electric heat lamps to warm the baby pigs and keep them from under the sow. Our inadequate shop is equipped with only an electric grindstone, but some farm shops have a wide variety of power tools, such as welders, saws, lathes, and drills.

On the farm, electricity enables 1 man to do the work of 20. Electrical feeding systems allow the buying, mixing, and feeding of grains, supplements, and forages in large quantities. Due to his electrical hired man, the farmer saves thousands of dollars by bulk buying.

Better crops, quality and quantity wise, are grown with the use of irrigation. Electric pumps to pump the water for irrigation run economically because the electricity rates decrease as more power is used. The pumps run night and day without checking and there are no costly overhauls.

Our home is typical of this community. It is supplied with pure, clean water by an automatic pump driven by electricity and has an electric water heater, ready to supply us at the turn of the tap.

Without rural electrification, our high standard of living would indeed be affected. Rural electrification provides the power to operate our Nation's farms and is vital to the Nation's economy.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Larry Pankonin)

When I was 2 years old, we moved to this farm which hadn't been occupied for several years so it wasn't signed up for REA. I can remember mother lighting the lamp with the little mesh bags which crumbled to nothing when touched. The gas iron which she pumped to make hotter, sometimes it took a long time to get started.

Finally in 1949, our farm was energized. It was fun to switch the lights on and off, just to see if they really would light. Stored gifts were unpacked such as: waffle iron, toaster, coffeemaker, lamps, clocks, mixer, iron, heating pad. Many have been added since, such as, skillets, can opener, deep-fat fryer, refrigerator, electric blanket, razors and vacuum sweeper.

A few years ago we got an automatic washer and dryer, which are handy when I dash home from school with dirty football, basketball or track clothes. I can toss them in and wash and dry them real quickly. Then too I'm always thankful for our dishwasher when I draw kitchen duty. Most all homes have television and one or two radios. And as time went on dad got electric tools for the shop. We use our electric welder which saves much time and expense. Our electric saw, grinder, drill, battery charger, soldering iron, air compresser, and extension cords all play a big part in farming. The electric heat lamps saved several litters of pigs for us this winter in 20° below zero weather. Our neighbors use them for their sheep and chickens.

Then there are conveniences that other people in our community enjoy. The combination stock tank that has electric water warmer is really a lifesaver for the stockman. Some of our neighbors enjoy their electric grain dryers and augers. Also at harvest time it's nice to have electricity so the harvesters can use their moisture checkers which saves many trips to the elevators. So many people in our community have deep wells or electric pump jacks and don't have to worry about enough wind to keep up a water supply. Several farmers milk lots of cows with electric milkers and cool the milk in big coolers, others use cream separators. One neighbor has an electric incubator and several have electric ranges, water heaters, and deep freezers.

Rural electrification brings lots of business, employment, and tax revenue to our community. The new REA building, besides serving its purpose as an office for the personnel, makes a pleasant place for group meetings. The service boys and office personnel are always kind and on the job.

We never appreciate electricity until it goes off for a few hours, then we know how much we depend on the "big operation, REA."

THE DEATH OF IATA?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the recent difficulties encountered by American-flag carriers in the airline industry and, for that matter, by our own Government, on the question of international air fares is a matter of serious concern.

It is disturbing indeed that we should be forced to acquiesce to an increase in passenger tariff schedules, in violation of our own economic self-interest, and I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a penetrating discussion of this problem contained in the May 4 issue of the Economist entitled "The Death of IATA?"

This article points out clearly and with an admirable lack of equivocation, that the International Air Transport Association no longer speaks with an effective voice because "the gulf separating efficient from inefficient airlines—by and large, American airlines for European—is now so wide that they no longer speak a common language." The writer makes the perfectly valid point that American-flag carriers, operating under the stimulus of private initiative, using the same aircraft, bought from the same manufacturers and flown along the same routes, as foreign carriers, manage to operate at a profit, when comparable foreign carriers operate at a loss. He goes on to ask the entirely appropriate question, "How can a satisfactory air tariff be worked out for airlines with such conflicting standards of efficiency?"

We may well take pride in the pioneering efforts of our own flag carriers and the unsurpassed standards of excellence they have achieved. In this regard, the observations contained in this, a foreign publication, are worthy of careful attention.

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

THE DEATH OF IATA?

In London, on the afternoon of Friday, April 26, the International Air Transport Association died. Even if International Air Transport Association refuses to lie down, it can be from now on only a ghost of its former self. Contrary to popular belief, International Air Transport Association has not been killed by the intransigence of Mr. Alan Boyd, Chairman of the U.S. Civil Aeronautics Board. It died because the gulf separating efficient from inefficient airlines—by and large, American lines from European—is now so wide that they no longer speak a common language. The International Air Transport Association solution, where 92 airlines meet to work out tariffs once a year, presupposes that airlines have a common denominator of business ability. This is no longer so. Some airlines are unable to recover more than a fraction of their costs at fares that leave others with comfortable margins in hand. Last year, the world's airlines are tentatively estimated to have turned an operating loss of about £40 million (1961) into an operating profit of about £20 million (on sales totaling £2½ billion). But within this total, some airlines earned reasonable margins of profit, while others made losses so great that their governments cannot allow the drain to persist unchecked. This is what has killed International Air Transport Association.

What is going to happen now? The International Air Transport Association airlines and their governments have the summer to ponder on it. The 16-government meeting that took place in London last week to debate whether or not air fares on the North Atlantic ought to rise immediately by 5 percent broke up late on Friday evening without reaching agreement, and informal talks continued into this week. Fourteen out of the sixteen governments maintained and still maintain that fares must increase. Two, the United States and Canada, stick doggedly to

their view that there is no economic justification whatsoever for permitting an increase. The split is deep, bitter and serious. On the surface, the delegates may have been arguing about a mere £9 13s. on a return ticket costing £173. But they were also, possibly for the first time, challenging the right of the U.S. Government, through its Civil Aeronautics Board, to impose its will on the airlines of other countries by insisting they charge what are—to those airlines—uneconomic fares at which they cannot pay their way. The meeting produced no answer to this. The CAB now regrets most bitterly that it delayed its intervention to prevent the fare increase until the 11th hour, just before the rise was to take effect on April 1, and after it had been approved by nearly all other governments.

This gesture, arbitrarily sweeping aside air tariffs and timetables agreed 5 months earlier by International Air Transport Association and throwing airlines half across the world into confusion, made the CAB appear callous and arrogant; it is never likely to lay itself open to criticism on that score again. But the error of timing is all that the CAB does regret. Mr. Boyd and his team, went home to Washington this week without having conceded so much as a dollar toward the case for higher fares.

The interesting—possibly, the historic—outcome of the talks is that the other governments let him go. They did not capitulate at the last minute and accept a face-saving formula that would have preserved the semblance of amity, even though Mr. Boyd did offer them a formula of sorts. It may not have looked a very generous one. The fare increase had been engineered by leaving fares themselves unchanged but halving the return ticket discount from 10 to 5 percent. The Americans indicated that they would approve this arrangement if the other countries would accept a $10 cut in the single Atlantic fare. A return ticket sold at the new discount would then cost much the same as an old ticket sold at the old rate of discount, and everyone would have been happy—except, perhaps, those airlines who needed the higher revenue and were not going to get it. By refusing to take this way out, the 14 governments have set themselves and Mr. Boyd a pretty puzzle.

The Ministry of Aviation has announced that Britain will introduce higher fares from May 12, in spite of American objections. All airlines flying between the United States and Britain after that date will have to charge these new fares, whatever their nationality, or be refused permission to land. Most of the other governments are expected to make the same kind of announcement, if their nerve holds. And what of the Americans? They do not have to make a positive response for some weeks. The Civil Aeronautics Board has no legal power to control international air fares; it cannot therefore stop Pan American or TWA from charging higher rates if other governments insist (although it will have to take steps to protect them from antitrust action if they do). But the U.S. administration's new aviation policy (explained in a note on p. 434) will change all this. Congress will be asked to pass legislation giving the CAB the same control over international air fares that it now has over domestic ones. This may not take long and when it is law, Mr. Boyd will have to adjudicate on the new, high fares. It is improbable that he would jeopardize his political reputation at home (his is a political agency, as opposed to the government departments with which he deals abroad) by approving them. So it will become possible for the British Government to find itself insisting on higher fares while the American Government insists on lower ones on the same route. Air traffic between their two countries could come to a halt.

Obviously, no one wants to see this happen. But at the London meetings, the irresistible force was given a push that has started it rolling toward the immovable object, and the two might well make contact this summer. It is no use expecting Mr. Boyd to budge. Time, plus a happy piece of chance, is on his side, and he is banking on the reluctant 14 coming round to his suggested $10 fare cut—sooner, rather than later. The key is not held by him, but by Canada.

Canadian air agreements were drafted with foresight and have clauses for dealing with just such situations. In any dispute about international fares, they say, the old ones must stay in force until the dispute is settled. Ministry of Aviation lawyers challenge whether this means what it says. If it does, fares to Canada will stay the same when fares to New York go up in a week's time. Some think this would divert a substantial amount of North Atlantic air traffic to the Canadian route. If that is at all likely, the airlines themselves may refuse to apply higher fares to New York and the opposition will crumble without the CAB having to use its big stick.

It is difficult to see what remains of International Air Transport Association as a fare-fixing forum after this debacle. It took the airlines 3 long, exhausting weeks of bargaining in Arizona to arrive at the fare structure that is now being torn up by governments. International Air Transport Association was brought into being, and has survived up to now despite internal strains and stresses, because however they quarrel among themselves, airlines were united in their common fear of fare negotiation by governments. Now their worst fears have come to pass. For their part, none of the government agencies that took part in last week's London talks are anxious after that experience to take over International Air Transport Association's hot seat. Indeed, their fervent wish is that International Air Transport Association will soon call a fare conference that will obediently proceed to unscramble the broken eggs and cancel out the offending 5-percent fare increase by the end of the summer.

This crisis will blow over, but the real problem that brought the 16 governments together in London will remain unresolved. How can a satisfactory air tariff be worked out for airlines with such conflicting standards of efficiency? All of them use the same aircraft, bought from the same manufacturers and flown along the same routes. Yet Pan American makes a profit across the world even when it sells little more than 4 seats in every 10; BOAC makes a £14 million annual loss. Does this prove a case for a fare cut or for a fare increase? Neither airline is unique: the Civil Aeronautics Board, in arguing against higher fares, could produce numerous examples of airlines making profits. As many cases can be found, mainly from among the industrial leaders of Western Europe, where they are making quite staggering losses.

One subject that will certainly be discussed by governments when they meet again to thrash out a new international air fares policy to replace International Air Transport Association will be how to narrow this gap in performance. It is obvious, looking at the Pan American results, that the huge savings from flying jets have not been passed on to the passengers; the last fare reduction on the North Atlantic took place before the jets entered service. One suggestion that will certainly be made is for direct government subsidies to be paid for operating unprofitable "public interest" routes, so that losses made on these will not have to be spread over an airline's whole operating account. (These public service routes are not a purely European invention: Pan American is under State Department pressure to fly into Casablanca against its better commercial judgment.) But it would be naive to think that this alone will reduce the gap between the costs of the best and worst airlines to tolerable proportions. Before the governments meet again, European governments in particular would be well advised to take a thoughtful look at the way their national airlines are run. One good outcome of the London meetings is that government representatives have been brought face to face with evidence that some of these airlines have really no right to be in business at all.

NEBRASKA REA ESSAY CONTEST

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it has been my privilege in the past to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the winning entries in the essay contest sponsored by the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

This year's essays, on the subject of "The Value of Rural Electrification in Our Home and Community," are among the best. The winners will be visiting Washington next week as part of their award.

I ask unanimous consent to have four of the best essays printed in the RECORD, each preceded by brief information about the contestant. The authors are Larraine I. Streiff, of Tryon; Alton Uhlig, of Ansley; Barbara Hadan, of Franklin; and Catherine Lueking, of Holdrege.

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

INFORMATION

My name: Lorraine I. Streiff; age, 17; grade, senior; school, McPherson County High School, Tryon, Nebr.; name of father, John A. Streiff, Flats, Nebr.

Contestant sponsored by the Custer Public Power District, Broken Bow, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

The purpose of our rural electric system is to bring the ranchers, farmers, residences, and businesses in villages and small towns, the benefits, the privileges, and the conveniences that can be had with no energy other than electricity. Our rural electric system is set up with the mindful purpose of giving maximum service at minimum cost. To this end our rural electric system is dedicated and is fulfilling its obligations.

The value of our rural electric system is something that no measure can evaluate and no mathematician can figure in dollars and cents. It is a value that you feel by knowing that you have this power at your fingertips with the flip of a switch, of seeing the lights come on by merely pulling a chain, pushing a button, or turning a knob. A value you can enjoy in seeing the benefits of labor-saving equipment, tools, and entertainment devices operated by electricity.

From the smalltown store with its modern coolers, air conditioning, freezers, and slicers to the individual who may have his or her joy in a mechanical hobby shop or some automatic gadgets, to the electrical appliances in the home, truly the value and benefits to our community are as varied as the individual.

Part of the value can be measured by the increased comfort of clean electric heat, the entertaining and educational programs received on our electrically operated televisions and radios, seeing our chicks grow up under the warm rays of electric brooders, and our

calves and pigs being given a better start under heat lamps.

From foods stored in the freezer, mother cooks well-balanced meals the year round on the electric range aiding in better health and a higher standard of living.

A complete, well installed, electric water system, not only affords hot and cold water at the turn of a knob but also beautifies our homesites by making possible flowers, lawns, and bountiful gardens. These, together with the peace of mind that comes with the knowledge that should a fire start, the water is ready and waiting to help extinguish it and we need not depend on a bucket brigade. This value no mortal can measure.

We wonder if men like William Gilbert or Benjamin Franklin had even the slightest conception of the subsequent benefits our community and we as individuals would someday receive from their experiments.

We feel that the late George W. Norris had an insight into the future when he fathered the Rural Electrification Administration. We wonder if he realized that the fulfillment of the purpose, the unmeasurable value of our rural electric system would be as well managed and as economical as today's system operates. Did he realize the convenience and modernization it would afford to the small towns, the rural communities, and individuals?

Our rural electric system makes it possible for us and those who come after us to share in the convenience, labor-saving devices, entertainment, better nutrition, and peace of mind brought to us in the form of electricity; one of the greatest discoveries since God said, "Let There Be Light."

INFORMATION

My name, Alton Uhlig; age, 17, grade, senior; school, Ansley High School; name of parent, Mrs. Arnold Uhlig, Mason City, Nebr.

Contestant sponsored by the Custer Public Power District, Broken Bow, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

The Rural Electrification Administration was created by Executive Order No. 7037, signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on May 11, 1935, under authority of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935. Senator George Norris from Nebraska and Representative Sam Rayburn from Texas were the main instigators of the Rural Electrification Act.

It was a dark land in 1935. At that time, only 11 percent of America's rural homes had or could get electricity at a price they could afford to pay. In the 25 years from 1935 to 1960, this count had increased to a total of 97 percent.

Before 1935, private power companies refused to extend lines into rural areas. One of the reasons for this was that people said, "Farmers do not want electricity," or "Farmers can't afford electricity." These statements were proved to be false after rural people were offered electric power at reasonable rates.

The main purpose of the rural electric systems is to provide electric power at reasonable rates to farm families. From past experiences of trying to get economical power into rural areas, the farmers decided the best way to do this was to form cooperatives. When the REA Act was passed, Congress provided the President with $100 milion for the purpose of making loans to the cooperatives. As of 1960, North Carolina had the largest loan of $4,530,692.62.

The electri power from the local rural electric system is one of the farmer's most valuable assets. It has transformed his methods of operations to a very great extent. He can do more chores faster and with less effort. This gives him more time to do other work or to enjoy some sort of recreational activity, which was once available only to his city cousin.

With the population growing by the thousands every day, the farmer must be able to increase production. "Willie Wirehand," the symbol of rural electric power, is getting more work to do every day. Now we say, "Let Willie do it," instead of Tom, Dick, or Harry. He is on the job 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. He never gets sick, never takes a vacation, and never complains as another common hired man would. Best of all, Willie's labor gets cheaper as he does more work. He feeds the cattle, milks the cows, pumps water, keeps food cool, heats the house, and does an ever-increasing number of jobs.

Economical rural electric power not only benefits the farmers, but also aids many businesses in the city. One banker said the largest check ever written on his bank was issued by the local electric cooperative to the contractor who built its lines. As cities become more crowded, new businesses build up outside of town. Many of them use electric power from the local REA system for lighting and heating purposes. Rural electric companies provide an increasing number of jobs for many people—office workers, servicemen, building contractors, etc.

Rural electricity is truly a growing industry as it serves an ever-increasing number of purposes. It is giving farmers and the people connected with the farmers a new and better way of life by making it more healthful and enjoyable.

INFORMATION

My name, Barbara Hadan; age, 16; grade, junior; school, Franklin High School; name of father, H. F. Hadan, Franklin, Nebr.

Contestant sponsored by the Franklin County Rural Public Power District, Franklin, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

Electricity is one of the most wonderful forces placed ready for the service of mankind.

Almost everyone who has ever planted a potato or milked a cow recalls a pet superstition concerning weather, crops, livestock, or people. Some of these are just that—superstitions; others are based squarely on scientific fact. It was a scientific fact when Benjamin Franklin captured fire from the sky and brought it to the ground. Franklin was not content to go on simply by guessing; he put his belief to proof.

One-hundred-two years ago another great man was born. Throughout rural America and especially in Nebraska, Senator George Norris is remembered as coauthor of legislation which led to the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration. Norris was a leader in the Nebraska public power program. He believed that efficient use of Nebraska's abundant water would provide low cost electricity and irrigation water and would create a better standard of living for all Nebraskans.

I was only 2 years old when rural electrification was brought to our community; so I do not know what it was like before we had electricity. But stopping to think what we would be deprived of if it were not for rural electrification, I will have to admit that REA has done much more for our community than I have in the past 15 years that we have grown together. I do know that it is electricity that keeps our community "humming." If it isn't the humming of motors here and there, it is the "humming" of happiness and contentment that electricity brings to a farmstead. The Franklin County Rural Public Power District puts the "spark" in our community and our community puts the "progress" in our county.

From a teenagers viewpoint rural electrification is a must. A few weeks ago REA was off for one evening due to a storm and I didn't get a chance to study my lessons as I should. The result was a poor grade in my studies. If our community would suffer the same reaction, if they were to part with rural electrification, it would be a serious downfall and backset to our community.

Rural electrification is doing more than ever before to help the modern farmer gain more produce, more profit, and more leisure time. It means power for hoisting hay, grinding feed, irrigating crops, and repairing farm machinery. It means heat for brooding chicks, hot and cold running water for modern bathrooms and plenty of light for the house and farm buildings. It means laborsaving kitchens. It means better schools. It means in brief, greater efficiency in agriculture, more pride and self respect, and a much higher standard of living.

I am proud of my home and my community. REA is the one big factor in making it a pleasant and exciting place to live, and for these things "we give thanks."

INFORMATION

My name, Catherine Lueking; age, 17; grade, senior; school, Holdrege High School; name of father, Lawrence Lueking, Atlanta, Nebr.

Contestant sponosored by the Twin Valleys Public Power District, Cambridge, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN MY AREA

When the Rural Electrification Administration was created in 1935, only 10 percent of the farms in the United States were receiving electric power. Today 93 percent of the Nation's farms are electrified. It has been estimated that the average farm family uses electricity in at least 67 ways while increasing the total labor output of the farm.

In the late 1940's when rural electrification was developed in my community, the average farm unit was not equipped with implements and machinery adapted to electricity. Farmers were plagued with hours of back-breaking labor and used hired men as well as family labor to accomplish their tasks. The entire family was required to manage even a moderate agricultural unit. Cows were milked and fed by hand and often even the vital water supply depended upon physical labor. Entertainment was often limited to a battery equipped radio and most social life ceased, by necessity, when the sun went down. Children sat around the lamp on the kitchen table to do their homework.

Today rural electrification means heat, light, and power for the average farmer in my area. With the cost of production at an alltime high, electricity gives low cost, efficient power to the farmer who must increase his output and hold his unit cost as low as possible to meet competition. While electrical power not only increases production, it decreases the labor required in processing agricultural products. Specialized electrical equipment illuminate farmyards, assure an adequate water supply, and automatically alleviate the farmer and his family of many unpleasant duties. At the same time the rural electrification program has added several billion dollars' worth of productive goods to the natural wealth of the United States.

Today rural areas also enjoy the same household conveniences and luxuries offered to their neighbors in the cities. The average farm home is heated and air-conditioned by electricity, the cleanest, handiest, most economical power available to mankind. Elec-

tricity has increased the leisure of farm families. Its presence has abolished the once isolated conditions which existed on the farm. The radio and television, adequate lighting for reading and study, and recreational facilities offered by the presence of electricity keep our community well informed and running smoothly.

The use of electrical power has decreased labor, increased output, and improved the standard of living of each farm family in my community for the average of $16.04 per month according to the April edition of the Electric Farmer. As competition becomes keener and production demands increase, farm families become increasingly aware of their dependence upon that silent, unknown, economic power, electricity. It is the means which enables my community to look to a future of improvement and opportunity. Rural electrification stands as one of the many examples of how the Government can help people help themselves.

HUNGARY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the reports that the Department of State is planning to establish normal diplomatic relations with the Hungarian puppet regime and that it will henceforth drop its opposition to the accreditation of the Hungarian delegation to the U.N. General Assembly, have gravely disturbed the American people.

As my colleagues will recall, I spoke on this matter on Monday of last week; and, in the colloquy that followed, some half dozen Senators of both parties took the floor to indicate that they were also opposed to any compromise that would close the books on the terrible crime perpetrated by the Red army in Hungary 6 years ago.

As an evidence of the public concern over the proposed revision of policy on the question of Hungary, I ask unanimous consent to have printed into the RECORD at this point a statement issued on May 20 by Mr. Byron B. Gentry, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. It is my belief that most of us would share Commander in Chief Gentry's conclusion that we have a "sacred obligation not to forget, and not to forgive, the Government that perpetrated one of history's most hideous crimes against humanity."

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

"The United States will be placing a belated stamp of approval on one of the cruelest atrocities in history if our Government goes through with reported plans for closer relations with the Communist regime of Hungary," so stated Byron B. Gentry, Pasadena, Calif., commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Commander Gentry stated the opposition of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to any softening of the official United States position toward Hungary. Continuing, Commander Gentry said, "The Communist Government of Hungary stands indicted before the world for treachery and cruelty of almost unprecedented scope in its treatment of freedom-loving patriots in the uprising of 1956. The blood of freedom-loving martyrs is not yet dry on the hands of the Communist rulers who shot, tortured, and imprisoned those who yearned for freedom from the Communist chains.

"The Russian and Hungarian leaders who directed the tanks and murderous gunfire against the practically unarmed patriots of Budapest are in positions of power and have been rewarded with higher authority.

"The Government of Hungary is still Communist and is still subservient to the Kremlin."

Continuing, Commander Gentry stated, "if the United States takes any of the reportedly proposed actions, such as full diplomatic recognition, it would be interpreted by anti-Communist freedom-loving peoples throughout the world as condoning the Red reign of terror in Budapest. As the recognized leader of the forces of freedom, the United States cannot, in good conscience, retreat from its position of complete condemnation of the evil acts of the Red Government of Hungary.

Concluding, Commander in Chief Gentry stated, "the Veterans of Foreign Wars, comprising 1,300,000 oversea combat veterans, does not believe that the passage of a few years washes away the blood, hushes the cries of anguish, or erases the record of atrocities committed by the Red masters of Hungary during the uprising for freedom in Budapest. The memory of the countless thousands, who willingly gave their lives in a brave but unsuccessful fight for freedom, imposes upon free peoples everywhere—and certainly upon the United States—the sacred obligation not to forget, and not to forgive, the Government that perpetrated one of history's most hideous crimes against humanity."

AMERICAN MEMORIAL TO THE GALLANT CREW OF THE NUCLEAR SUBMARINE "THRESHER"

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, at the Easter season—for centuries a period of rejoicing over the miracle of the resurrection—scores of American homes were grief-stricken because our Nation's ultramodern and potent undersea weapon, the nuclear submarine *Thresher*, had gone to the bottom of the Atlantic in a depth which precluded any chance of rescue or recovery.

All of those aboard—some 129 devoted, trusting fellow Americans, both service personnel and civilians discharging their tasks with self-abnegation and in committed service to their country—suffered unexpected, tragic death. They gave their lives in performance of duties solely and directly related to the safeguarding of our beloved United States.

They were victims of a most tragic disaster because they had assumed a responsibility to keep the Nation strong. They are heroes just as much as those who were casualties of World War II or in the Korean hostilities or others who have given their lives, as in Laos, in our effort to maintain freedoms around the world.

The sympathy of all Americans went out to the parents, the wives, the children, and other surviving kin. We trust their sorrow has been assuaged by pride in their son's, brother's, husband's willingness to assume any risk required to guarantee a posture of readiness to preserve independence and national honor.

I have just received a moving and touching letter from the parents of one whose young life was snuffed out when the *Thresher* plunged to its eternal resting place in the dark Atlantic waters. I believe it is an inspiration and typifies the determination of our Nation to keep the faith. I am sure it conveys the undaunted spirit of America and for that reason I desire it to have wide circulation, through incorporation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have this communication published at this point as part of my remarks.

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

TEMPLE CITY, CALIF., *May 17, 1963.*

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Your sincere sympathy over the loss of our son, Norman T. Hayes, on the U.S.S. *Thresher*, is greatly appreciated.

Our prayers are with the other families, especially those where children were left fatherless. It is a great sacrifice to make but we pray that the experience of the *Thresher* will make possible findings that will save other lives.

Norman was a true Navy man. He truly loved his country, the Navy and his boat. We were very proud of him and his accomplishments. One regret we have is that he didn't get to complete his qualifications as a submariner, due to the boat being in the yard for such a long period. He worked so hard and long to qualify and would have worn his dolphins with a great deal of pride.

The sympathetic reaction of the people to loss of the *Thresher* and the 129 men aboard has been overwhelming. This is truly a great country. Since the good Lord saw fit to take our son, we are proud it was in the service of such a great Nation.

With gratitude,

Mr. and Mrs. K. M. HAYES.

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

PUBLIC DEBT CEILING

Mr. KUCHEL obtained the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no pending business at this moment. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6009) to provide, for the periods ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from Virginia without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Has H.R. 6009 been laid before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I have a brief statement to make.

The pending bill is H.R. 6009. This is a bill to raise the statutory limit on the Federal debt. I opposed the bill in committee, and I intend to oppose it and vote against it here in the Senate.

In view of my position, and in fairness to all concerned, as chairman of the Finance Committee, I have asked the ranking majority member of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], to manage the bill during its consideration by the Senate.

THE FRIGHT PEDDLERS—II

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, almost 4 weeks ago, I took to the Senate floor in an attempt to drag from the shadows into the clean light of day some of the extraordinary activities and the miserable menace of those whom I termed the fright peddlers.

Today I rise to read into the RECORD and to make available to Americans who desire to pursue it a full report on the reactions and reverberations to that endeavor. And I trust that this second chapter on the fright peddlers will suffice for at least some time to come.

Mr. President, these are hard days for the cause of freedom.

International communism energetically pursues its ugly aim of world domination. It sneers at liberty and at self-government. It abhors the American concept of the dignity of man. It arrogantly believes that time is on its side.

By duplicity and deceit, through stealth and intrigue and subversion, it fanatically labors to subjugate free peoples, to divide the free allies, and to weaken the United States, the leader in the struggle for man's freedom in this somber globe. It is a respecter of strength, if nothing else.

And we—the people of the United States—are eternally dedicated to remain preeminently strong and to keep our freedom, whatever the cost may be.

What a tragedy it is, therefore, that the energies to weaken and to divide our country come, not only from the Communists, but from some of our own people—the fright peddlers and those whom they successfully terrify.

A singular anomaly of American political life is that the extremists, at both ends of the political spectrum, use the same techniques and agitate for almost the same ends, though, presumably, for different reasons.

In my comments earlier this month, I sought specifically to define the fright peddlers, to alert the American people to them and to their ways. I endeavored, point by point, to anatomize some of their most recent hoaxes.

I sought to implore the thousands and thousands of cruelly swindled victims to reappraise their acceptance of the fright peddlers' frauds. I urged them to rejoin the ranks of sound and sensible anti-Communist, pro-Americans, who will always be ready to pay whatever price is necessary to maintain our own liberties and our free way of life. Americans continue to follow the Patrick Henry philosophy.

But we are appalled by the peddlers of fright for paranoia and profit, who sow the seeds of discord and hate against anyone who has the temerity to question or reject their weird and fanciful dogmas.

The response to my May 2 comments, Mr. President, from California and from the Nation, has been, in a word, overwhelming, and, in two words, tremendously heartening.

I have received more than 10,000 letters, cards, and telegrams in response to the speech—and they are still coming in. The response has come from nearly every nook and cranny of our wondrous and wonderful country.

My staff and I make the educated guess that the mail has run about 4 to 1 in favor of my point of view, even if we include the barrage of unsigned epistles sopping with hate or bigotry. The first 500 telegrams ran nearly 10 to 1 in favor.

But the estimate of "pros" and "cons" is not what is really significant, in my opinion.

What really counts, it seems to me, is that so many thousands of Californians, and those from other States, who ordinarily do not write their legislators, have taken the time and effort to tell me of their support, and of their determination that the country we love shall never be taken over by the totalitarian extremists of either right or left.

As an American, I am deeply moved, deeply grateful, and deeply encouraged.

As for the volume of anguished protests, I think it demonstrates that the cancer of extremism in America is by no means trivial—nor in the least benign.

As a lifelong Republican, I am particularly proud of and pleased by the hundreds of communications I have received from those who have bothered to identify themselves as fellow Republicans, and who have expressed renewed will and heart to take on frontally those fright peddlers who are undermining our "Grand Old Party."

But—and this point I want to emphasize most strongly—the problem of the fright peddler is not limited to one political party.

It is almost unbelievable to read in the mail of the intimidation and the fear and the damage wreaked by the fright peddlers who belong to both parties upon Republicans, Democrats, independents, and just plain Americans at the community level—not only in my State but throughout our land.

It would be an impossible chore to recite from all of the mail in response to the speech. But I do want to offer excerpts from a number of letters in order to give my colleagues—and the people of my State and our land—further knowledge of what we confront, and of the encouragement of the people to carry on the battle against the extremists of both the right and the left.

The most typical response I have received is much like the following, from Hawthorne, Calif.:

> I agree this fright peddling is as un-American as communism.

Or, as expressed by constituents in Los Angeles, North Sacramento, San Rafael, and Orinda:

> Thanks * * * as an American, I abhor the lunatic fringe of both the left and the right.

I am sure most Californians agree, but, as with the ultraliberal leftist, the ultra-dogmatic rightist is very vocal.

Usually I am in the silent group, but at this time I had to break out with a rousing red, white, and blue thank you.

And—

> Your nonpartisan speech in the Senate deserves the praise of all those who love their country.

Many of the letters, of course, show concern for the Republican Party. For example:

From Sacramento:

> As a true conservative, I hold my head a little higher today as a result of your good work.

From South Gate:

> You have made me proud to be a Republican. It's about time someone with stature told these loudmouthed minorities where to get off.

From Burbank:

> I have been a Republican for more than 30 years and the rightwingers and Birchers are about to make a Democrat of me.

From Long Beach:

> These rightwing extremists are opposed to the essence of conservatism.

From Santa Barbara:

> As a middle of the road registered Republican, I have been hoping that someone in the party would come out strongly.

From San Francisco:

> As lifelong Republicans, voters since President Hoover's first candidacy, we have been becoming increasingly disturbed by the unrealistic reactionary tendencies of many Republican leaders and the unwholesome parasites attaching to them.

And from Sacramento:

> I am sure that you must know that you have the support and admiration of the majority of Republicans.

Even more important are the views of just plain concerned Americans. I shall cite just three:

From Santa Ana:

> I have never written to a Representative before, so don't quite know the procedure, but all I want to say is thank you * * *. We have lived in Orange County for 4 years and have been completely surrounded by hate and hysteria since we moved here. One begins to feel that this is the attitude of the whole country, which is terrifying. I know your stand will call for a big letter writing campaign by my neighbors. They are so busy protesting or impeaching by mail or telegram that they have no time to read what's going on in the world—granted that it's a little difficult to keep up when you refuse to read the Los Angeles Times, New York Times, Newsweek, Time, etc., as everyone knows they are subversive * * *. This middle of the roader is proud to have you represent her in the Senate.

Or from Belvedere:

> As an independent voter, I have felt an increasing irritation and frustration as I have witnessed the insane, irresponsible, and unintelligible activities of the extreme right

groups in this country. I know I have not been alone for Republicans and Democrats that I have talked to about it show an increasing concern about them.

And from an executive of a large chamber of commerce in California:

This tiny minority of fanatics has spread distrust, and in some instances, outright terror, far out of proportion to their numbers * * *. That you are concerned is to your credit. After all, only a handful cheered Hitler in the beginning.

Now, Mr. President, the picture, naturally, has not been entirely roseate.

A great many, although a minority, have written to me in fury and in fear, in intellectual dyspepsia and in dementia, in bluster and in fluster, in anguish and in agony, in violence, in sorrow, in iambic pentameter—and, quite often, in anonymity.

I have even heard, Mr. President, from the Voice from the Seventh Dimension, the Great Kalki, shake-Spoke, Harman the Red Neck and L. M. Tex (All American) Edmunds.

The Voice of the Seventh Dimension, in Millville, Calif., tells me, "Saints of God in which you call crackpots, you haven't see anything yet."

The Great Kalki has indicted me for "high treason and subversion and actively promoting Jewnitarian thus communism."

Harman the Red Neck is not at all happy with me, either, but he is mostly angry at the Birch Society because he feels it is "too middle of the road."

"All American" Edmunds feels "an agitated family of skunks could not have created a greater stench."

And I frankly do not know what shake-Spoke has in mind, other than a vague anticatholicism.

What is truly sad, however, is that, since the speech, I have received more than a hundred letters—and some on the nicest stationery—which are blatantly anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic, or racist.

I shall cite only a few of the blandest ones:

From Redondo Beach:

You can be read like a book now—anti-Christian.

That one was unsigned, but on a Birch Society post card.

From Long Beach:

Don't forget, sir, that this country was founded by white, Christian people, and we want our country to remain in the hands of white, Christian people.

Then this writer goes on to tell me again of that celebrated Russian colonel who "has taken over our Army, Navy and Air Force."

From Los Angeles:

I am a Bircher and you or anyone else that say (sic) I am unpatriotic, un-American, and I am doing the devil's work better than the Communist are a damn liar. I enclose some reading material for your information if you have the guts to read it.

Among the reading material are the usual Cinema Educational Guild tracts of Myron Fagan, the man cited by the California Senate Fact Finding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities in 1961 as purveying "heavy evidences of anti-Semitism" throughout many of his booklets.

From Santa Ana:

Mr. Fagan is at the top of the list of noble Americans. He and J. Birch Society and G. L. K. Smith tells the truth. That is what is hurting little fellows like you.

And from Chico:

You seem to condemn those that point out that the Jews control every country in the world * * *. Get wise to yourself * * *. Don't be so hard on the Birchers.

This correspondent also sends me a newspaper-sized, self-styled "patriotic" reprint put out by something called the Christian Educational Association of Union, N.J. It is, to put it exactly, sordid.

Now, 4 weeks ago, I made it plain that I did not consider all extremists to be bigots. I demonstrated that some are. I confessed I did not know how many or what proportion, and added that perhaps very few are.

The resulting mail, however, strongly suggests that more than just a few are.

In fairness, I must also note that I have received some mail from those who say they are close to the Birch Society—very, very few, for one reason or another, ever admit they are members—and have never heard of Gerald L. K. Smith, or his fellow travelers.

But there is no doubt that Gerald L. K. Smith has heard of the John Birch Society. Here, from the latest issue of his the Cross and the Flag, the May 1963 edition, are his precise instructions on how to infiltrate the Birch Society:

Followers of mine who have access to our literature should attend the John Birch Society meetings in their communities. Do not be aggressive and do not be offensive. Do not do anything to embarrass the Birch leadership, but always have a pocketful of literature and materials which you can hand out to interested people who might want to make a deeper study into the Communist menace.

On the other hand, I have even received a few letters much like the following from a woman in Ventura:

I am not a member of the Birch Society, but I know some persons who are and have read some of their bulletins * * *. I wonder if the Cinema Educational Guild is not a "pinko" group trying to ruin whatever good, for the American way, that "conservative" people are doing.

Things can even get confusing in the "you are either with us or against us" never-never land of the "extremist-verge."

It is depressing, also, Mr. President, to observe, in the responses to the speech, the very large number of Americans who stubbornly refuse to reject the claptrap which alleges that there are 35,000 Red Chinese troops on the Mexican border, about to invade San Diego, or of the thoroughly peddled fright that thousands of United Nations soldiers were trained in Georgia preparatory to a U.N. takeover of the United States, under command of that Russian colonel.

Hundreds of my constituents continue to believe in the water moccasin hoax, even in the face of the simple truth which I spelled out in the minutest detail 4 weeks ago.

Well, they will just have to remain wedded to the party line, for there is a point beyond which no one can go in attempting to persuade anyone to see the light. We may, however, pray that with the passage of time they may be able with reason, to cast off the frauds which have enmeshed them.

In writing finis to the great water moccasin scare—almost a classic in a case study of peddled fright—I do, however, want to cite two letters in stark contrast.

The first came attached to a note from a constituent. It arrived with the first water moccasin fright mail in late February. The letter was purportedly written by one P. A. Del Valle, president of something called the Defenders of the American Constitution, and national defense chairman of something else called the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies.

This letter stated in part:

The undersigned is convinced this (water moccasin) * * * signified rehearsals of the U.N. takeover of the United States of America under the disarmament treaty (sic) promulgated under Public Law No. 87-297 * * *. The urgency of this message is obvious. This appears to be a crash program to disarm the United States of America and make us a province of the U.N. May God in His mercy help us prevent this catastrophe!

The last letter on water moccasin that I want to cite arrived just the other day. Its author made no boastful claim of being a patriot. But I submit, Mr. President, he is the true patriot, the real defender of our American way of life. The letter is from a young U.S. Army lieutenant, who happened to take part in the guerrilla and counterguerrilla warfare exercise called water moccasin. This is what he writes:

I was amazed by the rumors flying about the country concerning the operation * * *. As for the internationalist and Communist tendencies insinuated by your constituents, I have yet to meet a group of gentlemen so devout in their anticommunism as those allied officers. (One hundred twenty-four foreign officers in all were on hand for the U.S. Army military exercise.)

If your sadly misguided constituents could only have had the opportunity to meet our allies, they would realize that their desire is only to maintain their home countries free from the ever-present threat of communism * * *. I will be assigned to Vietnam. I requested this duty, and consider myself to be extremely fortunate to be able to do something about the spread of communism than write fright letters.

There, Mr. President, is a fellow American who is a true patriot. And I salute him. I am sure the country does also.

But to return to the self-proclaimed kind and some more of what they are writing me:

From Santa Ana:

Who translated your recent speech from Russian into English?

From Long Beach:

And pooh-pooh to you, too—you, Socialist, you.

Those two, of course, were unsigned.

From North Hollywood:

You are pink. I might use a stronger word, but I am (believe it or not) trying to restrain myself.

That came from a 17-year-old boy, who tells me he is very active in local politics.

From Bodega Bay:

You do not sound like a true American * * * . I beg you, sir, please have mercy on Christ's children and your country or else the Communists will overthrow the Government. They are even now working for that through the World Council of Churches. May God help us.

This correspondent identifies herself as a devoted follower of someone called Carl McIntire, a hillbilly huckster of hate, and an unfrocked minister to boot.

Mr. McIntire, by the way, appears on several hundred radio stations every day to harangue, notably, for abolition of the United Nations, and, not at all incidentally, for the abolition of brotherhood.

To give my colleagues, fellow Americans and, possibly, maybe even a deceived follower or two, an idea of what kind of "great patriot" Mr. McIntire is, I cite only two indicators:

First, he was "deposed" by the United Presbyterian Church of America as a minister.

Second, the following is a sample of his wares:

Rome will sell her secret confessional system for political world power. But actually the Roman Catholic Church becomes a "spy system" * * *. Are not the Roman Catholics in the United States committed to a foreign power and do they not owe "obedience" and "submission" to its head, the Pope?

Since the May 2 speech, Mr. President, I have been hearing from quite a few of Mr. McIntire's followers. They tell me he questions my loyalty. If so, I must tell them that I question his sanity.

And from Thousand Oaks, Calif.:

Yes, we Birchers are frightened, and we intend to stay frightened * * * . We intend to clean out the Commies and fellow travelers in our Government * * *. And remember, if we lose, and the Communists take over, the collaborators will face the firing squad, right along with the resistors.

Such letters, of course, are not the most fun to receive. But they are not nearly so disturbing as the following letter, which is typical of a lot of the response mail.

From Santa Cruz, in my State:

I know the Birch Society is not a political party. But a lot of them are Republicans and the Birch Society members who are Democrats think the same way as the Republicans do. It would help to promote party unity to quit smearing the Birch Society. Do we want to lose the next election, too?

Mr. President, I cannot stress my feelings too strongly. I believe in the party of Lincoln. And I adore my country as you do. I want my party and my country to stand together against the Communist danger. Both parties will.

But I cannot and I shall not place the long-term welfare of my country ahead of any alleged short-term and dubious gain for my political party. It is as simple as that.

Moreover, I believe firmly that unity at any price, with those who damn the great Dwight Eisenhower and the late, courageous John Foster Dulles; who would accuse Milton Eisenhower of being a life-long Communist and who want our party to follow in the heritage not of Lincoln but of a self-proclaimed dictator, will mean catastrophe for the Republican Party, or, indeed, for any party.

Some of my correspondents have, in fact, said it much better.

For example, from Modesto, Calif.:

As a registered and voting Republican for approximately 50 years, I find myself in complete agreement with what you said. The stand you have taken and so ably defended should help tremendously in saving the Republican Party from complete collapse in its influence and usefulness and, what is vastly more important, the Nation itself from falling into the clutches of emotional extremists.

Or, again, from a woman in Monrovia:

You have said some things that need to be said over and over again by our Republican leaders. Instead of "splitting" our party, I am sure that it will help to restore it to its rightful position as a party of dedicated, thinking men and women.

In my judgment, that goes for the leaders in both parties.

Mr. President, 4 weeks ago, I cited a dozen reasons why I believe the right-wing extremists are not serving the welfare of America, but, in fact, performing a service for the Kremlin. Seldom, incidentally, have any of the anguished referred to these reasons. Almost all have responded blindly, after witnessing only the very first radio or television or newspaper reports.

There may be still another reason. It is, at any rate, suggested in a number of communications I have received from new Americans, who are former Europeans, such as this writer from Berkeley, Calif., who says:

In my youth I had the occasion to watch, at close range, the growth of the Nazi movement, and its eventual sweep across Europe. I am thoroughly familiar with their mode of operation and their foul, often paranoid mentality. I, for one, will not permit this to happen here, nor am I ready to laugh it off as insignificant. A Hitlerite America would hardly be better than a Communist one and I pledge myself to fight, with equal vigor, against both.

And so shall I.

Or consider this letter from Oakland:

I lived through 4 years of brutal occupation in my native country, the Netherlands. It is horrible to watch similar tendencies evolve in my new country. It is downright frightful to see politicians of national stature and widely read columnists skirt the issue at hand, avoiding to take issue with this vicious trend in our communities, even flirting with it for the love of votes or readers.

I think many of us sometimes wonder, too, though we do not like to admit it: Can it happen here? Could it? I pray not.

Still another typical missive I must take the time to cite is much like the following, sent in from Lakeside, Calif., unsigned, but on a John Birch Society post card. The message is simple and to the point:

You lier (sic). Jackman is not on the American Opinion Speakers Bureau. Peddle your filth in Russia.

Indeed, the Rev. Theodore Jackman, himself, denied to newsmen—I have a copy of the newspaper before me—that he was a Birch Society speaker a few hours after I took to the floor of the Senate on May 2.

I quote now from an Associated Press story that appeared in the Washington Star on May 3:

He (Mr. Jackman) said he had made some speeches in various parts of the country in connection with Operation Water Moccasin III "but as an individual and not as a member of any group." He refused to comment further on Senator KUCHEL's charges.

In fact, according to the newspaper in his hometown, the Greenville, S.C., News, Mr. Jackman "vigorously denied" that he was a spokesman for the American Opinion Speakers Bureau, as I alleged 4 weeks ago.

Now, Mr. President, this is a small point. But, I submit, it is the very kind of evasion and trickery which the Communists have practiced so well over the years—and are still practicing—and which the Birchers and their sympathizers are putting to extensive use.

Mr. Jackman and many of my correspondents say he has had nothing to do with the American Opinion Speakers Bureau.

At this point, I should like to cite two documents, which speak for themselves.

The first is a pertinent sentence from page 4 of the John Birch Society Bulletin of December, 1961. It states:

We have just this fall established our American Opinion Speakers Bureau, under very able executive management.

The second document, a leaflet from the American Opinion Speakers Bureau, lists "a representative group from our national roster," who are available as speakers to audiences, small or large, anywhere in the country.

And there, very prominent in the list, is the Reverend Theodore Jackman.

Also prominent is the following sort of apologia, which I have detected in a great many letters.

A schoolteacher in northern California told me that one of her pupils, who claims to be a member of the Birch Society, told the class the story of U.N. troops in Georgia waiting to take over the United States.

The teacher later brought a newspaper to class and read my statements describing the story as a hoax.

According to the teacher, the student merely shrugged:

Oh well, even if it is a lie, it will make people think, and that is what the John Birch Society wants to do.

Just think of it. I do not think Pravda or Herr Joseph Goebbels could have rationalized any better.

Mr. President, the fright peddlers and their followers will, of course, respond again—as they already have responded—that the letters I have selected for airing are not representative at all. And they will say that I have lied, as the woman in Santa Barbara, who wrote to me:

You say you get 60,000 letters a month. Well, I'm willing to bet that 99 percent of them are against you.

And so, I am now inviting as many members of the press who are interested to accompany me in a few minutes to my office in the Senate Office Building, where they will be free to prowl and plow

at will and at random through all the mail and quote whatever they wish.

I ask only that they do not use any of the names of the writers. I hope they will not do so.

This, of course, will not convince the extremists, either. For they are already convinced that the press of our country, with a few tiny exceptions, is in the grip of the monstrous conspiracy, too.

As with the Communists, the fright peddlers and their "I am not a Bircher, but" sympathizers cannot be converted by reason.

But I believe that those upon whom they may attempt to prey in the future can be armed with the truth to combat them.

I think that both of our political parties must meet the fright peddlers head-on, especially at the community level. Furthermore, I think every reasonable, self-respecting American, either in Government or out of Government, has a duty to speak out vigorously, in his church, in his club, in his veteran's organization, in the PTA's, and elsewhere, against those who seek to sow hate and fear among our people and against our institutions.

The overwhelming majority of Americans eternally reject communism. I am confident the same majority will repudiate the fright peddlers and their fellow travelers—if given all the facts. That is another reason why I have taken to the floor again today—to provide the facts.

Finally, Mr. President, I should like to enter into the RECORD at this point copies of newspaper editorials I have seen on the fright peddlers. Some of the newspapers are conservative. Some are liberal. Many are Republican in general philosophy. Only four editorials which I have seen so far have been unfavorable, and I include them, too. Forty-eight, incidentally, have been favorable.

The favorable editorials are from the Bakersfield Californian, the Contra Costa Times, the El Cajon Valley News, the Garden Grove News, the Glendale News-Press, the Lakewood Enterprise, the Los Angeles Times, the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, the Madera Tribune, the Oxnard Press-Courier, the Palo Alto Times, the Paradise Post, the Placentia Courier, the Redwood City Tribune, the Riverside Daily Press and Enterprise, the Sacramento Bee, the Sacramento Union, the San Francisco Chronicle, the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, the San Jose Mercury, the San Jose News, the San Leandro News, the Santa Barbara News-Press, the Stockton Record, the Sunnyvale Standard, the Tulare Advance-Register, the Vallejo Times-Herald, and the Watsonville Register-Pajaronian—all California newspapers.

Also, the Baltimore Evening Sun, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, the Chicago Daily News, the Corpus Christi (Tex.) Caller, the Detroit Free Fress, the Fayetteville Northwest Arkansas Times, the Honolulu Advertiser, the Louisville Courier-Journal, the Milwaukee Journal, the Nashville Tennessean, the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Times, the New York World-Telegram and Sun, the Philadelphia Inquirer, the Portland (Maine) Press-Herald, the Portsmouth (N.H.) Herald, the Salt Lake City Tribune, the Washington Daily News, the Washington Post, and the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times—newspapers from every area of our Nation.

And, finally, the Anaheim Bulletin, the Hayward Review, the Richmond (Va.) News-Leader, and the Santa Ana Register.

I request their printing in the RECORD simply and solely to demonstrate that the overwhelming majority of the free press of America is behind us and is opposed to fright peddlers. A number also describe and debunk some other peddled frights to which I did not allude in my remarks on May 2.

Mr. President, the extremists pose a threat to our country and to both of our political parties. They do their work in shadows. They cannot stand the light of day.

I remind my colleagues—and all Americans—what the sainted Lincoln said to a troubled nation in another time of crisis:

> To sin by silence, when there is a duty to protest, makes cowards of men.

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

[From the Bakersfield (Calif.) Californian, May 3, 1963]

SENATOR KUCHEL ASSAILS "FRIGHT PEDDLERS"

Pointing out that the United States has enough troublesome and dangerous problems without having its strength and wisdom crippled by baseless rumors, malicious lies and scurrilous accusations, Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, assistant Senate Republican leader and senior Senator from California, has issued a timely and well-founded blast against individuals and groups he describes as "peddlers of fright for paranoia and profit." His denunciation will be welcomed by all sensible and informed Americans who have witnessed with profound disgust and considerable alarm the activities of these groups and have rejected the slander and abuse that have been heaped upon many great and loyal Americans by what Senator KUCHEL calls self-styled patriotic organizations which range from the John Birch Society to the adherents of the Gerald L. K. Smith school.

These paranoic circles, he points out, have been responsible for a distressing number of hoaxes which have confused and terrified thousands of persons in California and elsewhere, citing item by item and tracing them to what he called self-styled "I am a better American than you are" organizations. The fanciful but horrific nature of these hoaxes aroused Senator KUCHEL to declare that "it is disgusting to find self-appointed saviors, whether infantile or cunning, preying profitably and psychotically on the fears of Americans in the name of anti-communism. Indeed, the ugly labors they perform are a service to the Kremlin itself."

Senator KUCHEL joins many other true Americans in denouncing these hate-peddlers and bigoted groups and individuals, and he observes that "clutching at half-truths and downright falsehoods, the fright peddlers fabricate hoaxes which frighten Americans and divert their attention from the real menace," sowing suspicion and hatred, undermining faith in American Government, institutions and leaders, setting up new racist and religious quarrels and maligning loyal citizens.

He has brought a sound and much-needed warning to the people of this country, and has brought hope and strength to those who have been shocked by this trend and have fought to restore sanity and honesty to public affairs.

His courage and forthrightness, his principles and his fight against extremists, fakers, and despoilers should be an inspiration to all Americans. He has, with this denunciation of extremism and refutation of the wild and paranoic rantings of the fright peddlers, rendered a great service to his country.

[From the Contra Costa Times, May 8, 1963]

KUCHEL'S ATTACK SIGNIFICANT FOR GOP

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL's attack on the Senate floor of rightwing hate groups was significant for a number of reasons.

First, it was one of the most detailed and comprehensive criticisms of these groups yet made by a public official. Added to this was the fact that it came from a Republican. It is the Republicans who can be most effective in battling the rightwing extremists because in the instances where the Birchers have attempted to work through one of our two major parties it is the Republican Party they have chosen.

KUCHEL has drawn the battlelines in California. It was significant that on the very day that KUCHEL made his speech, Richard Nixon announced he was moving to New York. Nixon was the only man who could have any sort of a hold on both wings of the party, although surely his hold was tenuous.

KUCHEL, who must be considered the titular leader of the moderate wing of the party in California, has foreclosed any possibility of working with the Birchers within the party. This may have been the biggest shot in the arm the party has received in a long time. One need only look to KUCHEL's smashing victory last year and to the defeats sustained by the party's rightwing candidates to see where the voters stand.

[From the El Cajon (Calif.) Valley News, May 5, 1963]

SENATOR KUCHEL NAILS A FEW LIES

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL said some words this week which have long needed saying by someone from his side of the political fence.

In a speech on the Senate floor, California's Republican Senator took a good roundhouse swing at those right wing extremists who go around organizing or joining "I am a better American than you are" patriotic societies.

Senator KUCHEL said about 10 percent of his mail is from such emotionally disturbed zealots. One of the most annoying characteristics of these zealots, the Senator observed, is that they call anyone a traitor who disagrees with them.

In addition, the zealots are "peddlers of fright for paranoia and profit." They spread hoaxes which have terrified thousands of Californians, causing them to write Senator KUCHEL for reassurance.

One hoax about which Senator KUCHEL has received many letters had to do with Operation Water Moccasin in Georgia. The letter-writers said they had been told of 16,000 African troops with rings in their noses and ears who were supposed to be participating in the Georgia exercises. Some of the letters also warned of Chinese Communist troops poised along the United States-Mexican border ready to invade this Nation.

When Senator KUCHEL wrote in return that there was no truth to the rumors about African or Chinese troops, he was accused of being either ignorant or a traitor.

"It is incredible," the Senator said, "that so many Americans have been so cruelly swindled and have allowed themselves to be so deceitfully duped."

KUCHEL told his colleagues he also had received more than 2,000 letters demanding abolition of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and repeal of the act creating it, on the ground that it would allow the President to transfer our Armed Forces to the

Secretary of the United Nations Security Council who is assertedly always a Russian.

These assertions are false. The Arms Control Agency neither provides for turning over control of our military forces to the U.N. nor any other foreign authority. Nor is a Russian in control of the Emergency Military Committee of the United Nations Security Council.

When people claiming to be conservatives indulge in such fright peddling, KUCHEL said they "defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism. I have nothing but contempt for the originators of the hoaxes and swindles." They are un-American and "are doing a devil's work far better than Communists could do."

These are strong words. But they come from a man who has the right to use strong words. In his position as a Senator, Mr. KUCHEL is able to know whereof he speaks when he is discussing the nature of military operations in Georgia or the functions and objectives of some Government agency. Furthermore, his words must be given greater weight because he is talking about people who come from his side of the political spectrum. He would not be castigating the extremists unless he felt the people as a whole needed to know the depths to which they are stooping.

If a few more leaders of the Republican Party had the insight and the courage to do as Senator KUCHEL has done in putting the finger on the fright peddlers and the hoaxers, we would not be seeing these silly billboards calling for impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren and we would not hear so many good citizens innocently repeating lies about our Government or the United Nations as if they were accepted truths.

[From the Garden Grove (Calif.) News, May 5, 1963]

CRASHING IN FLAMES

U.S. Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, of Anaheim, manned a verbal anti-aircraft-missile launcher last week. When the smoke cleared, political hoaxes were crashing in flames all over the American landscape.

Of course, this does not mean that self-appointed patriots won't build more and attempt to patch the old ones up in the hope they may get in a little more flying time. But California's senior Senator did clear the air for awhile.

KUCHEL let fly at what he called the contemptible slime of fright peddlers in their attempt to blacken the loyalty of former President Dwight Eisenhower.

He also targeted the ludicrous word from high up in the Birch councils that the late former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was a Communist agent.

He blew huge holes in a current fraud which held that the United States was training foreign troops, including barefoot cannibals, in Georgia as prelude to a U.N. takeover of the whole country. This lighter-than-hot air blimp, according to letters written the Senator, came out of the hanger of a Greenville, S.C., Birch Society spokesman.

Actually, the U.S. Army did have guerrilla training exercises in Georgia and, as is not all uncommon, some 124 officers from 17 foreign countries were there at the invitation of our Government. The arrangements for these military representatives of other nations had nothing to do with the U.N.

KUCHEL declared, "America has enough immediate and deadly enemies, without adding hobgoblins."

We agree.

[From the Glendale (Calif.) News Press, May 8, 1963]

IN MY OPINION

(By Carroll W. Parcher)

Writing from Washington the other day I referred to the volume of work in congressional offices and the stacks of mail which Members of the Congress receive—and answer—daily.

Soon after I left, Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, of California, made a speech in the Senate in which he referred rather pointedly to some of the mail he has been receiving lately. Fright mail, the Senator called it. And from his description it runs in the same pattern as some of the missives we receive around this establishment. This is the way Senator KUCHEL describes it:

"Note carefully the language typical of the fright letter. The writer is convinced, utterly convinced. There is no room for doubt. Of course this is happening, he says. And of course that is happening, he says. Because he knows. And how did he find out? And how, if it is possible, can we reach him with simple truth?"

I don't believe that during the course of his speech TOM answered that question. Probably there is no good answer. At least I've never found one. To the letter writers who know that John Foster Dulles was a Communist agent, or to those who know that Dwight Eisenhower is a stooge for the Communists, or to those who know that the only way the country may be saved is to impeach Earl Warren there isn't much you can reply with any hope of changing minds.

Senator KUCHEL says: "I cheerfully admit that I have, in the past, attempted to reply calmly and factually to fright mail, mustering all the reason and reserve I could summon. Yet I have found, over the years, that this is not quite the answer."

Move over, Senator. So have I. But I'm thankful that the volume of my mail doesn't approximate that of the Senator from California. In his speech to the Senate he said:

"In every day's deluge of mail at my office—which sometimes means as many as 5,000 letters, telegrams, and postcards—there are generally 100 or even 200 which I describe simply as 'fright mail.'

"Most of my colleagues receive such mail and most of them refer to it in much stronger terms. Coming from the most populous State in our Union, California, I think it is safe to say I get as much as anybody.

"It is difficult enough attempting to answer thousands and thousands of letters which seek 15 answers to 15 questions on complicated foreign and domestic policies and issues—and by tomorrow at the latest.

"Many times, the only economically and mechanically feasible way to reply is to send printed statements, which are then often returned in disgust because I have not answered with a long, personal letter."

As I've said before, just the contemplation of 5,000 letters to be answered would send me into an acute attack of the screaming meemies. Or worse. But after Senator KUCHEL has answered his letters, he says that: "The writers will come back a week later, terrified about something else, urgently stating that they do not believe me—and that I am either misinformed, or worse. Sometimes they darkly insinuate that treason has prompted the reply they have received."

I can't say that I'm glad that TOM KUCHEL, and many other Members of the Congress, I'm certain, receive such letters. But on the well-known theory that misery loves company, it's slightly comforting to know that newspaper editors are not the only recipients.

This sort of thing has been going on for quite a while, as Senator KUCHEL undoubtedly knows. The letters have been somewhat different in content, but essentially of the same type. I remember one I got away back in the days of the Roosevelt-Willkie campaign * * * "What has Willkie ever done for the workingman?" The words were all spelled out, too. So the only thing TOM can look forward to is that if he stays in the Senate for a long time, as there is every indication that he will do, the content of the letters may change. But the essential character will remain.

Incidentally, we enjoy getting letters around this shop, and are able to print a good many of them. So I hope the tribe of the writer-inners will not decrease. Only, perhaps, that they won't wax quite so vitriolic in some happier future day.

[From Lakewood (Calif.) Enterprise, May 9, 1963]

THEY ARE DOING THE DEVIL'S WORK

(By Publisher Maurice Harris)

Our Senator, TOM KUCHEL.

It is always good to have one's judgment corroborated. And so, it is with considerable satisfaction we recall the Enterprise endorsing TOM KUCHEL for Senator. Of course, we had much to go on, based on his record and experience in serving his State of California. While he was not always right, there was never any doubt as to his sincerity and dedication to State and to country.

Since mostly bigots and hypocrites are inflexible as to party, we have never been either irrevocably Democrat or Republican, feeling always that the caliber of the man should take precedence, regardless of affiliation.

Last week, it warmed our hearts to hear Senator TOM KUCHEL speak out with such firmness, logic and intelligence on his feelings regarding the hypocrites and crackpots in our midst.

His words conveyed so much more than could any words of ours, we quote them below:

"The curious fact is that the right peddlers, from the simple simpletons to the wretched racists, all claim to be conservatives.

"They defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism with that claim as thoroughly as the Communists defile the honorable philosophy of liberalism.

"I sympathize with some of my constituents who are honestly bewildered and confused by the trash of the rightwing extremists.

"But I have nothing but contempt for the originators of the hoaxes and swindles, from the ludicrous lears of the Birch Society to * * * the several hundred similar self-styled 'patriotic' groups.

"For they are doing the devil's work far better than Communists could do."

Bravo Senator KUCHEL.

May your voice be heard frequently, and your admonishments reflected upon by every freedom-loving American in the world.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 5, 1963]

DOING THE DEVIL'S WORK

For the first time—and not at all too soon—the U.S. Senate has heard a formal statement about the moral and material damage inflicted on our country by its "deadly dangerous enemies of the far right."

Senator KUCHEL, of California, made the address, which gains force from the fact that he lives in and represents one of the beehives of this far-right activity. Other Senators hear from the crackpots, too, but KUCHEL noted that he comes from the largest State in the Union and quite naturally receives more mail than most of his colleagues. He estimates that 10 percent of his 60,000 monthly letters fall in the category of "fright mail."

The instigators of the scare mail are a "relative handful" of rightwing zealots—members of the John Birch Society, assorted racists, income tax abolitionists, phobic opponents of the United Nations and most of the U.S. Government's formal foreign relationships, plus an even more venomous rag, tag, and bobtail that believe anyone who does not agree with their own queer and

puzzling dogmas to the last dot of an "i" is a prima facie Communist.

This poisonous mail convinces KUCHEL that those who inspire it threaten our country quite as gravely as that other sinister small minority, the Communists, and that in the end the fright peddlers serve the Communist cause by creating dissension and hysteria.

The evidence is strong in the Republican Senator's copious quotations from his mail. Typical correspondents engage his attention by saluting him as a traitor becasue he has denied the existence of, or refused to do anything about, the following allegations:

That thousands and thousands of Chinese Communist troops were poised on the Mexican border for an attack on California.

That 44 American or free world leaders are Communist agents. ("The gallant Eisenhower is a favorite taget," KUCHEL says.)

That a U.S. military maneuver in Georgia called Exercise Water Moccasin III was, in fact, a disguised U.N. operation for training African troops on American soil.

That the U.S. Government is trying to put all its Armed Forces under the command of a Russian general.

The reader may wonder where the hate peddlers find people to believe this bilge. KUCHEL's mail is ample testimony that such people are found and do believe—and are ready to denounce their senior Senator as a traitor for doing nothing to make America safe for them.

The immediate damage they do—they and their leaders—is visible all around us. They have seriously injured conservative Republicanism in California by representing themselves as its spokesmen. KUCHEL put it well:

"The curious fact is that the fright peddlers, from the simple simpletons to the wretched racists, all claim to be conservatives.

"They defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism with that claim as thoroughly as the Communists defile the honorable philosophy of liberalism.

"I sympathize with some of my constituents who are honestly bewildered and confused by the trash of the rightwing extremists.

"But I have nothing but contempt for the originators of the hoaxes and swindles, from the ludicrous leaders of the Birch Society to * * * the several hundred similar self-styled patriotic groups.

"For they are doing the Devil's work far better than Communists could do."

The tragic evidence is around us.

[From the Los Angeles Herald Examiner, May 4, 1963]

RIGHT TARGET

Senator THOMAS W. KUCHEL, Republican, of California, has taken a well-aimed swipe at those he terms the "fright peddlers" of the John Birch Society and other far-out splinter groups "who defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism."

We are glad to hear the Senate Republican whip voice these sentiments. They are an eloquent expression of much that has been irking responsible conservatives for some time.

Senator KUCHEL decried such extreme rightwing hoaxes as those asserting that a Russian colonel at the United Nations actually controls the U.S. Armed Forces, that thousands of Chinese Reds are poised in Mexico for an invasion of California, and that the U.N. is training foreign troops in Georgia to take over the United States.

While no one is underestimating the deadliness of the Communist menace, such fantasies are clearly idiotic or irresponsible. The senator is correct in noting it is curious that the fright peddlers, from the simple simpletons to the wretched racists, all claim to be conservatives."

It is sad to say that many patriotic and well-meaning citizens have been deluded into believing these fabrications.

Senator KUCHEL is performing a valuable service to true conservatives and the public in attacking the disseminators of such unconservative, un-American hysteria.

[From the Madera (Calif.) Tribune, May 2, 1963]

THE FRIGHT PEDDLERS

U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL today called on cruelly swindled Americans to reappraise the peddlers of fright for paranoia and profit and rejoin the ranks of responsible anti-Communist, pro-Americans.

The Tribune is happy to publish Senator KUCHEL's appeal and to second the motion.

"America has enough immediate and deadly dangerous enemies, without adding hobgoblins," the Senator said. "America can use all the responsible help it can get."

KUCHEL, assistant Senate Republican leader, identified the fright peddlers as hundreds of self-styled patriotic groups, ranging from the Birch Society to the followers of Gerald L. K. Smith.

He said they have been responsible for a number of hoaxes which have terrified thousands of Californians to the point of hysteria, particularly two most recent ones which claim:

The United Nations is training thousands of foreign troops, including barefoot savages, in Georgia, as a prelude to a takeover of the United States.

The United States no longer has an Army, Navy, or Air Force, because the act that created the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has turned over our military to a Russian colonel in the United Nations.

In a speech prepared for delivery in the Senate, KUCHEL exposed, step by step, the intertwined frights as hoaxes and traced their origin and perpetuation to a number of self-styled "I am a better American than you are" organizations, including the Birch Society, and even outright anti-Semitic and racist groups.

To document the panic they have produced, KUCHEL quoted from a number of the more than 3,000 hysterical letters and crude leaflets he has received from constituents.

But, he said, the most distressing statistic of all was that only 10 of the letterwriters raised even the slightest doubt or question about the validity of the claims.

"It is distressing and disillusioning to find persons or normal educational attainments—or any educational level—falling hysterically and emotionally, without reservation, for the unadulterated venom spewed by out and out crackpots for paranoia and profit." KUCHEL said.

"It is disgusting to find self-appointed saviors, whether infantile or cunning, preying profitably and psychotically on the fears of Americans in the name of anti-communism" he added. "Indeed, the ugly labors they perform are a service to the Kremlin itself."

KUCHEL noted that the fright peddlers all call themselves "conservatives," but observed:

"They defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism with that claim as thoroughly as the Communists defile the honorable philosophy of liberalism."

He pointed out that the fright peddlers also have in common "all out, uncompromising, hysterical demands," such as stopping all foreign aid, repealing the income tax, abandoning NATO and removing the United States from the United Nations—"very likely identical to the real hopes of the Kremlin."

(We might note that there are many people who do oppose such things as the U.N. and income taxes but do not belong in the "fright peddler" category.)

KUCHEL, citing evidence—noted also that some followers of racists and bigots have often found new respectable homes in extremist rightwing groups that deny being bigoted.

"Clutching at halftruths and downright falsehoods, the fright peddlers fabricate hoaxes which frighten Americans and divert their attention from the real menace," KUCHEL said.

"They sow suspicion and hatred. They attempt to undermine faith in our Government, its institutions, and leaders. They preach resistance to the laws of our land. They degrade America and Americans and do it as well as—or better than—the Communists do.

"Yet their followers—and even some honest conservatives—continually ask me: 'Why do I keep berating them?' "

KUCHEL noted that about 10 percent of the 60,000 letters, cards, and telegrams he sometimes receives each month fall into the category of fright mail. And he added:

"Can these cruelly swindled victims of the fright peddlers be shocked into a reappraisal of their swindlers and be reclaimed as valuable and effective contributors in the fight against the real enemy?

"I do not know. But I believe it is time such an attempt be made.

"Perhaps I am naive about this. Yet I feel there must be some—and they belong to both political parties—who can be persuaded to join the ranks again of sensible and decent anti-Communist, pro-Americans devoted to defending our Nation against defilement of both the extreme left and extreme right, here and abroad."

[From the Oxnard (Calif.) Press Courier, May 7, 1963]

REPRESENTATIVE TEAGUE AND SENATOR KUCHEL

Congressman TEAGUE performed a timely and patriotic act when he wrote about Senator KUCHEL'S forthright speech listing the sins of the John Birch Society.

Mr. TEAGUE is admittedly much more conservative in many aspects of governmental policy than is Senator KUCHEL. But Mr. TEAGUE showed that he is no less concerned than is Senator KUCHEL over the peddling of fright by the Birchers.

The thing that both of them could have said, but failed to do so, is that the first victims of fright are the John Birch members themselves.

They must be scared if they believe what they are saying. They, so far as they make themselves known, are men and women of intellectual standing, often of financial worth, and impelled by patriotic impulses. Yet they are furthering the very contempt of government that they seem to think is being implanted among the people by sinister agents of communism.

Mr. TEAGUE, with Mr. KUCHEL, specifically denounces the Bircher axioms that Chief Justice Earl Warren must be impeached; that repeal of the Federal income tax would be helpful to the Nation; that Communists run the United Nations and a Communist officer could control the Army of the United States; that it was encouraging the Reds for the President to invite Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela to visit this country; or that "international Jewish bankers" run America.

Some of these precepts were taken right out of the book of Adolf Hitler, which led to worldwide war and misery for millions. For it seems to be the habit of the unthinking to fix upon false causes of their troubles.

The pity of it is that young people in our schools, to a limited extent, are beginning to believe these things, and to talk about them, and to borrow the fear that their elders hold and spread.

[From the Palo Alto (Calif.) Times, May 3, 1963]

KUCHEL TAKES AIM AT EXTREMISTS

(By Alexander Bodi)

He stood at ease just inside the door of the crowded room, his big frame relaxed. His height and his shock of white hair made him stand out in the room, but you had to take a second look to realize that it was the Chief Justice of the United States in front of you.

Earl Warren had been a guest at a dinner of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and afterward dropped in at one of those soirees where there's too much alcohol and too much talking and too much standing.

We talked for 5 or 10 minutes. He seemed a bit lonesome, and welcomed the opportunity to chat with another Californian. He talked about his family and his visits to his grandchildren. He mentioned the old days when he was Governor of California. He didn't bring up anything about his current activities in the Supreme Court, nor the virulent attacks which have been made on him by the John Birch Society and southern segregationists.

I broached the matter tentatively.

"The Birchers," he smiled and waved a hand. "They don't bother me a bit. I pay no attention to them."

The matter was closed, and I drifted away, making room for others patiently waiting to talk with him.

Earl Warren can afford to ignore extremist attacks, for he's a big man and his job is an important one. Warren is remote from the fuss and furor of everyday politics, the arena where the ideological fight is going on.

Closer to the battle, politically if not geographically, is Senator THOMAS KUCHEL. I ran into him at another of the editors' soirees a fortnight ago.

He was concerned about the rightwing grab for power in California's Republican Party. As the highest elected Republican official in California, he feels he should be exerting his influence in State party affairs. Yet Washington is a long distance away, and as Senator his duties require him to be in Congress.

KUCHEL apparently resolved the dilemma we talked about 2 weeks ago by deciding to launch his offensive from there. Yesterday he teed off on the fright peddlers of the John Birch Society and other extreme groups.

KUCHEL touched on a subject that is of concern to a lot of thoughtful, sincere conservatives. That is that the good people—some the natural community leaders—in their frustration at being out of political power are turning to the leadership of extremist crackpot elements who preach hate under the guise of patriotism.

"It is distressing and disillusioning," KUCHEL said, "to find persons of normal educational attainments—or any educational level—falling hysterically and emotionally, without reservation, for the unadulterated venom spewed by out-and-out crackpots for paranoia and profit.

"The self-appointed saviors," he continued, "prey on the fears of Americans in the name of anticommunism and the ugly labors they perform are a service to the Kremlin itself. In the process," he added, "they defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism as thoroughly as the Communists defile the honorable philosophy of liberalism."

Warren has been the prime target of attack by extremist groups ever since the Supreme Court ruled that the black man is entitled to the same educational privileges the white man gets. The attacks on Warren have made some Republican politicians fearful—earlier this year when there was a move to have the Republican congressional delegation give a party for Warren the affair was postponed twice and when it was held only a few showed up.

KUCHEL will get some bitter response, no doubt, from people who at the mildest will charge that he's a poor Republican who was elected by a bunch of Democrats. The same Democrats, of course, without whom no California Republican can get elected to State or National office.

[From the Paradise (Calif.) Post, May 10, 1963]

SENATOR KUCHEL SPEAKS OUT SOME TRUTHS THAT NEEDED SAYING

U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL's scorching denunciation last week in the Senate of extreme rightwing hate groups and peddlers of fright voiced some truths that needed to be said by a responsible public official. And the Senator from California, where the hate campaign is particularly virulent, was the right person to say it.

The sort of thing he was talking about goes way beyond the expression of extreme political philosophies. Expression of political ideas, even such extreme ideas as those of the John Birch Society, is not something that should be discouraged.

What should be denounced, and what KUCHEL was denouncing, is the flood of filth and hate literature and letters that is being spread in an organized campaign. We do not doubt that a Senator or Congressman gets a great deal of this stuff. Anyone whose name is in the political news gets some of it.

Much of this literature is in printed form. Identical leaflets appear time and again from different sources, mailed out by individuals who follow the party line. Los Angeles is the most frequent place of origin of this type of material; however, it is also being mailed out right here in Paradise. In fact, a small business place here is apparently the deposit and storage place for this kind of literature.

An example of the rabid language of these tracts is: "Kennedy's death trap for United States" * * * "a blueprint of rank treason * * * only impeachment of Kennedy will save our country," * * * "Mongolian troops are to be stationed in Canada, Mexico, and the northern half of the United States, with Russian and Red Chinese troops in the southern half" * * *. "U.S. Government top secret bulletins provide documentary proof that U.N. is planned deathtrap for United States," and so on and on, attempting to prey on the fears of the gullible and the ignorant.

Racial and religious prejudice is a strong component of these hate publications. Examples: "The white man's present insane refusal to recognize the basic importance of race, can only result in his own extinction. He is being exploited and his tax money is used to support and encourage a Negro welfare state * * *. "If you want to be a big shot in America today, you must be a Jew, a Negro, an alien, or a racketeer." Some tracts are strongly anti-Semitic. One goes so far as to urge a boycott of Christmas Seals on the grounds that "anti-Christians" and Jews are listed as officers.

All these hate groups attempt to equate anti-Semitism, racial prejudice, and religious bigotry with patriotism and anti-communism. This is an aspect of the fear campaign that is more insidious than the invention of ridiculous stories that the United Nations is training foreign troops to take over the United States. It is an attempt to intimidate anyone who speaks up against the hate campaign.

"It is distressing and disillusioning," Senator KUCHEL said, "to find persons of normal educational attainments, or any educational level, falling hysterically and emotionally, without reservation, for the unadulterated venom spewed by out-and-out crackpots for paranoia and profit.

"It is disgusting to find self-appointed saviors, whether infantile or cunning, preying profitably and psychotically on the fears of Americans in the name of anticommunism. Indeed, the ugly labors they perform are a service to the Kremlin itself.

"They sow suspicion and hatred. They attempt to undermine faith in our Government, its institutions, and leaders. They preach resistance to the laws of our land. They degrade America and Americans and do it as well as, or better than, the Communists do."

[From the Placentia (Calif.) Courier, May 9, 1963]

WE ARE PROUD OF SENATOR TOM

In this era of fear and frustration, when the role of citizen in the world's most powerful Nation has proven too heavy a burden for some, many grand old words have been taking a semantical beating.

Are all conservatives really conservative? And liberal certainly, if not twisted, has been badly bent.

Out of the long months of wheelspinning which have been part of the usual scene in Washington and Sacramento this rainy winter and spring came some cool, clear words last week which may be the mark of a politician well on the way toward "statesman" status.

In Washington, California's senior Senator, THOMAS KUCHEL, of Anaheim, and an Orange County native son, pinpointed a topic which has obviously been bothering his colleagues and should be a topic for serious consideration among a wide spectrum of thoughtful Americans.

In reading the speech, and in particular the strong reaction from persons and groups who were carefully not named, we decided that from now on in this label-conscious society of ours today we would identify ourselves as a "Kuchel-Republican."

Quoted below are excerpts from the Senate speech as released last Thursday in Washington:

"U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL has called on cruelly swindled Americans to reappraise the peddlers of fright for paranoia and profit and rejoin the ranks of responsible anti-Communist, pro-Americans.

"America has enough immediate and deadly dangerous enemies, without adding hobgoblins," he said. "America can use all the responsible help it can get."

KUCHEL, assistant Senate Republican leader, identified the fright peddlers as hundreds of "self-styled patriotic groups," ranging from the John Birch Society to the followers of Gerald L. K. Smith.

He said they have been responsible for a number of hoaxes which have terrified thousands of Californians to the point of hysteria, particularly two most recent ones which claim:

The United Nations is training thousands of foreign troops including barefoot savages, in Georgia as a prelude to a takeover of the United States.

The United States no longer has an Army, Navy, or Air Force, because the act that created the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has turned over our military to a Russian colonel in the United Nations.

To document the panic they produced, KUCHEL quoted from a number of the more than 3,000 hysterical letters and crude leaflets he has received from constituents.

But, he said, the most distressing statistic of all was that only 10 of the letterwriters raised even the slightest doubt or question about the validity of the twin claims.

"It is disgusting to find self-appointed saviors, whether infantile or cunning, preying profitably and psychotically on the fears of Americans in the name of anticommunism," he added. "Indeed the ugly labors they perform are a service to the Kremlin itself."

KUCHEL noted that the fright peddlers all call themselves conservatives, but observed:

"They defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism with that claim as thoroughly as the Communists defile the honorable phi-

losophy of liberalism." Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican of California, May 2, 1963.

[From the Redwood City (Calif.) Tribune, May 11, 1963]

GOP SHOULD TRY NEW APPROACH

Those who read this column with any degree of consistency know that we often have been critical of the Kennedy administration and that in 1960 we supported his opponent for the Presidency.

Therefore, it might be expected that we would be elated by the report of Republican leaders in Congress that public disillusionment with President Kennedy has set in, and that the GOP will capture the Presidency and control of the House in 1964.

As a matter of fact, we do believe that the President, although continuing to enjoy great personal popularity, has suffered greatly by the turn of domestic and international events in the nearly 2½ years that he has been in office. And we have expressed belief that he can be turned out of office after a single term, even though this seemed highly improbable as recently as 2 months ago.

However, what the Republicans need is not merely speculation about the fading Kennedy image, but rather, a strong Republican program and set of candidates which can compete in the vote-getting arena with the powerful monied Kennedy troupe.

What Republicans must have in the 16 months between now and the Republican convention are some strong statements which show just where they stand and where the GOP can do the job better than it is being done by the Kennedy clan.

It needs the type of hard-nosed comments that Senator THOMAS KUCHEL uttered in rapping the guilt-by-association charges of the John Birchers. It needs cold, analytical statements about carefree Kennedy spending, such as those expressed by Senator THRUSTON MORTON. And it must spend more time developing a strong team for 1964, rather than taking pokes at most of the Republican eligibles.

If Republicans want to regain occupancy of the White House next year they need more than public disillusionment with President Kennedy. The Kennedy record will speak for itself.

The Republicans need to produce evidence that they can do the job better.

[From the Riverside (Calif.) Daily Press, May 4, 1963]

KUCHEL ON THE FRIGHT PEDDLERS

Periodically Senator KUCHEL zeros in on right wing extremists, their follies and their excesses and the dangers they pose. Thursday he loosed his major blast to date. It was directed at what he calls the fright peddlers, accusing them of doing the "devil's work far better than the Communists do."

California's senior Senator is concerned about those who, in the name of patriotism and anticommunism, peddle unreasoned fear and those who fall for it and pass it along to others as gospel truth. Ten percent of the letters he receives, the Senator said is this kind of fright mail. Others can match this figure.

He offered shocking examples from the mail received in his office.

He cited the twisted charges concerning Operation Water Moccasin, an army counter-guerrilla warfare training exercise in Georgia, which had 124 foreign observers. But the fright peddlers put out the story that this was a U.N. plot to take over the United States and that African troops were being trained in Georgia for this specific purpose. (One African country, Liberia, had observers present.) The embellishments on this general theme, listed by Senator KUCHEL, literally challenge the imagination.

* * * * *

Senator KUCHEL cited also the misinformation concerning the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the false charges that it means U.S. forces would be turned over to Soviet direction under United Nations auspices. In this connection he did name John Rousselot, the $24,000-a-year anti-Communist of the John Birch Society, also criticized again by Senator KUCHEL, as one of the fright peddlers to blame. Mr. Rousselot has been in this county—in Palm Springs and more recently in Elsinore, peddling unreasoned fright, trying to justify his job.

Said Senator KUCHEL of Mr. Rousselot:

"When one who was honored to be a Member of Congress for 2 years—even one who writes for an undisguised hate sheet—utters such a cry, there are people who listen and believe."

Senator KUCHEL's speech was long on documentation as well as denunciation. It was a healthy effort.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, May 6, 1963]

SENATOR KUCHEL SCORES PEDDLERS OF FRIGHT

U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, attempted to reach the conscience of America in his direct attack against self-styled "I am a better American than you are" group by whatever name, persuasion, or extreme boast.

His was a sobering analysis of the witch hunting going on under a dozen guises, all in the name of Americanism. We can hope his words touch the persons who need them.

Telescoped and paraphrased, this is the Kuchel indictment:

Americans are being cruelly swindled by peddlers of fright for paranoia and profit. The real damage is that they divide us when we should be united and divert us from the real challenge from without by creating doubt, neighbor of neighbor, within.

They call themselves conservatives but they defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism as thoroughly as the Communists defile the honorable philosophy of liberalism.

They sow suspicion and hatred. They attempt to undermine faith in the Government, its institutions, its leaders. They preach resistance to law. They degrade America and Americans and do it as well as, or better than, the Communists do. Indeed their "ugly labors" are a "service to the Kremlin itself".

This is something which needed saying on the floor of the U.S. Senate. It will not quiet the "I am a better American than you are" groups but it does expose them.

And it is distressing, as KUCHEL found, to discover how easily persuaded many Americans can be to the swindle of the professional haters. In more than 3,000 letters KUCHEL has received from his constituents expressing concern over the plot within to turn America over to communism, only 10 of the correspondents raised even the slightest doubt or question about the validity of the claims. Here is a naivete, shocking in its revelation and dangerous in its implication.

Have we so soon forgotten the division bred by McCarthyism and the broken lives it left? Is there so little trust left in law and in the courts, and in the agencies of government charged with our security? Can there really be those who believe, with the acceptance of a child, the wild accusation that Dwight D. Eisenhower, for one, is part of the Communist conspiracy, as he has been charged by extremist accusers?

If one of his stature is to be destroyed, who among the rest of us is safe from the self appointed saviors whether infantile or cunning who prey upon fear with falsehood?

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Union, May 15, 1963]

REPUBLICANISM: KUCHEL'S OR BIRCHERS'?

If any further evidence was necessary as to the insidious and destructively divisive character of the John Birch Society, it is found in the amazing and unwarranted resolution of Monterey County Young Republicans censuring the Senator for his forthright leadership in denouncing the Birchers.

Examine the facts. In his speech, Senator KUCHEL had not attacked or criticized Republicans. He had warned of the dangers of an extremist, radical non-Republican organization whose head has vilified such distinguished Americans and Republicans as Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Milton Eisenhower, former Secretaries of State John Foster Dulles, and Christian Herter, and practically every other outstanding Republican of recent years.

Senator KUCHEL is a nationally recognized Republican spokesman. He is a leader of the party in the Congress of the United States, is respected by the great majority of responsible personalities of both parties, and he won a magnificent personal endorsement by his overwhelming victory in the last election at a time when most other Republicans were being badly trounced in California.

If anybody has the right to discuss critically a movement which is seeking to infiltrate into the Republican organization, he does. Yet, a young Republican club—whose members were not much out of diapers at a time when he was already upholding the principles of the party and of the Constitution—took upon itself censuring him for exposing a non-Republican subversive movement.

Such temerity would be laughable as ludicrous, excepting for this incident showing how the Birchers gain control of a respectable movement and then use its name to carry on their invidious purposes.

The language of the Monterey Young Republicans—such as characterizing Senator KUCHEL's words as "irresponsible and unworthy of being uttered in the Senate"—shows that they are not the utterances of true Republicans. They are the outcries of the Birchers themselves using a Republican organization captured for their un-Republican ends.

The Birchers play well the Communist game of dividing true Americans from each other. While they themselves are not real Republicans (their local paid agent is a registered Democrat) and are against our free institutions, preferring an authoritative, monolithic form of government to our traditional democratic rights under our Republic, they cause disunity among Republicans and other honest anti-Communists.

It should be understood that these observations refer to the leadership of the Birchers, for among their rank-and-file members are many sincere persons who have joined in the mistaken notion that they were affiliating with a genuinely patriotic movement and not one which has proven to be such a peculiarly destructive force.

As between Senator KUCHEL and the Birchers, there can be no question as to the Americanism of one and the peculiar fanaticism of the other. Also, we must believe that Senator KUCHEL still speaks with more right and authority for the Republicans than those whose actions cause only injurious rifts.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, May 6, 1963]

SENATOR KUCHEL'S WELCOME WRATH

Senator KUCHEL'S magnificiently strong speech in the Senate last week denouncing and exposing the fright peddlers of the extreme right should be remembered in the

history of our country as one of the alarm bells of American liberty.

His speech was magnificient, first of all, because it was timely. It was the first public discussion in the Senate of the ghastly flood of "fright peddler" mail with which dismayed Members of the 88th Congress are daily being swamped. It was surgically factual. And it was filled with truly eloquent indignation at the contemptible, lying hysteria which rightwing agitators are peddling for profit among their fearful, duped audiences.

Anyone who believes in the proposition that democratic debate must be based on truthful discussion of the facts underlying public questions must welcome Senator KUCHEL's speech. As Californians, we are proud that we sent such a man to the Senate. The danger of which he warns, while "not as dread or as foreboding" as the Communist danger, is, as he says, "equally offensive and evil to all reasonable, rational, free American citizens."

We are especially glad, also, that this denunciation of rightwing extremism came as the voice of Republican reason, intelligence, and good will. The Republican Party, not only in California, but throughout the country, is suffering from the divisive and contaminating consequences of the tactics of the John Birch Society and other extremist groups. Senator KUCHEL has given his party an unmistakable example of how to clear its image of the Birchist tarnish. The way to disassociate the party from its vicious extremism is for its leaders to speak out, as he has done, not in the mealy-mouth language of political elocution, in which the speaker can point to any one sentence to refute any other sentence he has uttered, but loud and clear and unwaveringly.

* * * * *

We join KUCHEL in his rejoinder of "nuts" to this paranoid nonsense. And we hope to hear from some others in the Senate and Congress of the United States who may have the guts and good sense to stand up and declare themselves.

[From the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, May 8, 1963]

KUCHEL'S WARNING

Those people and organizations so effectively attacked by Senator THOMAS KUCHEL in his Senate speech last week are not ultraconservative, or conservatives of any kind at all. They are Radicals, with a capital R; their beliefs are a complete denial of the American way.

Said the Senator: "They defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism as thoroughly as the Communists defile the honorable philosophy of liberalism."

Senator KUCHEL's eloquence was not directed at the true conservative, the patriot who takes his stand on the Constitution and American tradition. Rather it was pointed straight at that far-out and noisy fringe whose tactics of lie and distortion are as un-American as those practiced by the Reds.

The Senator is too much of an aware and experienced public servant to derogate the menace of communism in its internal and foreign forms. Certainly that menace is real enough, as an examination of domestic events and a quick glance at the map of the world will confirm.

Truth is the best weapon against communism. Senator KUCHEL is correct when he exposes those who would substitute the big lie for it.

The preservation of American liberties is a battleground on which liberal and conservative alike can stand shoulder to shoulder.

[From the San Jose Mercury, May 6, 1963]

BOGEYMEN UNMASKED

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, of California, possesses acute clarity of vision and the courage of the convictions his vision occasions.

We suspect this, in large part, explains why he is the Republican Party's best vote-getter in California.

It is, therefore, of particular interest to Californians in general and California Republicans in particular, when Senator KUCHEL assesses the continuing attempts of the radical right to (1) scare the daylights out of the American people and (2) take over the Republican Party.

We are pleased to associate ourselves with Senator KUCHEL's remarks in this regard. In striking at the fright peddlers Senator KUCHEL cited a number of "hoaxes" and "whoppers" the radical right have attempted to palm off on Americans as gospel.

He noted specifically the contention that the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has turned—or will turn—over the nation's military establishment to a Russian colonel in the United Nations. This is not only the most silly, it is one of the most persistent of the scare-stories retailed by the indefatigable letterwriters of the far right.

Like Senator KUCHEL, we feel sorry for the fearful who swallow these terror tales whole and regurgitate them from time to time in panic. Also like Senator KUCHEL we have nothing but contempt for the originators of these hoaxes and swindles. As the Senator expressed it:

"The curious fact is that the fright peddlers, from the simple simpletons to the wretched racists, all claim to be conservatives.

"They defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism as thoroughly as the Communists defile the honorable of liberalism. * * * They (the hoaxers) are anything but patriotic. Indeed, a good case can be made that they are unpatriotic and downright un-American. For they are doing a devil's work far better than Communists could do."

To which we say a fervent "amen."

[From the San Jose (Calif.) News, May 4, 1963]

SAVAGES READY TO HIT UNITED STATES—OR ARE THEY?

It's pretty frightening—the thought of those Red Chinese hordes poised just below the Mexican border ready to invade the United States.

We would call for the Army to come rushing to our defense, but we are afraid the commanding officer would turn out to be a Russian colonel.

Or did you read Senator KUCHEL's account of the amazing stories being spread by the radical right?

The senior Senator from California took on the "fright peddlers" the other day.

KUCHEL, the assistant Republican leader in the Senate, said, "What the fright peddlers have handed down to one another, over the years, is a daisy of a whopper, a puerile and evil package of fright calculated to scare the daylights out of decent Americans."

He identified John Rousselot, former Member of Congress and now a paid executive in the John Birch Society, as the dispenser of a story that the U.S. Government wants to put its Armed Forces under the command of a Russian.

Another whopper singled out by KUCHEL has the United Nations training thousands of foreign troops, including "barefoot savages," in Georgia as a prelude to taking over the United States.

The rightwing cannot expect too many people to swallow these stories, but it relies on the "where there's smoke there's fire" technique. KUCHEL is pointing out that there may be nothing more behind this brand of smoke than a smoke-making machine.

The Senator does a service when he calls on genuine conservatives to ignore the extremists and "to join the ranks again of sensible and decent anti-Communist, pro-Americans."

Senator KUCHEL seems to have overlooked the widely distributed story about the U.N. plan to have Irish troops occupy California.

We don't know how the Irish soldiers will get along with the Red Chinese or the barefoot savages. It probably depends on how strong a leader the Russian colonel is. Do you suppose that instead of a swagger stick the colonel will carry a shillelagh?

[From the San Leandro (Calif.) Morning News, May 8, 1963]

A SINCERE AMEN TO SENATOR KUCHEL

California's senior U.S. Senator, THOMAS H. KUCHEL, has added new stature to his distinguished record of political service with his recent exposure of the far-right extremists, whom KUCHEL aptly labeled "fright peddlers."

The liberal Republican leader, in a speech before the Senate, noted that thousands of Californians had been terrified to the point of hysteria by a series of hoaxes conjured up by right wing elements such as John Birch Society members.

Some of the latter claims recited by KUCHEL included charges that:

The United Nations was training thousands of foreign troops including "barefooted Africans" in Georgia as a prelude to a "takeover of the United States."

Under the act that creater the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, a Russian colonel in the United Nations would always control American Armed Forces.

Thousands of Chinese Communist troops were "poised on the Mexican border for an attack on California."

"The curious fact," said KUCHEL, "is that the fright peddlers, from the simpletons to the wretched racists, all claim to be conservatives.

"They defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism with that claim as thoroughly as the Communists defile the honorable philosophy of liberalism."

The Senator said he sympathizes with those "taken in as dupes" but has "nothing but contempt for the originators of the hoaxes and swindles."

"They are anything but patriotic," declared KUCHEL. "Indeed, a good case can be made that they are unpatriotic, and downright un-American. For they are doing a devil's work far better than Communists can do."

Republicans, legitimate conservatives and those who believe in truth as a bulwark of democracy owe a sincere "amen" to the courageous senior Senator.

In most convincing fashion, he has unmasked the right wing extremists for what they really are.

There are those in southern Alameda County who have rebelled, snarled and kicked up their heels in rage at TOM KUCHEL's speech. They can be expected now to resort to their standard smear techniques in an effort to discredit the Senator.

In this effort we are certain they will suffer defeat.

Senator KUCHEL is perhaps California's most respected political leader. His smashing victory last fall despite heavy Democratic triumphs in all other major State races indicated he has solid, widespread support from all citizens of this State, regardless of political party affiliation.

And we are sure his support now is even greater.

[From the Santa Barbara (Calif.) News-Press, May 2, 1963]

KUCHEL SCORNS "FRIGHT PEDDLERS"

Senator KUCHEL gave fear-mongering political extremists both barrels in the Senate speech reported on the front page of today's News-Press. His address was a devastating

analysis of the mail that pours into his office from the "fright peddlers," as he calls them.

The Senator presented fantastic examples of the abusive Bircher-type correspondence that has become the trademark of the "I am a better American than you are" cult. The favorite word of its members seems to be "treason." Senator KUCHEL said, "I still cannot believe my eyes when I stare at the ugliest word in the American lexicon tossed about in a letter as casually as the 'Dear Senator' salutation which opens it."

After answering some of their lies, the Senator put his finger on the damage these people are doing. "Clutching at half-truths and downright falsehoods," he said, "the fright peddlers fabricate hoaxes, as we have seen, which frighten Americans and divert their attention from the real menace. They sow suspicion and hatred. They attempt to undermine faith in government, its institutions, and its leaders. They preach resistance to the laws of our land. They degrade America and Americans and do it as well as—or better than—the Communists do."

The Senator has performed a distinguished service in his forthright speech. The News-Press commends its words to every American who values truth.

[From the Stockton (Calif.) Record, May 7, 1963]

PRIDE IN SENATOR KUCHEL

California's Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL scathingly denounced on the floor of the Senate the rightwing extremist groups as "fright peddlers" who are "anything but patriotic."

"It is disgusting," Senator KUCHEL said, "to find self-appointed saviors, whether infantile or cunning, preying profitably and psychotically on the fears of Americans in the name of anticommunism. Indeed, the ugly labors they perform are a service to the Kremlin, itself. They seek to divide, and too often succeed in dividing, our people far better than any Communist agents could do."

Senator KUCHEL spoke from a position of substantial political strength. He was re-elected in November by a solid plurality of 725,000 votes. He is the Republican whip in the Senate. He resides in southern California which is home ground for more than a fair share of the State's crackpot organizations.

In making what probably is the strongest official denunciation yet of hate groups and fright peddlers, the senior California Senator invited attack that surely will be made with all the noise and viciousness that can be mustered by those who place anticommunism ahead of good Americanism.

We are glad this needed speech was made, proud that it was made by a Republican Senator from California.

[From the Sunnyvale (Calif.) Standard, May 3, 1963]

KUCHEL AND "FRIGHT PEDDLERS"

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL yesterday aided the cause of responsible conservatism with an attack on the "fright peddlers" who frequently hurt the Republican Party's image.

The senior Senator from California speaks from first-hand experience when he warns legitimate conservatives of the threat from purveyors of hatred and distrust.

He has frequently been the target of harsh criticism in extreme conservative circles because his record strikes some as too progressive.

Yet such attacks obviously have not hurt him with the majority of voters. He has successfully survived a generally unfavorable tide that has seen other State Republican leaders defeated.

His career is proof of the generally prevailing political view that a course of moderation has, in normal circumstances, the greatest appeal for the majority of American voters.

This fact does not silence his critics, but it does lend weight to his words. It helps the country to have a respected conservative leader issue such a warning against extremist groups.

There is genuine need for strongly held conservative viewpoints if the Nation is to maintain its traditional political balance. But such views are harmed by far-out spokesmen who try to usurp the label of conservative.

Senator KUCHEL obviously recognizes the threat implied in allowing the John Birch Society and even more extreme groups to become identified merely as conservatives in the public mind. Such a situation could only damage all real conservatives.

If the Senator's speech yesterday was a political warning to his party, it was also a definite warning to sincere anti-Communists not to be confused and stampeded by the peddlers of hate and suspicion.

Tales of "barefooted Africans" taking over the American countryside and Communist armies massing on the California border are sheer hysteria.

Not only do such fantasies mislead and confuse some well-meaning people, but they distract the country's attention from the real cold war issues and domestic problems facing us.

Such charlatanism deserves rebuke, and we are glad that a leading spokesman for responsible conservatism has seen fit to take a major role in alerting the public.

[From the Tulare (Calif.) Advance-Register, May 3, 1963]

KUCHEL BLOWS THE WHISTLE

Do you think all Americans are as normal and as reasonable as you are?

If so, guess again. It just isn't so. Paranoia and hysteria are rampant in our land and the fright peddlers are taking full advantage of this sorry state of affairs.

Once in a while, fortunately, some courageous soul draws a bead on these people who are like a cancer gnawing away at the heart of America and draws them up short with a ringing denunciation of their activities.

Such an event took place yesterday on the floor of the U.S. Senate when TOM KUCHEL, the able Republican Senator from California, called on cruelly swindled Americans to reappraise the peddlers of fright for paranoia and profit and rejoin the ranks of responsible anti-Communist, pro-Americans.

KUCHEL told his fellow Senators: "America has enough immediate and deadly dangerous enemies, without adding hobgoblins. America can use all the responsible help it can get."

He ripped into the fright peddlers who he described as "hundreds of self-styled patriotic groups" ranging from the John Birch Society to the followers of Gerald L. K. Smith. If a Democrat had said the same things, it is likely that he would have been branded a "Red." But these words, mind you, were spoken on the Senate floor by the Republican Party whip in the upper chamber of the U.S. Congress.

KUCHEL was particularly bitter in his speech about some of the purely fraudulent stories used by the fright peddlers to terrify Americans. These two, for instance:

The United Nations is training thousands of foreign trooops, including barefoot savages, in Georgia, as a prelude to a takeover of the United States.

The United States no longer has an Army, Navy or Air Force because the act that created the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has turned over our military to a Russian colonel in the United Nations.

Now, because you're normal and reasonable, you simply can't believe that anyone would swallow stories like those, can you? But they have. Senator KUCHEL said he has received more than 3,000 hysterical letters and crude leaflets from constituents on this subject. And, worst of all, only 10 of those letter writers raised even the slightest doubt of question about the validity of the twin claims.

Thank goodness most Americans haven't been hornswoggled by these extremists who employ the big lie in their untiring efforts to win new converts. And we can all be thankful that we have forthright people like TOM KUCHEL in high public office, ready to blow the whistle on the crackpots who, in his own words, "sow suspicion and hatred * * * attempt to undermine faith in our Government, its institutions and leaders * * * preach resistance to the laws of our land * * * degrade America and Americans and do it as well as—or better than—the Communists do."

[From the Vallejo (Calif.) Times Herald, May 11, 1963]

SOLON HITS HATE MONGERS

Conditions may be far worse than ordinary citizens imagine when usually calm and seriously minded Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, of California, rises in the Senate to denounce the hate, fear, and smear brigade which is flooding his Washington office with 3,000 to 5,000 letters and cards daily. He characterizes them as the "extreme right-wing hate" groups engaged in spewing their "contemptible slime" throughout the country.

It is distasteful to admit that large segments of the hate group are located in California where they engage in "spewing" their ultrasensational fear complex among people who are willing to listen to their doctrine and pass it along. From reading Senator KUCHEL's address, we learn that some of the fearful ones believe the U.N. is training African troops in Georgia, preparatory to taking over the United States, and that a contingent of Red Chinese troops are being trained down in Mexico to destroy this country.

Senator KUCHEL's correspondents are charging him with cowardice and even suggesting treason, for his failure to fall for this dangerous propaganda. Instead of making an effort to learn the facts and spread the truth, they are swallowing this filth hook, line, and sinker, and criticizing those who refuse to go along with their gullibility. As the Senator remarks: "These groups are doing a devil's work far better than Communists could do."

"It is distressing and disillusioning to find persons of normal educational attainments—or any educational level—falling hysterically and emotionally, without reservations, for the unadulterated venom spewed by out-and-out crackpots for paranoid profit."

There is no doubt that crackpots described by the Senator are at large, giving false witness, and frightening the gullible who listen to them.

[From the Watsonville (Calif.) Register-Pajaronian, May 3, 1963]

RADICAL LEFT?—RADICAL RIGHT?—BOTH REPRESENT DANGER

Nothing is so certain to send blood pressures soaring as the question of who should and who shouldn't be permitted to speak on college campuses.

The issue was a hot one again this week. Chancellor Edward W. Strong of the University of California made it that way by observing that if rightwingers were allowed to speak on campuses, then he couldn't see why Communists should be banned.

Strong was taken to task. Couldn't he recognize that the rightist, on one hand, is presumed to be a loyal American whereas the Communist, on the other, is a part of a foreign conspiracy openly dedicated to the overthrow of the American Government?

This is a good point, but it overlooks the fact that there are some hysterical right-wingers who appear just as determined to destroy our Government and its institutions as card-carrying Communists.

Some of these perverters of American principles, who belong to the "I am a better American than you are club," would have you believe the Government is crawling with Reds, that we are the victims of a Communist conspiracy by virtue of our membership in the United Nations, that the income tax is an insidious Communist (sometimes "Jewish" is substituted) plot to destroy the United States, and that if we are to survive, we must impeach or shoot the President, the Chief Justice of the United States, and nearly anyone else with whom they disagree.

As U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL said in a Senate speech this week, these self-styled patriots "sow suspicion and hatred. They attempt to undermine faith in our Government, its institutions, and leaders. They preach resistance to the laws of our land. They degrade America and Americans and do it as well as—or better than—the Communists do."

And added KUCHEL, a Republican: "They defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism * * * as thoroughly as the Communists defile the honorable philosophy of liberalism."

So, if a Communist speaker poses a danger to the minds of our university students, the same may be said of the radical rightist. In fact, he may represent even a greater hazard, for it is he who mounts the platform to the strains of "God Bless America," and it is he who spreads his poison as he stands before the American flag for which Americans fought and died.

Nevertheless, the issue centers not on which radical is the more dangerous, but on what limitations, if any, should be placed on representatives of either the far right or left to speak on our campuses.

We realize that the presence of a Gus Hall or a Gerald L. K. Smith on a campus is disturbing and even frightening to good citizens. Yet, if we bar speakers who represent unpopular causes, we run the danger of (1) restricting the open flow of ideas, which in time may choke off traditional academic freedom; (2) enhancing the attractiveness of the very ideas we're trying to suppress; and (3) displaying a singular lack of confidence in the ability of our young people to think for themselves.

Far better to get these despicable ideas out in the open where we can effectively deal with them. Let the universities be tolerant of repugnant speakers of any stripe, just so long as they plainly label them for what they are and what they stand for.

The university, too, has a responsibility to counter speaker with speaker, ideas with ideas, so as to expose students to the broad spectrum of conflict and philosophies of government and men reflected in our political structure.

In the end, we must assure that the voice of the moderates and moderatism prevail. For if we fall into the muck of the extremists, we and our institutions are doomed.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Evening Sun, May 3, 1963]

KUCHEL'S COMMONSENSE

Senator KUCHEL has the right words for them in his apt phrase "the fright peddlers." They are the publicists, professional and amateur, who dispense drivel to that small part of the American population gullible enough to believe the worst in any imperfect situation. As Senator KUCHEL says, "it is distressing and disillusioning to find persons of normal educational attainments—or any educational level—falling, hysterically and emotionally, for the venom spewed by out-and-out crackpots."

What, exactly, is the kind of nonsense put out by the John Birch Society and other extreme right-wing organizations? The Senator from California is specific. One is the assertion that the head of the U.S. Arms Control Agency is a dictator, not answerable even to the President or Congress, who can dismantle the American Armed Forces and turn them over to the United Nations. Another is the insistence that a Russian is in overall charge of United Nations military operations. A third is the recurrent revelation that President Eisenhower was nothing more than a front man for the Communists. And so on.

Presumably this kind of claptrap is more prevalent in California than elsewhere, for Senator KUCHEL says that 10 percent of his mail reflects such themes, while Maryland's Senators find it less than 5 percent. But the mere fact that circulation of such nonsense goes on is reason enough to bring it out in the open and denounce it. For when improbably wild reports are believed by the most credulous, seeking desperately for oversimplified explanations of why the world doesn't go exactly as they would like it, even the more sensible are affected by the fallout.

Senator KUCHEL has stood consistently not only against the crackpots but against the emotional rightwing of his own Republican party. To say what he has just said reflects neither great courage nor unusual perspicacity. But it does show plain ordinary commonsense, a refreshing commodity we can always use more of.

[From the Cleveland Plain-Dealer, May 4, 1963]

FRIGHT PEDDLERS

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, of California, hit the nail on the head when he said that rightwing extremists do "Devil's work far better than Communists could do." It is difficult to believe that anyone could believe such fancies as those revealed in some letters to Senator KUCHEL, such as these:

The U.S. Army is training African troops in Georgia in Operation Moccasin to take over the country for the United Nations.

African Negro troops who are cannibals are stationed in Georgia.

Sixteen thousand African soldiers, complete with nose and earrings, currently are in Georgia.

The U.N. plans to place Mongolian and Congolese troops over our dear United States.

Thousands of Chinese Communist troops are in Mexico, poised for an attack on California.

All our Armed Forces will be turned over to a Russian colonel at the United Nations.

The danger of such nonsense, Senator KUCHEL explained, is that "there are people who listen and believe."

Every sane American has a duty to discredit such fantasies whenever he hears them repeated.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, May 4, 1963]

THE POISON PEDDLERS

There are in this country some hundreds of persons capable of retailing the most astounding fiction as utter fact. And there are millions, apparently, whose capacity for believing nonsense is almost infinite. When the liars and the gullible get together on matters such as the loyalty of Dwight D. Eisenhower or an alleged Negro plot to take over the United States, the opportunities for destructive mischief are manifest.

The No. 2 Republican in the U.S. Senate, THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, ripped into these types in a Senate speech this week, naming names and citing examples of their handiwork.

In the van of the fright brigade he placed Gerald L. K. Smith; Former Representative John H. Rousselot, of California; the John Birch Society; and an outfit by the disarming name of United Societies of Methodist Laymen, Inc., of Austin, Tex.

Among the fables peddled as fact:

The Army is training African troops in Georgia in Operation Moccasin to take over the country for the United Nations. Some of the Africans are cannibals; other wear rings in their noses.

Thousands of Chinese troops are being assembled in Mexico for an assault on California.

On a certain day the Armed Forces of the United States will be turned over to a Russian colonel at the United Nations. (This was borrowed from a Hollywood scenario of a decade ago.)

Forty-four prominent American and allied leaders are secretly Communists; Former President Eisenhower is in league with them.

The U.S. Government is honeycombed with Communists.

KUCHEL said the outpouring of fright mail from the rightwing extremists amounts in his office alone to 6,000 letters a month.

The Senator, who has often run afoul of the fringers in his home State, makes the point that "they defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism * * * as thoroughly as the Communists defile the honorable philosophy of liberalism."

The comparison is apt, we believe. Indeed, the theory has been advanced that there may be a degree of collaboration between the extremists of the right and left. Clearly they share an objective, to create confusion through terror, and a method in the big lie.

[From the Corpus Christi (Tex.) Caller, May 6, 1963]

FEAR PEDDLING DENOUNCED AS A DANGEROUS RACKET

Republican Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, Senate minority whip and an enlightened conservative, took the floor recently in righteous indignation to denounce the "fright peddlers, from the simpletons to the wretched racists" who "defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism." It was a timely and courageous address from a man whose constituents number a high proportion of political extremists.

"It is disgusting," KUCHEL said, "to find self-appointed saviors, whether infantile or cunning, preying profitably and psychotically on the fears of Americans in the name of anticommunism." It is also dangerous.

Senator KUCHEL enumerated some of the preposterous rumors cropping up in what he called his "fright mail": That African savages are being trained in Georgia to help take over the United States for the U.N., that American Armed Forces have been subordinated to a Russian colonel in the U.N., that Chinese Communists are mobilizing in Mexico to attack California, ad nauseam. These are on a par with earlier rumors that a routine mental health program act was setting up concentration camps in Alaska for the "lunatic fringe" and that safe and beneficial fluoridation of municipal water supplies was a Communist plot to poison the Nation.

There are today literally hundreds of professional pamphleteers, scare-sheet publishers, lecturers and miscellaneous agitators in the despicable racket of profiteering on the gullibility and fears of uninformed or emotionally unstable people. The racket is astonishingly simple: Set up a scarecrow and rake in donations to lead the crusade to knock it down. And it generates a para-religious fanaticism that defies reasoned and researched rebuttal.

Senator KUCHEL was unable to prescribe any panacea for this cancer in the American body politic. The only arresting antidote apparent is for responsible statesmen to

warn of its danger to national stability and security, and for citizens to develop a healthier skepticism toward irresponsible and unsupported rumors.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, May 6, 1963]

THE EXTREMISTS GET A BLASTING

California's Republican Senator THOMAS KUCHEL did a good day's work when he stood up on the Senate floor to denounce "fright peddlers" who circulate preposterous lies with which "to scare the daylights out of decent Americans."

He was talking about the extremists and the sharpsters who make a good thing out of perpetuating the hate literature which has found a ready sale among the gullible.

That the hard-core gullibles will be overtaken with any greater ability to discern the hoaxes advanced by either fanatics or charlatans is not to be supposed. The hard-core gullibles will always be with us. Were it not so, confidence men would starve to death, and they don't.

Nor will the pamphleteers and "organizers" be dissuaded from their work, whether fanatics or charlatans. Both have found that there is good money to be had out of peddling falsehood which slanders fine, dedicated Americans with charges of communism.

However, Senator KUCHEL'S forceful attack on them, along with the praise he received from prominent Congress Members in both parties, will make easier the minds of those who subscribe to the idea that "where there is so much smoke there must be some fire"—and don't bother to inquire into the nature of the smudge.

Senator KUCHEL identified it exceedingly well when he said that those responsible for its stenchful smoke "defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism * * * as thoroughly as Reds defile the honorable philosophy of liberalism" and that a good case can be made for the extremists being "unpatriotic and downright un-American."

[From the Northwest Arkansas Times]

HITTING THE HATE PEDDLERS

It took a good deal of political courage for Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, to denounce, as he did, self-styled patriotic groups and their unadulterated venom, hoaxes, and lies. Particular courage was demanded, in this case, because in California self-styled groups of which he spoke are numerous and powerful.

The country as a whole owes a debt to Senator KUCHEL. The fright peddlers long have been setting themselves up for just such a roasting, and the California Senator did the job up brown, using language which cannot be interpreted to mean anything but what the speaker intended—a blast at those who imagine our Nation crawling with Communists.

The command of the English language as used by Senator KUCHEL in this instance must be admired. It is distressing and disillusioning to find many educated people falling hysterically and emotionally, without reservation, for the unadulterated venom spewed by out-and-out crackpots for paranoia and profit, he said. That is plain enough for anybody to understand. His remarks in this connection are only too true.

This publication the other day was urged by a telephone caller to support a movement the likes of which the Senator condemned. "Do you know any Communists?" the caller was asked. The reply, "Oh, yes. I know of quite a few." "Then you should inform the FBI." "Oh, I have."

But this was not enough—this citizen was determined to spread the word that Americanism in northwest Arkansas, as in all the rest of the country in which we live, is heavily menaced by an "ism" that is gaining converts at an amazing rate.

Nationally there are thousands of Americans who are being taken in by a campaign of hate and fear. The Senator pointed out "The curious fact is that the fright peddlers, from the simple simpletons to the wretched racists, all claim to be conservatives. They defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism with that claim as thoroughly as the Communists defile the honorable philosophy of liberalism."

The Senator's outburst will, of course, net many replies, and it will provide an opportunity for publicity for some of the men and women who preach the gospel he attacks. But the truths he tells blow a fresh breeze across the country, and his remarks should be welcomed by thinking Americans. The work of the extremists occasions high humor, provides many laughs, and does not seem very serious in many instances. But it is duping a percentage of the American public, convincing numbers that they must look under the bed before retiring lest the Reds get them, and generally kicking up suspicion and fear.

"It is incredible that so many Americans have been so cruelly swindled, and have allowed themselves to be so cruelly duped," Senator KUCHEL asserted, but this development is only too true.

Maybe Americans will stop and think, now that the situation is brought out forcefully and realize that if the Kremlin could have anything it wanted, one of the first orders would be confusion and suspicion among the American people. Doubt in the American system, fear of each other, a feeling that neighbors and friends are opposing the present system of government—all this is close to the Communist heart and helpful to the Communist cause.

The folks who are doing the most to bring about this state of affairs are the very hate peddlers of which Senator KUCHEL speaks.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, May 15, 1963]

THE SENATOR SAYS "NUTS"

The Birchers and allied extremists have attracted a great deal of attention in the past year with their fearful clap-trap.

Now Senator TOM KUCHEL of California has revealed new dimensions of the super-American movement. It is something which, according to columnist Marquis Childs, has caused considerable talk on Capitol Hill for some months—the flow of hate-and-fear mail to Congress.

Senator KUCHEL, in a Senate speech, estimated that of the 60,000 letters a month pouring into his office roughly 10 percent are from the radical right. They assert that United Nations troops have been training secretly in Georgia to take over the United States that thousands of Chinese Communist troops are poised on the Mexican border, ready to invade, that the Armed Forces are honeycombed with traitors.

The writers of these letters and of pamphlets charge that the U.S. Disarmament Agency is plotting to turn the United States over to Russia.

The Senator, a Republican, said he himself is accused of being pro-Communist or a traitor and that when he replies with the facts on a given issue the answer comes back that, well, at least he is a dupe.

The Senator let the hysteria-mongers have it with both barrels:

"It is disgusting," he said, "to find self-appointed saviors, whether infantile or cunning, preying profitably and psychotically on the fears of Americans in the name of anti-communism. Indeed, the ugly labors they perform are a service to the Kremlin itself."

To which we say, "Amen."

The Senator said this slander and abuse reveals an essential disloyalty on the part of those who deal in it. They have no confidence either in their fellow Americans or even in the democratic life or its strong appeal to others.

Do they really believe all they say, he asked.

"If they do, the only reasonable reply I can give to them which they will understand is the honorable, 100 percent, red, white, and blue expression: Nuts."

And to that we say "Amen" also.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, May 8, 1963]

SENATOR KUCHEL, SORELY TRIED, MADE A REMARKABLE SPEECH

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL smote the far-out right hip and thigh in a remarkable speech in the Senate last week. The California Republican has been sorely tried by Birchites in his home State who are trying to capture the Republican Party machinery. In his successful campaign for reelection last year, Senator KUCHEL attacked the Birch Society and ran his campaign independently even of Richard Nixon. KUCHEL won by a margin of 727,000 while Nixon was losing to Governor Brown by 297,000. Nixon never could bring himself to completely repudiate the Birchites running as Republicans in the general election.

Senator KUCHEL is a political moderate of the kind that seems to be popular in California. Nevertheless, the Senator says that of the 60,000 letters a month that come to him, about 10 percent are in the wild, right-wing category. These writers accuse him of being pro-Communist and a traitor. When he replies, giving the facts of a particular situation, these people respond by saying he is either a dupe or an agent practicing deceit.

The Senator has run out of patience. He told the Senate he is disturbed by the work of professional peddlers of hate and the wide range of crackpots who, through the printed word, radio, and television, spread fantastic charges that have no relation to the truth. These people, he said, are contributing to an atmosphere of growing hysteria. Senator KUCHEL produced samples of his correspondence as well as pamphlets and printed material making fantastic charges that, in the words of the Senator, reflect paranoia.

Among the tales being circulated by the "fright peddlers" are these whoppers: That the U.N. is, or was, training thousands of foreign troops, including barefooted Africans in Georgia, as a prelude to a takeover of the United States; that under the act creating the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, a Russian colonel in the U.N. would control U.S. Armed Forces; and that thousands of Chinese Communist troops are poised on the Mexican border for an attack on California.

Senator KUCHEL resents those who are spreading these falsehoods identifying themselves as "conservatives." "The curious fact is," he told the Senate, "that the fright peddlers, from the simple simpletons to the wretched racists, all claim to be conservatives. They defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism with that claim as thoroughly as the Communists defile the honorable philosophy of liberalism."

If the Senator keeps talking that way he may supplant fellow Californian Earl Warren as the No. 1 man on the far-out right's hate list. But how do you impeach a U.S. Senator, especially one who has just won a new 6-year term by a healthy margin?

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, May 13, 1963]

FRIGHT PEDDLERS

Two Republican Party leaders have leveled well-timed and considered attacks at the rightwing peddlers of "unadulterated venom," hoaxes and lies.

Senator KUCHEL, Republican, of California, in a well documented speech, told the Senate that the Nation is plagued by "fright

mail" and charges of treason in every phase of national life "spewed out by out-and-out crackpots for paranoia and profit."

Governor Hatfield, of Oregon, said in an Arizona speech that Fascists exist in this country now, often supported by rightwing businessmen, and "are a danger to our American ideals." The John Birch Society, he said, has individuals "dangerous to the American way of life."

KUCHEL told the Senate that he gets as many as 60,000 letters a month and as many as 10 percent of these are pure fright mail. They come from persons influenced by "I am a better American than you" organizations. They profess "to see our Government crawling with Communists" and pour spleen on anyone who does not share their "queer and puzzling dogmas."

Charges made in such mail are simply incredible. A current one flooding the Nation is that some 15,000 United Nations troops from 15 nations have been carrying out military operations called Water Moccasin III in Georgia.

These are largely Communist troops, the charge goes, including "pagan, ruthless, brutal, godless savages" from Mongolia and the Congo. They are, it is claimed, about to be turned over to a Russian general to conquer the United States.

What is this fantasy based on? The fact that our Army has been conducting a counterguerrilla exercise with 600 soldiers. The only foreigners involved are a total of 124 observers from Canada, Nationalist China, France, Great Britain, Guatemala, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Japan, South Korea, Liberia, Pakistan, the Philippines, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, and South Vietnam. The United Nations has nothing to do with the exercise.

Another current charge of the fright peddlers is that thousands of Chinese Communist troops are poised at the Mexican border to invade this country—with the connivance of Americans in high places, of course.

Another charge is that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, created by Congress by overwhelming vote, is really a cover for a plot to turn the Armed Forces of the United States over to the Russians. And, as Senator KUCHEL says, "when the charges are disputed, those who make them charge treason."

The California Republican professes seething contempt for the originators of the hoaxes and swindles—including the ludicrous leaders of the John Birch Society. Their goals, he points out, "are identical to the real hopes and aspirations of the Kremlin"—get the United States out of the U.N., end foreign aid, abandon the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, get out of Europe, and all the rest. To all of the hysterical, emotional, and venomous charges KUCHEL replies with "the honorable, 100-percent red, white, and blue expression: 'Nuts'."

Senator KUCHEL has performed a fine public service. As Governor Hatfield puts it, we are being called upon by fanatics "to counsel with our fears rather than with our faith." They do violence to our political system and our ideals. They try to divide our people—and sometimes succeed—just as Communist agents try. America, as Senator KUCHEL says, "has enough immediate and deadly dangerous enemies, without manufacturing hobgoblins."

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean, May 4, 1963]

GOP WHIP KUCHEL AIMS A WELL-DESERVED BLAST

The Senate Republican whip, Senator THOMAS KUCHEL of California, has done his party and his country a service with his forthright floor speech in which he charged that right-wing extremists do "devil's work far better than Communists could do."

Senator KUCHEL excoriated what he termed the "fright peddlers" who imagine plots against the country and "see our Government crawling with Communists." He specifically named the John Birch Society, but his indictment was broad enough to include those who wail of "no-win policies" and spread scare stories about Cuba with lies and half-truths as their foundation.

The fright peddlers, Senator KUCHEL said, have in common "all-out, uncompromising hysterical demands" some of which are "very likely identical to the real hopes of the Kremlin." He listed some of these as stopping all foreign aid, abandoning NATO, and removing the United Nations from the United States, among other things.

Among the incredible stupidities bruited about are stories that cannibals are stationed in Georgia in Operation Water Moccasin, whose object is to take over the country for the U.N.; that all our Armed Forces are to be turned over to a Russian colonel at the U.N.; and that Chinese Communist troops are in Mexico, poised to attack California.

"It is disgusting," Senator KUCHEL said, "to find self-appointed saviors, whether infantile or cunning, preying profitably and psychotically on the fears of Americans in the name of anticommunism."

We live in a time of anxiety, under the shadow of the H-bomb. There are many who are more than willing to exploit our discontents and fears. Wrapping themselves in flags, the superpatriots foment hysteria with hobgoblins and foster frustration with scapegoats. If it's trouble in Cuba or Laos, then it must be the "no-win clique" in the State Department which has allowed this to happen. The insinuation is bald and deliberately aimed at rousing the spirit of vigilantism.

Or, if not the State Department, then surely the U.N. where they are convinced the crafty rascals are plotting our downfall.

Senator KUCHEL is more than a little right when he says these fright peddlers do "Devil's work far better than Communists." Nothing would please the Communist world more than to have us divided and panicky at home, frustrated to the point of blindly striking out, distrustful of our own leadership and willing to wreck the alliance of our friends.

Thank heaven the vast majority of Americans are levelheaded enough to prefer reason to rhetoric, calmness to panic and courageous leadership to demagogs.

"America has enough immediate and deadly enemies without adding hobgoblins," said Senator KUCHEL. He deserves the applause of all who are concerned about their world and the Communist menace but who know that courage, patience and faith will win more battles than blind panic.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald, May 4, 1963]

HOBGOBLINS ON THE RIGHT

There are quite a number of John Birchers and others of the extreme right in Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL'S California backyard. To take them on in open battle as he has done repeatedly calls for political courage of no mean order. But the Republican Senate whip is performing a service not only to his party but to his State and his country by exposing those who, as he put it, "defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism."

The far right, like the far left, generally finds no respectable voices, among the press or public men, to speak for it. As a result, many canards originate in their little hate sheets and their little hate speeches and circulate unchecked. It is amazing with what credulity the wildest stories are accepted by those predisposed to believe them; the tale of cannibal Africans being trained by the United Nations in Georgia to take over the United States could, one would imagine, deceive no one, yet Senator KUCHEL says it is mentioned in many of the "fright letters" he receives.

There is a philosophy of conservatism, and, as Mr. KUCHEL says, it is an honorable one. But it certainly cannot be advanced by stories which sound like a mixture of the late and unlamented Julius Streicher's outpourings with the tales of the Brothers Grimm. Nor will American security be promoted by keeping a wary eye on imaginary Mongol hordes clustering just across the Mexican border. Above all, the wrong that is done to patriotic Americans by such rightwing calumnies represents a threat to the public service and the public order.

This country needs to have its best minds, and all good citizens, trading thoughts openly in the marketplace of ideas. What is damaging are under-the-counter deals, secret connivings, faked goods, and counterfeit intellectual currency. By acting as a kind of better business bureau to police the phony "ideas" of the right, Senator KUCHEL is doing a good, and a needed, job. As he says, the United States has enough dangerous enemies without inventing any hobgoblins.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 10, 1963]

WHO'S FOR THE CONSTITUTION?

President Kennedy has directed national attention to one of the anomalies in the pressure campaigns conducted by the superpatriots of the radical right. The tendency of these self-appointed defenders of the Constitution, the President noted, is to work ceaselessly for constitutional changes so basic they would upset its essential principles.

Mr. Kennedy was referring specifically to the three States rights amendments, which have already slipped through a score of State legislatures almost without debate. These proposals, as we have previously declared, would subvert the form of government established in 1787 by removing many of the powers of Congress and the Supreme Court. They are indicative of the perils that reside in the extreme right—perils well summarized by Senator KUCHEL, the Republican whip, in a recent speech on the Senate floor.

His theme was that right-wing fright-peddlers were doing "devil's work far better than Communists could do." He charged that those who pander to hate and fear in the name of conservatism "defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism with that claim as thoroughly as the Communists defile the honorable philosophy of liberalism." This is a judgment that will find widespread endorsement among responsible Americans of all political persuasions.

[From the New York (N.Y.) World-Telegram, May 8, 1963]

THE FRIGHT PEDDLERS

Senator KUCHEL, of California, has been reading his mail, as a good Senator should.

And some of what he has read alarms him, with cause. He calls it fright mail—inspired by crazy rumors and allegations deliberately planted by fright peddlers, to use another KUCHEL term.

There is nothing new in this, although the current wave, as illustrated by KUCHEL'S mail, may be more vicious than normal. This country, no less than others, has always had its quota of crackpots, zealots, bigots, dupes and superstitious ninnies.

The John Birch Society and similar outfits were the particular targets of KUCHEL'S indignation, and alarm.

There are no bigots like the super-patriotic type. One of the Senator's complaints was the readiness of these types not only to spread as gospel utterly false charges but their squint-minded habit of yelling Communist at everyone who disagrees with them, or questions one of their far-fetched concoctions.

This tactic, of course, stamps anyone who uses it. In this country, there is still the privilege of disagreement, of skepticism, of making mistakes without being called names.

In delivering on the Senate floor his well-documented scourging of the fright peddlers KUCHEL performed a service.

He answered them, that the people may better judge, even though one result certainly will be ashes on his head from these same elements.

What the Senator did not do, wisely, was to demand action against them, punitive or restrictive.

This would be their tactics.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer]

SENATOR KUCHEL AND "DEVIL'S WORK"

California's Senator THOMAS KUCHEL has a rare gift for a telling phrase which he used last week in a Senate speech devoted to the wide world of the far, far right.

His mail (largely from California) informed him, he said, that extremists of the right do "the Devil's work far better than the Communists do * * * fright peddlers who see our Government crawling with Communists."

Senator KUCHEL mentioned particularly the widespread idiocy about "African cannibals" training in Georgia to take over the country for the United Nations, which allegedly proposes to put it under the command of a Russian colonel.

Operation Water Moccasin in Georgia has, of course, been devoted to training American GI's in antiguerrilla warfare, something they may badly need to know.

What irritates the Senator most, apparently, is that these fantastic, ignorant eccentrics fancy themselves to be conservatives.

"They defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism with that claim as thoroughly as the Communists defile the honorable philosophy of liberalism," he said.

That is the very point we have made on this page several times in the recent past: By claiming to be the only true-blue Americans, lunatic fringers from both fringes obfuscate and confuse the great, wide middle ground where honest Americans must meet and map out their national needs and choices.

We hope the Senator was heard by all members of this sorry lot, not only those in his own State. He made it abundantly clear that their proudest claim—to exalted patriotism—is a fraud. Moscow would love to see such zealots come to power in America—and try to repeal the 20th century. It would insure a Red 21st.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Press-Herald, May 9, 1963]

"FRIGHT PEDDLERS" AND THEIR ILK COME UNDER FIRE OF SENATOR KUCHEL

Since he comes from a State having an over-supply of crackpots, fanatics, and believers in the rightwing line, all the way from the fuzzy-minded to the vicious, it took courage for GOP Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, to assail the John Birchers and other extremists on the Senate floor the other day.

Senator KUCHEL, a level-minded conservative, is angry at the groups he named for the fright mail they peddle and encourage, but also because they pose as conservatives and give true conservatives a bad name. It is incredible that people believe the tripe disseminated by the "fright peddlers," but the Senator says it crops up often in his mail—a typical canard the charge that a Russian colonel in the U.N. is the real boss of the U.S. military. Or take this one—the United Nations is training an army of African cannibals in Georgia, and when the time is ripe they will take over the whole country.

The theme of most of this garbage is good old American patriotism, but as a recent study of the fright groups points out, Gerald L. K. Smith is still viciously attacking the Jews, the Manion Forum is hot on the trail of "labor monopolies," the income tax, medicare, and the farm program are the targets of the well-financed Human Events newsletter, while a defrocked pastor of the Presbyterian Church U.S.A., Carl McIntire, whose 20th century "Reformation Hour" is heard on at least two Maine radio stations (we wonder if their proprietors know of his past record) is still trying to destroy the National Council of Churches.

These shrill voices will undoubtedly rise as the presidential campaign nears, and while they have nothing to sell but lies and prejudice and scare-talk, Senator KUCHEL wishes they would identify themselves for what they really are.

[From the Portsmouth (N.H. Herald, May 7, 1963]

BROADSIDE AT EXTREMISTS

Senator KUCHEL, of California, the assistant Republican leader in the Senate, has performed a notable public service by excoriating "self-styled patriotic groups" that peddle hate and fear in the name of patriotism, conservatism, Christianity, and anticommunism. What he said in a tough Senate speech should help to further alert the public to the dangers of extremism.

Senator KUCHEL laid it on the line. There was eminently good sense in his reminder that "America has enough immediate and deadly enemies without adding hobgoblins." Then he proceeded to describe some of the hoaxes and untruths which comprise these hobgoblins—the claim that the United States is training thousands of foreign troops in Georgia as a step toward a United Nations takeover, the assertion that U.S. forces are under the ultimate control of a Russian officer in the United Nations, the warning that thousands of Chinese Communist troops are on the Mexican border ready to attack California, and so on from one sick charge to another.

Such weird distortions of the truth are not, unfortunately, shrugged off by all Americans. As KUCHEL pointed out, even some educated people who ought to know better are "falling hysterically and emotionally, without reservation, for the unadulterated venom spewed by out-and-out crackpots for paranoia and profits."

Strong language? Yes, but strong language is needed. The fact that Senator KUCHEL was motivated in part by a desire to free the GOP in California from the taint of the extreme right does not alter the fact that he has contributed ably to public understanding of a nasty problem.

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune, May 5, 1963]

THE MODERN HYDRA

The mythical hydra was a nine-headed monster which grew two new heads whenever one was cut off. Last week, Senator KUCHEL, of California, took up arms against a modern hydra.

"Fright peddlers" of the extreme right, said KUCHEL in a Senate speech, are doing the devil's work far better than the Communists could do." He listed in detail wild rumors, now being spread around the country, whose obvious purpose is to foment distrust and suspicion. Ten percent of the letters he receives each month are in the far-out category, KUCHEL declared.

One persistent story is that the Army is training 16,000 African troops in Operation Water Moccasin to take over the country for the United Nations. In fact, "Water Moccasin" was an Army training exercise in counter-guerrilla warfare and the only African on hand was an observer from Liberia.

Another rumor says thousands of Chinese troops are in Mexico preparing to attack California. This is a pure fabrication with not even the hint of a factual starting point.

Still another rumor charges that U.S. Armed Forces will be turned over to a Soviet colonel at the United Nations. This originated from a Hollywood play written during the 1950's.

KUCHEL poured deserved scorn on those who spread as well as those who originate such dangerous and foolish stories. He attacked the John Birch Society by name, declaring that such self-styled patriot groups "are anything but patriotic."

Truth is the best weapon against falsehood. Yet as KUCHEL has discovered, when he patiently offers the facts to a correspondent, he frequently gets a letter in reply calling him a dupe or even a deliberate agent of deceit.

The modern hydra seems as difficult to defeat as its mythical namesake.

KUCHEL, as Republican Senate whip, has the political stature to command attention. He deserves the support of true patriots in combating mischiefmakers, fright peddlers and creators of hysteria.

[From the Washington Daily News, May 4, 1963]

DEAR SIR: YOU CUR—

Senator KUCHEL, of California, has been reading his mail, as a good Senator should. And some of what he has read alarms him, with cause. He calls it "fright mail"—inspired by crazy rumors and allegations deliberately planted by "fright peddlers," to use another KUCHEL term.

There is nothing new in this, although the current wave, as illustrated by Senator KUCHEL's mail, may be more vicious than normal. This country, no less than others, always has had its quota of crackpots, zealots, bigots, dupes and superstitious ninnies.

The John Birch Society, so-called, and similar outfits were the particular—and no doubt appropriate—targets of Senator KUCHEL's indignation, and alarm. There are no bigots like the superpatriotic type.

One of the Senator's complaints was the readiness of these types not only to spread as gospel utterly false charges but their squint-minded habit of yelling "Communist" at everyone who disagrees with them, or questions one of their farfetched concoctions.

This tactic, of course, stamps anyone who uses it. We still have the privilege in this country of disagreement, of skepticism, of making mistakes—without being called such names. He whose only rebuttal is libel is a stupe, undeserving of heed.

In delivering on the Senate floor his well-documented scourging of the "fright peddlers" Senator KUCHEL performed a service. He answered them, that the people may better judge—even though one result certainly will be more ashes on his head from these same elements.

What the Senator did not do, wisely, in exposing and rebutting these extremists, was to demand action against them, punitive or restrictive. This would be their tactics, but never to be copied by the overwhelming majority of reasonable, moderate people in this country.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 4, 1963]

"NUTS"

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL lit up the sky with his speech in the Senate on Tuesday about the fright peddlers. The light he shed exposed a peculiarly ugly contemporary

danger—the danger, as he put it, "of hate and venom, of slander and abuse, generated by fear and heaped indiscriminately upon many great Americans by * * * zealots in the ranks or clutches of self-styled 'I-am-a-better-American-than-you-are' organizations."

It is especially heartening and helpful to have the exposure come from Senator KUCHEL. He knows more about the danger than most. He faced it and triumphantly overcame it in his own State of California where the zealots banded together to oppose his renomination and reelection. They got no compromise or quarter from this healthy, straightforward American. TOM KUCHEL demonstrated that the best way to deal with the fright peddlers is to force them into the open and defy them unequivocally.

The Senator cited instance after specific instance of hysterical nonsense spewed forth by men claiming to be superpatriots—men who exploited the anxieties of fellow-Americans by telling them such tall tales as that thousands and thousands of Chinese Communist troops are poised on the Mexican border, that the United Nations is training troops in Georgia to take over the United States, that the Army, Navy, and Air Force are shot through with traitors. "It is disgusting," said Senator KUCHEL, "to find self-appointed saviors, whether infantile or cunning, preying profitably and psychotically on the fears of Americans in the name of anti-communism. Indeed, the ugly labors they perform are a service to the Kremlin itself."

The Americans who succumb to the poison of these fright peddlers betray their own essential disloyalty. They betray a complete disloyalty to the democratic process—a lack of confidence in their fellow-Americans; and they betray a complete disloyalty to the American way of life—a lack of confidence in the superior appeal of that way of life to free men. Do they really believe, Senator KUCHEL asks, that America is in the grip of a gigantic conspiracy. "If they do, the only reasonable reply I can give to them which they will understand is the honorable, 100 percent, red, white, and blue expression: Nuts."

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times, May 3, 1963]

THE FRIGHT PEDDLERS

The Republican Senator from California, THOMAS H. KUCHEL, has reached the end of his rope in attempting to practice tolerance and talk moderation. So Thursday in the U.S. Senate he attacked vehemently right-wing hate groups whom he described as fright peddlers who are doing "a devil's work far better than Communists could do" in the United States.

The reason that he has become exorcised is because 10 percent of the mail that he receives is coming from extreme rightists who are making all kinds of wild charges based on untruths and fancy. He cited as an example the charge that African Negro troops who are cannibals are stationed in Georgia. Another letter told of 16,000 African soldiers there complete with nose and earrings. Another letter told of the writer's knowing that the United Nations had plans to place Mongolian and Congolese troops within the United States. Senator KUCHEL mentioned letters describing thousands of Chinese troops in Mexico poised for an attack on California. And, of course, there was a letter naming various American and allied leaders as Communists, the total number being 44.

Senator KUCHEL said that he gets about 60,000 letters a month of which 6,000 are best described as fright mail. The Senator said, "I have nothing but contempt for the originators of the hoaxes and swindles, from the ludicrous leaders of the Birch Society, to any and all of the several hundred similar self-styled patriotic groups. They are anything but patriotic. Indeed a good case could be made that they are unpatriotic and downright un-American."

Senator KUCHEL's speech describing these hate letters may seem remote from northern New York, but this newspaper recently has been having an indirect experience with the type of person who may well have been writing to Senator KUCHEL.

Last January a mimeographed sheet called the Patriot carried on its first page a paragraph that reads as follows:

"We protest the third practice seizure under the United Nations flag which occurred at Watertown, N.Y., August 20, 1952, and followed the same pattern set in the earlier seizures in California and Texas." (The allegation is that the American flag was taken down from the city hall, the city officials were put in jail, and the United Nations flag put up in its place with martial law proclaimed under the authority of a U.N. military governor.)

In response to the foregoing comment, the Times has received several letters asking for the details of this alleged seizure of the Watertown city government. The answer is always the same. There was no such seizure by the United Nations. Here is what happened. In August of 1952 the military exercise at Camp Drum was arranged. The Aggressor Forces, as they were known, theoretically had captured Watertown and the Defenders were trying to reassert their control over the city. It had nothing to do with the United Nations. Rather it was a typical military exercise devoid of any relationship to the United Nations or one world or anything else that now seems to be so upsetting to these hate groups. This newspaper carried news stories.

There was no elevation of a United Nations flag over the city hall and, if anything, the exercise was a carryover from some of the World War II training manuals that the Army was using in those days. It will be recalled that military government known as Amgot was an important consideration in the winning of World War II, for it was Amgot, short for American Military Government, that took over cities immediately after their capture by American troops. The purpose of this takeover was to restore services to the civilians and reestablish some form of local community pattern, to feed the starving victims of war, to once again introduce police protection, and at the same time eliminate subversives who might be hidden in these communities.

This description of what happened has been mailed out on several occasions to those who mistakenly think that somebody hoisted a U.N. flag at city hall. For awhile we were inclined to pass these letters of inquiry off as odd examples of confusion. They now make sense in terms of Senator KUCHEL's speech. Fortunately for us, he is getting the heavy mail while we are getting a few strays. His voice is loud in the Government, ours is a whisper. We welcome his report to the Senate and the people of the United States, as do all citizens of honest, patriotic purpose.

[From the Hayward Review, May 5, 1963]

ANSWERS PLEASE

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL came out swinging with a chopping ax at the so-called right-wing of American political thought, not the leftwing, mind you, just the rightwing. He called them "peddlers of right for paranoia and profit."

The Senator's talk was strong as he called for all responsible Americans to rejoin the ranks of responsible anti-Communist, pro-Americans.

He asserts there are devious individuals, peddling hoaxes such as claims that:

The United Nations is training thousands of foreign troops, including barefoot savages, in Georgia as a prelude to a takeover of the United States.

We might suggest to Senator KUCHEL that he could enlighten some of the possibly misguided by filling a couple of gaps in his speech.

He didn't describe what he considers anti-Communist or pro-American. Maybe he could give his constituents a guide. Up to this point, he hasn't been too vocal on those two points.

And the Senator didn't say in his speech whether the so-called hoax of U.N. troops training in Georgia is true or not.

Senator KUCHEL has been closely alined with the forces in Washington who steadfastly contended for many months that there were no Russian troops in Cuba, only a handful of touring Red technicians.

More times than not in this era of stricter management of news from Washington it is difficult, if not impossible, for the home-folks to tell just who is perpetrating what hoax.

Perhaps the Senator will help keep his constituents more enlightened with the facts in the future.

[From the Anaheim (Calif.) Bulletin, May 9, 1963]

ON THE FENCE AGAIN

U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican from California, just isn't going to give anyone an opportunity to say that he is not riding the fence. In fact he must be the best fence-riding cowboy the West has ever had.

In order to retain his position of love and affection with the Washington Socialists he has climbed the podium to decry that those who would inform the American public of the dangers to our Government are "fright peddlers."

In a speech to a vacant U.S. Senate Chamber, with the exception of the selected news vendors of the New Frontier philosophy, KUCHEL has branded those who would inform the public of the Georgia United Nations maneuvers, the Communist takeover of Mexico, and the voting control of Russia in United Nations policymaking, as hysterians.

By his voting record in the U.S. Senate he has continually alined himself with those who would favor "one worldism," soft approach on Cuba, pro-United Nations control of the United States and coexistence with Russia. He has designated his belief in favor of centralized Federal Government control, believes in Federal aid to education, Federal urban renewal programs, Federal subsidized and controlled transportation, and Federal medicare programs.

He dislikes anything that would require a display of strength of character in opposition to the Socialist theorists in control of Government in Washington.

He is the darling of the liberals. He has made numerous trips to Paris to represent the U.S. Government in the Atlantic Community discussions. This body is one that would establish a one-world government of the free nations of the world. A body who would establish courts with supreme jurisdiction over those of the United States and that would require every free nation of the world to transfer all functions of their armed forces and defense to this body. He is in favor of such a body having jurisdiction over the education, health and welfare of every citizen in the United States under such an organization.

At the time of the adoption of the program last year of the Atlantic Community, the planners, including Senator KUCHEL, felt it was too far out to present to the general public. It would have to be spoon fed in small doses to them if it was to be accomplished.

There would be no need for the rightist, the conservative or fright peddlers if men like THOMAS KUCHEL were not intent on

stripping the Nation of its freedoms; not intent on depriving the people of their rights and privileges by centralizing all controls into the Federal Government; nor attempting to subvert this Nation into a one-world organization. If men like KUCHEL were willing to stand up and face the dangers of Russian aggression rather than placate and compromise with the eventuality of submission through coexistence those who venerate a government as guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution would not be forced to speak out.

Good Americans are not peddlers of fright, Mr. KUCHEL.

[From the Richmond News Leader, May 6, 1963]

SIMMER DOWN, MR. KUCHEL

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, the ultraliberal from California, delivered himself of a remarkably hysterical speech in the Senate last week. His theme was the far right, the John Birchers, the "fright peddlers," and all the assorted zealots who "see our Government crawling with Communists."

Before he finished the address, Mr. KUCHEL was screaming like a silly woman. It was an interesting exhibition of a mind taken over by panic.

Senator, we would say to this nervous Nellie, simmer down. Easy, boy. Easy does it. Things are not so bad.

Here in this office, we get the same "fright mail" that has the Senator so distraught. It is fascinating stuff. One splinter outfit is still hipped on the notion that the Kennedys will pack their political opponents off to a looney bin in Alaska. Another grouping exercises about this guerrilla training exercise in Georgia. Quite a few letters have to do with the Socialist bias of textbooks. The antifluoride people are cheerfully active. Here lately, a new source of alarms has arisen as a consequence of certain contingent "Executive orders" published in the Federal Register on February 20, 1962. The U.N. remains an unceasing concern; a ragtag remnant still wants to impeach Earl Warren.

Now, some of the people who are aroused by some of these things are probably certifiably nuts. But a great many of them are not insane at all; they are as sane as the Senator; saner. And if the gentleman from California wants to perform a public service, instead of merely making noise, he could go off to a quiet room and meditate for a few hours on the reasons why a large number of respectable Americans are filled with a sense of unease.

To be sure, it does seem irrational to imagine that the political foes of a powerful administration might be put out of the way, or successfully stigmatized, by commitment to mental institutions. But let the Senator reflect for awhile upon the case of Ezra Pound, and on the case of General Ted Walker last October.

Has the Senator read the press releases sent out by the Army itself in advance of that "Water Moccasin" exercise in Georgia? We have. They were strangely confusing documents, stemming from an agency of the Government that recently has defended its right to lie to the American people.

Has the Senator given careful study to a number of textbooks in economics and social science? We have. The fact is that many of these books are indeed viciously biased. Does the Senator not agree that at least a debatable question of personal liberty is present in the fluoridation controversy? It seems so to us. As for the curiously unpublicized Executive orders of February 20, 1962, to become operative in the event of atomic war, we ourselves are puzzled. In World War II, the Congress provided by law for prices and rent control, fuel rationing, and the rest. It is disturbing to find sweeping emergency powers simply decreed by Executive order.

It has seemed to us in recent years that a useful service is performed by both ends of the political spectrum. The ultraleftists, in a constant panic over fallout, strontium 90, ban the bombs, and the poor misunderstood rapists, seem to us a far greater danger to the Republic than the Birchers. They are not only soft in the head, but also soft in the spine. Yet their agitation has compelled many of us to think long and hard about thermonuclear war, civil rights, and due process of law. It is a useful work. By the same token, the more agitated flutters of the rightwing have served to draw attention to some very ominous abuses of power, actual or potential, by an intellectual elite that repeatedly has demonstrated its contempt for law and for the commonsense of the people.

We would not willingly suppress any of the crackpots who rattle the office doors with their knocking. Neither those of the right, nor those of the left. Let them pound away. The next knock you hear may come from another Whittaker Chambers. But perhaps that is not the sort of knock the Senator from California has ears to hear.

[From the Santa Ana Register, May 8, 1963]

KUCHEL'S FRIGHT PEDDLERS

Apparently Senator THOMAS KUCHEL has decided to give up on ever regaining the support he once had of the conservative element in California.

Mr. KUCHEL in the Senate last week sounded more like Gov. Edmund G. Brown and his cohorts than Brown himself as he talked about "fright peddlers," and urged that "cruelly swindled Americans" be persuaded to "rejoin the ranks again of sensible and decent anti-Communist pro-Americans."

It's no secret that antisocialism advocates around Mr. KUCHEL's home county and even in the Republican Party in the rest of the State have become increasingly discouraged with the way Mr. KUCHEL has voted with the New Frontier and against conservative principles. Quite a number have criticized KUCHEL to his face and in letters. But Mr. KUCHEL seems to be enamored of the idea that the Federal Government should subsidize the world from that apparently inexhaustible supply of fiat money.

So he takes the fact that some alarmed Americans have grown upset at what is being done to them by their Government (including KUCHEL), then expands some reports about some of those activities in and out of the United States to ludicrous point, then attacks the attackers in the best Pat Brown tradition.

His description of the "fright peddlers from the simple simpletons to the wretched racists," with its alliteration might well have been produced from the typewriter of one of Brown's well-paid publicists.

But the fact is most of KUCHEL's attackers have objected principally to his voting record, which has been increasingly in favor of big Government and against the individual. Americans for Conservative Action (ACA) rated KUCHEL 50 percent in his vote for conservative constitutional issues in the 88th Congress (1961–62), and 54 percent previously.

The Conservative Society of America (CSA) in its index for 1961 votes recorded KUCHEL as 25 percent conservative, with KUCHEL voting in favor of such things as Federal unemployment compensation, Federal educational TV, Federal aid to schools, housing and urban renewal, cultural exchange, Federal job retraining, disarmament and foreign aid.

We did a little checking of his 1963 record to see how he was voting this year. Not much legislation has been enacted thus far, but his votes are worth noting.

On S. 6, the subsidy for transportation, which passed the Senate 52–41, Republicans voted, 21 to 9, against the bill. KUCHEL was one of the nine Republicans who favored Kennedy's plan. On various amendments proposed by such conservatives as JOHN TOWER and FRANK LAUSCHE, KUCHEL usually voted against the amendments.

On the Youth Conservation Corps bill, KUCHEL was one of seven Republicans who voted for the Kennedy boondoggle.

It seems to us the Senator from Anaheim is bearing out the prediction of those who reminded voters last fall that it would make no difference between KUCHEL and Richard Richards, his Democratic Party opponent, and that to vote for the lesser of evils was still voting for evil.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. I compliment the Senator from California, the distinguished minority whip of the Senate, for his most excellent speech today, which is a sequel to another courageous speech which he delivered not long ago on the floor of the Senate.

I am not surprised to learn that so many commendatory editorials have been written in response to that speech, for the Senator from California has exemplified the position set forth in the quotation he gave from Abraham Lincoln; the Senator has not remained silent when there is a duty to speak out. I think that duty is incumbent upon other Members of this body.

I rise to call attention to the fact that not all of the hate mail and smear-and-fear mail comes from California, by any means. I think all Senators are plagued with it.

This morning I have brought to the floor four or five letters which I have received, and I should like to read excerpts from them into the RECORD.

A letter which comes from Provo, Utah, states, in part:

I have a very hot question for you. Just which side of the conflict are we on? Communism vs. capitalism? I read in the paper where our fleet has been given the command to carry out Castro's orders. These are: "Destroy all opposition to my regime." It seems that now the U.S.S.R. does not have to build their own ships; they merely ask J. F. Kennedy for units of the U.S. fleet and they get what they ask for. I have never before suspected J. F. Kennedy was a traitor to his country.

A letter from Clearfield, Utah, states, in part:

The only consistent criteria that we can find in our government handling of the situation in which people desire freedom, is that of suppressing that freedom. Not once since World War II have we effectively dedicated and committed ourselves to the cause of freedom, which our administration so ably talks about.

That also includes Korea when MacArthur's immediate superior as U.N. Commander was a Russian Communist. What has been the reason behind all this nefarious action?—our membership in the U.N.

A letter from Salt Lake City states, in one of its paragraphs:

Further, from what I have read, I consider President Kennedy a traitor to the cause of freedom and to have stabbed the people of Cuba in the back, broken his word, feared the Russian bluff, sold his honor and played the hypocrite in assisting, by default, the left hand establishment of a Communist military base in the Americas by an ineffectual hand slapping of Khrushchev, his buddy.

Has he not heard of too little and too late or is that his game? I believe the Government is seeking to destroy the peoples' freedom step by step. What about Congresmen's second offices and swimming pools, junkets, free politicking, nepotism, and so forth?

Another letter from Salt Lake City reads, in part, as follows:

Then there is UNESCO—their recent booklet published with the aid of American tax money entitled "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R." is conclusive proof that UNESCO is and always has been the world-wide propaganda agency of the Soviet.

* * * * *

It is time to protest, don't you think? Furthermore, the University of Utah has scheduled a program on April 19 and 20 entitled "The Model U.N." They have also requested participation by 63 high schools in our State and assigned a U.N. country to each. This undoubtedly deceitful presentation will be an insult and a disgraceful exhibition of deceit both to the students and the taxpaying public.

Wouldn't it be a far greater thing to replace that program with a pro-America activity?

Of course such letters are virtually endless.

I shall read excerpts from only one more, which I think would be particularly fitting in context with the speech of the Senator from California. Part of this letter reads as follows:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

Re "Moss Raps Skousen on Floor of Senate," by Frank Hewlett, S. L. Tribune for March 20, 1963.

Senator FRANK E. MOSS,
(Liberal Democrat),
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I do not use the word "Honorable" in addressing you, because I do not consider any representative of the American people honorable who betrays them by all the unconstitutional acts perpetrated against them by the present Democrat administration. And this applies not only to the J. F. K. administration, but all the recent ones, beginning with J. F. K.'s announced idol, F. D. R., who first recognized the Bolshevik regime in the U.S.S.R. (against their best interests and ours), and who first inaugurated the Marxist graduated income tax which unlawfully redistributes the people's wealth (to suit the powers-that-be) and which tax is gradually reducing our middle class to tax-ridden peons. In poll which I saw, compiled by District of Columbia Committee for Constitutional Action, your name was at the bottom of the list for Americanism.

Then toward the end of the letter, the following appears:

Let's get with it, Mr. Moss, and quit trying to fool all the American people all the time. At least some of us are able to put two and two together and get four. I haven't read Mr. Skousen's pamphlet; he isn't one of my favorite people, because he doesn't tell all the truth about America's enemies either, but the answer to Skousen's question is an emphatic "yes." And if you don't like the John Birch Society, just whom do you like? The ADL and the communistic ADA? Don't you believe in anticommunism, Socialism, Fabianism, and Red Harvardese at all? Do you believe in the Constitution of the United States of America—or its enemy, the U.N. Charter? I know of very few American Constitution lovers in Washington—beginning with J. F. K.—they regard it as antiquated and outmoded: which is doubtless why they ignore and violate it continually.

And I see where our young immature wet-behind-the-ears Peace Corpsmen are marrying the aborigines in countries where they've been sent to help; also American soldiers are rebuked by superiors for hotly embracing their Vietnamese sweethearts as they "love 'em and leave 'em." All part of the Communist mongrelization plan, which our officials work so hard to promote. And so, some of us say, Hail and Farewell, America, most God-blessed Land: rest in your grave until a nobler breed of men and women arise to redeem thee from thy foes, within and without, men and women worthy of their American heritage.

Letters of that sort that are constantly spawned and come to us deserve the kind of ringing answer that has been given by the senior Senator from California.

Reference was made by the Senator to the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies. Recently, in Salt Lake City, that organization held a dinner in order to make an award. Because the organization was making an award in my native city, I looked up the tenets of the Coalition of Patriotic Societies. Incidentally, they have been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The tenets of the Coalition accord right down the line with the sort of wording that we find in many of the letters that come to us.

In one week in my city four rightwing speakers, speaking in different places, most of them for an admission price, spewed out a constant assault and attack on our country, on our duly constituted authorities, and on the purposes and mode of our Government.

As the Senator from California has pointed out, many of the rightwingers are careful to deny membership in the Birch Society—as though that would make any difference. But whether they carry a card of the John Birch Society or not I do not think is the test. The test is, What is the purpose, the motivation, and the accomplishment of these purveyors of hate?

I gladly join with the senior Senator from California and associate myself with his remarks. I call on all Senators to stand up and speak back to those who would besmirch the honor of our country and who would convey abroad the fear, the hate, and the apprehension that comes over our people.

In recent times I have been able to tell where these meetings have been held in my State by the sudden letterwriting that would originate in a given area. Many people are misled. I believe the Senator has performed a great service for us today, and I thank him for it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish first to express my thanks to my able friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss]. Beyond that expression I wish to say that he has performed a service in demonstrating that in his State, which is a considerable distance from my own, the purveyors of hate—some for paranoia, some for profit—are agitating. They are present in many States of the American Union. How many I do not know. But the only way that those who are doing the devil's work can be brought to a halt is for the spotlight to be put on them.

I said in my comments, and repeat now, that the problem is not a partisan problem. The fright peddlers belong to both political parties. They seek to weaken each, to bend each to their own views. We have our partisan differences, but Senators and the people of our country are united in their unyielding determination to keep our freedom, including, I must say, the freedom of speech, even when abuse of that freedom may occur.

I salute my friend from Utah across the aisle for his effort in what ought to be a crusade by all people who have the responsibility of leadership in the United States to extirpate the purveyors of the venom and hatred who here and there tragically spring up among the people of our country.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I am glad to yield to my able friend, the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, we have just heard an address of the greatest significance by the distinguished Senator from California. Every American ought to benefit from the courageous and determined action of the Senator from California in exposing the tactics and the dangers of the extreme rightwing movement. I sincerely believe that his analysis of the fright peddlers of America, which he has given us on two occasions, will go down in history as a Senate classic.

Our colleague by his remarks today and previously has reinforced the elements of moderation and reason on which the future of our country must be based. The Senator from California has not condemned political unorthodoxy.

He is not criticizing conservative viewpoints. The conservatives, like the liberals, obviously have an importance and place in the American political structure and their views deserve consideration. What the Senator from California has made clear is that the bigots, the hate-mongers, and the so-called superpatriots do not belong in either of our great national political parties. I cannot praise the remarks of the Senator from California too highly. He has performed in the noblest traditions of the Senate, and has rendered a service to the entire country. Today, as always, I am proud to claim him as a friend and a colleague.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am most grateful to my friend and my colleague the able junior Senator from New York. I thank him for his comments.

I remember reading Shirer's book, "The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich." I remember that, in the early days, Corporal Hitler began to amass the rudiments of political power when so-called respectable members of the communities in Germany gave him aid and comfort and helped to finance his fanatical dogmas.

It takes money to spew spleen on the American system and American statesmen, living and dead. I have often wondered from where the money comes.

But there is one way to banish this ugly movement which the able Senator

from New York has described; that is by putting the spotlight on it and having men, in and out of public office, speak out against it.

I think the power of the hate-mongers politically reaches its zenith in local elections—in municipal contests, in voting for local school boards, sometimes in voting for Representatives in the Congress of the United States. That is why it is preeminently important for the people—the plain, decent, good citizens of our country to be armed with the truth, to have courage, and to be given encouragement in participating in the elimination of a very ugly menace to our society and to the cause of American union with respect to our dedicated purpose of maintaining our Union strong and free.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. In this crusade of hate-mongers very often there are those who try to give it the aura of being a religious crusade or a Christian crusade of sorts. This doctrine is as far from Christian brotherhood as anything could be.

In my State of Utah the largest church in membership is the Mormon Church, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. There are times when some misguided people have tried to drag the church into this matter. I therefore wish to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by the presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints concerning the Birch Society, denying either the use of its facilities at any time for meetings of this sort or the right of anyone to indicate that the church had any sympathy at all with the movement; and also a statement from the Salt Lake Tribune of March 21, 1963.

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

LDS PRESIDENCY ISSUES STAND ON BIRCH SOCIETY

The first presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints Thursday issued a formal statement to "correct the false statements and unwarranted assumptions regarding the position allegedly taken by leaders of the church on political questions in general and the John Birch Society in particular."

The statement follows:

"The church recognizes and protects the rights of its members to express their personal political beliefs, but it reserves to itself the right to formulate and proclaim its own doctrine.

"We believe in a two-party system, and all our members are perfectly free to support the party of their choice.

"We deplore the presumption of some politicians, especially officers, coordinators, and members of the John Birch Society, who undertake to aline the church and its leadership with their partisan views.

"We encourage our members to exercise the right of citizenship, to vote according to their own convictions, but no one should seek or pretend to have our approval of their adherence to any extreme ideologies.

"We denounce communism as being anti-Christian, anti-American, and the enemy of freedom, but we think they who pretend to fight it by casting aspersions on our elected officers or other fellow citizens do the anti-Communist cause a great disservice.

"We again urge our bishops, stake presidents, and other officers of the church to refuse all applications for the use of our chapels, cultural halls, or other places for political meetings, money-raising propaganda, or to promote any person's political ambitions."

The statement was signed by President David O. McKay, Henry D. Moyle, and Hugh B. Brown, counselors in the first presidency of the church.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Mar. 21, 1963]

Ezra Taft Benson, member of the Council of Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-day Saints, was asked if he was a member of the John Birch Society.

Mr. Benson said he is too busy with his church work to join many organizations he would like to support.

"I have stated, as my personal opinion only, that the John Birch Society is the most effective nonchurch organization in our fight against creeping socialism and godless communism."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] has served the whole country in an extraordinarily fine way, in view of his experience in his own State, in the two speeches he has now made on what he calls the fright peddlers of the radical right.

For too long our country was deeply concerned with the threat of the radical left—Communists, neo-Communists, Communist-oriented persons, fellow travelers—a concern with which I thoroughly agreed, a concern which I shared, but which, in many quarters served either to obscure or to make opaque the vision with respect to the radical right, which is equally a threat to our freedom, and a subversive threat, having just about the same capabilities in that regard that the Communists have. Indeed, the strange pattern of how these two extremes often meet is one of the most extraordinary things which have come out of the speeches made by the Senator from California.

The anti-Communist struggle must be looked at as an antitotalitarian struggle. It is in that sense that the speeches of the Senator from California have been so useful. They have demonstrated that "it can happen here," and that not only are the Communists pushing, striving, and trying to take over, but, perhaps in a somewhat less radical way, perhaps not so well organized, although I think they are pretty well organized; perhaps not financed by the Government, but certainly financed by a number of misguided individuals who can provide that kind of financing—we are also faced with the dangers of an ignorant or perhaps a calculated, radical right.

I think it has been most helpful to the country to have this pointed out. It is particularly timely at this moment, when we are facing such grave dangers of violence or other acts of desperation which may characterize our terrible mistakes—for which we are paying now—in the field of interracial relationships. At such a time, in the name of law and order, it is so easy to characterize as "Communist" anything which one does not like or which one fears. In such circumstances it is so easy to take extreme positions. In our society we face threats from both the radical left and the radical right. When all the facts are known, it becomes apparent that we face these problems primarily because of the stubborness, the duplicity, the cupidity, and the double dealings which emanate from the Communist society itself; and when a similar presentation of the subversive character of the radical left is not made by such extremists, it is all too easy for them to emphasize their views as members of the radical right.

So, Mr. President, I think the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] has rendered a marked service by both the timing and the content of his speeches, and also by giving us the benefit of the editorial comments—both the overwhelmingly great number of commendatory and approving editorials, and also the very small number of disapproving editorials—which his remarks have generated in the press of the country.

Inasmuch as a Member of this body almost necessarily has to be a specialist, almost as a matter of natural selection, I hope very much that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] will be encouraged by the satisfaction to his own conscience and by the public interest displayed, as well as by the approval of his colleagues. I highly approve of his action. I hope he will continue his efforts in this field and will remain a permanent sentinel to warn and to point out the abyss which lies at our very feet while we maintain our struggle against communism, which is so active in many parts of the world.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I wish to speak in support of the remarks of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] in commending the action of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] for bringing to our attention and to the attention of the country this serious problem.

A little more than a year ago it was my privilege to visit California, together with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], who, with me, spoke at a meeting of persons who were deeply concerned about the radical right in that part of the country. Those who sponsored the meeting said they had the highest regard for the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and for his understanding of the issues involved.

I mention this matter because I think it important to have the country understand, in fairness to the State of California, that it was before his recent reelection, not after it, that his position on this issue became so well known, and that it is not true that it is politically dangerous in California to be as outspoken a supporter of decency as is the Senator from California—although I am sure he did not take this position in any sense because of political motivation. However, it is obvious that it is an advantage politically to be on the right side of issues of this sort in California, as it is elsewhere in the country; and I am very glad that the Senator from California has taken the floor of the Senate to speak on these occasions.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from California [Mr.

KUCHEL]. Coming from New England, where we have a smaller quantity of hatemongers than seem to be prevalent in other parts of the country, I realized my blessings as I listened to the thoughts of my colleague. I believe that if there is one way of truly protecting our country from weaknesses from within, it is by ventilating and exposing the diatribes of the hatemongers and letting the people of the country as a whole be aware of what they are doing, so that those who hear an individual hatemonger will not think that he alone is being honored by his attentions.

NAACP SUIT TO ENFORCE CONSTITUTIONAL REDUCTION OF REPRESENTATION OF STATES WHICH DENY THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Federal Government has fallen far behind in the march toward progress on civil rights.

As a result of the failure to enact meaningful civil rights legislation, we have forced the victims of discrimination to resort more and more to self-help. Those who have insisted upon watering down or obstructing every attempt to provide the Federal Government with the authority it needs to deal effectively with deprivations of constitutional rights cannot complain now that more drastic action is necessary.

A vacuum has been created by the inability or refusal of Congress and the executive branch to respond to the urgent demands of the situation. Ignoring the injustices and inequities which have existed for so many years has only served to aggravate them and develop a greater insistence upon action now.

It was almost 7 years ago when I was a Member of the other body—at that time the ranking minority member of the House Committee on the Judiciary—that a determined effort was made by the chairman and myself and others, to give the Department of Justice authority to initiate suits for preventive relief in all cases involving denials of constitutional rights. We succeeded in maintaining this provision in the 1957 Civil Rights Act which passed the House, only to witness its elimination in the Senate. Those who thought they won a great victory by their successful insistence that this provision be stricken as the price for any action on civil rights bear a heavy responsibility for the crisis in civil rights which has since become evident.

It should be apparent to everyone now that the longer these problems are allowed to exist without solution, the longer resentment against second-class citizenship is allowed to fester without remedy, the longer denials of constitutional rights are condoned without action, the more likely it is that impatience will turn to outrage and demonstration to riots. We must come to our senses before it is too late. I am not suggesting that we act out of fear, but I am pleading that we act out of a new awareness of our obligations to the Constitution, the heritage of freedom we so proudly proclaim, and the understanding of the mood and determination of fellow Americans who have struggled for so many years against intolerance and oppression.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People today has initiated a legal action to enforce the provisions of the 14th amendment requiring the reduction of representation of States which deny or abridge the right to vote. I have always been more concerned with removing impediments to the free exercise of the franchise than with reducing the number of Representatives from particular States. But it must be conceded that the Constitution is clear on this point. It says that the basis of representations shall be reduced in States which do not permit qualified citizens to vote. The fact that this provision has not been enforced has not eliminated it from the Constitution, and it continues to have the same force today which it had almost a hundred years ago when it was written into the fundamental law.

We can expect the action of the NAACP to be greeted by the same outbursts which have been vented against other attempts to enforce the provisions of the Constitution. The same cries of States rights which were raised against the school desegregation decision and the State reapportionment cases will be heard. Well, there are such things as States wrongs as well as States rights. How about State responsibilities? After a hundred years, is it not time that the 14th Amendment was enforced either by compliance with its standards or by implementation of its sanctions?

The action of the NAACP would be unnecessary if Congress had taken steps before now to make certain that citizens of the United States were not denied the right to vote. If the Supreme Court now holds that the 14th Amendment has been violated by the unfair apportionment of representatives, can it be fairly said that it is usurping legislative powers? In my judgment the answer is no, because Congress has forfeited the opportunity to act and the Constitution cannot be ignored indefinitely. Let those who would condemn the courts consider the conditions which they have created. In truth, they have forced resort to the courts for the vindication of Constitutional rights by their own successful exploitation of the many devices for blocking legislative action in the Congress. If the anti-civil-rights claims of victory in the past now have a hollow ring, they have no one to blame but themselves.

The suit initiated by the NAACP is of historic significance and is destined to rank with the school desegregation suit and the State reapportionment cases in importance. I commend this organization for pressing its efforts to enforce the Constitution and to give authority to its eloquent commands.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the suit which is being started today by the Legal Defense Fund of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to enforce the 14th amendment provision which requires reduction in the congressional representation of any State which denies the right to vote arbitrarily in violation of the Constitution.

The suit signalizes the relative roles of the judiciary and the Congress in the struggle for equality, which is so rapidly coming to a head at this time. In 1945, in *Saunders* v. *Wilkins*, 152 F. 2d 235, a suit brought in Federal court in Virginia to enforce this section of the Constitution because of the disenfranchisement of 60 percent of the voters because of the poll tax, the court stated:

> It is well known that the elective franchise has been limited or denied to citizens in various States of the Union in past years, but no serious attempt has been made by Congress to enforce the mandate of the second section of the 14th amendment, and it is noteworthy that there are no instances in which the courts have attempted to revise the apportionment of Representatives by Congress.

The court dismissed the suit as raising a "political question" which the court could not adjudicate.

Since Congress has continually defaulted on such "political questions" the Supreme Court has been increasingly pressed to resolve them. The Court has accepted the responsibility. In 1961, in the case of Gomillion against Lightfoot, the Court rejected the "political question" rationale which had been used by the district court in Virginia and held the virtually total exclusion of Negro voters from the city limits of Tuskegee, Ala., was a violation of the 15th amendment guarantee against discrimination on grounds of race, creed, or color.

This decision was followed by the Tennessee apportionment case, Baker against Carr, which completely put to rest the "political question" doctrine in regard to apportionment.

Because of this display of understanding of the legal doctrine involved by the Supreme Court, the legislatures of the Nation are now stirring with long overdue action toward reapportionment to reflect the enormous changes in population which have occurred in this century, only a fraction of which had been reflected by the legislatures themselves.

The case now filed by the NAACP legal defense fund is of the same order. Congress has failed to take account of even the unanimous findings of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission in its 1961 report on voting that "substantial numbers of Negro citizens are, or recently have been, denied the right to vote on grounds of race or color in about 100 counties in 8 Southern States" through literacy tests and other qualification tests, arbitrary and discriminatory registration procedures, threats and intimidation, or the fear of retaliation.

The response of the Congress has been rejection of even the mild sixth-grade literacy test bill and passage of only the antipoll tax constitutional amendment, which is still wending its way through State legislatures and which, I believe all agree, is hardly a major step toward eliminating flagrant denials of the right to vote, though I welcome it.

Section 2 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution provides a clear remedy for denial of the right to vote: Reduction of the representation of the State in the

House of Representatives. The NAACP legal defense fund suit lays the ground work for such reduction by ordering the Secretary of Commerce and the Director of the Bureau of the Census to compile the figures as to the denial of the right to vote at the next census and to submit the proper apportionment of Representatives to Congress in accordance with the 14th amendment provision.

Again the issue is clearly posed: Will Congress fulfill its responsibility, or will the courts be required to take the lead?

The NACCP action to which I have referred is now pending in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, with a long list of plaintiffs, and is directed against the Secretary of Commerce and the Director of the Bureau of the Census.

This is a real first, and will be looked at with the greatest of interest by all of us. As one who has fought in the Senate for 7 years for the so-called part III of the Civil Rights Act, granting power to the Attorney General to sue in representative civil rights cases, I welcome very much this initiative of the NAACP. I point out that it represents a direction which, had it been taken sooner, might have prevented the dread national crisis now confronting us, and to which, many of us are determined, there must be brought national attention and national legislation. However, this initiative is most useful and most worthwhile, and I am delighted that the NAACP is taking the initiative, knowing that it will be pushed with vigor and effectiveness, as, indeed, it is the same type of approach which brought about the landmark decision in the Brown against Board of Education school desegregation case in 1954.

THE WHEAT REFERENDUM, THE FARMER, AND THE FARM BUREAU

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, a week ago today the U.S. wheat farmers decided they did not want a certificate plan for the 1964 wheat crop. They rejected a carefully designed program which sought to reduce the burden of surplus stocks and the cost of the farm program while at the same time protecting the income of farmers. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, one of the most dedicated and able men in public life today, worked long and hard with his department advisers and the Congress to develop a program that would balance the interest of farmers, taxpayers, and consumers.

A major share of credit for the rejection of this plan is being given to the leadership of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which, as we know, led the campagin for a "no" vote in the referendum.

Farm Bureau officials have not been reluctant in accepting this credit, and they should not be. They conducted a vigorous campaign, largely along the negative lines in which they have become increasingly skilled.

There was, however, one positive aspect to the Farm Bureau's effort to achieve a "no" vote. Wheat growers were told, time and time again, by the organization's spokesmen, from President Shuman on down to clerks in county Farm Bureau offices, that if the certificate plan were voted down the Congress would replace it with a new and better and more constructive program for 1964.

This pledge, this promise, was repeated day after day, night after night, despite the fact that the referendum clearly spelled out the alternate program in the event wheat growers rejected the certificate plan.

All through the Farm Bureau's written and spoken pleas for "no" votes, the words "new" and "better" and "constructive" appear in descriptions of the promised legislation.

On May 7, just 2 weeks before the referendum of last Tuesday, President Shuman of the Farm Bureau Federation testified on the new feed grain bill before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and devoted a great deal of time to criticism of the proposed certificate plan for wheat.

At that time, as a member of the committee, I specifically asked Mr. Shuman—a man for whom I bear no personal malice and, in fact, one with whom I enjoy cordial personal relations—if he believed new legislation would be passed to give our wheat farmers a better income at less cost to the taxpayers should the referendum fail. He answered with a definite, unqualified "Yes."

Now, this consistent reference of the Farm Bureau to new legislation placed upon the organization responsibility to submit to the Congress a proposal for a new wheat bill.

Within a few days after the referendum, the American Farm Bureau responded to this challenge.

But the response is a pathetic delusion.

It does not uphold the promise contained in the word "new" that was used so liberally in the antireferendum propaganda. It is, in fact, a slightly warmed-over version of the extravagant Farm Bureau land retirement bill that has been floating around the Halls of Congress for years without being taken seriously by the Congress.

It does not uphold the promise contained in the words "better" or "constructive." It, in fact, cuts total farm income and increases very substantially the annual outlay from the Federal Treasury. It cannot be called better no matter what basis of comparison is used.

In reading this proposal, I am reminded of the story of the pastor in a little Midwest town who, after serving his church for 3 years, happened to notice, in thumbing through its records, that he had a far better tenure mark than any of his predecessors. Some had been around as little as a few months; none more than a single year.

Curious, he questioned the senior member of the board of deacons about it. The deacon tried to avoid an explanation but, finally forced to comment on the short terms of former pastors, explained it this way to the preacher:

"The truth is," he said, "that this town has never really wanted a preacher around at all, and you've come the closest."

I believe the truth is the Farm Bureau hierarchy does not want any farm program around at all, and the current revival of its old favorite is about as close as growers could get to that status.

The massive land retirement proposed by the Farm Bureau bill simply calls for idle acres; it is not specifically aimed at the surpluses which are giving the farmers income trouble and giving taxpayers budget trouble.

This shotgun approach, to have any degree of effectiveness in bringing supply and demand for feed grains and wheat into balance, would have to take at least 75 million crop acres out of use in addition to the present conservation reserve and some of them, advises the USDA, would be acres now devoted to foods not in surplus supply, such as soybeans.

The bill emphasizes the retirement of whole farms—which will, once more, bring protests to the Congress from every rural community and chamber of commerce across the rural heart of the country. Deserted farms, rented by the Government, are not markets for the goods and services which the families in towns must sell for their own survival; they are instead a sure blueprint for the creation of ghost towns. Vacant farms mean vacant stores and schools and churches in rural America.

In brief, the Farm Bureau is proposing to spend in 1964 nearly $2 billion for idle acres—hundreds of millions more than was spent for acreage diversion under the 1962 feed grain and wheat programs—and at the same time cause a loss of hundreds of millions of dollars in the already inadequate income of farm families.

The Farm Bureau is proposing that the feed grain program already adopted for 1964 and 1965 by the Congress—a program that has made marked progress toward the goals of higher farm income, reduced surpluses, and lower Government costs—a program that has achieved a high degree of popularity with our farmers—be set aside.

In South Dakota, the wheat growers cast nearly a two-to-one affirmative vote in the wheat referendum. They did not vote for the glittering promise of something better in return for a "no"; they voted to accept the certificate plan for a year in order to test its effectiveness in meeting their own income problems and meeting the Nation's surplus and farm program cost problems.

The certificate plan, however, did not receive in many States the high degree of endorsement given in South Dakota. Obviously, many farmers, including a minority of South Dakotans, voted in response to the implied Farm Bureau pledge that something new, something better, something constructive would be forthcoming.

However, the proposal submitted is not new, it is not better, and is not constructive.

During the past 3 months the voice of the Farm Bureau leadership has been heard on every radio and TV station, in every magazine and newspaper, and at crossroads meetings across the land urging farmers to vote "no."

I suggest that this leadership again take to the air and the press. Let them

travel the countryside explaining to wheat and feed grain farmers why they should urge Members of the Congress to vote "yes" on a proposal that idles land and people, cuts farm income, and increases the demands upon the Federal Treasury and the American taxpayer.

Before the Farm Bureau leaders seriously ask the Congress to repeal the voluntary feed grain bill we have enacted and devise a new wheat program let them first explain the full ramifications of their proposed substitutes. Let them sell it, too, to those whom they promised new and better and constructive wheat legislation.

They had faith in their version of the facts in May. Let them demonstrate this faith, then, in June.

I frankly do not know what kind of program the wheat farmers of the Nation want. I do not know what kind of legislative response the Congress will make, if any, at all, to the defeated wheat referendum. I do know on the basis of countless conversations with farmers, merchants, and community leaders across rural America that I could not look these people in the eye or live with my own conscience if I supported the current Farm Bureau proposal.

AWARD PRESENTED TO SENATOR RANDOLPH BY THE NEW YORK STATE COMMISSION FOR THE BLIND

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, about 10 days ago the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and I were due to go to New York, he to receive a plaque on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Commission for the Blind of the New York State Department of Social Welfare, and I to make the principal address. Both of us were fogbound due to the closing of the New York airports, which was coincidental with a late evening session of the Senate. Therefore our respective speeches had to be read. The plaque that was to be presented to the Senator from West Virginia reads:

Presented to the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, U.S. Senator, West Virginia, for his outstanding contribution in creating a substantial new economic opportunity for blind persons through legislation bearing his name, and for his consistent devotion to the general welfare which has so enriched the lives of all Americans.

Also included in the citation was the notation that the presentation was made "on the occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the New York State Department of Social Welfare, Commission for the Blind, April 30, 1963."

Mr. President, our colleague has a record of having performed significant services for blind and blinded citizens and handicapped persons generally; and he is honored especially by the blind for his outstanding work in the passage of the Randolph-Sheppard Act authorizing establishment of vending stands operated by blind persons in public buildings.

I believe our colleague's acknowledgement of the award he received from the New York State Commission for the Blind is a significant statement worthy of being brought to the attention of our colleagues.

I request unanimous consent to have the remarks of the senior Senator from West Virginia printed in the RECORD.

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

This is a deeply moving moment in my life, not alone because of the award which has been generously bestowed, but also because of the vision of nearly 27 years which it brings to mind.

In the past quarter century we have seen momentous changes in the pattern of American life. Not the least significant of these has been the growing sensitivity of our society to the problems of the infirm and afflicted within our midst. We are moving ever closer toward the conviction that the claims of the handicapped are not an appeal for charity but for justice—for the right to live a full and constructive life within the limits of one's own potentialities. This we owe to handicapped persons, not because of the afflictions which set them apart from others, but because of the essential humanness which binds all of us together.

In this regard it is significant to note that throughout the Nation, approximately 75 percent of blind rehabilitants are now placed in competitive employment, and that the type of work selected varies more as a result of the individual's interest and aptitudes than as a result of the presence of blindness.

Through State-Federal vocational rehabilitation services, some 4,712 blind persons were rehabilitated during fiscal 1962. In most instances these persons are now productive, self-sufficient members of the community, making contributions rather than simply being a liability.

Intensive training programs are being offered to members of State vocational staffs to improve their effectiveness in such areas as vending stand supervision, industrial placement, mobility instruction, and home teaching. Comprehensive training of professional staff, plus research and demonstration of training grants are enabling the State vocational rehabilitation agencies to constantly upgrade service offered to the blind.

In the State of New York during fiscal year 1962, 332 blind persons were rehabilitated. The State now has two optical aid centers, one operated by the Industrial Home for the Blind and a second by the New York Association for the Blind. The Industrial Home for the Blind also has established an outstanding facility for the deaf-blind, known as the Anne Sullivan Macy Service, which is rendering invaluable assistance to this often neglected group. The New York Association for the Blind, in addition to its optical aids clinic, conducts a research and demonstration facility providing professional placement to the blind.

The New York State Commission for the Blind, and counterpart organizations in other States throughout the country, have been among the vanguard in educating America to the necessity of lending impetus to programs designed to benefit blinded citizens. Therefore, I gratefully accept this award, not only for myself, but for the many others who have given their hearts and their hands to the noble task of restoring their fellow men and women to a life of greater dignity and self-respect.

To those of you who have committed yourselves to this work, I would leave you with these words of John Galsworthy:

"Restoration is at least as much a matter of spirit as of body * * * to heal the one without the other is impossible. If a man's mind, courage, and interest be enlisted in the cause of his own salvation, healing goes on apace, the sufferer is remade; if not, no mere surgical wonders, no careful nursing, will avail to make a man of him again. * * *

"A niche of usefulness and self-respect exists for every man, however handicapped; but that niche must be found for him. To carry the process of restoration to a point short of this is to leave the cathedral without a spire. To restore him and with him the future of our countries, that is the sacred work."

SOVIET OIL OFFENSIVE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a very important development with respect to the oil offensive pursued by the Soviet Union in Europe, which also came before me as chairman of the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference.

At the outset, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Eastern Europe Faces Fuel Lag," published in the oversea edition of the New York Times of April 4, 1963.

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

EASTERN EUROPE FACES FUEL LAG—STUDY SAYS UNEVEN SUPPLY THREATENS INDUSTRIAL DRIVE

(By Paul Underwood)

WARSAW.—Soviet bloc nations are working out a balance sheet of Eastern Europe's supply and demand for fuels during the next 20 years. Preliminary studies indicate shortages of energy may prove a bottleneck in the area's drive to industrialize.

Estimates show that if development plans are carried out without substantial improvements in efficiency, Eastern Europe outside the Soviet Union will face a combined yearly deficit of 100 million tons of conventional fuels by the 1980's.

Only the Soviet Union will be in a position to meet its fuel energy requirements from home production. However, it is considered unlikely that Moscow would be in a position to satisfy the needs of her Communist-ruled allies.

The question of the area's fuel energy balance is one of the problems now exercising the economic minds of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, or Comecon, the bloc's version of a common market.

Comecon's executive committee checked over preliminary estimates at a meeting in Moscow last month and approved plans for the completion of the study. A survey of the situation was published recently by Zycie Gospodarcze, a Polish weekly economic review.

NATURAL FUELS DECLINE

The publication made the following points:

The known reserves of fuels within the Soviet bloc countries taken as a whole are enormous. However, the distribution of these reserves among the individual countries is very uneven. The Soviet Union, which has 70 percent of the population of the bloc and about the same percentage of its total industrial production, enjoys 95 percent of the community's raw material resources.

Not only are the resources of the other countries limited but, with the exception of Poland's coal, reserves of natural fuels are near exhaustion.

If the extraction of oil in Rumania and coal in both Czechoslovakia and East Germany continues to increase at the rate of recent years, "deposits now available will be exhausted within the next 30 to 40 years," the journal declared.

Although Soviet output can be expanded well beyond present levels, Zycie Gospodarcze said the bloc as a whole would have to help finance such an expansion. Otherwise, because of the slow return on such investment, the rate of growth of the Soviet national income would decline.

This again poses a problem, the journal declared. The share of fuel energy investments in the development programs of the bloc countries is already so high that it precludes a substantial increase. Zycie Gospodarcze said some expansion of fuel output within the bloc was feasible and would help reduce the expected deficit of the 1980's. "But we cannot eliminate it," the journal added.

It declared that more hope lay in increasing technical efficiency, in greater use of plastics and other substitutes, and in saving materials.

The journal asserted that the yearly per capita consumption of fuel in Eastern Europe outside the Soviet Union was virtually the same as that of the six countries of the European Common Market—2.9 and 2.7 tons, respectively.

Yet Eastern Europe's industrial output is only a little more than 50 percent as great as that of the Common Market, it added.

One important reason for this, Zycie Gospodarcze said, involved production practices. Eastern bloc machines weigh 15 to 20 percent more than similar Western machines. This means more steel is being used, and, therefore, more energy is being consumed than is necessary. Reducing the excess would enable the bloc to produce more per ton of fuel.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the article indicates that Eastern Europe has not only become a substantial fuel deficit area, but that if the ambitious industrial plans of the East European bloc are to be carried out, the requirements for Soviet fuels within the bloc will rise sharply.

In view of the serious alarm caused in the United States by the Soviet Union's oil offensive—I use the word "offensive" in the economic sense—since 1955, with which I agree, I asked Secretary of State Rusk and Secretary of the Interior Udall for an immediate appraisal of the current Soviet capabilities to continue to wage an oil offensive against the West, in the light of the developments narrated in the New York Times article to which I have referred, which indicated that the Soviet bloc requirements would themselves take a good part of the oil production of the Soviet Union.

I have now received replies from the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of State, and I believe they will be of great interest to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that they, together with my requests of both Secretaries, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

APRIL 18, 1963.

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

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to my attention that the Soviet bloc nations are working out a balance sheet of Eastern Europe's supply and demand for fuels during the next 20 years.

Preliminary estimates prepared by Comecon show that if development plans are carried out without substantial improvements in efficiency, Eastern Europe, outside the Soviet Union itself, will face a combined yearly deficit of 100 million tons of conventional fuels by 1980.

Their study asserts that the yearly per capita consumption of fuel in Eastern Europe outside the Soviet Union is virtually the same as that of the six countries of the European Common Market—2.9 and 2.7 tons respectively, although Eastern Europe's industrial output is only a little more than 50 percent as great as that of the Common Market.

It was further pointed out that even though the reserves of fuel in the Soviet Union are presently enormous, the resources of the other East European countries are near exhaustion. If the extraction of oil in Rumania and coal in Czechoslovakia and East Germany continues to increase at the rate of recent years, deposits now available will be exhausted within the next 30 to 40 years, and requirements for Soviet oil within the bloc will rise sharply.

Under the circumstances, the Soviet oil offensive threat might have to be reevaluated. I would very much appreciate having your comments on this matter.

With warm regards,

Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1963.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: As promised in my letter to you of April 25, 1963, we have reviewed the supply and demand of fuels in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe satellites. We have also examined the original source of the information quoted in your letter of April 18, and find the material, although containing some political overtones in favor of the Polish economy, to represent a fairly authoritative statement of the problem facing Soviet bloc nations.

Projections as far as 30 to 40 years forward are highly speculative and subject to wide variation in ideas as to what lies ahead. This is especially true with respect to energy, where developments in the nuclear field conceivably could result in drastic changes in the energy pattern—given the impetus of an economic "breakthrough" versus conventional fuels. Our comments therefore apply only to the relatively near future.

Current estimates show that Eastern Europe (exclusive of the Soviet Union) is now an energy-deficit area and that this status has been reached much earlier than anticipated. To meet the growing energy requirements of East Europe will not be easy for the U.S.S.R. The growth in domestic production of crude oil is being hampered by a lack of equipment suitable for the discovery and development of new fields. At the same time, extraction of coal has fallen well below plan and production of gas has been disappointing. Thus, more petroleum will be required at home to make up for below-plan output of coal and gas. It is probable that for the next several years at least the growth in availability of petroleum may be closely paralleled by a growth in Soviet domestic demand.

There is no doubt that the Soviet Union already has proved oil reserves adequate to support a production level considerably higher than that required to meet anticipated Soviet domestic and East Europe satellite oil demand. The real questions are (1) how fast will these reserves be developed, or new discoveries made productive, (2) how much of the productive capacity thus created will be used for exports to East Europe, Cuba and Communist China, and (3) how much more will be available for export to Western markets.

The answers to these questions are difficult to predict. The solution to the first obviously is a function of capital investment, plus improved efficiency and advanced technology; the second is directly related to Soviet willingness to sacrifice growth in home demand in favor of supplying the satellite nations; the third is primarily governed by politicial decisions.

In the report prepared at my request last October by the National Petroleum Council, it is noted that exports of oil from the Soviet Union to satellite countries of East Europe in 1965 might reach 20 million metric tons (400,000 barrels daily) compared with only 9 million tons (180,000 barrels daily) in 1960. Soviet plans already envisage the delivery of 15 million tons (300,000 barrels daily) to Eastern European satellites through the "Friendship" pipeline system in 1965. An additional 5 million tons (100,000 barrels daily) is presently expected to move into these countries by a combination of tanker deliveries from Black Sea ports and overland means other than pipelines, although the "Friendship" pipeline is capable of being expanded to an ultimate capacity of 35 million tons (700,000 barrels daily) by the addition of pumping stations as needed.

Available evidence does not support the probability of any dramatic upsurge in the export of oil to nonbloc countries from the U.S.S.R., at least through 1965. Nonetheless, continued Soviet effort to increase its tanker fleet, plus construction of pipelines to and expansion of export facilities in the Black Sea area indicate that exports of oil from this source will continue to grow, although at a slower rate than that observed for past years.

In this connection, the National Petroleum Council report referred to above estimated that exports of Soviet oil to Western nations would increase from 565,000 barrels daily in 1961 to almost 1 million barrels daily in 1965. Current evidence, based largely on performance during 1962, when Soviet exports to the free world showed a relatively modest gain over the 1961 level as compared with prior annual increases ranging from 25- to 65 percent, tends to indicate that 1965 exports to the West may be somewhat less than the 1 million barrels daily previously estimated.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 23, 1963.

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: In my letter of April 25, 1963 (acknowledging the receipt of your letter of April 18), I promised that the Department would comment further on the Soviet oil problem as soon as the various departments and agencies of the Government had completed an analysis of the Polish study which you so kindly brought to our attention.

The Department of State has seen Secretary Udall's reply of May 11 to a similar letter addressed to him and has nothing to add to his able statement concerning the facts. The Department is particularly concerned with the imponderables mentioned in his fourth and fifth paragraphs, which read as follows:

"There is no doubt that the Soviet Union already has proved oil reserves adequate to support a production level considerably higher than that required to meet anticipated Soviet domestic and East Europe satellite oil demand. The real questions are (1) How fast will these reserves be developed, or new discoveries made productive? (2) How much of the productive capacity thus created will be used for exports to East Europe, Cuba, and Communist China? and (3) How much more will be available for export to Western markets?

"The answers to these questions are difficult to predict. The solution to the first

obviously is a function of capital investment, plus improved efficiency and advanced technology; the second is directly related to Soviet willingness to sacrifice growth in home demand in favor of supplying the satellite nations; the third is primarily governed by political decisions."

In view of the imponderables, the Department plans to maintain present policy and, in cooperation with our friends and allies, to keep the situation under close and continuous study.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe that Secretary Udall's response, especially, places this problem in a substantially different light than heretofore viewed by most people. According to the latest estimates of the Department of the Interior, the probability of any dramatic upsurge of Soviet oil exports to nonbloc countries within the near future, at least through 1965, is not supported by available evidence. To be sure, exports from the Soviet Union to nonbloc markets can be expected to grow, but at a slower rate than that observed for the past 7 years; namely, 1955 to 1961. The Secretary offers the following evidence to support this view.

First. Exports of Soviet oil to Western nations have remained at roughly the same level in 1961 and 1962; namely, about 565,000 barrels a day. This is contrasted with annual gains in preceding years which ranged between 25 and 65 percent, gains which caused justified alarm in the West. Soviet oil exports increased from 80,000 to 565,000 barrels a day between 1955 and 1961.

Second. Eastern Europe has become an energy deficit area much sooner than expected. The indication is that exports of oil from the Soviet Union to the East European bloc are climbing very rapidly.

Third. Due to the growing energy requirements of the Soviet Union and the high costs, and the disappointing performance of the Soviet coal industry, the availability of Soviet oil for export outside the bloc has evidently been temporarily reduced.

Fourth. Based on the energy requirements of the Soviet bloc in 1962, the Secretary of the Interior believes that the National Petroleum Council's estimates of potential Soviet exports to nonbloc nations of 900,000 to 1 million barrels a day by 1965 is somewhat high.

These conclusions are supported by other authoritative sources, such as those of Edmund K. Faltermayer in the Wall Street Journal of April 22, 1963, and evidence submitted to the Joint Economic Committee during its December 1962 hearings, entitled "Dimensions of Soviet Economic Power."

It is, therefore, evident that the economic capability of the Soviet Union to wage a massive oil offensive has been curtailed, at least for the time being, and that we are entering a new phase of the Soviet oil offensive against the West. I would be the last to argue that the Soviet Union is no longer capable or determined to use its oil resources in a drive directed against selected target countries for political or strategic purposes. The Soviet Union remains committed to power expansion through economic warfare by its own ideology, for which we can find abundant evidence.

We also find that Western European governments are beginning to learn that they pay heavily for depending upon the Soviet Union for their fuel requirements. The experiences of France, Israel, Finland, Greece, Austria, and Iceland, as reported by experts of the Standard Oil Co., of New Jersey, continue to bear witness to this real hazard. The Soviets' objective is to exploit the dependence of Western countries for their essential fuel requirements in order to influence their national policies at a critical period, by threatening to cut off oil, just as it rattles its rockets whenever it is annoyed with the policies of the United States or with some other part of the free world.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the memorandum of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, to which I have just referred, and also the article written by Edmund K. Faltermayer, published in Wall Street Journal of April 22, 1963.

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

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT BY YEVGENI GUROV OF SOJUZNEFTEXPORT, FEBRUARY 6, 1963, "DOES SOVIET OIL THREATEN WESTERN MARKETS?"

(Prepared by Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, C. & P. E. Department, New York, N.Y., March 14, 1963)

On February 6, 1963, Mr. Yevgeni Gurov, chairman of Sojuzneftexport, the U.S.S.R. oil export organization, issued a statement entitled "Does Soviet Oil Threaten Western Markets?" Fundamentally the memorandum sought to show that Soviet oil exports are of a commercial character and that free world countries need have no fear of them. The memorandum discussed Soviet oil pricing, Soviet production and export capabilities, and Soviet oil security to its free world buyers. It concluded that this oil is much like free world oil and holds no security problems for the free world. The purpose of this note is to examine the validity of the Soviet memorandum.

PRICING OF SOVIET OIL

Mr. Gurov seeks to show that during 1960, Soviet oil was sold in capitalist countries at an average discount of 17 percent less than the list price, whereas in the same year free world oil companies sold about 11 percent of Middle East oil production at a 20-percent discount from posted prices. In addition, the memorandum attempts to show that in some specific cases, in sales to Brazil and the United Arab Republic, Soviet prices have been about the same as free world prices. There are a number of deficiencies in Mr. Gurov's statements:

1. The reference to Soviet prices being 17 percent less than the "list" price is curious since such a Soviet list has never been made public and was not previously known to exist. Comparison of Soviet prices with such a "list" would not seem to be a meaningful comparison.

2. It is interesting that Mr. Gurov found it necessary to compare a discount on total Soviet oil sales with a discount in the Middle East which applies, even according to the Soviet figures, to only 11 percent of free world oil production in that area.

3. The important question on price is the amount paid by the customer. Therefore, Soviet oil prices should be compared with free world prices in some of the countries which import substantial quantities of Soviet oil. In Italy, a country which purchases about 22 percent of total Soviet oil exports, the price of delivered Soviet crude is about 30 percent below that of the comparable delivered price of Arabian crude. West German governmental statistics on crude import prices at the German border in 1961 indicate that Soviet crude was imported for 82 cents per barrel (or 32 percent) below the average cost of free world crude imports.

4. Another way of examining Soviet pricing philosophy is to note that the official Soviet statistics contained in the publication "Foreign Trade of the U.S.S.R. for the year 1961" show that the price of Soviet crude sold to free world countries, excluding Cuba, was $1.38 per barrel f.o.b., or only 54 percent of the $2.54 per barrel f.o.b. price charged to the satellites and Cuba. Interestingly enough, if the $1.38 per barrel price to free world consumers was 17 percent less than the Soviet list price in 1961, then the $2.54 average price to the satellites and Cuba indicates that captive customers pay over 150 percent of list price.

5. Average Soviet export prices to the free world do not tell the complete story. Prices are often reduced in specific markets when this is desirable to attain overall Soviet political or economic objectives.

6. Mr. Gurov sought to show that Soviet prices to the UAR were about the same as those of free world oil companies. The Sojuzneft export price of $1.76 per barrel f.o.b. that Mr. Gurov mentions was the initial proposal. However, his statement fails to mention that the Soviet offer was later reduced to $1.58 per barrel and it is believed the sale was made at $1.43 per barrel f.o.b.

7. U.S. oil companies have not sought to persuade the U.S. Government to buy oil from private companies and sell it at a discount in markets where Soviet oil is being delivered. Such a step on the part of the Government would be most undesirable from the oil industry's point of view.

SOVIET OIL EXPORT CAPABILITY

Mr. Gurov states that Soviet oil exports have had the usual commercial growth, not exceeding that registered by other large oil exporting countries. He indicates that the free world need have no fear of the Soviet future export potential, inasmuch as the growth of consumption within the Soviet will use much of the increasing production. The Comecon (Friendship) pipeline is presented as one that will be used to meet the oil requirements of the Soviet bloc countries in Eastern Europe.

It would appear that Mr. Gurov's position is not a correct one. Soviet oil exports have increased at an annual rate of 35 percent per year since 1957 compared with a similar annual rate of 10 percent for the Middle East. As to future export plans, Mr. Gurov's remark seemed quite contrary to his own statement at the 1960 Arab Congress that the Soviet intends to recapture the 19 percent of the Western European oil market which it had in the early 1930's. Such a level of exports to Western Europe would be about 2½ times the current level, and would indicate that it is the Soviet goal to make Western Europe dependent on Soviet oil for a substantial part of the latter's total energy supplies. Mr. Gurov's recent statement is also inconsistent with his earlier statement to the U.S. oil industry delegation to Russia at which time he estimated that Soviet exports might continue to increase from 15 to 20 percent per year.

Tangible evidence of Soviet oil export plans is provided by the capacity of new pipelines, either completed, definitely planned, or under construction, of approximately 1,500,000 barrels per day at Soviet terminals in the Baltic, Central Europe, and the Black Sea. The major tanker building program which the Soviet has under way at the present time and its investments in dredging and other improvements of export facilities, seem to provide a clearer picture of Soviet plans than Mr. Gurov's recent statement depicts.

SECURITY OF SOVIET SUPPLIES

Mr. Gurov seeks to show that about half of the Soviet deliveries of crude and products are now made by long-term contracts and that such contracts guarantee reliable and stable supplies of oil to free world countries.

The demonstrated insecurity of Soviet supplies has already been brought home to several free world governments. In late 1956 Soviet shipments to Israel were cancelled without explanation following the invasion of Suez. On November 28, 1958, Finland found that Soviet exports of oil were cut off for the remainder of the year after Conservatives had been included in the Finnish Cabinet. Largely as a result of an implied Soviet threat to curtail trade, the Conservatives withdrew from the Finnish Cabinet and the Cabinet was forced to resign. In late 1961 the U.S.S.R. refused to deliver 40,000 tons of gasoline and oil which had been ordered by Greece and which were urgently needed. Even within recent months, Austria, Egypt, and Iceland have all found that the Soviet has not delivered promised oil, and have had to call on free world oil companies to supply the deficit. Within the past week, the Soviet Government has halted all coal deliveries to France under its recently signed agreement with France. The move was made to support striking French miners during the current French labor crisis. It is a clear-cut example of Soviet willingness to openly use export trade to shape the national policies of free world countries.

In summary, it appears that Mr. Gurov's effort to have Soviet oil thought of as normal commercial trade is rather unsuccessful. Soviet actions in its oil dealings provide far more conclusive proof as to Soviet motives than does Mr. Gurov's statement. Premier Khrushchev's statement that "We value trade least for economic reasons and most for political purposes" is a more realistic summary of current Soviet oil policies than Mr. Gurov's recent memorandum.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 22, 1963]

SOVIET OIL PUSH—VAST PRODUCTION DRIVE FACES OBSTACLES BUT HAS MADE BIG GAINS—RUSSIA'S OUTPUT MAY EQUAL UNITED STATES BY MID-SEVENTIES IF MONEY, DRILLING PROBLEMS SOLVED—SHIPMENTS TO WEST SOARING

(By Edmund K. Faltermayer)

BAKU, U.S.S.R.—Edmund Gaikovich Iskenderov, an oil engineer, works in an office perched on steel pilings 2 miles out in the Caspian Sea, linked to the mainland and several dozen offshore oil wells by trestles.

About the sound of a heavy sea and nearby pumps drawing crude oil from 6,000 feet below the sea's floor, he talks of pushing Russia's oil search further from shore. "We've got a new drilling rig that will operate in water 200 feet deep, twice the depth with present rigs," he declares. "With it we'll explore as much as 90 miles offshore."

None of this would startle U.S. engineers, who have drilled in water as deep as 287 feet. But it demonstrates the enthusiasm behind Russia's highly successful drive to find and produce oil. Since 1950 the U.S.S.R. has displaced Venezuela as the second-ranking oil producer and has been steadily gaining on the first-ranking United States.

RUSSIAN OIL OUTPUT RISES

Russia's daily average oil production rose to 3.7 million barrels last year, about half the U.S. output of 7.3 million barrels. In 1950 Russia produced only 800,000 barrels a day, one-seventh of the U.S. level in that year.

Oil has become a major weapon in the Soviet push for trade with non-Communist countries. Partly through relentless price cutting, Russia boosted sales of oil and oil products to non-Communist nations to an estimated 560,000 barrels a day last year. That was a sevenfold increase from 80,000 in 1955. West Europe now gets 9 percent of its oil imports from the U.S.S.R. compared with less than 2 percent in 1953. Oil accounted for one-fourth of Russia's earnings of free world currencies last year, giving it funds it badly needs to buy advanced industrial equipment in the West. The U.S.S.R. has become a significant competitor of Western oil companies operating in Europe.

Assuming no acceleration in the growth of U.S. oil production and a fulfillment of present Soviet goals, output of Russian oil would move ahead of U.S. production by the mid-1970s. Soviet exports to the West would be likely to rise sharply, too. The National Petroleum Council (NPC), an industry group that advises the U.S. Government, estimates that Soviet shipments to non-Communist countries could rise 60 percent, to some 900,000 barrels a day, just in the next 3 years.

But despite the spectacular gains so far, Russia's path to these goals will be far from easy. Soviet oil production, like output in some of its other basic industries, has shown some recent signs of losing momentum. Annual percentage gains in oil output, for instance, have declined steadily from a postwar record of 19.2 percent in 1955 to 12 percent last year. And while the Kremlin's oil production goal was exceed last year, the 0.5 percent overfulfillment was the smallest so far in the current 7-year plan which runs through 1965.

CAPITAL SHORTAGE A PROBLEM

A major Soviet problem is a general shortage of capital. Last year, Russia's economic planners allotted only 5 percent more investment money to the oil and gas industry than in 1961, one of the smallest annual increases in recent years. For 2 years in a row, the Soviet weekly Economic Gazette recently disclosed, the apportionment of investment funds for the Tartar Autonomous Republic (Tataria), which accounts for 38 percent of Soviet crude oil production, has been reduced instead of increased. Lacking adequate electric power, pipes, storage tanks, and related equipment, oil men in the area have not been able to put all their new wells into operation, the publication said.

For the past 2 years crude production (in Tataria) has increased more as a result of forced extraction from already-drilled wells than from bringing new ones into operation," the Economic Gazette reported. And some fields have failed to fulfill production goals "for the first time in many years," it adds.

Deficiencies show up in other ways. Premier Khrushchev recently disclosed that the nation did not fulfill its production plan for oil-producing equipment in 1962.

The Russians also have experienced an important failure in drilling technology as they have drilled deeper wells in search of oil. Russia uses a "turbodrill," which it claimed as a major development a few years ago, for about 85 percent of its drilling. Wells are drilled by a toothed, circular bit on the end of pipe, which is added in sections as the hole gets deeper. In most U.S. drilling, a motorized "rotary rig" at the surface revolves the drill pipe and bit, boring into the earth much as a carpenter drills into wood.

With the turbodrill, the drill pipe doesn't rotate. The bit is turned by turbine action as liquid mud is pumped down the pipe. This method overcame Russia's problems of making sufficient drill pipe that could withstand the twisting of rotary drilling. But it is understood that the turbodrill's high turning speed rapidly burns out bits as heat increases at lower depths.

TURBODRILL ABANDONED

Thus, Russia has decided to abandon use of the turbodrill below 2,000 meters (6,560 feet). Such wells are relatively shallow by modern standards. U.S. drillers have gone as deep as 25,340 feet.

Western oil specialists say a major part of the problem is that Soviet drill bits are inferior in quality. This gets support from Russians themselves. "Suffice it to say," a Soviet official told a Communist Party gathering late in 1961, "that in Bashkiria (part of the Volga-Urals field north of here) 80 to 100 bits are used in drilling a 2,000-meter well."

If the Russians switch to rotary drilling for deep wells, as seems likely, the Soviets soon may be shopping in the West for drilling pipe and bits, American oilmen say. The United States maintains strict export controls on such items but other Western nations do not.

Russia already is getting a sizable amount of materials and equipment from the West for its oil offensive. According to an NPC study, the U.S.S.R. has placed orders in non-Communist countries for 35 ocean-going tankers. These, plus other vessels now being built in the Soviet bloc and in Yugoslavia, will make the U.S.S.R. self-sufficient in export tankerage by 1965. Russia now charters Western-owned vessels to carry part of its export shipments.

Three Western countries, Italy, West Germany, and Sweden, contracted to supply about 40 percent of the 40-inch pipe the Russians needed to complete the 2,300-mile Friendship pipeline system linking the vast Volga-Urals oilfields with Russia's Eastern European satellites. Since Soviet-bloc steel mills cannot provide enough large-diameter pipe, these contracts, according to the NPC, "breathed new life into the pipeline construction program and averted a delay of far-reaching proportions."

SOME SALES BANNED

Under prodding by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, West Germany and Italy—but not non-NATO Sweden—recently banned further sales of large-diameter pipe to the U.S.S.R. The new embargoes are not expected to seriously delay completion of the line, scheduled for next year. Further plans call for two branch lines to Baltic ports to permit direct loading of ocean-going tankers. These lines are expected to cut the cost of shipping a barrel of oil across western Russia to 29 cents from $1.05 presently, using rail cars, according to the NPC.

Despite Soviet troubles and efforts by the United States to cut down on technical and other aid from the West, most American oilmen figure Soviet output will continue to grow although perhaps at a slower rate than the Russians forecast. In 1961, according to NPC estimates, the U.S.S.R. had more geophysical field crews seeking oilfields than the entire free world.

Massive exploration already has paid off handsomely. Crude production from the Volga-Urals fields, developed almost from scratch in the postwar period, now represents three-quarters of Soviet output and dwarfs production from the once dominant Baku area. Important recent finds have been made on the Mangyshlak peninsula on the northeastern shore of the Caspian, and at Markovo, in East Siberia. The Russians have glowingly described the Mangyshlak field, still undeveloped, as a multi-million-barrel find, comparable to many in the Middle East.

Russia's proved oil reserves are estimated at 28.5 billion barrels compared with 35.3 billion in the United States. But some geologists guess Russia may have reserves of 200 billion barrels, counting vast areas not yet surveyed.

CASPIAN DRILLING DRIVE

Offshore drilling is being pushed in the Caspian to provide a continuing nearby source of crude for refineries and shipping facilities here at Baku, long a major Russian

oil center. Many land wells in the area have played out. About 60 miles offshore in the Caspian, the Soviets have built an entire town on stilts since 1949, calling it Neftyanye Kamni (oil rocks) for rock formations in the area. Workers spend 5-day stints on the 70-odd miles of trestles, commuting on their days off by helicopter and boat from their homes in Baku.

Soviet refining capacity, which has consistently lagged crude output, was to be expanded by some 92 percent in the economic plan which runs through 1965. Although there have been reports that this effort is behind schedule, it is known that 17 new refineries are being built and many more expanded.

At the new Baku oil refinery, built in 1952, Rza Gasanovich Aleev, deputy director, proudly shows a visitor a 156-acre expansion site, where two catalytic cracking towers are rising for use in breaking down crude oil into separate products, such as gasoline and diesel oil. "The tonnage here will approximately double," says Mr. Aleev, "but the value of our production will triple" during the present 7-year plan.

He says the new units will increase the maximum octane of gasoline produced at the refinery to 85 or 86 from the present 72. Russia's refineries have long been deficient in capacity to produce higher-grade gasoline and diesel fuels.

Addition of this type of capacity could help Russia's export effort significantly. Russia has a surplus of gasoline but has had trouble selling it in the West because of its low octane. At that, refined products accounted for 38 percent of its total free world exports of oil and oil products.

To cope with the competition, Western oil companies are underbidding Soviet crude oil prices in some markets. Costs of taking oil out of the ground in Russia vary from 39.6 percent of the national average in Tataria to 217 percent in the Baku area and 331 percent on bleak Sakhalin Island in the Pacific. But on the average, by Soviet reckoning, it costs 65 to 70 cents a barrel. Adding exploration outlays, the cost rises to nearly $1 a barrel, which is about what Mideast oil costs Western companies after Arab governments receive royalties. These oil companies generally have lower transportation costs to Western European markets than do the Russians, although this advantage may diminish when the Friendship pipeline is completed. Most Western oilmen figure the Russians have been subsidizing sales in the West in order to earn foreign exchange.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe that the current breathing spell—and that is all the present lull in the Soviet oil offensive means—should be seized upon to:

First, undertake an immediate review by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, NATO, and/or other suitable bodies to which the U.S. adheres, of the divergent East-West trade policies of the Western nations.

Second, we should use this occasion to enact U.S. legislation to encourage maximum allied cooperation in the application of existing controls on strategic trade with the Soviet bloc; we should give the President flexible authority to conclude special arrangements dealing with East-West trade problems between the United States and other NATO countries; and finally, we should provide the United States with flexible tools to enable us to take the initiative in East-West economic competition.

Third, we should encourage closer cooperation between private business and Government in meeting the problems caused by the politically motivated Soviet economic—including oil—offensive.

In November 1962, the Plenary Session of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference adopted the recommendation of its Economic Committee, of which I am the Chairman, that the North Atlantic Council review existing arrangements for the coordination of the policies of the member countries of the Alliance on East-West Trade; that member countries should avoid excessive dependence on imports of oil from the Communist countries and should diversify their sources of supply; and that member governments should consult together in the NATO Council to coordinate action within the framework of NATO, with regard to East-West trade in nonstrategic goods.

Through an amendment which I proposed and which was adopted on June 23, 1962, to the Export Control Act of 1949, Congress declared it to be U.S. policy to formulate a unified commercial and trading policy to be observed by free world nations in their dealings with Communist bloc-dominated countries. I am at present awaiting a status report on what has been done by our Government to implement this amendment and shall inform the Senate when I have received this information.

On May 9, 1963, I introduced a package of bills to further encourage closer cooperation among the Western Allies in East-West trade. Thus there is an incentive to act. We have a breathing spell due to the internal needs of the Communist bloc, and it is urgent that we take some action of the kind I have recommended to the Senate.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we have still to meet the challenge presented by the problem of providing for the health care of older people. Hospital costs are continuing to rise and an increasing percentage of our population consisting of Americans 65 years of age and older are being confronted by the problem of paying for the health care they need at a time when their earning power has drastically declined and their incomes are at a low static level. The need for a Federal program paid for on a contributory basis to defray at least the largest part of the cost of the health care will become more acute as more and more Americans live longer, thanks to modern medical advances, while health care costs continue to go up. The bill which I have introduced sets forth certain basic principles of cooperation between the Federal Government and the private sector in dealing with this problem. This is the way in which I believe we can solve this problem in a reasonable and satisfactory manner.

This approach to the problem of health care insurance for the aging is discussed in some detail by Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Eisenhower administration and currently director of the Eastman Kodak Co. of Rochester, N.Y. Mr. Folsom is also a member of the National Committee on the Health Care of the Aged which I was instrumental in organizing, has been making a careful study of the entire problem.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article written by Mr. Folsom, entitled "How To Pay the Hospital," which is appearing in the Atlantic Monthly, July issue.

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

HOW TO PAY THE HOSPITAL

(By Marion B. Folsom)

Medical care for older people will be a lively legislative issue again this year. Actually, there is little or no opposition to assisting older people with their heavy medical expenses. The point of contention is how that assistance should be given.

A dramatic situation, such as the depression of the thirties, which brought about the Social Security Act, is not needed to highlight the growing urgency of some kind of plan for helping older people to pay their medical bills. About 9 percent of all Americans, some 17 million individuals, are over 65 years of age. Both the percentage and the number are increasing. Their need is pressing because of these factors:

1. The rate of long and serious illness is higher among older people than among those under 65.

2. The cost of medical care is going up. Between 1948 and 1962, the increase was 65 percent. During this same period, hospital daily service charges went up 155 percent.

3. Upon retirement, the individual usually suffers a substantial reduction in income.

Thus, more and more people are experiencing increased medical costs at the very time when they are least prepared to meet added expenses.

It is true, of course, that people in retirement have more security now than in the past. Social security benefits, growing payments from private pension plans, and greater personal savings generally enable the retired person to take care of himself in reasonable comfort, as long as he retains good health. But when serious illness strikes him or his wife, the high cost of medical care may quickly exhaust his savings and use up income needed to meet normal living expenses.

Medical expenses are not such a hazard to employed people. Most employers today pay benefits for absence due to sickness and provide group plans for insuring the wage earner and his dependents against hospital, surgical, and, in a growing number of cases, major medical expenses. Altogether, 130 million Americans now participate in hospital-insurance plans and almost as many in surgical-insurance plans. So complete is this coverage by voluntary plans that there has been little agitation for Government health insurance to cover the entire population.

But the situation of retired people is far less favorable than that of the employed. Few group plans continue to cover a man after he retires, and often the higher premium rate under an individual policy is more than he can afford. A recent study by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare stated that "those with relatively low incomes are likely to have most difficulty in paying large bills and are least likely to have health insurance."

Some employers now provide medical insurance for their retired people, with the company paying part or all of the cost. But such plans are expensive and can be afforded only by well-established companies. So it may be many years before an appreciable number of retired employees will have such protection.

As Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in 1955 I urged employers to include health insurance benefits in their pension plans, with all or some part of the cost being paid by the employer. At the same time I also proposed to insurance companies that they establish a pool or underwriting group on a nationwide basis to experiment with lower cost plans for covering the aged, but nothing came of the suggestion.

Last year in New York State several insurance companies did join in an underwriting arrangement to provide medical insurance for people over 65. Premiums were reduced, but the cost is well above Blue Cross and Blue Shield rates.

The insurance companies naturally have to charge higher premiums for older people because of the higher incidence of long illness in this group. For the same reason, the growing number of older people covered at normal rates by Blue Cross has contributed to the rapid increase in Blue Cross rates. The Michigan Blue Cross lost $18 million during 1962 in its program of caring for 255,000 people over 65. Had it not been for this older group, the organization would have shown a profit of $12.5 million. It is now asking for a substantial increase in premiums from all subscribers.

The need, then, for some kind of nationwide action is generally acknowledged. The question is, What kind of action?

The choice is between the Kerr-Mills plan, a relief system enacted in 1960, or a Federal contributory social-insurance plan. This is the same choice we had back in the thirties when the Social Security Administration was established. Those of us who were active in developing a Federal system for providing financial assistance to the retired agreed that old-age assistance, a relief plan, was necessary to meet the temporary situation. But we also agreed that over the long run a social insurance system, financed by contributions of the employee and employer and providing stated benefits as a matter of right, would be far better, for there are basic objections to old-age assistance.

To begin with, widespread dependence upon relief does not fit well into our American way of life. Furthermore, these relief benefits have not declined as expected. There are still more than 2 million people receiving assistance grants. This has been due in part to the exclusion of certain groups from the contributory system, but even more to the growing leniency of local welfare officials in determining need—especially as the Federal Government has paid a rising percentage of the relief grants. The Federal share, originally set at 50 percent, now exceeds 75 percent in some States. For the country as a whole, the Federal share averages 63 percent and amounts to $1.2 billion a year. Once the formula is set, the Federal Government has no control.

Were it not for the benefits paid under social security, a great many more people would be receiving old-age assistance grants. In that case, an annual cost of perhaps $5 billion would now be charged to general revenue, which is raised mainly by income taxes.

The Kerr-Mills Act set up a joint Federal-State plan under old-age assistance. According to its terms, people who become indigent as a result of illness are eligible for medical relief payments. The qualification tests for the medically indigent are more liberal as to income, property ownership, and responsibility to relatives than the tests for those who now qualify for old-age assistance. Federal grants to the States cover from 50 to 80 percent of these payments, the poorer States receiving a higher percentage. The Federal Government, it will be observed, has no control over the total amount of these grants. In effect, it simply honors the welfare bills submitted by the States, paying them out of general revenue.

If complete reliance for medical care of the aged were placed upon the Kerr-Mills plan, we would probably have the same experience we have had with old-age assistance, as is already evident in States that have adopted the Kerr-Mills plan. The qualification tests would be liberalized and the percentage of older people to qualify would rise steadily—especially in low-income States, which pay only 20 percent of the cost. On the other hand, wealthier States, which pay 50 percent, might tighten too much, leaving many people without the care they need.

As with old-age assistance, the Federal share of the cost comes from general revenue. Before long, the result will be an extra burden of several billion dollars on Federal income taxes.

Another factor to be considered, especially by the medical profession, is that as the cost of the States' share increases, especially in the States paying 50 percent of the cost, the difficulty of obtaining revenue will probably cause these States to exercise close control over doctors' fees and hospital room rates.

But of all the reasons why we should not depend exclusively upon the relief system, I believe the most compelling was eloquently expressed by the Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady, secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, when he wrote:

"As a responsible, independent, self-respecting individual in intention, if not in fact, the ordinary citizen hopes Government help, when necessary, will be available to him as a 'right' for at least the more likely hazards he faces, without humiliating or demoralizing conditions such as the periodic investigation of his resources in order to balance them against his needs * * *. Our ordinary citizen also feels that where he contributes to the cost of his protection, or even if his employer contributes on his behalf, he has in some sense earned a 'right' to the benefit. He wants to become a 'partner' in the plan and not just its beneficiary."

Several plans have been proposed to finance medical care for the aged through the social security system. The compromise bipartisan proposal, the Anderson-Javits bill, received the support of almost half of the Senators last year and is coming up for consideration again this year. Under its terms, any person receiving social security benefits would be entitled to certain payments covering hospital and nursing home care. He would be entitled to 90 days of inpatient hospital care after having himself paid $10 a day for the first 9 days. Outpatient hospital diagnostic services would be paid after a deductible amount of $20. The insurance would also cover skilled nursing home services for 180 days following hospitalization, and would pay for 240 home visits by visiting nurses.

This plan would be financed by an additional social security tax on both the employer and employee of one-quarter of 1 percent on the first $5,200 of annual income. The Social Security Administration, with its 612 offices and low cost of administration (2 percent of benefits), could handle the plan at a low cost.

The collections would be placed in a separate trust fund for the payment of benefits, with no adverse effect on the Federal Budget. The same committees in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives would determine both the level of benefits and the tax rates. As has been the case in the old-age insurance plan, the committees would keep close check on the program.

Under the compromise proposal, however, groups or individuals would have the option to continue their coverage under Blue Cross or insurance company plans after retirement, with the Government paying the cost of the basic protection. Company group-hospitalization plans could be continued with only minor changes, and either the company or the insurance agency would be reimbursed by Social Security for the cost of the basic services. Thus, full advantage would be taken of private agencies.

The bill also provides for those over 65 who are not social security beneficiaries—at present about 3,500,000 people—with the cost to be borne by general revenue. However, over 92 percent of people now reaching retirement age are covered under social security or other governmental retirement systems, physicians being the only large group not under these systems. Thus, the uncovered group in the future would be very small.

In addition to its other advantages, the social security approach is the only proposal that would provide equal treatment for the increasing number of people who move from State to State, especially upon retirement. The relief approach would place a heavy burden on Florida, California, and other States which attract the retired. Also, most newcomers to a State are ineligible for welfare until after a certain period of residence.

There are few objections raised nowadays against social security. Yet there are numerous objections raised against financing a limited hospital-care program under the social security program. Let us examine these criticisms:

1. "It is socialized medicine and will affect the quality of medical care." There is little basis for this charge, as the only doctors affected will be the hospital resident staff—a very small percentage of the Nation's physicians. The individual would have free choice of hospitals, and all accredited hospitals would be eligible. The program would not interfere with the quality of medical care any more than Blue Cross insurance has.

2. "It is a foot in the door to socialized medicine." There is no reason why active workers and their dependents cannot be adequately covered by private agencies. The proposal at hand would be limited to those over 65—a group which will not exceed 10 percent of the population for many years. And even for this group, the provisions for hospitalization would cover only about 40 percent of their medical costs. Private agencies would be given full opportunity to cover the other services for the aged.

3. "It should cover all medical costs for the aged." The concept is to provide only what most persons consider basic coverage, as evidenced by the widespread sale of hospital insurance. It would be up to the individual or his previous employer to provide supplementary protection. Basic coverage under a governmental plan would undoubtedly stimulate supplementary plans, just as social security has stimulated growth in private supplementary pension plans.

4. "Benefits should not be paid to individuals who can well afford to pay for their own medical care." This criticism would apply only to those now retired or soon to retire. It is the basic principle of social insurance that everyone should contribute and everyone should benefit.

5. "The program will result in overutilization of hospitals, and many new ones will have to be constructed." There is already overutilization of general acute hospitals, due in part to widespread sale of hospital insurance. The deductible feature in the proposed plan (which is not contained in Blue Cross plans) would serve as a check on unnecessary use. But if the situation should be aggravated by the governmental plan, our communities might then face up to the growing need for better nursing homes, for extended care facilities, for rehabilitation units, and for more organized home-care plans—all to relieve the expensive general hospitals and to provide suitable care at a lower cost.

6. "I object to a compulsory plan." First, a payroll tax is no more compulsory than an income tax, which is necessary for the relief system. Second, a voluntary system would

not solve the problem, because many people in the low-income group would probably not join the plan, and a disproportionate number of those who would join probably would be those in the poorest health. Insurance people call this "adverse selection."

7. "It will interfere with the private enterprise system—both profit and nonprofit insurance agencies." I firmly believe that, far from interfering, the proposed plan would prove a real boon to these agencies. I do not see how insurance companies can profitably cover older people for medical expense at normal rates. Blue Cross coverage of the aged at the usual rates tends to raise the cost for all other people. The Anderson-Javits proposal, by paying for the basic protection, would relieve these agencies of the most burdensome part of covering older people. The agencies could then offer attractive supplementary plans.

The financial soundness of the social security system has been questioned by its critics on many occasions. It is only natural that similar doubts should be expressed about the financing of a hospital-care plan for the aged to be tied in with social security. I think it is most important that misunderstandings on this point be removed.

As Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I appointed an Advisory Council on Social Security Financing to study all financial aspects of the system. Included were the chief actuary of a large insurance company, a bank president, a former bank superintendent of New York State, and other experts. In their unanimous report to Congress in 1958, they said, "The Council finds that the present method of financing the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program is sound, practical, and appropriate for this program."

Of other fears expressed in the thirties—that the old-age insurance plan could not be administered efficiently, that the benefits would get out of hand, that the system would interfere with the initiative to save, that insurance companies would be adversely affected—none of these has been borne out.

The system has proved to be a sound plan for providing basic protection for people in their retirement years upon which they and their employers can build. Benefits have been kept reasonable relative to wages; the cost of administration is at the low expense ratio of 2 percent; a contingent reserve fund of close to $20 billion has been accumulated; the system has stimulated the widespread adoption of supplementary employer pension plans; per capita insurance and savings of all types have increased substantially.

Behind every criticism of social insurance, I am sure there is a sincere conviction that the Government is intruding in an area that can be best handled by the individual. It is a good sign when people show concern over any development which seems to them inappropriate within a democratic society. But in the case of hospital care for older people, it is clear that some plan of assistance must be provided; by one method or another, we are going to continue helping older people who cannot pay their medical bills. How can we do this in the fairest possible way?

If we do it by welfare or assistance payments, we must use a means test and we must inevitably discriminate against those judged capable of paying their own way, even though this may mean exhausting their life savings and placing a heavy drain upon their children. The indigent will be helped in every case; the provident unfairly bypassed in many cases.

A plan of social insurance, on the other hand, requires contributions and pays benefits on the same basis in every case. Because of the contributory feature, the individual feels his active participation and is entitled to benefits as a matter of right. What could be more equitable, or more democratic?

In my opinion, the only logical solution to the hardship faced by people over 65 because of rising hospital expenses is a contributory social-insurance plan following the basic principles of the bipartisan Anderson-Javits bill.

CENSUS COMPILATION OF FIGURES ON DENIAL OR ABRIDGEMENT OF THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New York and also with the remarks of other Senators who may have spoken on this subject, in commending the filing of the suit today in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, in an effort to require the Secretary of Commerce and the Director of the Bureau of the Census to compile, in the next decennial census, figures in regard to the denial or abridgement of the right to vote.

For decades, section 2 of the 14th amendment has been—to our shame—a dead letter. The suit filed today in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia would restore life to this part of the Constitution.

Section 2 provides that:

Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

There can be no dispute that the right to vote of many tens of thousands of Americans is denied or abridged. The findings of the Civil Rights Commission are official confirmation of what all of us have known for a long time—namely that the right to vote is denied arbitrarily in many places because of the color of the applicant.

According to the 1959 report of the Civil Rights Commission, there were 158 counties with a majority Negro population located in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. Fifty-one of these counties have 3 percent or less Negro registration. Forty-one others have less than 10 percent Negro registration. Only 11 had more than 30 percent Negro registration, and the remainder had between 10 and 30 percent Negro registration.

In its 1961 report on voting, the Commission again reported substantial deprivation of civil rights in the 21 black-belt counties studied by the Commission.

Said the Commission:

In 17 of these counties, Negroes, although they constitute a majority of the population, do not vote at all, or do so only in small numbers. The reasons for the failure to vote include fear of economic or physical reprisals, official discrimination, blatant or subtle, and lack of education and motivation. Negroes are not members of white party organizations, white candidates do not court Negro votes nor do they take account of Negro needs. The result is that the white minority governs an all but voiceless Negro majority.

The filing of this suit would not be necessary if the Congress had not failed in its responsibility to protect the voting rights of all our citizens. If it is uncomfortable to be reminded that Congress has not utilized its authority to implement section 2 of the 14th amendment, there is no other place to put the blame, for Congress has allowed itself to be dissuaded, by the threat of filibuster and by actual filibuster, from facing up to a grave national issue.

What we confront is not a southern issue or a local issue. It is national in scope. The plaintiffs in this action represent not only those whose right to vote is denied, but also those in other States whose votes have been debased or diluted by the congressional apportionment which fails to take into account, contrary to the direction of section 2 of the 14th amendment and the equal protection clause of the same amendment, and the due process clause of the 5th amendment, the denial and abridgement of voting rights in certain States. Thus, this group of plaintiffs point out that, were the apportionment based as the Constitution directs, their respective States would be entitled to additional representation in the Congress.

We should not need this suit to prod us to an awareness of our responsibilities. I hope it will be successful. But I believe we should not await its outcome to do what we should long since have done—that is, act to assure that there is a census to carry out the provision of section 2 of the 14th amendment. We do not have to wait for a court decision. We can and should act now.

The Congress of the United States can, and should, play a meaningful role in one of the great struggles of our time—the struggle to realize the objective so clearly set out in the Constitution. As one Member of the Congress, I deeply hope we shall no longer stand aside, but shall undertake the responsibility that is rightfully ours.

Mr. President, if the complaint in this case has not already been printed in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that the complaint in the case of Lampkin and others against Hodges and Scammon, to which I and other Senators have referred, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia—Civil Action No. —]

DAISY E. LAMPKIN ET AL., PLAINTIFFS *v.* LUTHER HODGES, SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., AND RICHARD M. SCAMMON, DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., DEFENDANTS.

COMPLAINT—ACTION FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF

I

A. The jurisdiction of this court is invoked pursuant to 11 District of Columbia Code,

section 306. This is an action in equity against officers of the United States, to be found in the District of Columbia for a declaration that they should perform duties owed to:

(1) plaintiff Daisy E. Lampkin, a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania; plaintiffs Nathaniel Denman and Lucille Denman, citizens of the State of Massachusetts; plaintiffs R. Sims Allison, E. Davis Allen, William A. Ross, Ina Boon, Arthur Kennedy, and Pearlie Evans, citizens of the State of Missouri; plaintiffs Maurice Rosenfield and W. N. Daniel, citizens of the State of Illinois; plaintiffs Theodore M. Berry and Charles Lucas, citizens of the State of Ohio; and plaintiffs James H. Garrott and J. Edward Atkinson, citizens of the State of California, by reason of rights secured by section 2 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and by 2 U.S.C., section 6, each of which provides for the reduction of the number of representatives apportioned to any State which denies or abridges the right to vote, and by further reason of rights secured by the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment and the due process clause of the 5th amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

(2) plaintiffs John Lundy, Raymond Harris, Henry Franklin Mason, Nephus Homus Banks, and Dennis Gillus, citizens of the State of Virginia; plaintiffs Laura McGee, Clarence A. Robinson, William McGee, and Milton H. Hancock, citizens of the State of Mississippi; and plaintiff Carole L. Tureaud, a citizen of the State of Louisiana by reason of rights secured by section 2 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States and by 2 U.S.C., section 6, each of which provides for the reduction of the number of representatives apportioned to any State which denies or abridges the right to vote.

B. The jurisdiction of this court also is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C., section 1343 to redress the deprivation under color of State law, statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, and usage of rights, privileges, and immunities secured to all plaintiffs by section 2 of the 14th amendment and 2 U.S.C., section 6, and also secured to those plaintiffs who are citizens of the States of Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Missouri, Illinois, Ohio, and California by the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment and the due process clause of the 5th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

II

A. The plaintiffs bring this action on their own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated pursuant to rule 23(a)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

B. There are common questions of law and fact affecting the rights of plaintiff Daisy E. Lampkin of Pennsylvania, plaintiffs Nathaniel Denman and Lucille Denman of Massachusetts, plaintiffs R. Sims Allison, E. Davis Allen, William A. Ross, Ina Boon, Arthur Kennedy, and Pearlie Evans of Missouri, plaintiffs Maurice Rosenfield and W. N. Daniel of Illinois, plaintiffs Theodore M. Berry and Charles Lucas of Ohio, and plaintiffs James H. Garrott and J. Edward Atkinson of California, and all other citizens of their respective States whose votes have been debased or diluted by the congressional apportionment which, contrary to section 2 of the 14th amendment, 2 U.S.C. section 6, the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment and due process clause of the 5th amendment allocates representatives among the States without accounting for the denial and abridgement of the right to vote by some of them as hereinafter set forth.

C. There are common questions of law and fact affecting the rights of plaintiffs John Lundy, Raymond Harris, Henry Franklin Mason, Nephus Homus Banks, and Dennis Gillus of Virginia, plaintiffs Laura McGee, Clarence A. Robinson, William McGee and Milton H. Hancock of Mississippi, and plaintiff Carole L. Tureaud of Louisiana, and all other citizens of their respective States who have had their right to vote denied or abridged and who have a right to be protected by the sanctions of section 2 of the 14th amendment and 2 U.S.C., section 6.

D. The classes which plaintiffs represent are so numerous as to make it impractical to bring them all before this court. A common relief is sought. The interests of said classes are adequately represented by plaintiffs.

III

A. This is an action for a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. sections 2201 and 2202. There is an actual controversy now existing between the parties to this action as to which plaintiffs seek the judgment of this court. Plaintiffs seek a definition and declaration of the legal rights and relations of the parties with respect to the question:

Whether section 2 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment and due process clause of 5th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; 2 U.S.C., section 6; 2 U.S.C., section 2a; and 13 U.S.C., sections 4, 5, 11, 21, 141 require Defendant Hodges and Defendant Scammon to take necessary steps to prepare and to transmit a statement showing the number of representatives to which each State is entitled as required by section 2 of the 14th amendment which provides as follows:

"Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State."

IV

A. Plaintiff Daisy Lampkin is a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania and of the United States, over 21 years of age. She is, and has been, a duly registered voter for all general elections in the State of Pennsylvania.

B. Plaintiffs Nathaniel Denman and Lucille Denman are citizens of the State of Massachusetts and of the United States, over 21 years of age. They are, and have been, duly registered voters for all general elections in the State of Massachusetts.

C. Plaintiffs R. Sims Allison, E. Davis Allen, William A. Ross, Ina Boon, Arthur Kennedy and Pearlie Evans are citizens of the State of Missouri and the United States, over 21 years of age. They are, and have been, duly registered voters for all general elections in the State of Missouri.

D. Plaintiffs Maurice Rosenfield and W. N. Daniel are citizens of the State of Illinois and of the United States, over 21 years of age. They are, and have been, duly registered voters for all general elections in the State of Illinois.

E. Plaintiffs Theodore M. Berry and Charles Lucas are citizens of the State of Ohio and of the United States, over 21 years of age. They are, and have been, duly registered voters for all general elections in the State of Ohio.

F. Plaintiffs James H. Garrott and J. Edward Atkinson are citizens of the State of California and of the United States, over 21 years of age. They are, and have been, duly registered voters for all general elections in the State of California.

G. Plaintiffs John Lundy, Raymond Harris, Henry Franklin Mason, Nephus Homus Banks and Dennis Gillus are Negro citizens of the State of Virginia and of the United States, over 21 years of age.

(1) Plaintiff John Lundy is and was in 1960 and 1962 in all respects eligible to vote in the State of Virginia except that it requires plaintiff (by the Constitution of Virginia, section 20) to make application to register in his own handwriting which he is unable to do and therefore plaintiff was unable to register to vote in the 1960 and 1962 general elections and will be unable to vote in future general elections in the State of Virginia.

(2) Plaintiff Raymond Harris is and was in 1960 and 1962 in all respects eligible to vote in the State of Virginia except that it requires the payment of a poll tax in order to vote at general elections which plaintiff has not paid in 1963 and therefore plaintiff is unable to vote in the next general election to be held in the State of Virginia.

(3) Plaintiff Henry Franklin Mason is and was in 1960 and 1962 in all respects eligible to vote in the State of Virginia except that it requires plaintiff (by the constitution of Virginia, section 20) to make application to register in his own handwriting which he is unable to do and it requires the payment of a poll tax in order to vote at general elections which plaintiff has not paid and is financially unable to pay and therefore plaintiff was unable to register to vote in the 1960 and 1962 general elections and will be unable to vote in future general elections in the State of Virginia.

(4) Plaintiff Nephus Homus Banks is and was in 1960 and 1962 in all respects eligible to vote in the State of Virginia except that it requires plaintiff (by the constitution of Virginia, section 20) to make application to register in his own handwriting which he is unable to do and therefore plaintiff was unable to register to vote in the 1960 and 1962 general elections and will be unable to vote in future general elections in the State of Virginia.

(5) Plaintiff Dennis Gillus is and was in 1960 and 1962 in all respects eligible to vote in the State of Virginia except that it requires plaintiff (by the constitution of Virginia, section 20) to make application to register in his own handwriting which he is unable to do and the State of Virginia requires the payment of a poll tax in order to vote at general elections which plaintiff has not paid and therefore plaintiff was unable to register to vote in the 1960 and 1962 general elections and will be unable to vote in future general elections in the State of Virginia.

H. Plaintiffs Laura McGee, Clarence A. Robinson, William McGee and Milton H. Hancock are Negro citizens of the State of Mississippi and of the United States, over 21 years of age.

(1) Plaintiff Laura McGee is and was in 1960 and 1962 in all respects eligible to vote in the State of Mississippi except that it requires plaintiff to pass a constitutional interpretation test in order to vote which plaintiff was unable to pass and it requires the payment of a poll tax in order to vote which plaintiff has not paid and therefore plaintiff was unable to register to vote in the 1960 and 1962 general elections and will be unable to vote in future general elections in the State of Mississippi.

(2) Plaintiff Clarence A. Robinson is and was in 1960 and 1962 in all respects eligible to vote in the State of Mississippi except that it requires plaintiff to pass a constitutional interpretation test in order to vote which plaintiff was unable to pass and it requires the payment of a poll tax in order

to vote which plaintiff has not paid and therefore plaintiff was unable to register to vote in the 1960 and 1962 general elections and will be unable to vote in future general elections in the State of Mississippi.

(3) Plaintiff William McGee is and was in 1960 and 1962 in all respects eligible to vote in the State of Mississippi except that it requires plaintiff to pass a constitutional interpretation test in order to vote which plaintiff was unable to pass and it requires the payment of a poll tax in order to vote which plaintiff has not paid and therefore plaintiff was unable to register to vote in the 1960 and 1962 general elections and will be unable to vote in future general elections in the State of Mississippi.

(4) Plaintiff Milton H. Hancock is and was in 1960 and 1962 in all respects eligible to vote in the State of Mississippi except that it requires plaintiff to pass a constitutional interpretation test in order to vote which plaintiff was unable to pass and it requires the payment of a poll tax in order to vote which plaintiff has not paid and therefore plaintiff was unable to register to vote in the 1960 and 1962 general elections and will be unable to vote in future general elections in the State of Mississippi.

(5) The purpose and effect of the constitutional interpretation test, which plaintiffs Laura McGee, Clarence A. Robinson, William McGee, and Milton H. Hancock did not pass is to deny and abridge the right to vote to Negro citizens on the basis of race. The test is administered, and was administered to plaintiffs Laura McGee, Clarence Robinson, William McGee, and Milton Hancock in a different manner to Negroes than to whites.

I. Plaintiff Carole L. Tureaud is a Negro citizen of the State of Louisiana and of the United States, over 21 years of age. She is in all respects eligible to vote in general elections in the State of Louisiana except that her right to vote has been denied and abridged by the requirement of the State of Louisiana that persons seeking to register to vote answer questions on a registration form without error of any kind, the purpose and effect of such requirement being to deny and abridge the right to vote to Negro citizens on the basis of race.

V

A. Defendant Luther Hodges is Secretary of Commerce of the United States and he is to be found in the District of Columbia. He is charged with duties under law to take a decennial census of population of the United States for the purpose of apportioning Representatives in Congress and to report the tabulation of population as required for the apportionment of Representatives to the President of the United States. The Secretary of Commerce has been delegated duties by the President of the United States to compute the number of Representatives in Congress to which each State is entitled. A statement showing the number of Representatives in Congress to which each State is entitled has been and will be prepared under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce and transmitted to the President of the United States.

B. Defendant Richard Scammon is Director of the Bureau of the Census and he is to be found in the District of Columbia. He has been delegated duties by the Secretary of Commerce to take a census of population in each State of the United States every 10 years as required for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress. The basic constitutional and statutory purpose of this census of population is to determine the number of Representatives in Congress to which each State is entitled.

C. Plaintiffs allege that defendant Director of the Bureau of the Census and his predecessors in office have been delegated duties by the Secretary of Commerce to prepare a statement showing the tabulation of population as required for apportionment of Representatives in Congress and the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled under an apportionment by the method known as the method of equal proportions. Plaintiffs allege that the Director of the Bureau of the Census prepares such a statement and transmits same to the President of the United States or to the Secretary of Commerce for transmission to the President of the United States. The only duty of the President of the United States with regard to this statement is to transmit it to the Congress. Upon receipt of this statement by Congress, the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled as reported therein becomes, pursuant to 2 U.S.C., section 2a, the apportionment of Representatives in Congress.

VI

Plaintiff Lampkin on February 28, 1963, wrote to defendant Hodges complaining of the failure of the Department of Commerce to take any action to carry out section 2 of the 14th amendment and the laws of the United States in the face of widespread denial of the right to vote in many Southern States. Plaintiff Lampkin pointed out that the Department of Commerce has not taken any action through the Census Bureau to obtain such information as to disfranchisement as would be necessary to enforce the law in this regard and requested that defendant Hodges advise her whether there is any present intention to take the necessary steps to enforce these provisions.

VII

In reply, plaintiff received a letter dated March 8, 1963, from defendant Scammon which stated:

"This is in reply to your letter of February 28 to Secretary Hodges concerning article 14, section 2 of our Constitution.

"Even though the Constitution provides for certain functions and activities, this does not necessarily insure their being carried out unless Congress gives specific legislative authority. Even then, unless necessary funds are appropriated by Congress for the specific activity, there is no way any Government agency may proceed to carry out the necessary job. As you no doubt know, the funds appropriated to Government agencies are available only to carry out the projects specifically described in the appropriation request.

"I appreciate your interest, and will inform you if there are any proposals concerning article 14, section 2."

VIII

A. The Bureau of the Census last attempted to comply with the requirements of section 2 of the 14th amendment in the census of 1870. Defendants have not taken and do not intend to take any steps to have census enumerators or others at the next decennial census compile figures as to denial and abridgment of the right to vote and defendants have not taken and do not intend to take such steps as may be necessary to prepare and transmit a statement showing the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled on the basis of said figures as required by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

B. It is readily possible for the defendants by means of the census to make inquiries to provide a count of persons who (1) did or did not register at the preceding elections; (2) did or did not vote at the preceding elections; and (3) did not register or vote respectively at preceding elections for specified reasons, including denial and abridgement of the right to vote by the States. Plaintiffs allege on information and belief that modern statistical knowledge and techniques possessed by defendants are adequate to secure the information required with a high degree of reliability and accuracy. Specific questions to be asked and procedures to be employed would not be more complicated than those employed in many inquiries now being conducted by the Bureau of the Census. The results of such inquries would be as reliable, accurate, and valid as data the Bureau of the Census and the United States now employ and rely upon for many purposes required by law and for other reasons of public importance. In order to insure a high degree of accuracy and reliability, specific questions and procedures to be employed should be developed in accordance with prevailing census techniques (for example, on the basis of pretest operations and sample survey checks for accuracy) well in advance of the actual census period.

IX

A. Defendants have a duty under 2 U.S.C., section 2a; 13 U.S.C., sections 4, 5, 11, 21, 141 and other provisions of law to prepare, compile, and compute a tabulation of population as required for the apportionment of Representatives and to prepare, compile, and compute a statement showing the number of Representatives in Congress to which each State is entitled and to transmit said statement to the President of the United States for the purpose of transmittal to Congress. In so doing, defendants are required by section 2 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment and the due process clause of the 5th amendment to the Constitution of the United States and 2 U.S.C., section 6, to take all necessary and proper steps at the next decennial census to compile figures as to denial and abridgement of the right to vote and to prepare, compile, compute, and transmit a statement of the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled based upon denial and abridgment of the right to vote as required by section 2 of the 14th amendment.

B. To the extent, if any, that 2 U.S.C., section 2a; 13 U.S.C., sections 4, 5, 11, 21, 141, and other provisions of law directing defendants to prepare, compile, compute, and transmit a tabulation of population and a statement of the apportionment of Representatives in Congress fail to require defendants to comply with section 2 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and 2 U.S.C., section 6 and the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment and the due process clause of the 5th amendment to this extent said provisions of law directing defendants to prepare, compile, compute, and transmit the apportionment of Representatives in Congress are unconstitutional, null, and void in violation of the Constitution of the United States.

X

A. Defendants have taken no action, and do not intend to take any action, to prepare, compile, compute, and transmit the apportionment of Representatives in Congress consistent with section 2 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, 2 U.S.C., section 6, the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment and the due process clause of the 5th amendment.

B. There is overwhelming evidence that denial and abridgement of the right to vote by certain of the States exists to an extent that constitutionally requires loss of Representatives in Congress by those States and a gain of Representatives by other states which do not deny and abridge the right to vote. For example:

(1) Requirements that a poll tax be paid in order to register to vote in Federal and State elections in the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia, deny and abridge the right to vote of white and nonwhite persons to such an extent as should result in the loss of Representatives in Congress by these States and proportionate gain by others.

(2) In 1960 in the State of Louisiana approximately 465,556 nonwhites over 21 years of age (69.1 percent of the total), in contrast to approximately 396,108 whites over 21 years of age (27 percent of the total) were not registered to vote. A substantial number of persons not registered to vote in Louisiana were disfranchised by the requirement that they pass a constitutional interpretation test and literacy test to register. Moreover, a substantial number of persons have been disfranchised by arbitrary and discriminatory practices which disfranchise nonwhites. The great difference between the percentage of eligible registered nonwhites and whites compels the conclusion that the requirements for registration are administered with the purpose and effect of disfranchising large numbers of nonwhites.

(3) The U.S. Civil Rights Commission and the Department of Justice have in their custody data which establish conclusively that in every southern State with educational or other requirements for voting numerous white persons vote regardless of their ability to meet these requirements whereas numerous nonwhites are consistently denied and abridged the right to vote by these educational and other requirements.

(4) According to the 1959 report of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission there were 158 counties with a majority Negro population located in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. Fifty-one of these counties have 3 percent or less Negro registration. Forty-one others have less than 10 percent Negro registration. Only 11 had more than 30 percent Negro registration, and the remainder had between 10 and 30 percent Negro registration.

C. Plaintiffs allege that on the basis of statistics, reports and information as to disfranchisement in the hands of defendants and other officers or agents of the United States, as well as reported opinions of U.S. courts, defendants know or should know it is likely and probable that the State of Pennsylvania where Plaintiff Lampkin resides; the State of Massachusetts where Plaintiffs Nathaniel Denman and Lucille Denman reside; the State of Missouri where Plaintiffs Allison, Allen, Ross, Boon, Kennedy and Evans reside; the State of Illinois where Plaintiffs Rosenfield and Daniel reside; the State of Ohio where Plaintiffs Berry and Lucas reside; and the State of California where Plaintiffs Atkinson and Garrott reside, would receive at least one additional Representative in Congress each, and that various other States including the State of Virginia where Plaintiffs Lundy, Harris, Mason, Banks and Gillus reside; the State of Mississippi where Plaintiffs Laura McGee, Robinson, William McGee and Hancock reside; and the State of Louisiana where Plaintiff Tureaud resides, would lose at least one Representative in Congress on the basis of an apportionment which reduces the number of Representatives apportioned to States in accordance with section 2 of the 14th amendment of the Constitution of the United States and 2 United States Code, section 6.

XI

A. The failure of defendants to prepare, compile, compute, and transmit an apportionment which takes into account denial and abridgement of the right to vote violates the rights of plaintiffs in that:

(1) Plaintiffs Lundy, Harris, Mason, Banks and Gillus, citizens of the State of Virginia; Plaintiffs Laura McGee, Robinson, William McGee and Hancock, citizens of the State of Mississippi; and Plaintiff Tureaud, citizen of the State of Louisiana, have the right to receive the protection of the reduction imposed by section 2 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States and 2 United States Code, section 6, in order to redress and deter denial and abridgment of their right to vote for reasons other than those specified in the amendment;

(2) Plaintiff Lampkin, citizen of the State of Pennsylvania; plaintiffs Nathaniel Denman and Lucille Denman, citizens of the State of Massachusetts; plaintiffs Allison, Allen, Ross, Boon, Kennedy and Evans, citizens of the State of Missouri; plaintiffs Rosenfield and Daniel, citizens of the State of Illinois; plaintiffs Lucas and Berry, citizens of the State of Ohio; and plaintiffs Atkinson and Garrott, citizens of the State of California, have the right secured by section 2 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment and the due process clause of the 5th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and 2 U.S.C. 6, not to have the value of their votes debased and diluted and to have their votes be of approximately equal value as those of voters in States denying and abridging the right to vote and are entitled to invoke the prescribed reduction of section 2 of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution to protect this right.

XII

Plaintiffs are now suffering and will continue to suffer irreparable injury by the maintenance of defendants' policy, practice, and usage as set forth herein, including denial, abridgement, dilution, and debasement of the right to vote. They have no plain, adequate, or complete remedy at law to redress these wrongs and this suit for a declaratory judgment is their only means of securing adequate relief. The pursuit of any other remedy would be futile, inconvenient, and would not offer them substantial relief.

Wherefore, plaintiffs pray this court issue an order declaring that section 2 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, 2 U.S.C., section 2a; 2 U.S.C., section 6, the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment and the due process clause of the 5th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and 13 U.S.C., sections 4, 5, 11, 21, 141, require defendants Director of the Bureau of the Census and Secretary of Commerce to: (1) take all necessary and proper steps to prepare to compile figures as to the denial and abridgment of the right to vote at the next decennial census; (2) prepare, compile, compute, and transmit an apportionment based on said figures in accordance with section 2 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States and 2 U.S.C., section 6. Should the court determine that 2 U.S.C., section 2a, and 13 U.S.C., sections 4, 5, 11, 21, 141, or any other provisions of law provide for the preparation, compilation, computation, and transmittal of an apportionment in any other manner, plaintiffs pray said provisions be declared unconstitutional, null, and void as in violation of the Constitution of the United States to the extent they direct defendants to prepare, compile, compute, and transmit a tabulation of population for the purposes of apportionment of Representatives in Congress and a statement of the number of Representatives in Congress to which each State is entitled without requiring defendants to comply with the provisions of section 2 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States and 2 U.S.C., section 6.

WILLIAM B. BRYANT,
JACK GREENBERG,
CONSTANCE BAKER MOTLEY,
JAMES M. NABRIT III,
MICHAEL MELTSNER,
Attorneys for Plaintiffs.

JAPAN SHOWS THE WAY TOWARD IMPROVEMENT OF RAILROAD SERVICE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, an article in the Washington Post of Sunday, May 26, by Mr. Bernard Krisher graphically describes construction of the new high-speed railroad between Tokyo and Osaka in Japan.

I believe that this railroad, which Japanese National Railways has scheduled for operation next year, offers a most stimulating example to us as we seek to solve our own complex transportation problems, specifically in the great, urbanized megalopolitan corridor extending between Boston and Washington. In my joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 18—of January 17, 1963, I referred to the Japanese line as a practical demonstration of the kind of imaginative thinking we ourselves need. If we are to realize our potentials for economic growth and a dynamic concept of intercommunication, I believe that rapid intercity passenger rail transport is essential.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD. It is especially timely in view of the fact that the Commerce Department has just begun a detailed study of transportation requirements for the Northeast region of our country.

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

SPEED OF 123 MILES PER HOUR ON DREAM RAILROAD

(By Bernard Krisher)

TOKYO.—While almost everywhere else in the world railroads are taking a back seat to travel by car or plane, the story is just the opposite in Japan.

One of the most exciting things happening here is the construction of the "dream railroad" linking Tokyo and Osaka over a span of 320 miles.

When the new Tokaido line begins operations late next year—just before the Olympics—it will run 80 of the fastest passenger trains every day, at speeds reaching 123 miles an hour, over the longest stretch of rail without a single crossing. The running time between Japan's two largest cities will be cut from 6½ to 3 hours. This is the same time it now takes to travel by commercial airliner, including the time to and from the airports.

As construction continues full speed along Japan's most heavily populated and industrialized area, history is also being made along a 23-mile stretch of rail at Odawara, 25 miles south of Tokyo, where a shiny ivory and blue prototype of the "Dream Express" goes through tests for speed, air pressure, seat comfort and safety.

Earlier this year a speed record of 158.72 miles per hour was attained, although trains won't exceed 123 miles per hour when operations begin.

Construction of the new line, whose route runs parallel to the old Tokaido line, was necessary because the present load has reached the saturation point. The area served on this route encompasses not only Japan's three largest cities, Tokyo, Osaka, and Nagoya with respective populations of 8.6, 3.1 and 1.7 million residents, but also comprises 40 percent of the nation's population, 70 percent of its industrial output and about 60 percent of the national income.

Furthermore, the area's rate of annual increase continues to outpace the national average. The route carries 25 percent of the Japan National Railway's freight and passenger traffic, yet accounts for only 3 percent of its total operating mileage.

The present line, which boasts every modern improvement, has, however, no more capacity for growth. Trains are so crowded

that reserved seats on expresses are invariably sold out the day tickets are placed on sale, 2 weeks ahead. The long lines which form at dawn in front of Tokyo station ticket windows—hours before they open—are reminiscent of opening day at the Met. As many as 260 trains per day, both ways, ranging from superexpress passenger trains to local freight trains are now running on the same tracks.

Despite the urgent necessity for improvement, getting the project started was not easy. Aside from bureaucratic inertia, the greatest physical problem was completion of the new Tanna tunnel—Japan's third longest—begun August 6, 1959. Previous construction of the tunnel on the old line had taken 16 years and completion of the new line depended on how rapidly this tunnel could be built.

When it was finished in only 3 years, utilizing the most advanced engineering techniques, completion of the new line was assured by 1964, a deadline which the JNR could safely aim for by using the Olympics as a magic weapon.

The moving spirit behind construction of the line has been the JNR's 79-year-old recently retired president, Shinji Sogo. The presidency of the JNR has never been an easy one: one president died mysteriously during a labor dispute. Two other presidents, including Sogo's son-in-law, were forced to resign following train disasters.

Sogo, determined to let nothing stand in the way of completion of the new line, found everyone he spoke to in favor of the project, but very pessimistic about the possibility of realization.

"I visited all the cabinet ministers personally," he recalled, "and I also went to see the important members of the (ruling government) Liberal-Democratic Party. I told them of the importance of the railway for the nation. I said it is like an artery for the human body—and this human body is Japan. We cannot grow economically once we have saturated the power of the old line."

One by one, Japan's influential politicians backed Sogo and on April 13, 1959, the transportation minister formally approved construction plans. Things moved fairly rapidly after that. A week later, groundbreaking ceremonies were held at the new Tanna tunnel site and in August construction was begun. In November, 10 intermediate stations were decided on. In January 1960, location of the terminals at Tokyo and Osaka were officially decided and in May 1961, the JNR signed an agreement with the World Bank for an $80 million loan to aid its investment which is expected to top $800 million, including interest.

In August the major items for the construction standards were agreed on. It was decided to utilize standard gage rails, rather than the narrower gage now used in Japan. Two months later routing of the line was decided and last June the test runs on the model section were begun.

Sogo was able to stand up against most political pressures that the line bypass or go through certain favored areas. The only unreasonable concession forced on Sogo was to situate 1 of the 10 express stops at Hajima, only 11 minutes away from the Nagoya station. Hajima, which is near the hometown of Bamboku Ohno, vice president of the Liberal-Democratic Party, has a population of only 41,438 residents.

Acquiring the 105,000 acres necessary for construction of the new Tokaido line was no easy task. While most Japanese wanted their country to build the world's most modern railroad, they preferred that its tracks not go through their property. Many lived on land owned by their families for centuries.

Cemeteries had to be transferred and near the large cities, temples, homes, office buildings, and shops had to be torn down to make way for the new tracks.

Because of the high speed of the trains, rail curvature has been kept to a minimum. The new route is thus about 30 miles shorter than the old one. But it still follows Japan's winding coast. A straight-line route would have required tunneling under Mount Fuji.

According to present plans, the line—which will boost capacity threefold—will be completed by next April and will go into operation in September, following 4 months of tests. Once the new line is in operation, the current Tokaido line will be utilized for short-haul, city-to-city passenger traffic and the bulk of freight traffic.

Because of the speed of the new line, it expects no competition from airlines, but once the new superhighway linking Tokyo and Osaka is completed, possibly by 1965, some traffic will be diverted to the road.

To avoid human error, the trains will be controlled by ATC (automatic train control device) whereby the speed and slowdowns will be automatically regulated through signals sent through the tracks. JNR technicians say the trains could theoretically operate without engineers and may do so someday, but for the time being engineers will stay aboard the bullet-shaped locomotives of the "Dream Express."

TROUBLE IN THE SHOEMAKING AND FISHERIES INDUSTRIES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in view of the serious difficulties confronting our shoemaking and fisheries industries throughout New England, I request permission to insert into the RECORD a most thoughtful and cogent article, written by Mr. Donald R. Larrabee and recently published by the Pawtucket Times, of Rhode Island.

Both industries not only have been traditional bulwarks of New England productivity, but also have important bearing on our national economy. Both are facing financial crisis: The shoe industry because of foreign imports which have increased a full 600 percent since 1955; the fishing industry because of an antiquated fleet which can best be rejuvenated through Federal assistance and thus regain the preeminent position it historically enjoyed.

While I support the general principles just established by our negotiators with the European Economic Community as a means of bolstering free-world cooperation and trade, I note that when "significant disparities" would greatly favor one nation over another, special action should be considered justifiable.

Mr. President, I heartily recommend this article to the attention of us all and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TWO OLD NEW ENGLAND INDUSTRIES, SHOES AND FISHING, ARE IN TROUBLE

(By Donald R. Larrabee)

WASHINGTON.—Spokesmen for two of New England's old-line industries have left their calling cards with Congress during the past few days. Shoes and fisheries are still in serious trouble.

Foreign competition, both from imports and State-subsidized operations, continues to cloud their economic future and to threaten the jobs of thousands of skilled workers.

While both industries can cite ample statistics to show the heavy increase in imports from low-wage countries and both want the Federal Government to help out, there's a striking contrast in the relief measures being urged upon Congress.

Shoemen are asking for—and relying upon—the traditional approach of quota restrictions on foreign footwear. The fishing industry, having despaired of ever getting effective curbs on foreign fish, has decided it can overcome the competitive disadvantage if Uncle Sam will go more than half way in financing a modern, up-to-date fishing fleet. Bigger and broader subsidies for construction of fishing vessels would revitalize the industry, Congress was told last week.

Both industries are important to the U.S. economy. The shoe industry's problems affect some 260 congressional districts in 38 States. And closely tied to the fate of the domestic fishing industry on both coasts is the Nation's private shipbuilding business, which has not exactly flourished in recent years.

The shoemen are not asking for legislation. They have observed the Kennedy administration's frontal attack on cotton textile imports and can't see any good reason why an international "voluntary" agreement should not be negotiated to control shipments of foreign shoes to this country, both by category of footwear and by country. Such a plan now is in effect for cotton textiles after White House intervention.

Shoe imports last year were 600 percent above the 1955 figure—an increase from 8 million pairs 7 years ago to more than 55 million pairs. At the present rate, the industry expects imports of 125 million pairs in 2 years. Exports have been dropping steadily. The prediction that alarms New England lawmakers most is that, unless the present import trend is reversed, some 47,000 job opportunities in the shoe industry may be lost by 1965.

While the shoe industry is preparing its injury case for the Tariff Commission, the fishing industry no longer talks of tariff barriers against foreign products. If the American fleet can be so strengthened and rebuilt, the industry seems to feel it can become a vigorous competitor and regain its former preeminence among fish-producing nations of the world.

The Senate, at least, seems likely to pass an administration-backed plan under which the industry could obtain Government subsidies covering up to 55 percent of the construction costs of new vessels. This would pretty well make up for the cost advantage available in foreign yards, where large steel vessels can be built for about 50 percent less than in U.S. shipyards.

An old U.S. law requires that domestic fishing vessel owners must have their ships built in the United States if they are to make direct landings of their catch at American ports. The statute was first enacted as a protection to domestic shipyards and there is no serious intention of repealing it.

But it is unquestioned that this added cost of buying fishing vessels in domestic yards has discouraged the industry from a badly needed modernization program and, it is argued, since Government imposes the restriction, it should make up the difference. Foreign nations have been subsidizing their fishing fleets for years.

Interior Department officials put most of the blame for America's slippage as a fish-producing nation on the fact that obsolete vessels are still trying to compete with new, large, and highly efficient ships from Russia, Japan, Canada, and many European nations. They have cited evidence that the limited subsidy program now in effect has stimulated activity in two Maine shipyards which had not built a fishing vessel in 15 years.

Thus, with the prospect of more vessels being produced under the proposed subsidy incentive, Government officials look forward

hopefully to a spirited revival of activity in small private shipyards and the preservation of shipbuilding skills that may be sorely needed someday in a national emergency.

GOALS OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY—DEPARTMENT OF STATE BOOK ENTITLED "DEPARTMENT OF STATE—A REPORT TO THE CITIZEN"

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I would like to call our attention briefly to a book just published by the Department of State entitled "Department of State—A Report to the Citizen."

To me it affirms eloquently the goals of our foreign policy: security through strength; progress through partnership; enlightened aid to the less developed areas of the world; the furthering of international cooperation for a worldwide community based on law; and the attainment of a lasting peace through tireless efforts and perseverance.

The book has been beautifully edited and put together and to my mind is cheap at the Government Printing Office's price of $1.50. It graphically describes our achievements as we work toward these goals. Moreover, I consider it a highly valuable educational document, portraying the Department's operational procedures in each of its complex and varied, yet interrelated fields; and it reveals the Department's innovations in preparing both for routine activity and potential crisis.

As a former Foreign Service officer, I concur with these comments of Mr. Joseph McCaffrey, over station WMAL–TV, on May 19, 1963; and I particularly endorse the viewpoint that this book deserves wide circulation through our schools and libraries.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. McCaffrey's remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

COMMENTARY BY JOSEPH MCCAFFREY ON WMAL–TV EVENING NEWS PROGRAM, MAY 15, 1963

I want to talk about a book tonight. A book I think everyone should read. It isn't, unfortunately, on the bestseller list. It is a Government document.

This is it. "Department of State" subtitled "A Report to the Citizens." This is an explanation of what the State Department is, who makes up the Department, how the Department operates.

The State Department is, perhaps, the most abused of all the executive departments. When anything happens in the world which isn't to the advantage of the United States, the State Department gets the blame.

As if wiping out the Department and starting all over again would also wipe out the major international problems confronting us in this atomic age.

The fact is that the State Department and its vital role in the compact world of today are not generally understood by the American people. This book contributes to a better understanding.

But as matters now stand, few people will ever see this book—10,000 have been printed by the Government Printing Office to sell at $1.50 each.

What is really needed is for groups interested in international affairs or American government to get together and buy copies of this report to the citizen for junior high school and high school libraries in their communities.

This book deserves a wide circulation. Wider, I am sure than it would normally get, unless, as I mentioned, organizations take it upon themselves to help distribute this book to schools and classrooms.

PUBLIC DEBT CEILING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6009) to provide, for the periods ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the bill would raise the national debt limit to $309 billion. The Secretary of the Treasury made his case. It appears in the hearings. He pointed out to the committee that in order to manage our public debt in an orderly way and in an economical fashion the national debt limit would have to go up to $309 billion.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] offered an amendment in the committee to extend the debt limit to the end of the fiscal year 1964. The amount would be the same.

I wish to be forthright with the Senate and make clear that although the bill which was passed by the House provided for a mere temporary extension to the end of August, no one is under the impression—and certainly the junior Senator from Louisiana is not; nor does he believe the majority of the Democrats are under the impression—that we can stay within the proposed $309 billion debt limit after August. The predictions are that during the last 3 months of the year, the revenue of the Government will be substantially less than it is during other months. The expenditures would remain constant, with the result that it would be necessary to ask for a further increase in the debt limit next August. I should not desire to give anyone the impression that it would be otherwise.

It did seem to the Senator from Louisiana that, in proposing a debt limit of $309 billion to be continued until the end of the fiscal year, the Senator from Delaware was proposing to the committee that the Secretary of the Treasury be given a little more latitude and a little more leeway than he would have otherwise. However, as a practical matter, it appears in many respects to make no real difference in view of the fact that, based upon the appropriations which the Senate has already made, the rate of expenditures of the Government, and the projected income of the Government, it will be necessary to raise the figure above $309 billion later this year. How much we shall have to raise it, no one can accurately say at the present moment. As Senators well know, the President is requesting a tax reduction bill, which would increase the deficit in the next fiscal year 1964. The junior Senator from Louisiana has not yet decided how he will vote on that bill. He would like to see what the bill looks like if and when the bill comes from the House. That is one thing that will have to be taken into consideration when we say what our debt limit should be during the next fiscal year.

So in many respects it seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that, while the amendment was meritorious, it was a distinction without a real difference. If the amendment were accepted, the bill would go back to the House. I am informed by various Members of the House that they are having difficulty at this time obtaining a quorum in the House, because a number of Members of Congress have either returned home or are not available in Washington to provide a quorum. A single Member could object to granting a rule or agreeing to the Senate amendment. The whole issue might have to go over to Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday of next week, when a rule could be granted and a vote taken, in the event there were difficulty in developing a quorum to vote in the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is the Senator from Louisiana speaking for or against the committee amendment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am beginning to explain why I propose to vote against the committee amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator will yield further, I hope he will get around to that subject because he supported the amendment in the committee and thought it made a great deal of sense. He was very enthusiastic for it. He is in charge of the bill, which was reported from our committee by a vote of 11 to 2. He was one of its most enthusiastic supporters. I should be interested to hear what happened in the meantime to change his mind.

I should like to ask the following question: As the bill came over from the House the debt limit established would expire on August 31, at which time the debt would return to $285 billion. Does the Senator from Louisiana tell the Senate now that we do not need the extension beyond August 31, or does he think, as he did last Thursday, that we will need at least the $309 billion and that it would make better sense to leave the bill as the committee reported it?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I find no fault with the Senator over the amendment. This Senator was of the impression that the distinguished ranking Republican member of the committee was trying to help the Secretary of the Treasury to meet his problems. I do not quarrel with the Senator's good intentions. What I say is that, having the same purpose—wanting to help the Secretary of the Treasury to manage the public debt in an efficient manner and in a manner which he believes would be appropriate—under the circumstances, the junior Senator from Louisiana voted for the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

What will happen if the bill goes back to the House? I know the Senator has certain commitments from some of the

House leadership, particularly on the Republican side of the aisle.

If the bill is sent back to the House, and if a single Member of the House objects to the procedure of raising the debt limit, that Member can object to a unanimous-consent request, and then the whole question will have to go to the Rules Committee. Then a rule will have to be provided. Again, a single Member of Congress could insist upon a quorum. There might be great difficulty in obtaining a quorum.

In view of the fact that it will be necessary to ask for a further increase in the debt limit in August, anyway, we might as well provide this increase and settle it, even though in many respects the Senator's amendment would help the situation more than the bill which came to us from the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCARTHY in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not understand why there would not be a quorum in the House. After all, the House is in session as is the Senate. Members of the House are supposed to be present and I venture to say there is a quorum present in the House.

I do not think we should fail to amend any bill in the Senate merely because the House might not approve, nor do I think we should start taking orders from the White House.

The Senate Committee on Finance, in its consideration of the bill, adopted this amendment. The amendment was offered in good faith. I think it is wrong to put the Secretary of the Treasury in a position in which he can sell the bonds and then on August 31 to force him to tell the country and the world that the debt limit is going back to $285 billion, which would mean that on September 1st we would be repudiating about $20 billion or $25 billion of the debt. That would be the height of fiscal irresponsibility. I do not think the Finance Committee, the Senate, or the Secretary of the Treasury should deal with the national debt on a 60-day installment plan.

The Secretary of the Treasury should have this authority for at least a year in advance. I feel that we should put more of the debt on a permanent basis, as discussed with the Senator from New Mexico, but that is beside the point. The very least we can do is to give the Secretary a margin with which to operate for a full 12-month period, so that he will know he can manage the debt.

The Senate will be tied up in August with many other things to consider, but under the suggestion of the Senator from Louisiana, at that time we would be operating under another unnecessary deadline. I hope the Senate will act with a greater degree of responsibility and retain the amendment. I venture to say that there is not a single Member of this body who would not say the debt limit will have to be extended beyond August 31 at least in the amount of $309 billion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I know the distinguished Senator from Delaware is not surprised that I take this position. I discussed it with the distinguished Senator earlier this morning. I told the Senator that I felt it might be necessary to oppose the committee amendment.

So far as the junior Senator from Louisiana is concerned, he is, in one respect, moving to reconsider his vote. As the Senator knows, under the Senate rules when any Senator wishes to move to reconsider, he must have voted with the majority. I voted for the Senator's amendment in the committee, and I am now seeking to have the Senate stay with the House language for the reason that although, in some respects, the Senator's amendment would improve the bill, it also would confront us with the possibility that this Nation would go $600 million over the national debt ceiling on Friday; and then the Secretary would be compelled to manage the national debt in ways the Senator from Delaware would not advocate, in ways which are not good debt management, in ways which would tend to cost the Government rather than to save the Government money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We should make this situation very clear. Perhaps the Senator thinks that we can stay within the $309 billion debt limit between now and January 1. I tell the Senator, however, that that will not happen. It will be necessary to ask for a further increase in the debt limit.

I voted to increase the debt limit several times under the administration of President Eisenhower. Though I hope it will not be true, I fear it will be necessary to vote to increase the debt limit more than one more time under President Kennedy. That is a fact of life. I am sorry it is that way.

As the Senator knows, our country is running a deficit this year. I am informed that even if there were a balanced budget, the revenues which are expected to come in during the last 3 months of the fiscal year would be less than required, and it would still be necessary to increase the debt limit.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to have the Senator understand my position. It is my best understanding that the Treasury will not be able to stay within the limit of $309 billion until January 1. It will be necessary to provide an increase, anyway, some time in August.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should like to reply to two parts of what the Senator from Louisiana has said.

First, the Senator said that the Secretary would be forced to go over the debt limit by $600 million if the Congress did not act by the end of this week. I disagree with that. The Secretary presented a chart before our committee which showed his projections. He said that he would like to borrow up to $305.6 billion on May 31. That would give him $6.2 billion cash on hand.

All the Secretary would have to do in order to stay within the debt limit, if we did not increase it, would be to use $600 million of his cash balance. Then we would not have to pay interest, and there would still be more than $5 billion in cash left.

Why does the Secretary need $6 billion or $7 billion to "play around with"? I like to have a large balance in my checking account, too, but it often becomes low; and when it does I have to cut down on what I buy.

There is nothing unusual in this instance. No doubt the Senator noticed the Secretary's report, wherein he states that on June 10, even if the debt limit is increased, the Secretary plans to reduce his cash balance down to $3.6 billion, and on the 11th it will be down to $3.4 billion. The Secretary himself confirms the view that he can operate with $3 to $4 billion balance. Why should we raise the debt limit to provide $6 to $6.5 billion cash balance this week?

I think it will be necessary to act before June 25. I agree with the Senator on that point. We agreed in the committee to hold hearings one morning and to report the bill the same day, and I agreed to have the bill considered any time the leadership wanted it considered. I am not trying to delay action. But we should not continuously operate under a "shotgun" approach. I should like to get away from a "shotgun" emergency next August.

Unless we approve this amendment we will face the same situation in August or a situation which is even worse. I repeat that the Secretary does not need to have this action today. If he had needed to have it today it would be evidence of irresponsibility on his part for not having come to the Congress earlier and asked for action. I am becoming tired and somewhat impatient with these continuous emergencies.

I talked with the Secretary and representatives of the Department a couple of months ago, and I told them, "Do not wait until the deadline and then give us 24 hours to act. Give us sufficient time to consider your request."

As to the question of whether the Secretary will need to have an increase beyond $309 billion later, I recognize the Senator's position in that regard. The Secretary himself said that he could not at this time intelligently tell our committee how much of an increase beyond $309 billion he would need until after he knew what Congress would do with respect to the tax bill and what it would do on the appropriations.

The Senator from Louisiana knows full well that the Congress—even the Finance Committee—will not know by August 31, what the Congress is going to do with respect to the tax bill. That is one reason why I say we should extend the $309 billion debt limit beyond that period. Let Congress first take action on the tax bill, so that we can find out what is needed. Then both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Congress would know what would be in the tax bill. We would know what had been

provided in the appropriation bills. We could then act more intelligently.

I still say that both the Senator from Louisiana and I were correct when we voted the amendment in the bill the other day. I am sorry the Senator has departed from his own sound position. I respect him nevertheless, and I shall listen with interest to his arguments, though I hope he will not be persuasive with the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I say to my good friend from Delaware that it may very well be that the Senator's amendment will prevail. If the amendment prevails, we will do the best we can with it.

I have voted both with and against the Senator at times. I believe the Senator from Delaware, as much as the Senator from Louisiana, has gone to conference and fought for amendments, whether we agreed or not, because that was the will of the Senate. I am perfectly willing to follow that course. His amendment has much to recommend it.

The Senator wants to give the Secretary a $309 billion debt ceiling, which is $24 billion above the so-called permanent debt ceiling. In my judgment, we are only kidding ourselves when we say that there is a permanent debt ceiling of $285 billion. It will be more than $309 billion.

Even if we accept the Senator's amendment and give the Secretary a $309 billion debt limit for several months longer, still we shall have to face the problem. It will be necessary to hear a request to raise the debt limit, even if the Congress does not pass a tax bill. In other words, we shall still be compelled to consider a raise of the debt limit again some time in August. At that time we shall come nearer to knowing how much the increase required will be.

The Nation has not been as prosperous as we hoped it would be; revenues have not been as large as we hoped they would be, and there has been more unemployment than we had planned—therefore there will be a deficit. Even if we do not have a deficit—because the expenditures are not as much for the last 3 months as for the rest of the year—we shall have to raise the limit some time before the end of the year.

I hope the Senator from Delaware, in offering this proposal of $309 billion, was not under the impression that we were going to be able to stay within that limit during the remainder of the year. I wish that were possible, but it is a forlorn hope. We are going to vote big appropriations for defense and space projects. We are going to vote big money for atomic energy. We are going to vote for foreign aid. I will vote against the aid bill, just as I have been voting against it, but I assume that bill will be passed as it has been passed before. When we vote for such appropriations, the bills will have to be paid.

While the Senator's amendment would, on the face of it, offer us hope that we would stay within the $309 billion limit, I do not think we could.

I do not say the amendment is bad. I voted for the amendment. It has merit. But whom do we think we are kidding? We cannot go back to a limitation of $285 billion at any time soon, and we will find it necessary to vote a further increase.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the point I am making in support of the amendment. Why stop at August 31 when everybody knows we cannot revert to the $285 billion ceiling. As to how much is going to be needed for the rest of the year we do not know. I am sure the Senator recognizes that the American taxpayers are disgusted with continually rising expenditures. By supporting this amendment we will have an opportunity to show whether we really believe in controlling expenditures. Personally I believe we can cut back some of the expenditures and thereby eliminate the necessity of further borrowings.

I agree with the Senator from Louisiana that if we give the administration all the money requested for spending and all the tax cuts it wants we shall have a bigger debt. We shall probably need a debt ceiling of $350 billion if we try to satisfy all their requests. But I hope Congress will have more sense than to comply with all the new requests coming to Congress from this administration. I do not think we can afford to continue spending money like a drunken sailor nor can we comply with all the requests from the White House.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that under present law the debt ceiling is $305 billion?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. At this moment.

Mr. SMATHERS. According to the tables presented to us by the Secretary of the Treasury, that debt ceiling will be punctured on May 29, when it will go up to $305.2 billion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. Thereafter, on the next day, will it not go up to $305.6 billion, and thereafter increasingly go up, though at some intervals down, but finally will reach $310 billion in August? If that is true, is it not a fact that if we do not raise the debt limit, and do it in time, the Secretary of the Treasury will not be able to invest some $2 billion in bond security, withholding tax, and other trust funds and thereby cost the Government money?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator refers to the old-age and survivors insurance fund, the social security fund, and certain other trust funds. That would be true. I am informed that, if we raise the debt limit at this time, it will provide for better debt management and tend to save the Government money by allowing certain transfers to be made into funds which count against the debt. If the Secretary buys bonds which pay the best interest rate to the old-age and survivors insurance fund, for example, those bonds count against the national debt, and he should buy such bonds, because they would yield better returns than would be the case if the Secretary had to buy securities which do not count against the debt.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may read what the Secretary of the Treasury said in answering a question by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and then ask the Senator for a comment? The Senator from Illinois asked:

> Assuming that finally the Congress took a figure, let us say $305 or $306 or $307 billion for a 1-year period and you found yourself in a squeeze. What would the Treasury do in order to keep itself going with that kind of a ceiling?

The Secretary gave a long answer. Finally he got down to a significant part of the answer and said:

> The Secretary of the Treasury is trustee of those trust funds. He is supposed to invest them, but is not told when. The Secretary of the Treasury is also charged, and I think it is his main duty under the Constitution, with preserving the fiscal integrity of the United States and there would then be a conflict between those two duties. It might be that we would not invest the trust funds for a period, until new money is coming in. The trust funds would then lose the interest on those moneys and that would hurt them actuarially. I think later on that would have to be fixed up by an appropriation—

I presume an appropriation by the Congress—

to replenish the trust funds.

> The second area is to do what has been done in the past, which is to delay the payments on bills, salaries, and anything else, grants to States, all the various expenditures.

So, as a practical matter, is it not true that the Secretary of the Treasury needs to have the debt ceiling raised before next Friday if he is to operate in an orderly fashion?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. The Senator from Louisiana is convinced of that. The Senator from Delaware has made the point that the Secretary of the Treasury could use his cash balances and draw them down. That is possible. It is conceivable. On the other hand that those balances, which, it has been indicated, in some cases would go as low as $3.6 billion at some times.

Mr. SMATHERS. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. SMATHERS. On that point, is it not a fact that the Senator from Louisiana questioned the Secretary when he was before the committee and the particular point which is now being suggested by the Senator from Delaware was then suggested, namely, that the cash balances be used, and that the Treasury draw in from banks all over the Nation the amount of cash which the Federal Government has on deposit in such banks? In reply, Secretary Dillon said this:

> The only answer is not to pay the bills, and that I cannot conceive of.
>
> That had to be done literally in 1957 when the debt limit was too low. They simply postponed the bills, and asked defense contractors to carry the bills for from 3 to 6 months. That was done. It was very difficult to owe a lot of people, and finally when the money was available, they were paid with interest. We didn't save any money on it.
>
> Senator LONG. Some time ago we pulled the strings so tight that Bob Anderson had

to call all his money into a single bank. He couldn't leave the money in the various banks, he had to call it all into a single bank and pay it from that one bank. I believe he also had to do various things that cost the Government money, did he not?

Secretary DILLON. Yes. He had to use a device which raises money for the Government outside the debt limits by putting out some Government agency obligations that are not counted as part of the debt.

And so forth. But is it not a fact that when that money was withdrawn from banks throughout the country, in some way it contributed to the recession of late 1957 and 1958, because money which would otherwise have been available for lending to business communities in those areas of the country was withdrawn from those banks?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As the Senator knows, the general Treasury procedure, when it collects money in taxes and other ways, is to leave the money in the banks where it is collected. If it were collected in Florida, the Treasury would leave it in Florida banks. Those banks would therefore have money available to lend in those areas.

It helps the economy there. When the Secretary of the Treasury has the string pulled so tight that he is practically cutting his own chest, the Secretary must pull all that money out of the various States, States like Florida—we in Louisiana have only about $44 million, whereas in some States like New York it amounts to $1 billion—and put it in a central bank so he can keep up with exactly how much he has left in the account from hour to hour.

The Senator from Delaware has made the point that the Secretary proposes to have a rather large cash balance on a particular day. I believe he mentioned $6 billion. The Government spends an average of $2 billion every 5 days. That is enough for only 15 days to work with, even if he has a larger figure. Even then we must assume that everything works the way it is planned it will work. As the Senator from Florida knows, some of these estimates are not borne out.

A contractor may finish a job ahead of time, and may want to be paid for it. He is entitled to be paid for it. Revenue expected to be realized from a particular source might not come in at precisely the time anticipated. Therefore, the Secretary of the Treasury needs a certain amount of flexibility.

I sometimes gain the impression that the distinguished chairman of the committee and some other members of the committee have the feeling that if we could keep the string tight enough, the Secretary of the Treasury would have to go to the Secretary of Defense and other Cabinet officers at a Cabinet meeting and tell them not to spend so much money, and in that way reduce their budget. However, that theory does not seem to work.

The Secretary of Defense may say, "I will save the country from communism, even if we cannot afford it. I want $50 billion."

A Senator may say, "He will need more than $50 billion. We should vote more than that, because we will need the B–70 bombers. We will give him more money."

The Secretary may say, "Even if you give me the extra money, I will not spend it."

The Senator may say, "We will appropriate it, and then find a way of making him spend it."

Congress has done that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. It is a trifle ridiculous, it seems to me, to be appropriating money and at the same time not giving the Secretary of the Treasury the opportunity to borrow the money which we are appropriating for defense and space programs and for other vital matters.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask Senators to permit me to yield to the Senator from Florida and to give me an opportunity to answer the question of the Senator from Florida. Then I will be happy to yield to other Senators.

I have had the feeling for some time that the proposal might work in the way that has been suggested. There are people who feel this way in good conscience, and I do not blame them for making the proposal. They feel that if we keep the debt ceiling tight enough, the Secretary of the Treasury will have to go to a Cabinet meeting, for example, and say to the other Cabinet officers that they should spend less money. I have had the idea that that might work. However, we never did make use of that plan, and we have never done that to the Secretary of the Treasury. I have concluded that we should give the Secretary of the Treasury enough elbow room so that he can manage the national debt in the best possible way.

Mr. President, we bring a man down from New Jersey, where he has probably made millions of dollars a year, and put him in a job that pays him $25,000 a year, which no doubt does not come anywhere near making it possible for him to meet his expenses. Then we proceed to appropriate $8 billion more than we receive in revenue, and say to him that he ought to find a way not to spend money for defense, space, and public works, old age assistance, and for everything else for which we have appropriated money.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator has mentioned the able chairman of the committee. I am sure the Senator agrees that our distinguished chairman has always been completely forthright and honest, and certainly consistent in that, while he has always voted against raising the debt ceiling, he has consistently voted against large appropriations which he felt would cause the debt ceiling to exceed the debt limit we have established.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance were in a position to insist that the Government be operated in the way that he would like to have it conducted, there would be a surplus every year until the year 2000, and at that time the national debt would have been paid. I fully understand that theory. The chairman has stood for that principle consistently throughout his life. Furthermore, he has voted against programs for which some of us have voted. I have voted for some when I thought they were good expenditures, and when I thought it was a good investment in America, and might help build up America and make us stronger and more prosperous. The chairman of our committee has always taken the attitude that in no year should we spend any more than we raise. I never heard him advocate anything else but that. I admire him for his consistency.

Mr. SMATHERS. If the Senator will yield for another question or two, I will desist, and let other Senators question him. As I understand, the position of the Senator from Louisiana is that he is making his motion because of the realization of a very practical situation which exists in the other body, in that the House is having difficulty getting a quorum in this season of the Memorial Day weekend. Therefore, if Congress does not act by Friday of this week, we are in trouble and, in fact, it will cost the Government of the United States a considerable amount of money, because the Secretary of the Treasury will not have the latitude he needs to invest the trust funds. Therefore, what the Senator from Louisiana is attempting to do in this practical situation is what amounts to an economy course of action, an attempt to save money, and at the same time give to the Treasury Department the elbow room that it needs to manage the public debt of the United States. Is that what the Senator is attempting to do?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct. The Secretary would be able to manage the national debt in the way he thinks he should manage it for the next 90 days. Either with the Williams amendment, which the committee adopted and for which I voted, or under the House bill, he would be able to take care of it for the next 90 days.

Neither one would provide the Government the requirements it needs through the first of next year. Therefore, we must later in the year vote to raise the debt limit to take care of the expenditures we have already voted. We must vote to raise the debt limit again no matter whether we take the Williams amendment or whether we take the House bill. When we are told that we will go beyond the debt limit on Friday, and in view of the fact that we might not be able to get a conference together and have the results of the conference agreed to in the two Houses between now and Friday, we ought to go ahead and pass the House bill, because it makes very little difference as far as the problem is concerned.

Mr. SMATHERS. But it would save money to the Treasury.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is what I want to bring out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

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

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I tried to restrain myself at the time the Senator from Delaware was questioning

the Senator from Louisiana. I trust the Senator from Delaware will restrain himself now, at least to a partial extent, with his great discipline, until I have finished asking a few more questions of the Senator from Louisiana. Then I will be glad to let the Senator from Delaware proceed.

I should like to come back to the question we were discussing. I note from page 49 of the hearings that the Senator from Nebraska asked the Secretary of the Treasury:

Senator CURTIS. If there is no reduction in taxes, we will have to go somewhere between $315 billion and $320 billion?

The Secretary said:

Secretary DILLON. Yes. You can easily figure that one or two different ways, and see why. This year we have a deficit—we have a deficit this year of $8 billion, roughly, take that as the figure. Last year we had a ceiling that was necessary to cover the difficult part of the year on the basis of a balanced budget, it came down later on, but the early part of the year, it was $308 billion. Obviously, this year, starting with the deficit of $8 billion, we need $8 billion more than $308 billion, and that is $316 billion. That is one way of finding an answer.

Another way is to take the figure we had, the highest debt we had during November, December, and March periods, when we were tight, and each case it was something just over $305 billion, or $305.5 billion, add the $8 billion to that and you get something about $313.5 billion and then add provision which we have to have and always have had for some flexibility, which has been some $3 billion, and again you get $316 billion or $316.5 billion. So that is why I say it is somewhere in that area.

It would depend somewhat on appropriations whether it might be slightly higher; but it would be under the $320 billion and over the $315 billion. So even if we adopted the amendment that was offered in the Committee on Finance by the able Senator from Delaware, which would raise the limit to $309 billion to June 30, 1964, it is very evident that we are to exceed that limit prior to that date. In fact, we will be getting in the neighborhood of $320 billion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As a practical matter, if we were to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Delaware and stay with it—and I voted for it in committee—we would probably be able to go for a little while beyond the August 31 date—perhaps 30 days, or 45 days—and still remain within the provisions of the Williams of Delaware amendment.

In that respect, the Senator from Delaware gives the Secretary of the Treasury a little better break than he would otherwise have; but the difficulty is that the debt limit would be broken through between now and the time we might agree to in the Williams amendment, unless we were careful. So we had better leave the Secretary of the Treasury in a position to manage the debt in a responsible fashion.

I think Senators on the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, believe the Secretary is doing the best he can. The bill was reported by the committee with one dissenting vote. If the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] had wanted to go all out and fight the bill, more Senators would have voted against the bill. I believe every member of the committee except the distinguished chairman voted to report the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Even with the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware, the bill would carry us into the next fiscal year, with a $309 billion ceiling. We would not revert to the permanent ceiling of $285 billion until July 1, 1965. In the light of what the Secretary of the Treasury said, Congress would have to reconsider the debt ceiling before it adjourned this year?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When I voted for the committee amendment—and incidentally, I oppose it only after explaining to the ranking Republican member that I felt it necessary to vote against it—the Senator from Delaware objected to the committee meeting; therefore, the committee could not meet while the Senate was in session. The Senator had that privilege; I do not question his right to object. But I met with other Democrats on the committee, including the distinguished chairman, and explained that while I thought I was helping the situation when I voted for the Williams amendment, it appeared that I might have hurt the situation by causing the Treasury to manage the debt in a way which the Secretary would not approve, as the result of a few days delay in passing the bill. I did not feel that we ought to go home for the Memorial Day weekend without having settled the question.

When the Secretary of the Treasury said he was breaking through the ceiling, I did not think we ought to make him do a number of things that he ought not to do, which would be poor business practice, in the hope that we might be able eventually to take care of the situation.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the able Senator from Louisiana. I believe he is taking a very sensible position in view of our understanding of the situation in the other body. I believe it would cost the Government money if we delayed action between now and 2 weeks from now. Despite all the arguments to the contrary, it would still cost the Treasury money. If Senators are interested in the economic and orderly operation of the Government, they will vote against the adoption of the committee amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I did not know when I voted for the Williams amendment that we would have to ask for another increase in the debt limit, even though we agreed to the Williams amendment. I had entertained some hope in committee that that would not be the case. I am firmly convinced, whether or not we pass a tax reduction bill, that we will be faced with the unpleasant necessity of the Government paying its bills, and confronted with the necessity of having to ask Congress to vote for a higher ceiling than $309 billion. That will be true even if the budget is balanced between now and the end of the year.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, first I thank the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Florida for at least approving my amendment in principle, even though they will not vote for it. Both of them have now said they believe it would be a more responsible position for the committee and the Senate to give the Secretary of the Treasury an increase in the debt limit of $309 billion for the full year, but.

As to the argument of the Senator from Florida that if we do not pass the bill by Saturday night the Treasury will lose money, I have heard that argument before, and I am not in the least concerned by it.

The Secretary of the Treasury has stated that the debt limit would be increased to $305.2 billion, which will be $200 million over the debt limit if the bill be passed today; and by Saturday the amount will be brought up to $600 million above the debt limit. But he has $6.2 billion in cash, and he certainly does not need that much. Why borrow this week when he does not need it?

The Senator from Florida argues that if the bill is not enacted by Saturday night it will cost the Treasury money. I believe that just the reverse is true. Why pay interest on $600 million this week when it is not necessary to do so? The Senator from Florida said that to cut the cash holdings of the Secretary of the Treasury below $6 billion would precipitate a depression by requiring the Secretary to call in money from all over the country. That statement cannot be supported by the Secretary's own statement.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a report from the Secretary of the Treasury showing the cash balances for the next 3 months.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Delaware not to insert that report on my time. I should be perfectly willing to have him insert it on his own time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Very well; I shall insert the report in the RECORD later.

According to this report of the Secretary the cash will drop on the 6th of June to $4 billion; on the 9th of June to $3.6 billion; and on the 11th of June to $3.4 billion, or $3 billion less than there would be in the Treasury Saturday night even if we do not pass the bill. Who is saying that a depression will be precipitated in the second week of June because of this decline? I think that is absolutely absurd. The Treasury will not need the money. There are few times when the Treasury has $6 billion in cash. It is not needed this week, and it will not be needed in the early part of June.

If the Secretary of the Treasury is as responsible as he should be he would have known 2 months ago that an increase would be necessary and would have asked for it then instead of waiting until today. I am tired of these requests for an increase immediately or that otherwise the Treasury will go broke.

We want the Secretary of the Treasury to have adequate room in which to maneuver. There is no reason why the bill would not be satisfactory if it were

passed as the committee reported it. The ranking minority member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, from Wisconsin, has said that he as one of the conferees will accept it. If the members of the administration's own party will not provide the means to finance our debt beyond August 31 let them accept the blame for such action and not place it on the Senate.

In my opinion it would be a highly irresponsible action on our part not to provide the Secretary with this authority provided under this amendment. I am sick and tired of hearing about these created emergencies. We have enough of them without manufacturing one ourselves.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Members of the Senator's party in the House of Representatives had their way, I do not believe they would have permitted any increase. I think only one Republican Member of the House voted to pass the increase in the debt limit, which we believe to be necessary.

As the Senator from Delaware knows, there is no real difference between the proposal he is supporting and the action taken by the House, so far as what would happen in the next few days is concerned.

The question is whether we should insist on an amendment which admittedly contains some merit, although it may mean that we will not be able to pass on legislation for some time to come. We should go ahead and pass the House bill, recognizing the small amount of difference.

I suppose I might have taken the attitude which the Senator from Delaware took on occasions when I was offering amendments on Eisenhower debt limit bills. I offered amendments to increase the old age welfare payments, and other amendments in which I had considerable interest. The distinguished chairman of the committee made the point that it was necessary to pass the debt limit bill promptly, and not wait for a week or a month. So I was arguing then in the same way as the Senator from Delaware is arguing now, that the matter was not urgent; that we ought to take time to consider the amendments and insist on the bills going back to conference. So I can understand how the Senator from Delaware feels about his amendment—and there is much to be said for his amendment.

I only say that I fear very much that we shall not have increased the debt limit before Congress goes home over the Memorial Day weekend, and thus the Secretary will be forced to manage the national debt in a way in which he does not wish to manage it and in a way which will cost the Federal Government money, rather than save it money.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But, Mr. President, in all good conscience let me point out how silly the Finance Committee would look, after having reported the bill to the Senate by a vote of 11 to 2, if it were now to accept such an amendment, when the only argument in favor of acceptance of the amendment is a thin assumption that the House conferees, members of the Ways and Means Committee, will not concur in the Senate amendment. How does the Senator from Louisiana know they will not? That is a sheer assumption.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I think they will eventually, but I do not think they will concur in it today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How can the Senator from Louisiana know, until the Senate conferees sit down with the House conferees?

Let us pass the bill in the form in which it came to us from the Finance Committee, and then let us have a conference this afternoon. When the conference report is prepared, we can concur in the conference report, and then can wind up this affair, and that will be the end of it.

But the Senator from Louisiana proceeds on the assumption that the House will not concur in the Senate amendment. I think the Senate amendment will result in a good bill, by providing for a $309 billion debt ceiling effective until January 30, 1964.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In my judgment, any Senator who votes for an amendment has a right thereafter to move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered, if he thinks he might have made a mistake by voting for the amendment, even though it might not have been a great mistake.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, that is true.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe I speak for eight Democratic members of the committee—a majority of the Democratic members—when I say that we are of the opinion that we would have done better if we had stayed with the language voted by the House. So far as I know, I do not speak for any of the Republican members of the committee; but we could not obtain consent to have a meeting of the committee held during the session of the Senate today, in order to find that out. The distinguished Senator from Delaware objected to the request to permit the committee to meet during the session of the Senate today. I did not make that request; but, as a courtesy, the majority leader requested permission for the Finance Committee to meet during the session of the Senate today, in case the committee wished to hold a meeting. But the Senator from Delaware objected. That was his privilege, and I do not quarrel with him for doing it.

However, I discussed this matter with the Senator, and I told him that I thought we should move to reject the committee amendment. I still think there is much merit in the amendment; and if the Senate tells me to do the best I can in the conference to have the amendment included in the conference report, I shall try to get the House conferees to accept it. But I do not think that would be the wisest course.

I do not think the Finance Committee made a foolish mistake. No one is perfect; but, on the whole the Finance Committee has as little politics in it and makes as few mistakes as any other Senate committee. I think the Finance Committee does a fine job, and I will defend its record against that of any other Senate committee or that of any House committee.

As a member of the committee who heard the testimony there and though we might be able to operate within the $309 billion limit, I now realize that that is a distinction without a difference, because I know we shall not be able to stay within the $309 billion limit until the first of the year; it will have to be raised again.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the junior Senator from Louisiana admits that the entire argument is based on the assumption that the House conferees will not accept the Senate's version of the bill. That is the whole burden of his argument.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It might be impossible to have a conference held before Monday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is also a sheer assumption.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But that situation could be brought about by only one Member of the House.

I know the Senator from Illinois often can predict with fairly good accuracy what the Republican leadership of the House will do, and those Members are honorable men who keep their word. But the leaders among that group cannot speak for all of the 100-odd Republican Members there; and I know they cannot speak for the Democratic Members. In fact, often the Democratic leaders there cannot speak for all the Democratic Members.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I realize that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am prepared to yield the floor, Mr. President; but I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Louisiana said I objected to the request that the Finance Committee be allowed to meet during the session of the Senate today. It should be pointed out that the reason I took that position was that this bill was already before the Senate, and presumably the members of the Finance Committee should have been on the floor to debate the bill. I did not see the wisdom of holding at that time a meeting of the Finance Committee, to reconsider a bill which had already been reported to the Senate by a vote of 11 to 2 just because the White House said so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, let me say that the one who objected was not the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]; it was the majority leader.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, let me say that this is a good bill, either with the Williams amendment or without it; and I believe we should pass the bill today, and should send it to the President, because I think this matter—and I know I differ with the Senator from Delaware when I say this—should be settled before the Members of Congress return to their homes over the

Memorial Day weekend. The Senator well knows that this entire matter was almost the subject of a complete Donnybrook in the House, and an effort was made to get Members to return from their homes to be present in the House to vote on this bill. In fact, I think one of them had to be brought back from Puerto Rico, and others had to return to Washington from various parts of the country, in order to participate in that vote. Even then, the bill was passed by a margin of only nine votes. So, inasmuch as the matter is highly controversial, there is no way by which we could be sure that no Member of the House would object to the request for unanimous consent. If objection were made, the Secretary of the Treasury would then be forced to manage in ways in which he would prefer not to engage.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. What will happen if the bill is not passed and is not signed into law by tomorrow night?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We are told that then we shall exceed the national debt limit by about $600 million. So, as a practical matter, the Secretary of the Treasury will then begin to draw on his reserves; and funds which should be invested in trust funds will not be invested in them; and the Secretary of the Treasury will have to find various other ways—perhaps by drawing money from the banks across the Nation into a central New York bank—to give him a little more certainty about how much of a cash balance will be on hand at any one time. He will have to take various steps of that sort. There are various ways by which the Secretary can proceed—if he finds that the debt ceiling is about to be exceeded—to manage, if he is forced to do so.

The amendment to which I refer would undertake to extend the $309 billion ceiling to the end of the next fiscal year. I voted for the amendment because at the time it seemed to be a good one. But now I am reliably informed—and I am firmly convinced of it—that we shall have to increase the debt limit again before the end of the year, because during the last 3 months the Government's income has been less than it is during the average month—with the result that the expenditures will greatly exceed the income, even if there were to be a balanced budget.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the committee amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to reply briefly to some of the arguments advanced by the Senator from Louisiana. First, I understand his position. I also appreciate the fact that he advised me before he started that he would oppose the amendment and that he was perfectly willing to settle the question in the Senate rather than to go back to the committee. I appreciate his cooperation.

The reason I offered the amendment is that I believe the bill without it is to some degree an act of irresponsibility on the part of the Congress. I am surprised that the Secretary of the Treasury would ever condone or approve extending for a mere 60-day period the debt ceiling whereby he could finance the cost of this Government. Under the bill as it came from the House the debt ceiling would drop from $309 to $285 billion on August 31.

The only way such a reduction could be accomplished would be to pay off in the next 60 or 90 days about $24 to $25 billion of our national debt. No one connected with our Government would say that such a reduction is possible. Therefore, we know we will have to extend the debt limit again in August. Why not extend it to $309 billion now through the full fiscal year and be done with it? Then if, as the Senator from Louisiana and others have pointed out, they want to raise the debt ceiling another $10 to $12 billion before we adjourn, we would at least know more about what we would need at that time than we would on August 31. Neither the tax bill nor the appropriation bills will not be acted upon by that date.

The Secretary of the Treasury said that he could not make an estimate as to what he would need until he found out how much the tax cut would be. Likewise, we will not know what the final action will be on the appropriation bills until later. It will take some time to determine the answers to these questions.

I hope we can provide a debt limit of $309 billion for the full year and that we can cut appropriations, or hold them down to the point where spending will not be increased next year. I should like to see the projected $8 or $10 billion tax cut, which the Secretary wants to finance on borrowed money, defeated.

If those things should occur we could live with a debt limit of $309 billion. The time has come to make the effort. The extra $10 or $12 billion that will be asked for some time later this year, in August or in September, is to finance the increase in the spending for the New Frontier—that is, the increased costs over and above the costs of last year—and to finance the tax cut. I think both of those proposals are unsound. It is unsound to increase spending when there is a deficit. It is unsound to talk about cutting taxes when there is a deficit. That is just so much political propaganda. I do not think anyone would really argue that it makes any sense to borrow money to finance a tax cut.

As to the argument which has been made that if we do not pass the bill tonight the Treasury will lose money, that is "poppycock." We have heard that argument time and time again. Under the existing law the debt ceiling will remain at $305 billion until June 25. Even if we do not act at all it will remain at $305 billion until June 25. On June 25 it will go to $300 billion, and on July 1 it will go to $285 billion.

I agree that we must act before June 25, but we do not have to act this week. The argument that if we do not act this week the Secretary of the Treasury will be $600 million over the ceiling is not correct.

The Secretary has indicated that he would like to increase the debt to $305.6 billion on May 31. That would give him $6.2 billion in cash on hand, and he does not need that much cash on hand. He operates well with less than that. I cite the fact that in the month of June, even assuming the bill is passed, he will be operating on less than $5 billion cash on hand more than half the time. Even by the Secretary's own computation, if the ceiling is $309 billion on the basis of the House bill provision, he will be down to $3.6 billion cash on hand on the 10th of June, and on the 11th of June he will have only $3.4 billion cash on hand. Why could he not operate for the remainder of this week with $5.5 billion cash on hand? That is $2 billion more than he plans to have on hand for the week of June 10.

To say that if we do not pass the bill he would have to borrow another $600 million this week and pay interest on it is silly. Why should he borrow $600 or $800 million when it is not needed?

The Senator from Louisiana had much to say about high interest charges. That would be paying unnecessary interest. The Secretary would have to pay 3 or 4 percent interest, and I see no reason for subsidizing the banking institutions to that extent. If the Secretary does not need the money he should not borrow it this week even if he had a $400 billion debt ceiling. Based on his own computation, he will not need it before June 8. I do agree that based on his computation he would be in a jam if we did not pass the bill by then.

I am not trying to delay the passage of the bill. I told the majority leader earlier that I thought hearings on the bill could be completed in 1 day. They were, and the bill was reported the same day by the committee. I suggested that the bill be considered by the Senate yesterday. I think it would have been wiser, but the bill was put over until today. I do not object to that procedure, but it was not my suggestion that consideration of the bill be postponed until today.

The bill could have been acted on earlier. I think the House would accept our committee suggestion. I think we should at least try.

An argument has been made that if we do not pass the bill today, the Secretary will use some money from trust funds. I wish to make it very clear that if the Secretary of the Treasury should ever dip into the money in the trust funds and start spending it by canceling the bonds and saying, "We will not count it as a part of the national debt," I shall ask for

his removal as Secretary of the Treasury; I do not care who holds the position at the time.

I have said much in the Senate about employers who have been withholding income taxes and social security taxes from the pay envelopes of their employees and withholding retirement payments from the pay envelopes of railroad employees and then not sending that money to the Treasury Department. I have said that no employer has a right to consider moneys which are thus withheld a part of his own funds, to spend them for a few days or weeks, and perhaps end up defaulting. I have said that that money belongs to the employees and should be treated as trust funds and sent to the Federal Treasury. The Secretary agreed with that. There are laws which make it a penalty if an employer confiscates the money which belongs to trust funds.

I am amazed to hear anyone suggest that the Secretary of the Treasury resort to the same practice. He is as responsible as any employer for turning that money over to the trust fund. The day that he starts robbing these trust funds and using the money for our regular expenditures I shall ask for his removal as Secretary of the Treasury. I do not care who he is or in what administration he serves. Those funds do not belong to the Government. He has no authority to spend them. Neither do we in the Congress have any authority to do so. We should put a stop to that thought right now.

The argument that the Department intends to use them but a few weeks and then repay with interest is the same old argument used by every embezzler that has ever been caught.

We should give the Secretary some leeway for managing the debt, and I am going to vote for the passage of the bill today; but I will not support him if I ever catch him tinkering with these trust funds. I hate to see the debt ceiling raised. I have supported reductions in appropriations, as have many other Senators. I shall be advocating sometime this afternoon a cut in the next appropriation bill, which the Senate will consider following this particular measure.

The way to hold down the debt ceiling is to hold down the appropriations. I agree with that approach. I only hope that Senators who agree will support that position with their votes. We cannot hold down the debt ceiling if we increase appropriations and then cut taxes.

But I say again that if the Congress in the months to come increases appropriations for all the departments and if the Congress approves the tax cut, we shall have no choice other than to give the Secretary of the Treasury at a later date an increase in the debt ceiling. Those who support increased expenditures and the cutting of taxes will have no choice other than to provide for the Secretary of the Treasury adequate authority whereby to finance the national debt.

I think there is no question that if the administration gets all the money for which it is asking in increased appropriations—by the way, the administration is asking for increased appropriations for every single department of Government, cutting nowhere—if the administration gets all the money that it wants to spend and still gets the tax cut, the Senator from Louisiana will be 100-percent correct when he predicts that the administration will be back to Congress for a $10 or $12 billion increase in the debt ceiling. It probably will not even stop there.

I have never seen an administration that can dream up so many ways to spend money.

If we should provide the administration will all that it indicates it would like to spend and a cut in taxes in addition, the deficit could well double the deficit that has been projected. It could be such as to require a $340 or $350 billion ceiling on the debt before many years.

I hope that a greater degree of responsibility will be shown so that all that money will not be appropriated. Still, that question will have to be considered in the months to come.

The Secretary of the Treasury told our committee that he could not intelligently state how much of a further increase he would need in the debt ceiling this year until he had the answers to these two questions. The first was, "What are you going to do with respect to taxes?" The second was, "What are you going to do with respect to appropriations?"

The answers to those questions will not be determined by the Congress by August. Therefore, why should we put ourselves in a position in August so that we will be again operating in a vacuum unless it be that the administration would find it preferable to conceal the facts from the American people. By putting it all in one package in August it will be necessary either to vote for a $320 billion ceiling or to go back to a ceiling of $285 billion.

Frankly, in my opinion that is what they want. They like emergencies because they think that then Congress will not take the time to examine their requests. Some day they are going to be fooled.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me say to my good friend that I do not believe he would say that this Senator is trying to conceal anything.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. I referred to the administration.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This Senator is not trying to conceal the fact that if Congress votes a tax cut there will be a big deficit. This Senator is not trying to conceal that from anybody; nor is this Senator trying to conceal the fact that, at the present rate of spending money which we have already appropriated, it will be necessary for the administration to ask the Congress to raise the debt ceiling above $309 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct if we spend the money.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We shall have to look at the appropriation bills and at the tax bill, to see what we should do with them, and to see how much it will be necessary to raise the debt limit. This Senator is not trying to conceal that fact. That is the one big thing the Senator from Louisiana has worried about for some time with regard to the tax bill. I had been against tax bills, on occasion, before they reached the Finance Committee. I found myself voting for tax bills after the Finance Committee got through considering them, especially if my amendments were adopted. Other Senators tend to feel likewise. But we will not know the answer to that question until later.

We ought to face the problem. I am ready to face it now. When we vote on the tax bill, if we vote for any major reduction in taxes, it is going to increase our deficit for a year or two, or perhaps more, by billions of dollars. I do not have to say that to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. When I said that somebody may be trying to confuse the people, I certainly did not mean the Senator from Louisiana, because I have not heard anybody make a clearer presentation than he has made.

The Senator from Louisiana has made it clear that if Congress is going to authorize increased expenditures, the debt ceiling will have to be raised whether taxes are cut or not. If taxes are also cut the debt ceiling will have to be increased even more. The Senator from Louisiana was very clear on that point. The administration, however, has not admitted this point.

I think we should let the American people know the facts. I think we can do it better by separating these two proposals. Let us raise the ceiling for next year to $309 billion—we know the debt will reach that point—and then wait until we get the appropriation bills, which may be by the end of September. I hope we will have them sooner, but again we may not. We will not know the full answer until action has been completed on the tax bill. The Secretary of the Treasury himself said he did not know how much of a further debt ceiling increase he is going to ask for until he knows the answers to those two questions: First, the appropriations; and, second, the tax cuts.

The basis for my offering the amendment is to protect our debt until June 30, 1964. But, whether it is August, September, or October when we act on the appropriations and the tax cuts the new debt ceiling change could then be offered to cover the increased expenditures and the deficits that will result from the tax cut.

If taxes are cut by $10 billion and spending is increased by $10 billion, there will be a request for a $20 billion increase in the debt ceiling by the Department. I do not think there is any foreseeable end to what can be asked unless Congress sometimes stops and says, "You have had enough." I think the time has come when we should say, "You have spent enough." We should start on this next appropriation bill later today.

What I would like to see is a debt limitation of $309 billion for the full year ending June 30, 1964. This Congress, by its votes on appropriation bills, such as the one the Senate will have before it this afternoon and in later days, could roll back appropriations to what they were last year, and by so doing tell the administration by our votes that we are not going to increase spending next year, and then reject the tax cut. If we did that I think we could come near living within $309 billion next year and there would be no need for a further increase. But it cannot be done if this proposal is not followed.

As evidence that the Secretary of the Treasury would not be embarrassed if the bill were not acted on today but that it could readily go over, even if it went over until next week. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the Treasury report of its debt and cash balances projected for the next 3 months.

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

Estimated cash balance and debt subject to limit day by day for period May 1–Aug. 31, 1963

[In billions of dollars]

Day	May 1963		June 1963		July 1963		August 1963	
	Cash balance (excluding gold)	Debt subject to limit	Cash balance (excluding gold)	Debt subject to limit	Cash balance (excluding gold)	Debt subject to limit	Cash balance (excluding gold)	Debt subject to limit
April 30	[1] $5.3	[1] $303.4						
1	[1] 5.9	[1] 303.4			$8.1	$305.3	$4.9	$306.4
2	[1] 6.6	[1] 303.5			7.8	305.3	5.0	306.4
3	[1] 7.1	[1] 303.4	$5.7	$305.6	7.5	305.3		
4			5.2	305.6	[2]	[2]		
5			4.8	305.6	7.0	305.2	5.0	306.4
6	[1] 6.7	[1] 303.4	4.3	305.6			4.5	306.3
7	[1] 6.2	[1] 303.4	4.0	305.6			4.2	306.3
8	[1] 6.2	[1] 303.4			6.3	305.2	4.2	306.3
9	[1] 6.4	[1] 303.5			5.8	305.2	4.2	306.3
10	[1] 6.4	[1] 303.5	3.6	305.6	5.5	305.2		
11			3.4	305.6	5.3	305.2		
12			4.5	306.8	5.2	305.2	4.2	306.3
13	[1] 6.5	[1] 303.5	4.5	306.8			4.2	306.3
14	[1] 6.6	[1] 303.4	4.6	306.8			4.5	306.3
15	[1] 5.8	[1] 303.0			5.4	305.7	4.7	306.8
16	[1] 6.2	[1] 303.1			5.2	305.5	5.1	306.8
17	[1] 6.7	[1] 303.1	4.7	306.8	5.1	305.4		
18			5.1	306.7	5.0	305.4		
19			5.8	306.3	6.7	307.2	5.3	306.8
20	[1] 7.1	[1] 303.1	6.9	305.7			5.7	306.8
21	7.4	303.1	8.0	305.4			6.0	306.8
22	7.5	303.0			6.5	307.2	6.2	306.7
23	7.5	304.0			6.2	307.2	6.3	306.7
24	7.4	304.0	7.7	304.3	6.0	307.3		
25			7.8	304.2	5.8	307.3		
26			8.1	304.1	5.7	307.3	6.2	307.7
27	7.0	304.0	8.3	304.0			6.0	307.7
28	6.6	304.0	8.2	305.3			5.8	308.6
29	6.4	305.2			5.5	307.3	5.7	309.4
30	6.4	305.2			5.4	307.5	7.1	310.0
31	6.2	305.6			5.4	306.4		

[1] Actual. [2] Holiday.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The report shows that even if we should not act on this bill today the Secretary of the Treasury would have $2 billion more cash on hand, even with the debt ceiling of $305 billion, than he is planning to have on hand by June 10.

There is no reason why the taxpayers should be paying interest on that $2 billion for that period. The taxpayers could use this savings.

There have been too many Frontier bureaucrats who have been too free and easy with the taxpayers' money. I do not think there is any limit to what the New Frontier crowd in Washington could spend if we took the reins off. I have never heard of so many wild ideas for spending. I sometimes wonder if they spend their nights dreaming of new ways to spend money. But this $309 billion debt is not imagination. It is a reality, and if only these free spenders would get out of orbit and come back to earth and realize that at some time this debt must be paid.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator from Delaware able to tell whether or not the Federal Government is now indebted to the various trust funds that comprise the money that ought to be impounded for the payment of retirement moneys?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The trust funds, by law, are invested in Government bonds. It could be argued that the Government has thus spent the money anyway. Those bonds are the same as those the Senator or I would buy. They bear interest, and the important point is that they are counted as a part of the national debt. While those funds are invested in Government bonds they are a part of the debt.

What was suggested here today was that rather than to issue bonds for the trust funds, let the Secretary take the money and spend the funds as though they were a part of the general fund. That would be stealing money which does not belong to the Government. It would be the same as the employer who spent social security or railroad retirement taxes that had been deducted from the employees. Suppose an employer said, "I can spend this money for a while. I will hold it for a few months and spend it for my own use." That money does not belong to him. He has no right to do that. Neither does this money belong to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. It belongs to the trust funds.

I would certainly be here objecting very strenuously if the Secretary of the Treasury ever decided he could cancel Government bonds and spend the money as part of the general fund. Heretofore we have criticized employers for similar action.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has answered the question.

Mr. President, I contemplate voting against the lifting of the debt ceiling to the amount set forth in the bill. I contemplate supporting the Senator from Delaware in the proposal which he has made.

I should like to delineate my reasons for the two judgments which I have reached. In doing so, at the beginning, I wish to read the contents of a letter received by my office from an Ohio citizen on May 23. I am deliberately omitting his name. I think this citizen has set forth the problem with such accuracy and such premonition that what he has written ought to be heeded. He wrote:

As you may know there is presently a U.S. savings bond drive being promoted throughout industry. The campaign is being carried out by top level corporate management, the president of my company being one.

My personal convictions have always been against continued deficit spending both on domestic and governmental levels. Of course, any money I put into savings bonds makes it easier for the Government to run a deficit. Consequently, it is against my principles to buy savings bonds.

The enclosed article from the May 2, 1963, edition of the Wall Street Journal makes it rather clear to me why it is financially unsound to buy savings bonds.

When I was first approached about buying savings bonds, I declined for the two reasons stated above. I have since been reapproached and told to reexamine my position. Being a salaried employee, I of course recognized my "mistake" and signed up for savings bonds. (My livelihood and advancement is dependent upon the relationship I have with my employer.)

I have the problem of saving and preserving the earning power of those savings for my children's education 16 years hence and for my wife and my retirement in 40 years. With these goals in mind history shows that U.S. savings bonds are not a prudent investment. Consequently, I would like to register a protest against the high pressure sales tactics that are bound to arise when a corporate management's prestige is "on the line" as it is during an industrial savings bond campaign.

I would appreciate your comments on the two following questions.

1. What are your thoughts on the attached editorial, specifically underlined sections 1, 2, and 3?

2. What safeguards could be written into any future industrial bond drives to take the pressure off of salaried employees like myself whose personal convictions and financial judgment dictate against the buying of bonds?

I will now read from the editorial in the three respects mentioned by the writer of the letter:

1. For the truth of the matter is that our neighbor was defrauded by his Government. So has been every citizen who bought

such a retirement policy, every person who long ago bought U.S. savings bonds, all the frugal people who for years have "put a little aside" in some bank for their old age.

2. Nor has this been an accident. For a generation now it has been the deliberate policy of the U.S. Government to depreciate the value of its money.

Especially through its constant deficit operations.

3. Just the same, at our neighbor's house the other evening the Secretary of the Treasury in person couldn't have sold a 10-year baby bond, much less a 25-year annuity. For not even he could pledge with a straight face that a decade hence the innocent will not have once again been cheated by their Government.

That brings me to deficit spending. In 26 of the last 33 years we have operated on a deficit basis. While there are times when deficits are inevitable, because of the emergency of war, or other catastrophe, it must be admitted that there are times when deficits ought not to be the basis of operating our Central Government. The deficit this year will be approximately $8 billion. Under the tax-reduction proposal and the Government money spending program, the deficit in fiscal year 1964 will be $10 billion. It is anticipated that the deficit in the 1965 fiscal year will be $10 billion, and $10 billion in 1966.

The people of the country are begging for tax relief. We will give it to them through deficit operations. There is no thought in mind whatever about reducing spending. As we continue to spend more than we take in, it becomes necessary to sell bonds. This citizen from Cuyahoga Falls asks me to advise him on what to do. I have not answered his letter. I have not answered it because I fear telling him the truth. To tell the truth, the advice would be, "The bonds which you buy will not pay you back the money dollar value that you gave for the bonds." That is a most difficult position for a person to occupy. Governor TALMADGE has been through it. Governor CARLSON has been through it, and probably Governor BOGGS, also, and Governor BYRD. All of us who were in office during World War II have been through it.

Time and again I went into a factory or into a merchandising store and urged citizens to buy bonds. I said to them, "If your Government falls, everything else will fall, and you will be no worse off. For every dollar you pay for the bonds you will get a dollar back."

It is now 18 years later. The bond for which a dollar of 100 cents producing value was paid in 1942 was paid back at the rate of about 46 cents a dollar. There was some justification for that inflationary and deficit operation during the war. But now we are in peace. Yet we continue to operate on a deficit basis. Can I say to my fellow citizens, "Congress is spending more each year than the money it makes available through taxes. Deficit operations are inevitable. In the next 3 years there will be $30 billion of deficit, but I advise you to buy bonds"? Can I do that honestly?

I make this statement and plea especially to Members of the Senate who have been voting for money-spending programs and causing deficits. How do we answer the question posed by the citizen? We cannot do it and be truthful. I have examined the situation as it prevails, and frankly I begin to wonder: What shall I do in order to insure that my annuity, my savings in the bank, the pensions of the minister and the schoolteacher, and the retirement pay of the ordinary miner and field worker will not be eroded by the callous, cruel conduct of the U.S. Congress and those who are urging the spending of money far in advance of having money available to be spent?

In 1945, when World War II was concluded, the national debt was $268 billion. It is now 18 years later, and the debt limit is up to $303 billion—$35 billion more; although within a period of 20 years after every other war in which our country was engaged the debt incurred in the battles was practically liquidated. We now have the unusual experience that although there was a period of prosperity, the debt was not reduced. It has risen from $268 billion in 1945 to $303 billion in 1963.

Let us consider what has happened in the past several years. On June 30, 1961, the Federal debt was $289 billion; on June 30, 1962, it was $298 billion. Congress raised the limit $10 billion in 1 year. Today it is $303 billion.

On June 30 of this year the debt will be $305 billion; on July 31, $306 billion; on August 31, $310 billion. On August 31 of this fiscal year, the limit will probably rise to $320 billion, without considering the deficit of $10 billion of the next fiscal year and another $10 billion in the following fiscal year being added to the debt.

I respectfully submit that this is not a healthy condition. It is not the manner in which the American husband manages his household. It is not an exemplification of the virtues that were reflected by our ancestors who fought for the establishment of our country.

I have been speaking about the sale of bonds. I have in my hand a book entitled "Fiscal and Monetary Policy." It contains the proceedings of a conference sponsored by the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, held on November 14 and 15 in Washington, D.C. Representatives of labor and management, bankers, college professors, businessmen, sociologists, and economists were in attendance. Approximately 200 persons were in attendance. They finally broke up into roundtable discussions. I shall read a statement made in one roundtable discussion by Dr. Colm, Chief Economist of the National Planning Commission. Dr. Colm reported to the whole body:

In the afternoon session some members felt that the discussion on monetary policy was almost with the assumption that in order to make a tax reduction effective in terms of economic expansion, it had to be associated with a central bank policy which makes reserves available for the banks to buy some of the bonds. This was vigorously opposed by several members of the group who wanted to insist that any possible deficit should be entirely financed through placement of bonds with private savings.

Towards the end we got a sort of 99 percent agreement—

That sounds quite interesting. Evidently there was an argument about who would buy the bonds. The banker said, "We ought not to buy them unless we are permitted to buy them out of our reserves; and if they were to be bought in that way, the savings bonds would drop in value." I continue to read:

Toward the end we got a sort of 99 percent agreement when I think the latter group agreed, at least one of them—the other kept quiet—that bank financing might be tolerated, if necessary, as an interim measure if, then, out of the growing gross national product, income, and increased profits, more savings funds would be forthcoming so that in the long run the financing could be shifted entirely to private savings.

Mr. President, one of three situations will prevail. Banks will buy the bonds, if they so choose, not by reason of a relaxation of the reserve requirements, but out of the moneys which they have in liquidity that can be loaned.

Second, the banks could buy bonds if the central bank were to relax the reserve requirements. That would mean endangering the stability of the banks and contributing to inflation.

The third course is for the taxpayer—the ordinary citizen—to buy bonds out of his savings. I shall urge the buying of the bonds eventually; but I shall vote on the floor of the Senate, with all my might, for the adoption of a course that will give some semblance of guarantee that the person who listened to me when I urged the buying of bonds will have a chance to get back dollars of the same value that he paid for the bonds. This purpose can be achieved; and one way to start is by voting against the raising of the debt ceiling.

I have been a Member of the Senate for 6½ years. During that period I have tried to keep the Government operating on a budgetary basis. With other Senators, I have fought against spending money for nonessential purposes; against the Government taking on functions that historically belong to local governments; against the Government entering into functions that have never belonged to Government but always to private enterprise. Frequently I have felt frustrated in the fight. Time and again I have left the Chamber at a time when more spending was being approved or when larger deficits were being fixed. However, finally I find some consolation in the realization that if it were not for the presence on this floor of Senators such as the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and others, the condition of the country would be worse than it is.

Mr. President, I will vote against the proposed increase in the debt ceiling. I will vote against it because I believe honesty requires that I do so. I will vote for the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, because I believe that amendment is necessary in order properly to approach this problem.

Those are my views on this subject. I have no hesitancy in proclaiming them. Probably my mail next week will be loaded with letters from those who will say I am opposed to progress. Mr. President, "progress" of the type that has been promulgated is, in truth, only destruction. We may get away with it for a period of

time; but the piper will have to be paid. Meanwhile, we attempt to console ourselves and sing and rejoice in the fact that we can spend, not tax, and buy votes in that way—but thinking not at all about the burden we are transferring to the generations to come.

I will not do it. I have been in public life too long to become bankrupt in morality at this time; and I will not follow the arguments of economic advisers who ridicule what is called puritanical morality. Every time I think of the derision that the economic adviser to the administration heaped upon those who believe in puritanical morality, I shudder. I checked on the meaning of that phrase. One has puritanical morality when he adheres with scrupulousness to truth and justice. Yet the economic adviser says to the people of the country, "Cast aside your morality, and proceed in whatever manner you think will be most helpful to you now."

Mr. President, all I can say is, God spare the soul who thinks that way.

In the solitude of the night, when all is quiet, and when one meditates about his service to his fellow men and to his country, and when one thinks about the lives that were given in the wars of our Nation to insure its future life, I can only pray that those who are advocating a policy of spending more, taxing less, and raising the debt ceiling will recognize that they are acting completely in conflict with all that is decent and right in the concept of a decent American.

Mr. SALTONSTALL obtained the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me, to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield, if I may obtain unanimous consent to do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have listened closely to the remarks of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] about the terrible morality of the Members of Congress who handle the appropriation bills. During the next few weeks the Senate will be confronted with several appropriation bills—among them, the Interior Department appropriation bill, which will be the next order of business. I wonder whether the Senator from Ohio and other Senators who apparently have some objections to what is being recommended by the Appropriation Committees will come to the Senate Appropriations Committee and tell it just where it should do the various things they have suggested. I know that certain portions of the appropriation bills can be dealt with in the way proposed; but I believe we should view this subject in proper perspective.

Sixty-three cents of each tax dollar goes for military expenditures. I do not know what Members of Congress have voted against the Defense Department appropriation bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, is the Senator from Washington asking me a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; and I am prefacing it in this way: 7½ cents of each tax dollar goes for the Veterans' Administration. I do not know of any Member of Congress who has voted against that appropriation.

Approximately 7¼ cents of each tax dollar is spent for interest on the debt—a subject we are discussing today. That debt is incurred primarily during war periods.

About 3½ cents or 4 cents of each tax dollar is spent for foreign aid.

Those expenditures leave us with about 19½ cents of each tax dollar—or approximately 20 cents—to be devoted to operating the rest of the Government. I would be the last to suggest that we could not make some savings in that part of the budget. But for years I have been handling a $12 billion appropriation bill. My friend the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and I have worked very hard on the problem. In all these years we have never reported a bill over the amount of the budget; it has always been less than the budget.

Of course it is easy to make statements about how terrible some things are. But I suggest that we should receive some help from other Senators. They should point out to us where cuts could be made.

For example, do Senators wish to have cuts made in the funds appropriated for the Federal Communications Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Veterans' Administration, or the Space Agency?

I think we do a fairly good job in keeping down the amounts of appropriations; and I believe we should have some help, occasionally, from the Senator from Delaware, for example, who sometimes has suggested to the Appropriations Committee where it could effect savings.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me ask what the question of the Senator from Washington is.

Mr. MAGNUSON. My question is as follows: Where does the Senator from Ohio suggest, in particular, that we make such cuts?

Mr. LAUSCHE. To begin with, I would say the committee could make cuts in the appropriations for every division of the Government. For 10 years I was Governor of the State of Ohio; for 4 years I was mayor of Cleveland; and I know what the attitude of public agencies is. They always ask for more than they need. I have observed that although the House votes for cuts—and we have before us now an example of that—the Senate votes to restore the amounts the House has cut; then conferences are held, and from the conferences come further restorations of the cuts.

There is one circumstance which I think exculpates the Appropriation Committees; namely, that once a built-in expenditure is voted, the appropriation is inescapable. But if an end is put to the practice of providing built-in expenditures, the Appropriations Committees can be relieved of a great burden.

However, I repeat that since World War II, our debt has increased $35 billion, and it now appears that it will rise $30 billion more.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at this time I must attend a committee meeting of very great importance. Before I leave the Chamber, I desire to make a brief statement. When I yielded to the Senator from Washington, I thought he wished to ask a brief question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill will begin on June 12. At that time will the Senator from Ohio give the committee the benefit of his wisdom and experience as Governor of Ohio and mayor of Cleveland? Will he tell us, in relation to that particular bill, which would be our responsibility, where he would make his proposed cuts? I know that we can make some, but we desire the benefit of the Senator's advice.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have been a member of a committee of which the Senator from Washington is chairman.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Year after year in that committee I have argued in favor of reducing expenses.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On the floor of the Senate I have voted against giveaways and grants, but my votes usually were in the minority. I need not tell the Senator from Washington my views. He has listened to them and he knows what they are.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know the views of the Senator from Ohio, but I should like him to become specific. I think we would probably accept his advice.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would, at the very beginning, cut straight across the board. The cut would not have to be large. In the past several years I have felt that our foreign aid program has been too large. I believe that the Federal Government should quit getting into functions that belong to local governments. I believe that we should cease to subsidize private and other industry. The Senator from Washington has been the archexponent of subsidizing the merchant marine. Every year some new bill is before us providing for subsidies sponsored by the promoters of the merchant marine. I do not know how many billions of dollars we have expended in such subsidies. Those are a few ways in which I would begin to cut the budget.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Ohio is correct. I have been for the American merchant marine since the law was passed in 1936, and I am still for it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I must ask for the regular order. I must proceed, because I have a committee meeting at 2 o'clock. I thought I was yielding for a simple question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was a simple question. I am sure the Senator from Ohio will accommodate me.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, I will accommodate the Senator from Washington by a further statement; but I shall not intrude upon the time of the Senator from Massachusetts now.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee for a great many years, but not as a member of the Finance Committee, although I was a member at one time, I

have taken a great interest in budget procedures and in the expenditures and revenue of our country.

I hope that the recommendation of the Finance Committee as reported to the Senate will prevail and that the ceiling of $309 billion will run through the fiscal year 1964. If it has to be increased, then it should be increased when we have a clearer understanding of the tax revenues. It should not be brought up separately at the end of August and be a fluctuating debt limit with several changes from month to month.

In my report to my constituents in Massachusetts on March 14, 1963, I wrote that I considered a review of the debt limit to be the only overall look we in Congress can take of the entire Federal budget. Therefore, we must keep the debt limit close to the actual needs of the Government so that we have an opportunity from time to time to take this look. Until the proposal to establish a Joint Committee on the Budget becomes law, the fact remains that a consideration of the debt limit is the only method we now have available.

In considering the overall debt limit, we must bear in mind that unused authorizations to expend from the public debt, commonly called back-door spending, were $26,944 billion as of the close of the last fiscal year. As of March 31, 1963, it was $27,360 billion.

That is money which goes into the national debt and must be within the debt limit. So we are considering that sum as well as the appropriations and expenditures. We hope that some of this unused authority is never used; for instance, the $5 billion for our stock subscriptions to the International Bank. On the other hand, over $6 billion is for the HHFA. Certainly there is a good possibility that a significant part of this amount may be used.

Congress continues to make new authorizations. During fiscal year 1962, $1,567 billion of new increases in authorizations were granted, and during that fiscal year departments borrowed from the Treasury a net of $2,826 billion. This record established by the present administration leads us to believe that unused authority to borrow from the Treasury will be used if there is clearance available under the debt limit.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have opposed this granting of authority to borrow from the Treasury. I believe we should appropriate instead of borrowing from the Treasury because the authority to borrow is an opportunity to increase our cash deficit, and once granted, Congress loses all review of the timing of such borrowings except when we are considering the statutory debt limit. Furthermore, we all know that there is a major lag in the Federal spending from the time the money is appropriated. These unexpended balances and unfunded contract authorizations can be spent by the administration with some restrictions at any time.

Forecasting the future is difficult. The Bureau of the Budget has its problems with predictions of revenues. Several months ago I placed a summary of the budgetary revenue predictions in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that the summary may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Original budget estimates and actuals

[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Receipts			New obligational authority			Expenditures		
	Original budget	Budget review current estimate [1]	Actual	Original budget	Budget review current estimate [1]	Enacted	Original budget	Budget review current estimate [1]	Actual
1946	38.2	36.6	39.6	86.8	[2]	102.3	80.0	82.5	60.3
1947	29.5	37.3	39.7	31.0	[2]	41.1	33.8	39.2	38.9
1948	34.9	38.8	41.4	33.5	[2]	38.7	34.7	34.2	33.0
1949	41.9	37.4	37.7	43.4	[2]	40.8	37.1	39.0	39.5
1950	40.2	37.2	36.4	44.6	[2]	50.2	41.1	42.7	39.5
1951	36.6	[3]	47.5	[4] 40.5	[3]	[4] 84.1	41.8	[3]	44.0
1952	54.4	[5]	61.3	94.4	[2]	92.9	70.4	69.9	65.3
1953	70.1	67.9	64.7	84.3	87.8	80.2	84.6	78.1	74.1
1954	67.8	67.5	64.4	72.9	66.3	62.8	77.6	71.2	67.5
1955	62.4	59.1	60.2	56.3	58.6	57.1	65.4	63.7	64.4
1956	59.7	61.8	67.8	58.6	62.4	63.2	62.1	63.5	66.2
1957	65.0	69.3	70.6	66.3	67.7	70.2	64.6	68.6	69.0
1958	73.1	73.5	68.6	73.3	71.6	76.3	71.2	71.4	71.4
1959	74.0	67.0	67.9	72.5	77.2	81.4	73.6	78.9	80.3
1960	76.4	78.3	77.8	76.8	79.3	79.6	76.3	78.2	76.5
1961	83.3	80.8	77.7	79.4	80.5	86.7	79.1	79.7	81.5
1962	82.3	82.1	81.4	80.9	93.1	[2]	80.9	89.0	87.7

[1] Amounts in these columns are revised estimates contained in the annual review prepared at the end of each session of Congress. The new obligational authority column includes January recommendations, subsequent amendments, and supplementals anticipated for later transmittal.
[2] Not available.
[3] None issued.
[4] Subsequent to the original budget, sizable increases in the military estimates were submitted to the Congress.
[5] No estimate of receipts made in brief review issued.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I believe that those summary predictions illustrate so clearly the problem Congress and the administration face. At no time in our national budgetary processes are revenues and expenditures closely related except when the Treasury is considering the size of the deficit that it must fund or the size of the surplus which is available to reduce the national debt. It is the responsiiblity of Congress to keep the Federal Government solvent and further authorizations and spending should be related to revenues. For this reason, I feel that the debt limit must be held close to the expected deficit.

Today our cash balance is $7,652 billion. Our Federal debt is just under the statutory limit of $305 billion. By the end of August the Secretary of the Treasury estimates that our cash will be somewhat less than this at $7.1 billion and our debt subject to the limit will be $310 billion. He predicts that the debt and the cash will go up very sharply on the last day of August.

I therefore hope that the Senate will accept the recommendation of the Finance Committee and place the ceiling at $309 billion for the next fiscal year.

A tax bill is anticipated. When we have that bill before us, we will have a better understanding of what the revenues for the next fiscal year of the Government will be. We will then also have a better understanding of what the appropriations and expenditures will be in the next fiscal year, and if there is a further change in the statutory debt limit needed, we will have the background on which to base it. I hope, therefore, that the Finance Committee's recommendation will be adopted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, my good friend the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] asked that both the Senator from Ohio and I be specific as to how the Appropriations Committee could save some money. I really appreciate that invitation, and I am delighted to accept his offer. He is correct in his suggestion that we should be specific. I begin by calling attention to a notice which has just come over the United Press wires. I should like to read it. The statement is described as one of the most startling proposals to save money that has ever been discovered by a frontiersman. The man who made the statement has said that it is a radical idea. The statement is as follows:

> The military has come up with a new way to save money. It is called buying only what we need. Assistant Defense Secretary Thomas D. Morris pictured it as a pretty radical program. He told Congress in testimony published today it should cut costs by $1.3 billion a year.

Think of it. An Assistant Secretary of Defense has come forward with what he thinks is a new and radical idea. Now what is this startling new proposal. To buy "only what we need."

I should like to inform the Assistant Secretary of Defense that in Delaware we learned that principle in the first grade of school. It is an insult to the intelligence of the American people for him to come forth now and say that it is a new and radical idea which the frontiersmen have discovered.

Every taxpayer who has had to make his own living and support his family found that out years ago the hard way.

I do not know what is taught at Harvard, but in the first grade of the schools of Delaware the children are taught that the way for a man to save money is to buy only what he needs.

I suppose, though, the President will make a great hero of this man who after all of these years of public service, has just discovered this fundamental principle that "the way to save money is to buy only what you need." That gets

back to the point I made before. With a little commonsense in these departments we would have no trouble.

Again I wish to continue being specific, because I appreciate the Senator's invitation. Not long ago the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hodges, made a statement in which he said that he had more employees in his department than he knew what to do with, and he wished that somebody would let him alone and let him reduce the number. Since that time he has added about 3,000 more employees than he had. Some suggestion has been made that he put those 3,000 employees to work trying to find out how to get rid of the ones he already had and did not need. There is something which the Senator from Washington can do specifically. The Secretary of Commerce is asking for an additional $150 million next year to add 3,497 more employees to his department. He added 3,000 last year after he made a public statement that he had more than he knew what to do with. Yes, to be specific, I suggest the Senator cut the request back to the number when the Secretary said he did not need more employees. That can save a considerable amount of money. Reduce the number of employees. That is a very simple way to cut spending, and I will not even claim it is a new idea.

I should be delighted to help the Senator from Washington in this regard; let us be specific and start by rolling the expenditures of all agencies back to the point where they do not have more money than they had last year.

That is not a radical proposal. It is nothing new. That would only carry out what the President of the United States promised he was going to do. I am not sure that he was doing anything other than making a political speech, but let us proceed as though he meant what he said. The President, in his state of the Union message on January 14, made this promise to the Congress; I quote:

> I will shortly submit a fiscal 1964 administrative budget which, while allowing for needed rises in defense, space, and fixed interest charges, holds total expenditures for all other purposes below this year's level.

The President also said:

> This requires the reduction or postponement of many desirable programs, the absorption of a large part of last year's Federal pay raise through personnel and other economies, the termination of certain installations and projects, and the substitution in several programs of private for public credit.

The President told the Congress that—with the exception of space, interest charges, and defense—we should hold expenditures to last year's level. To be specific, the way to accomplish that is simply to hold the appropriations to that level.

An appropriation bill is scheduled to come before the Senate this afternoon. That bill would provide $49,399,300 more than was appropriated last year. The way to save $49 million-plus this afternoon is to vote for a motion which I shall make later to send that bill back to the committee with instructions to comply with the President's suggestion and hold expenditures at or below last year's level.

The answer is so simple. It is so easy to be specific; all we have to do is for Members to vote the way we are talking. It does no good merely to talk about economy; let us vote for it. My friend from Washington will have an opportunity this afternoon to be specific. By all means I urge that his committee insist that all agencies do what they should have been doing long ago; namely, buying only what they need. But I am not going to pat a man on the back and call him a hero because he suddenly wakes up to a simple truth known to any first grade child in the State of Delaware or in the State of Washington.

It is a sad commentary on frontier bureaucracy when an Assistant Secretary calls a press conference to tell the world that he has just discovered that the way to save the taxpayers' money is for the Government to buy "only what it needs."

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate what the Senator from Delaware has said. I am sure that all of us appreciate the Senator's recommendations in this regard. The $49 million which is in the Interior Department appropriation bill no doubt covers a number of items which involve certain programs, particularly west of the Mississippi River. I do not think there is much involved for Delaware. Perhaps those items are justifiable. Perhaps they are not.

I make the point—and I insist on making it—that the Appropriations Committee never reports a bill which is over the budget figure. We do not intend to do so, so far as I am concerned.

I am sure the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] agrees with me in that regard. We sit in the committee day after day and week after week. Once in a while we would like to receive the benefit of some advice from Senators who stand on the floor and say, "This is a terrible thing you want to do."

When it comes to the question of voting on passage of an appropriation bill, all Senators vote for passage.

When we are talking about buying for the defense of this country, I think this suggestion is not radical at all. I learned about that in the first grade in school, in Minnesota. That is a good thing to do. That refers to the defense budget.

How many Senators have appeared before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which deals with the Department of Defense, to object to parts of the Defense Department appropriation bill? I could count them on the fingers of one hand, over the years. However, when the bill comes to the floor Senators stand up to say, "These terrible spenders are the fellows who want to do all these things."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. How many times have Senators appeared before my little subcommittee—it is not so little any more—and said, "The Veterans' Administration wants $7 billion. Let us cut in."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know of one. How many have appeared before the committee in connection with items for other agencies? We cut those appropriations. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and I cut the personnel figures last year.

But it is a different thing to say that we are going to hold the figure level from year to year. That is not a good basis for proceeding. The country is growing. I am always amazed that every year there is a headline stating, "The Federal budget is bigger this year than it was last year." Of course it is. It will be bigger 10 years from now than it is now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I suggest to the Senator that he should be careful, or he may be ridiculing the President of the United States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; I am not.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. For the Senator's information, I was quoting the words of President Kennedy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Far be it from me to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is why I wanted to caution the Senator, because I was reading a statement made by the President of the United States. That was not my statement. I was quoting from a speech made by President Kennedy before a joint session of the Congress last January.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. Some items can be cut down. My plea is that, instead of having broad talk about spending money, we should get down to specifics. We should say, "Do it here" or "Do it there."

The Senator from Delaware has suggested one item. That is helpful. The Senator should come to the committee and tell us about it. The Senator should not wait until the bill reaches the floor and then say, "All these Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, who have worked day in and day out, week in and week out, and have finally come up with their best judgment, do not know what they are doing."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I appreciate the position taken by the Senator from Washington. He knows very well the point I am making.

Mr. MAGNUSON. When there is a final vote on an appropriation bill in the Senate, how many "noes" are there?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. A vote will be taken this afternoon—wait and see. If the bill is not cut back to the proper level there will be at least one vote against it.

Mr. President, the Senator from Washington knows it is very easy to say that a Senator should not object in the Senate to what the committee does unless he goes before the committee to protest.

There will be a yea-and-nay vote in a few minutes on an amendment which was approved by the Finance Committee. I do not know how the Senator from Washington will vote, but he did not come before our committee and object to the amendment. Therefore, based on his argument he will vote for the amendment. But I respect the Senator's right to vote as he pleases, and I am sure he will extend to other Members the same right.

But I have some more helpful suggestions for my friend from Washington

and I am delighted at the opportunity to pass them along.

The President in his campaign in 1960 said that there were already too many Federal employees. Yet the administration has added 129,000 employees since the President has been in office.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Where?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, I have a breakdown. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a report of those employees, as furnished by the committee under the chairmanship of the Senator from Virginia, be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD

(Statement in connection with the monthly report on Federal personnel and pay for December 1960)

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of December totaling 2,356,720. This was a net decrease of 3,947 compared with employment reported in the preceding month of November.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1961, which began July 1, 1960, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1960	2,382,549		125
August	2,384,933	2,384	
September	2,364,636		20,297
October	2,360,534		4,102
November	2,360,667	133	
December	2,356,720		3,947
Net decrease for 1st 6 months of fiscal year 1961			25,954

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of December was 1,324,586, a decrease of 2,568 as compared with the November total of 1,327,154. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in December was 1,032,134, a decrease of 1,379 as compared with 1,033,513 in November.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD

(Statement in connection with the monthly report on Federal personnel and pay for March 1963)

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of March totaling 2,485,738 as compared with 2,483,511 in February. This was a net increase of 2,227, including an increase of 2,826 in temporary employment under the public works acceleration program authorized by Public Law 87-658.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1963, which began July 1, 1962, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1962	2,510,950	14,455	
August	2,512,199	1,249	
September	2,485,324		26,875
October	2,482,982		2,342
November	2,498,312	15,330	
December	2,486,628		11,684
January 1963	2,477,940		8,688
February	2,483,511	5,571	
March	2,485,738	2,227	

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of March was 1,429,054, an increase of 7,422 as compared with the February total of 1,421,632. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in March was 1,056,684, a decrease of 5,195 as compared with 1,061,879 in February.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the Senator will find that most of those increases are in the space program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; they are not. For example, this year the President is asking in his budget that came to the Congress for an increase in appropriations to provide for 36,492 new employees to be added next year over and above the number of employees last year. That is the budget which was sent to the Congress.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let us break those figures down, to find out how we could cut something out of the budget.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator from Washington will just be patient I will break the figures down.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is, the President is asking to have employees added at the rate of 3,000 a month; 100 every day 7 days to the week; or 4 every hour. What the President is asking for fiscal year 1964, getting down to the figures, is for extra money to add a new employee to the Federal payroll at the rate of one every 15 minutes, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. I say that he does not need them.

Where would those employees go? 5,315 more employees are requested for the Department of Agriculture.

The President is asking for 3,497 extra employees in the Commerce Department. The Secretary of Commerce said that he did not need as many as he already had.

For the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the request is for 5,931 more employees next year.

For the Department of Justice, the request is for 765 new employees.

The Department of Labor wants money for 1,293 extra employees.

These are over and above what he had last year, and they have already had 129,000 additional employees in the first 2½ years.

The General Services Administration wants 3,208 additional employees.

The Post Office Department wants 9,650 additional employees. I have not reached the Space Administration. The Senator from Washington thought that most of the new employees were for the Space Administration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; I said a great number.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. To be exact 3,953 are for the Space Administration, or about 10 percent of the total, and the rest are for the various domestic agencies.

Eight hundred and two additional employees are wanted for the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The Treasury Department wants 4,149 new employees.

The Interior Department wants 3,999 new employees. That bill will be before us later today. Let us see what happens.

Why does the administration want so many new employees? I am not even counting the Defense Department. These are new employees for domestic agencies that the President said were to hold down the costs. If the Congress gives him the money he wants and which the Budget Bureau has requested 36,492 extra employees will be added to the public payroll in the next 12 months.

The President is asking for money to add one new employee every 15 minutes during the entire fiscal year 1964. Remember this is an administration in which the President in his campaign speeches said he had more than he knows what to do with.

Is being specific enough? Let us cut each appropriation back. I offer my recommendations to the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We would like to have the benefit of the Senator's presence.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall be delighted to let the Senator have the benefit of my presence. I will even bring down a picture to put on the wall if it will encourage him to hold down this spending.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; the Senator's pictures do not do him justice.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have always felt the same way, but most of my friends think quite the contrary. [Laughter.]

At any rate, I shall be delighted to come before the committee. I will even hold the Senator's hand while he votes if the Senator wants me to do so—anything to promote commonsense in the departments. I welcome the opportunity offered by the Senator from Washington. I am sure he will agree with me that we do not need to add the number of employees suggested by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may thoroughly agree with the Senator. All members of the committee may agree with him. The only one we have been considering that the Senator has been talking about is the GSA. If the Senator picks out the appropriations he thinks the GSA should not have—the House has probably cut some of the requests—perhaps the Senate committee will cut some. Tell us which ones the Department should not have. We will give the Senator the most sympathetic audience he has ever had.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Sympathetic audiences do not save a dollar. We have had sympathetic audiences before.

Mr. MAGNUSON. By sympathetic, I mean we will cut some if necessary.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is better. Congress has been expressing sympathy to the taxpayers for years. If sympathy had a cash value nobody would have to work; everybody would be rich.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then, I hope the Senator will vote against the Defense Appropriations bill, the Veterans' Administration bill, and the interest on the debt bill, which we are talking about today.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, we are not talking about interest on the debt.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And all the other items that make up 81 percent of the taxes the American people pay. The Senator from Delaware has never voted against them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Delaware has never voted against them on final passage.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, I have, many times. I do not recall just which ones. I have voted against my share of them. I am going to make a motion later this afternoon which I hope the Senator will support; it will be in line with what the President promised in his campaign speeches. I will sit beside the Senator from Washington while he votes if he thinks it will help calm his nerves and enable him to cast an affirmative vote for the American taxpayers. I will do anything in the world to help the Senator from Washington get on the right side.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will be glad to hold the Senator's hand to help him get on the right side.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not want to be led astray.

The Senator from Delaware has served on a committee with the Senator from Washington. I enjoyed that service, but I found that we had quite a few disagreements on holding down subsidy costs. But I am always willing to discuss the subject with the Senator from Washington since he has such a gracious way.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is walking into the shadows now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would not want to go into the shadows with the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is going far down the road somewhere. The Senator from Delaware and I have had many arguments about the American merchant marine. A law was passed 25 years ago which provided the rules of the game, the appropriations, and the amount of money necessary to keep the merchant marine alive. The Senator from Delaware and I have had many arguments, but never has he shown up with an amendment to amend the act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, yes; I have.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The basic subsidy act?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, the Senator from Washington just would not listen.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Which amendments were they?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Several amendments to appropriation bills.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The appropriation has to be made by law. I am talking about the basic act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. So am I. Once the subsidy has been contracted for, it becomes an obligation. Congress each year decides to what extent the department can commit us to pay these subsidies for the next 12 months. We have voted on that authority in every appropriation bill for the past several years. I have offered amendments to cut it back every year. I do not recall a single time when the Senator from Washington has done so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have joined the Senator from Delaware on three or four occasions.

Anyway, I invite the Senator from Delaware to come before our committee with his figures and statistics.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall be glad to do so. I will even go to dinner with the Senator some time if that will impress upon him the need for economy.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I promised to yield to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], but I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Did the Senator say he was going to move to recommit the debt limit bill, or another bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, not the debt limit bill.

I yield now to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON. Evidently the Senator from Wyoming was not vocal enough to make himself heard in his request to have the Senator from Delaware yield.

Mr. President, I was not a Member of this body last year, but the RECORD discloses that the 87th Congress was cajoled into making the $308 billion ceiling on the premise that we would have a balanced budget and that the $308 billion was needed only for a seasonal peak. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct, and that was the testimony given to our committee. It was claimed that the increase was needed only for a seasonal peak, and that there would be a balanced budget for the full year. The administration did not balance the budget but instead increased the deficit by $8 billion.

Mr. SIMPSON. The $8 billion was an indication that the estimate of last year was sheer nonsense. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; or they did not know about what they were talking. But in any event it was unrealistic. They did not live up to their promise. I think if we could hold the debt ceiling at $309 billion here today it would be realistic. Then we should serve notice on the administration that this is it and that they can hold down spending. There is nothing unusual about that formula. The Senator and I have just so much money coming to us. We have to gage our purchases in line with the money we receive. All the argument to the effect that the only alternative to an increase in the debt ceiling is for the Government to default on its obligations is nonsense. There is another alternative—the administration can stop creating so many bills. Let them spend public money just as carefully as they do their own.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does not the Senator believe this would be a mandate to the Treasury Department to live within the debt ceiling through 1964, and to cut out nonessential and extravagant expenditures?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would. My vote this afternoon is going to make clear that that is my intention.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on many subjects I agree with the distinguished Senator from Delaware, who has just spoken. I am sorry that I must disagree with him on the issue now pending before the Senate. Probably our purposes are the same, but our methods of accomplishing them are a little different. I intend to vote against the amended bill as it came from the committee, and vote against any increase in the debt ceiling.

I feel privileged to consume a short period of time on the floor of the Senate to talk about appropriations, since the name of the senior Senator from Colorado has been mentioned on the floor during the past hour. I believe a few remarks with respect to appropriations may be appropriate. It is true that the Independent Offices Subcommittee, on which I have the honor to serve as the ranking minority member, with the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], has come forth each year with a bill which was not in excess of the budget. It is not an easy matter to do that. The appropriation bill covers all the Independent Offices and Agencies of Government. It provides for the ICC, the FPC, the FCC, and so on down the line with respect to all the regulatory agencies.

Through all of this we have one common problem which recurs again and again, and that is that the backlog of cases before the regulatory agencies of government constantly increases. Yet we have found that it does no good simply to let it ride.

So far as we can, we have put every pressure upon the regulatory agencies to firm up and key up their procedures and adopt new methods of procedure. This has been done in some instances. However, on the whole probably there is justification for some increase each year in the personnel required. It is very difficult to face this particular problem. To those who would like to help us solve the problem I say that I join my distinguished chairman and invite them to testify in the effort to help solve it. It is one of the most irksome and burdensome problems that we share. However, in respect to other appropriations, I doubt very seriously if any agency can expand itself from a $2 billion agency to a $6 billion agency in 2 years and do an effective job. I doubt if there is any man or any group of men alive who can expand a program that fast and use the money effectively. Yet I have watched the Senate in the past 2 or 3 years, and noticed that anything which has the word "research" in it goes. Let no one believe for a moment that the executive department of this Government has not become wise to that fact. The most simple tabulations and calculations are now called research. If a man wants to find out what is happening in a certain area, an accountant is not put on the job with an adding machine, which is all that is required. It immediately becomes a research project, and this involves at least $200,000, $300,000, or perhaps $200 million, for all I know. Anything that is passed off as research goes.

Yesterday I had an opportunity to talk with one of the most distinguished scientists in the country. He told me what many scientists had told me privately, that research in this country is going downhill in many areas because Congress is providing too much money. He told me how a particular advisory committee of which he is a member in NIH listed projects one by one. He said that if

any sense were applied to the appropriations it would be possible to eliminate the worst projects before getting down to the bottom of the list. They have so much money that they must scramble to put it out. This is true not only of NIH, but it is true also of the National Science Foundation and other agencies. I am not one who wants to stop research. I have had a long and abiding interest, particularly in basic research, because I believe that in basic research are to be found true values that will advance our country. Senators, individually, and as a whole, should awaken to the fact that, merely because a group of department people come before us and brand something research, that does not necessarily mean that it is required or will develop into anything. It is pretty hard to find any tangible results, particularly when some of the greatest discoveries of this century have come from countries where governments do not subsidize research to the extent that we do.

We might call a halt to the fantastic Peace Corps. I believe we appropriated $80 million for it, or that is the price tag on it this year. We might call a halt to it until we find out where it is going and what it is going to do. A few thousand letters gathered together by the Peace Corps personnel downtown do not prove that the Peace Corps is a success. We might stop, for example, the old CCC, the local Peace Corps that we have now started and which, I am sorry to say, the Senate has voted to establish. We could do hundreds of things to cut down expenses. We could have thrown the accelerated public works program out the window, where it should have been thrown. In that way we would have saved $900 million on boondoggling.

We could have done the same thing with area redevelopment. If we had done that, Mr. President, we would not have transferred one depressed area of the country to another. Federal employees have been put out all over the country literally hammering communities to take money. I could go through a whole series of examples. The challenge has been made rather loosely that the way to reduce expenditures is to vote to cut appropriations. I will vote to reduce appropriations, but I do not agree with the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] when he says that by raising the debt ceiling to $309 billion we will say to the executive department that we are going to make the $309 billion stick in the Senate. We are not. We are never going to make it stick until Members of the Senate, individually and as a group, or at least a majority of them, decide that Government expenditures constitute a threat to the economic health and well-being of this country.

I intend to vote for many cuts. I will vote for some increases. I announce now two increases that I will vote for. I will vote for more money for the B–70 program. I will vote for more money for the supersonic transport, so that the shortsighted people, who cannot see over the horizon but somehow get a clear concept of the moon, will know that we must do something on this earth to keep ahead of people who are here—not only those in orbit. The $309 billion will be raised again next year, and this will be ineffectual in holding it down.

I heard the President's statement in his State of the Union message. I loved the words. I wish I could have found the tune. But the tune is one of maddening irresponsibility. Each day brings more requests for new programs, expanded programs and new boondoggling, which do this country no good and never will.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it has been said over and over again, in substance, that the bill before the Senate would not control spending. It is not a ceiling on the debt. The debt is created by spending. Spending comes about when we vote authorizations. After we set into motion spending programs, appropriated money, and inaugurated many programs, started new projects, and entered into new fields, increased costs, raised wages, placed more people on the payroll, and have done all these other things, the bills start to roll into the Treasury.

The Treasury must either pay them or not pay them. For the Government to fail to pay its bills could well lead to serious trouble at home and abroad.

The measure before the Senate is not a ceiling on debt. I wish it were. I would like to see a ceiling on spending. I would like to see a constitutional amendment that compelled the Government to live within its means and to retire the debt. But again I say that spending and debts come about because we vote for programs.

I yield to no one in my opposition to the expansion of the Federal Government. I yield to no one in consistently opposing measures that cost money. But all of that has gone by. Now the question is, Shall we let the Secretary of the Treasury borrow enough money to pay the bills? My answer is that if the Treasury will come before us in a forthright manner, without playing politics, without trickery, and without emergency, I shall, much as I do not like to do so, vote to grant the Secretary of the Treasury the authority to borrow more money.

It would be in the best interests of the country. It would call for more orderly financing and more elbow room to manage the national debt, if the action we take were to extend for the full coming fiscal year. The amendment adopted by the Committee on Finance is sound. I do not want anyone to suggest to me that he is for orderly financing and for giving the Secretary of the Treasury elbow room, but vote for a proposal that will send the borrowing ceiling down to $285 billion by the end of August. If the Committee on Finance amendment is defeated, that is what will happen. There will be a debt of something over $305 billion. By our votes, we will be putting a ceiling of $285 billion on the borrowing power. That would not be honest with the people back home. That would not enable the best possible borrowing on the part of the Treasury.

I point out something further. We cannot do much about the bills that will come in the next 2 or 3 months. The spending has taken place. The bills have to be paid. The Armed Forces must be paid. Contractors must be paid. Veterans' hospitals and other services must be continued. We cannot do very much to lessen the spending in the next 2, 3, or 4 months. But we can do something about the spending 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, or 12 months from now. If this measure is passed with the amendment of the Committee on Finance, there will be a borrowing limit of $309 billion. That is enough to operate the Treasury all of the next fiscal year, if the Treasury so chooses.

There are many things that can be done. The Secretary of the Treasury said he would have to go to $315 or $320 billion if all the proposed programs were enacted. Congress does not have to enact them. A project that is expected to be finished in 12 months can be dragged out to 18 months. Congress can refuse to initiate certain projects or programs. Some of the programs should be defeated; the starting dates of others can be delayed.

Many things can be done to curtail spending during the next 6 months. But we are helpless as to the immediate future.

There is no way in which to justify a vote for the bill before the Senate if the amendment of the Committee on Finance is defeated, because we shall be voting deliberately to reduce the borrowing power to $285 billion. We know that that will not work. We know that there will be another crisis. We know that it will be used in the last day or two to boost the debt far above $309 billion, or even $315 billion.

I realize that perhaps nothing that has been said here will influence any votes. I have tried to act responsibly in these matters. For the most part, I have voted to increase the borrowing limit over the years, because it was necessary for the Government to pay its bills. The time to hold down expenditures is when we consider authorizations and appropriations.

However, if the amendment of the Committee on Finance is defeated, it will be a clearcut indication that politics is being played with this issue. It will be a clearcut indication that the people back home—the taxpayers—are being deceived. It will be a clearcut indication that we are being maneuvered into a corner, so that there will be another deadline, another crisis. Then, at the end of August, the proposal will be either to take it or leave it; and what we will get to take will be very high.

So I shall vote to adopt the amendment of the Committee on Finance. It is a good amendment. If it is defeated, those who believe in a higher debt and more spending, those who believe in planned deficits, will have to take the responsibility to deliver the votes to give to the Treasury the power to borrow in order to pay its bills.

I, for one, am disappointed in the Treasury for not supporting the amendment of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, when we come to grips with the public debt ceiling, and discussions about appropriations are injected into the debate, I am reminded of the fellow down in Kentucky who had a balky mule. The mule lay down on the pavement and would not budge, notwithstanding all

the punishment administered by the very humble owner, including the building of a fire under the mule.

By sheer happenstance, a veterinarian came along. He said, "Sam, what's the matter?"

Sam replied, "I can't do a thing with this mule."

So the veterinarian reached into his case, got out a syringe, and gave the mule a good sticking in the hind quarters. The mule got up and bounded down the street.

Sam looked at his departing mule and said, "Doc, how much was that?"

The veterinarian replied, "Well, I'll charge you only 10 cents."

"Well," Sam said, "Here's 30 cents. Give me two shots, so I can catch the mule."

So the appropriations go up, and the debt ceiling, in proportion to the appropriations, goes higher, and we kick up the debt ceiling. The appropriations and the debt go higher and higher, and higher goes the ceiling.

This is a peripatetic ceiling, so to speak. The debt and the appropriations walk together.

Before 1917, there was no debt ceiling. At that time, in the Second Liberty Loan Act, Congress established a ceiling of, roughly, $11,500 million.

Then it started up. The next ceiling was $45 billion. The next ceiling was $65 billion. Then it went up to $125 billion. In wartime it rose to $210 billion. Then it went up to $260 billion, and then it rose to $300 billion.

It went back to $275 billion; but then it went up, on a temporary basis, to $281 billion. Then it scooted above $300 billion.

It is like the little mule. It takes a couple of shots to catch those expenditures, and up goes the debt ceiling.

Then, Mr. President, we go in for an interesting fiction: We now make a distinction between the permanent debt ceiling and a temporary debt ceiling. We have had nine temporary ceilings and three permanent ceilings in the last 8 years. Then, to outdo ourselves, we have actually had five ceilings in the past 3 months. There was one ceiling on the last day of March. The following morning there was a different ceiling. Then there was still another ceiling, as the chairman of our committee well knows. On June 24, there will be still another ceiling; and on June 30 there will be another ceiling; and if we do not do anything by the 30th of June, there will be still a different ceiling. So we are willing to be "ceilinged" to death, it seems.

However, as everyone knows, a little nonsense is spouted on this floor once in a while. If we wish to hold down the debt limit, the place to do so is in the Appropriations Committees. I listened with great interest to the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] speak about having Senators come to the Appropriations Committee and give it the details. I served for 18 years on the House Appropriations Committee and on the Senate Appropriations Committee, and I do not think I am a rank amateur on that subject. But when I was managing the agricultural show, I put a man in the Department of Agriculture; and I went to every bureau head there, and I had them to lunch; and I said to them, "You are to respond to his questions and you are to give him what he requests; otherwise, you will settle with me in the committee room." Mr. President, that got results.

The tragedy is that Senators are so busy that they do not have enough time. Members of the House serve on only one subcommittee, and that is their work during the session. But I say to our very distinguished chairman that once I served on five subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, and at the same time I served on seven subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee. I do not quite know what I did with my "spare time," I must say. I used to operate "on roller skates."

It is in the Appropriations Committees that the job must be done; and the debt ceiling bill is only an echo of what the Appropriations Committees do.

We cannot put all the blame on the Treasury Department. However, I believe one admonition can be made. The distinguished Senator from Delaware said to the Secretary of the Treasury, several months ago, "Do not come at the last minute." But last week we met under the expert direction of our distinguished friend the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and listened carefully to the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury. I sympathize with his problems, and I do not wish to throw any rocks. Frankly, he must have some maneuverability and some flexibility. I do not quite know what the central bankers in Europe would say if we were to slice the funds available to the Secretary of the Treasury so close that the central bankers in Europe would come to the conclusion that Congress had no confidence in the Secretary of the Treasury. Certainly that would be a disaster.

Neither can we reduce his cash balances. He operates in a cash balance area of, let us say, $4,200 million up to $5,700 million. There could arise an eventuality—for, after all, we are on thin ice—so far as the imbalance of payments between our country and other countries is concerned. I do not want the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury to be tied, and I am willing to be reasonable in that connection. Moreover, I do not want him to have to resort to what one might call "phony" financing.

We know that Bob Anderson, the Secretary of the Treasury under President Eisenhower, did that in 1957; he had to go into the market and sell nonguaranteed obligations. But when that is done, the interest rate rises, and the result is to add to the interest on the public debt, which now is over ten thousand million dollars a year.

Mr. President, there may be some who get comfort from saying, "We owe it only to ourselves." Mr. President, we cannot pick up a chunk of cobblestone that has been put down under the highway program and put it on the front porch of a man who holds a Government saving bond, and say to him, "Here is your interest." He wants his interest paid to him in the coin of the realm which he can spend with the butcher or the grocer or at the department store or in paying his income tax to the Government. So the interest must be paid to him in money. The result is that the interest charge rises.

I would not want the Secretary of the Treasury to use some of the cash which must go into trust funds—for example, into such funds as the Railroad Retirement Fund and the Social Security Fund. Congress makes those appropriations out of the general revenues. Suppose the Secretary of the Treasury were to grab several billion dollars and say, "Congress has not gotten around to appropriating this into the social security account; so I will use this cash." Mr. President, if that were done, I would regard it as a public violation of his fiduciary responsibility. So such action is not taken.

Some say, "Go ahead; we have many assets which can be put on the market." But, Mr. President, that would result in a forced sale of assets; and I would not wish that to be done.

So what would the Secretary of the Treasury do? If he were instructed to make a forced sale, that would tipoff the securities market. In order to sell Government bonds, the Secretary of the Treasury has to proceed in the same way that the Singer Sewing Machine Co. or the International Harvester Co. or any other industrial concern in the country proceeds; he has to go into the same market.

Mr. President, what would Members of Congress say about the Secretary of the Treasury if he were so mistaken in judgment as suddenly—overnight—to drop $1 billion worth of assets into the market? Members of Congress would wish to run him out of office. So I do not wish to put the Secretary of the Treasury in that hole.

Frankly, I think the Secretary of the Treasury has done wisely and well in connection with the debt ceiling. He said an increase to $307 billion would be sufficient up to June 30. So we have provided for that. He said that a debt ceiling of $309 would get him out of the fire up to August 31, even though he would nudge through the ceiling a little. But he has a cash cushion to fall back on.

But we went further. We said, "Mr. Secretary, we will make the $309 billion ceiling last, not until August 31, but until June 30, 1964." So he will not be in trouble.

We know he must make a further request; he said he would have to. The appropriation bills have not yet been passed; neither has the tax bill. So how can the Secretary of the Treasury know now what his expenditures column will show on a projected basis and what the debt ceiling will have to be? He may have to say to us, "I must have a debt ceiling of $325 billion." If he said that, I would not be surprised, in view of the way Congress spends money.

Mr. President, the way Congress spends money is certainly a caution. But so long as Congress spends the money, we might just as well take credit for the drought as well as for the rain, because the ceiling is there, and the money is made available by this body and the other body.

The Constitution provides:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

Congress is the exclusive custodian of the public purse. Let no Member of Congress try to duck his responsibility. It is here. We will not shirk it. I have never tried to duck it. I have defended on the platform every one of my fiscal actions for the past 30 years. I love to confess in public because it is good for the soul. I think people like it.

We have presented a good bill. What kind of hole would we put the distinguished chairman of the committee in if we voted down the bill when it came from the committee by a vote of 13 to 2? The distinguished Senator from Louisiana, who has offered the amendment to remove the new "time" provision, voted for the bill in committee; he so admitted on the floor of the Senate earlier in the day. What kind of hole would the Senator put us in?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator ask what kind of hole the chairman of the committee would be put in?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The chairman voted against the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is all right, but the Senator considers the committee as an entity. Does he deny that that was the vote?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I was present and I voted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly, but I was present and heard the testimony of the Secretary before I had to come to the floor of the Senate for a 12 o'clock meeting of the Senate. Do not pin that on me. I know where I was.

My duty was to be in the Senate Chamber at 12 o'clock. I left the committee at 7 minutes to 12, in time to undertake the duties of the leadership here. But my vote was cast. I was the first to ask the Secretary of the Treasury questions, by the grace and sufferance of our distinguished chairman.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I wish to say to my good friend from Illinois, whom I dearly love and admire——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I love my friend dearly, too.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I know what it is to prevail on the floor of the Senate. I have had an amendment in which I believed very strongly agreed to. Then I have seen as good a friend as the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] walk in and move to reconsider the vote by which my amendment was agreed to, and watch the leadership defeat the amendment after it had been agreed to.

We have had proposals agreed to, and then heard the statement, "I am afraid this will not work out too well. He had better change it."

Even the Senator has changed his mind on occasion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The only people who do not change their minds are in cemeteries and kindred places. I merely wished to make clear what happened in the committee. By an overwhelming majority vote the bill was reported to the Senate. All I have said is that I believe the Senate ought to sustain its Committee on Finance. Then we shall go to conference on the bill.

I have listened to my friend. I have interposed in his conversation because the whole burden of his argument was that we could not persuade the House to agree. That is an unwarranted assumption. I have been on hundreds of conference committees, first on the other side of the Capitol coming over here, and subsequently on this side going over there. We must assume that we have a record. We have the facts. And there is nothing so stubborn as a fact. We have the facts with us. I think we ought to vote. I am ready to vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I shall speak only for a moment.

First, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of the times the debt limit has been increased. The list appears on page 5 of the report.

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

Debt limitation under sec. 21 of the 2d Liberty Bond Act, as amended—History of legislation

Sept. 24, 1917:	
40 Stat. 288, sec. 1, authorized bonds in the amount of	[1] $7,538,945,400
40 Stat. 290, sec. 5, authorized certificates of indebtedness (outstanding revolving authority)	[2] 4,000,000,000
Apr. 4, 1918:	
40 Stat. 502, amending sec. 1, increased bond authority to	[1] 12,000,000,000
40 Stat. 504, amending sec. 5, increased authority for certificates outstanding to	[2] 8,000,000,000
July 9, 1918: 40 Stat. 844, amending sec. 1, increased bond authority to	[1] 20,000,000,000
Mar. 3, 1919:	
40 Stat. 1311, amending sec. 5, increased authority for certificates outstanding to	[1] 10,000,000,000
40 Stat. 1309, new sec. 18 added, authorizing notes in the amount of	[1] 7,000,000,000
Nov. 23, 1921: 42 Stat. 321, amending sec. 18, increased note authority to outstanding (establishing revolving authority)	[2] 7,500,000,000
June 17, 1929: 46 Stat. 19, amending sec. 5, authorized bills in lieu of certificates of indebtedness; no change in limitation for the outstanding	[2] 10,000,000,000
Mar. 3, 1931: 46 Stat. 1506, amending sec. 1, increased bond authority to	[1] 28,000,000,000
Jan. 30, 1934: 48 Stat. 343, amending sec. 18, increased authority for notes outstanding to	[2] 10,000,000,000
Feb. 4, 1935:	
49 Stat. 20, amending sec. 1, limited bonds outstanding (establishing revolving authority to)	[2] 25,000,000,000
49 Stat. 21, new sec. 21 added, consolidating authority for certificates and bills (sec. 5) and authority for notes (sec. 18); same aggregate amount outstanding	[2] 20,000,000,000
49 Stat. 21, new sec. 22 added, authorizing U.S. savings bonds within authority of sec. 1.	
May 26, 1938: 52 Stat. 447, amending secs. 1 and 21, consolidating in sec. 21 authority for bonds, certificates of indebtedness, Treasury bills, and notes (outstanding bonds limited to $30,000,000,000). Same aggregate total outstanding	[2] 45,000,000,000
July 20, 1939: 53 Stat. 1071, amending sec. 21, removed limitation on bonds without changing total authorized outstanding of bonds, certificates of indebtedness, bills, and notes	[2] 45,000,000,000
June 25, 1940: 54 Stat. 526, amending sec. 21, adding new paragraph: "(b) In addition to the amount authorized by the preceeding paragraph of this section, any obligations authorized by sections 5 and 18 of this Act, as amended, not to exceed in the aggregate $4,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time, less any retirements made from the special fund made available under section 301 of the Revenue Act of 1940, may be issued under said sections to provide the Treasury with funds to meet any expenditures made, after June 30, 1940, for the national defense, or to reimburse the general fund of the Treasury therefor. Any such obligations so issued shall be designated 'National Defense Series'."	[3] 4,000,000,000
Feb. 19, 1941: 55 Stat. 7, amending sec. 21, limiting face amount of obligations issued under authority of act outstanding at any one time to. Eliminates separate authority for $4,000,000,000 of National Defense Series obligations.	[2] 65,000,000,000
Mar. 28, 1942: 56 Stat. 189, amending sec. 21, increased limitation to	[2] 125,000,000,000
Apr. 11, 1943: 57 Stat. 63, amending sec. 21, increased limitation to	[2] 210,000,000,000
June 9, 1944: 58 Stat. 272, amending sec. 21, increased limitation to	[2] 260,000,000,000
Apr. 3, 1945: 59 Stat. 47, amending sec. 21 to read: "The face amount of obligations issued under authority of this Act, and the face amount of obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States (except such guaranteed obligations as may be held by the Secretary of the Treasury), shall not exceed in the aggregate $300,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time."	[2] 300,000,000,000
June 26, 1946: 60 Stat. 316, amending sec. 21, adding: "The current redemption value of any obligation issued on a discount basis which is redeemable prior to maturity at the option of the holder thereof shall be considered, for the purposes of this section, to be the face amount of such obligation," and decreasing limitation to	[2] 275,000,000,000
Aug. 28, 1954: 68 Stat. 895, amending sec. 21, effective Aug. 28, 1954, and ending June 30, 1955, temporarily increasing limitation by $6,000,000,000 to	[2] 281,000,000,000
June 30, 1955: 69 Stat. 241, amending Aug. 28, 1954 act by extending until June 30, 1956, increase in limitation to	[2] 281,000,000,000
July 9, 1956: 70 Stat. 519, amending act of Aug. 28, 1954, temporarily increasing limitation by $3,000,000,000 for period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1957, to	[2] 278,000,000,000
Effective July 1, 1957, temporary increase terminates and limitation reverts, under act of June 26, 1946, to	[2] 275,000,000,000
Feb. 26, 1958: 72 Stat. 27, amending sec. 21, effective Feb. 26, 1958, and ending June 30, 1959, temporarily increasing limitation by $5,000,000,000	[2] 280,000,000,000
Sept. 2, 1958: 72 Stat. 1758, amending sec. 21, increasing limitation to $283,000,000,000, which, with temporary increase of Feb. 26, 1958, makes limitation	[2] 288,000,000,000
June 30, 1959: 73 Stat. 156, amending sec. 21, effective June 30, 1959, increasing limitation to $285,000,000,000, which, with temporary increase of Feb. 26, 1958, makes limitation on June 30, 1959	[2] 290,000,000,000
Amending sec. 21, temporarily increasing limitation by $10,000,000,000 for period beginning July 1, 1959, and ending June 30, 1960, which makes limitation beginning July 1, 1959	[2] 295,000,000,000
June 30, 1960: 74 Stat. 290, amending sec. 21, for period beginning on July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1961, temporarily increasing limitation by $8,000,000,000	[2] 293,000,000,000
June 30, 1961: 75 Stat. 148, amending sec. 21, for period beginning on July 1, 1961, and ending June 30, 1962, temporarily increasing limitation by $13,000,000,000	[2] 298,000,000,000
Mar. 13, 1962: 76 Stat. 23, amending sec. 21, for period beginning on Mar. 13, 1962, and ending June 30, 1962, temporarily further increasing limitation by $2,000,000,000	[2] 300,000,000,000
July 1, 1962: 76 Stat. 124, amending sec. 21, for period—	
1. Beginning July 1, 1962, and ending Mar. 31, 1963	[2] 308,000,000,000
2. Beginning Apr. 1, 1963, and ending June 24, 1963	[2] 305,000,000,000
3. Beginning June 25, 1963, and ending June 30, 1963	[2] 300,000,000,000

[1] Limitation on issue. [2] Limitation on outstanding. [3] Limitation on issues less retirements.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Eleven of the increase in the debt limit were under President Eisenhower.

Sometimes I wonder how we Democrats were ever able to resist the temptation to heap upon Republicans the sort of chastisement we receive when a Democratic President asks for an increase in the debt limit. I wonder how we managed to resist the opportunity to spend several hours making speeches about excessive expenditures under Republicans each time when the debt limit was raised. President Eisenhower asked eight different times for an increase in the debt ceiling limit. During his administration the limit was increased from $275 billion to $298 billion. We had some prosperity during much of that time.

The Senator from Louisiana knows what the Secretary of the Treasury is up against when he tries to do something like that.

We kept the funds so tight that during the Eisenhower administration we would approve a small increase and then drop back to a previous level. The Secretary of the Treasury was compelled to do a number of things he did not wish to do, which cost our Nation a great deal of money. That was not the way in which the debt should be managed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, which appears on page 24 of the hearings, illustrating some of the things that the Secretary of the Treasury under the Eisenhower administration had to do because we did not give him enough leeway to handle the debt in ways that he felt it should not be handled.

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

Estimated additional cost of agency borrowing compared with Treasury borrowing

	Agency	Description of issues		Term	Amount	Approximate Treasury borrowing rate	Spread	Estimated additional cost
		Percent			*Millions*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Million*
Oct. 28, 1953	CCC	2½	Aug. 2, 1954	9 months	$357	1⅞	⅝	$1.7
Dec. 17, 1953	CCC	2¼	do	7½ months	449	1¾	½	1.4
Feb. 2, 1954	CCC	2⅛	do	6 months	351	1⅝	½	.8
Nov. 12, 1954	CCC	1⅝	Aug. 1, 1955	8½ months	1,169	1¼	⅜	3.1
Jan. 20, 1955	FNMA [1]	2½	Jan. 20, 1958	3 years	570	2	½	8.6
Oct. 29, 1957	FNMA [1]	4⅞	June 26, 1958	8 months	802	4⅛	¾	4.0
Jan. 20, 1958	FNMA [1]	3⅝	Aug. 23, 1960	2 years, 7 months.	797	3	⅝	12.9
Total								32.5

[1] Management and liquidation functions.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, debt analysis staff, Jan. 16, 1958.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Treasury spelled out very clearly why the bill should become law today. I ask Senators to look on page 25 of the hearings. They will see that he explains the situation. He has money coming in, which money is to be invested in trust funds. When we invest the trust funds, that should be in Government bonds, which are an obligation of the U.S. Government bearing interest. So automatically a debt increase is called for.

Tomorrow the Secretary of the Treasury should invest $1,200 million of money. That money is coming in and should be invested in trust funds. It then becomes a part of the national debt. The Secretary will not be able to do it.

If Senators will look at page 25 of the hearings, they will see that the situation is spelled out clearly. The table appears elsewhere in the hearings. The Secretary makes reference to the table to show that it is his obligation to invest the funds as they come in from withholding taxes, social security taxes, and other Government trust funds. Of course, he will not be able to do so because, unless we raise the debt limit, it will be against the law starting tomorrow for him to invest that money in trust funds.

As I have indicated, I do not know what the House will do. I am told it will have difficulty in developing a quorum if a single House Member wishes to resist the measure. As a practical question, we will have another opportunity to vote on the question of the debt limit some time later this year. Now the Secretary of the Treasury has an obligation to buy Government bonds with trust fund money, which will put us through the debt limit tomorrow. That is why the bill should be passed today. Of course, we do not have to do our duty, but we should.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished Senator has said that the Secretary of the Treasury has an obligation to purchase trust fund obligations tomorrow. By what process was that obligation placed upon the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Secretary has a fiduciary relationship as the person who manages the withholding receipts that come in. In that capacity he must invest such receipts on behalf of the people who would benefit from the trust fund.

Mr. GORE. That trust and responsibility was placed upon him by an act of Congress, was it not?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We created that trust by an act of Congress. If we should not raise the debt ceiling to the limit proposed, we would make it against the law for him to do what Congress requires him to do, which seems rather ridiculous to this Senator.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected, because the bill should become law today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

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

CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this morning I received a telegram from Mr. Steuart L. Pittman, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Defense. An identical telegram was sent to the Governor of the State of Oregon; to Mr. Ben Musa, speaker of the Oregon State Legislature; to my colleague from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]; and to Representatives in Congress WALTER NORBLAD, AL ULLMAN, EDITH GREEN, and ROBERT B. DUNCAN.

The telegram reads as follows:

I wish to inform you that I have today sent the following telegram to the Portland City Council:

I understand that the City Council of Portland has taken steps to eliminate those civil defense activities in the city intended to meet wartime disasters. It is the considered judgment of the President and Secretary of Defense that existing fallout shelter space supported by warning and local emergency organization would significantly improve the chances of survival of people in any part of the United States in the event of nuclear attack. Portland is one of several dozen cities fortunate enough to have shielding from fallout radiation adequate to accommodate its entire population. The Federal Government has shipped a large amount of shelter supplies, purchased with funds appropriated by Congress, to nearby Federal warehouses to stock this potential shelter resource and make possible an effective working shelter system in Portland. Your city, fulfilling its part in a joint Federal, State and local undertaking, has already obtained permission from the owners of 203 buildings to accommodate 337,420 people in shelter areas. Your decision to eliminate the activities which could bring this resource for saving lives into actuality is one of profound significance for the people of Portland.

The civil defense program is now an integral part of the total military defense effort. Progress in strengthening this country through military and civilian measures of defense depends on a coherent national effort. I would hope that any decision by

the city council to pursue an independent and inconsistent policy on defense matters would be finalized only after careful study. Therefore I urge that you consider forming a committee of civic leaders to examine the complexities of this problem. I would be glad to meet with such a group in Washington or Portland for the purpose of making available any information we can on the nature of the threat and the validity of defensive measures available to Portland. Our conclusion is simply that nuclear war, while not likely, is a possibility over the years ahead, which we cannot ignore. If it should occur, the chances of Portland being passed up by nuclear explosions but subjected to lethal radiation would be very real. And if this should happen, the failure to organize the effective use of existing shelter space in Portland would mean that a large part of the Portland population would be overexposed to radiation with tragic consequences which could have been avoided at negligible cost and considerable application to a difficult management task by those who run the city affairs.

Pending clarification of Portland's capacity and intention to use the results of the shelter survey and Federal shelter supplies, I have instructed my regional director to hold up all Federal civil defense resources earmarked for the city of Portland. Should you so request, this aid would be restored, but if supplies have been rerouted to other cities, the startup time would take many additional months. Should an emergency arise and the city be unprepared, I would urge that you at least have developed a method for the people of Portland to know which buildings would offer shielding against radiation. Even though such shelters would not be stocked, nor staffed by trained people to manage them and to monitor radiation, and even though the warning system may have deteriorated, chaotic and unplanned use of the protected areas would be better than nothing.

STEUART L. PITTMAN,
Assistant Secretary Defense (Civil Defense).

My reply to Mr. Pittman by letter a few hours ago was as follows:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In reply to your wire urging me to support continuation of the civil defense program in Portland, Oreg., and the State of Oregon, I wish to advise you that I find many of the arguments advanced by your Civil Defense Administration to be very unconvincing.

I have been advised this morning that the Oregon State Legislature has voted against appropriation of funds for continuation of the State civil defense program. The action which has been taken in my State by the Portland City Council and the Oregon State Legislature is indicative of increasing suspicion in our country that much of the civil defense program is unrealistic, wasteful and tends to create a false sense of security in case of nuclear war. It also indicates that increasing numbers of people feel that greater efforts should be made in ending nuclear testing, reaching disarmament agreements compatible with national security and doing a better job of protecting our greatest defense weapon; namely, our economy by eliminating huge wastes in the Pentagon Building. In my judgment, scarecrow arguments will not sell civil defense much longer to the American people.

I am sure that the municipal leaders of Portland and the leaders of the State government of Oregon at both the executive and legislative levels would be glad to confer with you, if you requested such a conference. However, I do not think the suggestion contained in your wire that Federal civil defense resources earmarked for Portland might be rerouted to other cities will prove to be very persuasive.

I see the action which has taken place in Oregon to be an indication of the increasing recognition on the part of more and more people that if we get into a nuclear war, we have had it and those who come out of holes in the ground called civil defense shelters will not have much to come out to.

Nevertheless, if the Civil Defense Administration can offer the people of my State and the people of the country as a whole a realistic civil defense program that makes sense, I am sure that fair consideration will be given to it. However, the fact is that much of the civil defense program to date hasn't made sense to many people, including myself.

Last year we had a State disaster in the most catastrophic storm in our history and there was widespread State criticism of the collapse of the civil defense program. If it can't meet the emergency of a storm, it offers little hope for meeting the emergency of a nuclear attack.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. President, the city of Portland and the State of Oregon have taken the first steps to remove first the city and then the State from the Federal civil defense program. At the moment, it is still possible that one or both of these actions may be reversed. But in light of the earlier rejection by the voters of Portland of a bond issue for civil defense purposes, it does not appear likely that the decisions of the Portland City Council and the State legislature will be changed.

Certainly the people of Oregon were sadly disillusioned last October 12 about the whole civil defense concept. The devastation visited upon Oregon last Columbus Day by the sudden typhoon which swept in off the Pacific Ocean paralyzed most of it. The disruption of transportation and of services that have come to be a part of our way of life, especially power, was just a taste of what civil defense would be confronted with in the event of a nuclear attack. Yet the civil defense setup on which the people of Oregon and the Nation as a whole have spent a good deal of money, was completely immobile. Not even its communications system, which is alleged to be a major function of civil defense, was brought into operation.

Much was said afterward about whether civil defense was supposed to have functioned during that storm, or whether the entire responsibility in cases of natural disaster lies with other agencies of Government. But that is not a realistic issue, because I do not think there is any evidence that civil defense would have done any better if it had had the sole responsibility. Civil defense was unable to cope with a sudden emergency. And that is the kind of situation it would have to deal with in the case of nuclear attack.

The experience Oregon had with civil defense inadequacy last fall has raised again the whole issue of how useful it is to spend large sums on the program. There is, in my opinion, little purpose in attempting to defend a civilian population against direct nuclear blast. The possibility of constructing blast shelters that would protect a large percentage of the population against both nuclear blast and fallout would probably cost more than the entire defense budget. and even then, the reality of such protection is questionable because of many unknown factors.

A somewhat better case can be made that a large percentage of a population outside the direct blast area can be protected from radiation. But it is only a guess as to how much of the Nation would be targeted. We know that Russia does not plan to use its nuclear weapons primarily against military targets, as does the United States. Their missiles are undoubtedly targeted on population centers, on the theory that since Russia lacks weapons in such large numbers and in such variety of delivery as we have, they have to get the most mileage from them possible, meaning to threaten the greatest number of people. France is constructing its nuclear program on the same theory. A handful of nuclear bombs will go further against large cities than against isolated missile sites. So in any nuclear war, we would have to expect cities like Portland, which have relatively little military value, to be targets, anyway.

But even if a population is threatened only by fallout, the question of how they will survive afterward remains. Civil defense has done little about that. Water supply, sewage, food, and other necessities will all depend upon local supplies for an indefinite period. Animals and vegetation, except for weeds, will be killed by the same radiation from which human beings can be sheltered. Transportation, power, and communications will be nonexistent for an unknown length of time.

The decision of Oregon indicates that a great many people are becoming aware of these problems and are not satisfied with what the present civil defense program is doing about them. I think there is an increasing awareness that avoidance of the disaster itself, in the case of nuclear war, is the only protection for the American people.

As the senior Senator from Oregon, I wish to say to the people of Oregon and the Nation that I have many reservations and great doubts about the effectiveness of the whole civil defense program as it is now planned. I am satisfied great waste is involved in this part of the civil defense program, as is involved in much of the operation of the Pentagon Building.

The Pentagon Building has done a tremendous propaganda job on the American people by putting forth a fear program in connection with the whole civil defense program. It seems to think that if the people can be kept frightened long enough, they can be persuaded to continue to approve the appropriation of great sums of money that, in fact, are wasteful in connection with the defense of the country.

I shall continue to vote for defense dollars that can be justified for the protection of the security of my country, but I am not going to vote for unjustified military expenditures because to do so would weaken the greatest defense weapon the American people have, namely, the economy of this country. If we continue to weaken the economy

of this country, irreparable damage will be done to its security.

So I respectfully say the time has come for this administration to reexamine its entire civil defense program. I am proud of the fact that my State, the Portland City Council, and the legislature of my State, have issued the first warning to this administration that it had better take another look at the civil defense program from the standpoint of its efficiency and cost.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I express my admiration for the real and needful public service to the people of Oregon and to all Americans that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon has today again rendered in this Chamber.

The senior Senator from Oregon has again manifested and demonstrated here that he is one of the truly great and perceptive public servants of our time. I take the floor not only to express my admiration of him, but to express again my congratulations to the officials of the city of Portland and of the State of Oregon, for the fact that they have concluded that the entire civil defense program has proved to be a huge boondoggle costing the American taxpayers, to this good hour, at least $1,300 million, and accomplishing no effective results whatever.

It is a fact, as has been recognized by leaders in the city of Portland and in the State of Oregon, that, in reality, H-bombs and modern missiles and the rapid advance of science have rendered the whole civil defense concept obsolete.

It seems to me that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Defense deserves the rebuke he has received. Furthermore, he went altogether out of line in trying to sell Federal funds, one might say, to the mayor and City Council of Portland, and in offering to go there and have those patriotic and fine officials, who know the situation in their city and State, reverse their decision.

By the way, Assistant Secretary Pittman was a lawyer. No doubt he was a good lawyer. Also, he had been an AID official in the past. So he has had some practice in throwing American largess around, in the form of the taxpayers' money, throughout the world. As the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon has stated, Federal civil defense officials are engaged in scare tactics. These tactics are deplorable and should cease immediately.

I call attention, in that connection, to a 53-page critical appraisal of the entire fallout shelter plan. The old plan of evacuation of a city such as Washington was abandoned. Now, in a moment of terror, it is proposed that people crawl into holes in the ground or the basements of public buildings, shivering and awaiting the conquering paratroopers. That is a futile and defeatist attitude, and it is extremely doubtful that it will save any lives in event of a nuclear attack. Nowhere in the huge subway system in London is there a shelter sign. There is nothing of that sort in France. There is nothing of that sort in the Soviet Union.

As the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon has said, instead of spending money on an organization which, in my State and others is operated in great part by political hacks, some of them in my own party, if we were to concentrate our efforts on negotiating patiently, despite frustrations and disappointments, for a nuclear test ban treaty with adequate safeguards establishing the Arms Control Agency on a permanent basis, something worthwhile would undoubtedly be accomplished. The lesson of history since the turn of the century shows that an uncontrolled arms race has eventually lead to a world war.

Instead of the politicians in the Defense Department and the big brass in the Pentagon trying to scare people with a shelter program, why do they not listen to prominent scientists who state that the Russians can explode nuclear weapons in the air over cities, instead of at the surface? This could cause the fallout shelters to turn into ovens and cook the people inside of them, just as 60,000 of the people of Hamburg were roasted to death in an hour, when a huge air raid causing firestorms took place in World War II. That raid was infinitesimal in its destructive power compared with the destructive power of one atomic bomb with a 1-megaton yield. Those in the Pentagon altogether disregard the fact that under such circumstances, if our citizens did not burn to death immediately they would probably suffocate because all the oxygen would be consumed in the so-called shelters. Following that there is the even deadlier threat of radioactivity. This is the conclusion of many prominent scientists.

Again I express my commendation and high admiration for a truly great public servant, the senior Senator from Oregon, who has reported a factually correct analysis of the civil defense problem. I am sure that his efforts will go a long way toward saving the taxpayers of our country many millions of dollars.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in closing I thank the Senator from Ohio for his kind remarks. The RECORD should show that for a long time he has been a very precious and biased friend of the senior Senator from Oregon. I do not know of anything more valuable.

However, I am indebted to him, and I believe the American people should be indebted to him because he was the first Senator to carry on a major effort to at least try to bring the civil defense program within the realm of feasibility. That is what is needed in the appropriations for civil defense as we consider them this year. We must make a thoroughgoing examination of every cent for which a request is made.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I have no desire to comment on the remarks of the Senator in connection with the civil defense effort. However, I was interested in his remarks in relation to the Pentagon and the wasteful practices that he claims have been in existence there.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee I know that I and the distinguished chairman and the other members of the committee have long been concerned with possible wasteful practices and with reductions that might be made without affecting the muscle of our defense posture, which of course none of us wants to do.

For example, this year, in the authorization bill we have cut approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars from the amount requested. We believe we did so without affecting the posture of our Defense Establishment. In a short time we shall consider the military construction bill. I notice that the House has cut a considerable amount of money from the amounts requested by the administration.

We intend to take a hard look at it and spend many hours this year, as we did last year and in previous years, in trying to find areas where reductions can be made in this program. Of course, in a program that involves so much money there are bound to be some areas where reductions can be made economically. I say to the Senator that, as a member of the committee, if the Senator has any suggestions to make as to what reductions might be made in areas where we could reduce the authorizations, without endangering our defense posture, I will be happy—and I know the distinguished chairman of the committee and other members join me in saying this—to hear from the Senator at the time we take up the military construction bill and our other military bills.

I know that the Senator will join me in saying that the men and women in our Defense Establishment are highly underpaid, compared, for example, with public servants in the civil service. We hope to hold hearings early in an effort to rectify the situation. I am sure the distinguished Senator would not want us to effect economies at the expense of reductions of pay of these people, when they are entitled to an increase in their pay based on the pay of employees in other branches of the Government.

Again I say that I would be very happy to have Senators submit suggested reductions in any area in which he might feel reductions should be made in order to reduce the tremendous cost that is placed on the backs of our taxpayers.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator. In the first place, his remarks contain a confession that there has been great waste in the recommendations of the Pentagon, as is shown by the economies he states have been made by his committee. I will be happy to join issue with the Armed Services Committee. In my opinion, the committee could cut out 20 percent of the authorization and strengthen the security of our country. I suggest that the committee take a look at our programs involving NATO and other American military activities in Western Europe, and bring to the floor substantial cuts in those programs. I suggest that the committee take a look at the whole military aid program around the world; and I suggest that the Armed Services Committee take the position that it is about time that some of the

other free nations of the world assume their share of the cost of defending freedom in connection with military aid around the world.

When we get to the domestic scene, I believe I can go into the defense budget item by item; and I shall be glad to appear before the committee and show specifically where the budget could be cut 20 percent, without jeopardizing the security of the country.

The time has come to look at the propaganda that is put out by the Pentagon and the raids that the Pentagon is making on the Treasury for appropriations which in my opinion are undeserved.

PUBLIC DEBT CEILING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6009) to provide, for the periods ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 1, to strike out "August 31, 1963" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1964." On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was on my feet. I was about to interpose a request for a quorum call. However, I withdraw my request and instead desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the exact, precise question now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "August 31, 1963" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1964."

Mr. DIRKSEN. So the Senate is about to vote on the amendment in the bill as it was adopted by the committee and reported to the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida will state it.

Mr. SMATHERS. If it is desired to vote for the position taken by the House, as advocated by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], will the vote be "nay"?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A negative vote will restore the language of the House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So, Mr. President, while neither of these statements is exactly in the nature of a parliamentary inquiry, a "yea" vote would sustain the committee and the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay," and the Senator from Hawaii would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea" and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 46, as follows:

[No. 99 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Allott	Goldwater	Robertson
Beall	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bennett	Hruska	Saltonstall
Boggs	Javits	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Simpson
Carlson	Keating	Smith
Case	Kuchel	Stennis
Cooper	Lausche	Talmadge
Cotton	McClellan	Thurmond
Curtis	Morton	Tower
Dirksen	Mundt	Williams, Del.
Dominick	Pearson	Young, N. Dak.
Edmondson	Proxmire	

NAYS—46

Anderson	Holland	Monroney
Bartlett	Humphrey	Morse
Bayh	Inouye	Moss
Bible	Jackson	Muskie
Brewster	Johnston	Nelson
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy	Pell
Cannon	Long, La.	Ribicoff
Church	Magnuson	Smathers
Dodd	Mansfield	Sparkman
Fulbright	McCarthy	Symington
Gore	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	McGovern	Yarborough
Hart	McIntyre	Young, Ohio
Hayden	McNamara	
Hill	Metcalf	

NOT VOTING—16

Aiken	Ervin	Miller
Clark	Fong	Neuberger
Douglas	Hartke	Prouty
Eastland	Kefauver	Randolph
Ellender	Long, Mo.	
Engle	Mechem	

So the committee amendment on page 2, line 1, was rejected.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

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

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement of my reasons for voting against the bill.

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

DEBT LIMIT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The bill (H.R. 6009) now before the Senate would raise the legal limit on Federal debt for the fourth time in 2 years. And the Secretary of the Treasury says the administration will ask for its fifth increase within 90 days.

I opposed this bill in committee. I shall vote against it here. I expect to oppose the next request for another increase—which is already announced as scheduled to be made before the end of August.

In fairness to the administration, as chairman of the Finance Committee, I asked the ranking majority member of the committee, Senator LONG of Louisiana, to manage the pending bill during its consideration in the Senate.

This bill would legalize Federal debt of $307 billion through July 31; and after that, the limit would be temporarily raised to $309 billion for the rest of the coming fiscal year, which ends June 30, 1964.

The permanent statutory limit on the debt is $285 billion. Under the present temporary limit—which expires June 30—the ceiling is now $305 billion, and it will drop to $300 billion on June 25.

On June 30, 1961, the Federal debt was $289 billion.

On June 30 last year it was $298.2 billion.

Today the debt is $303 billion.

On June 30 this year, the Secretary of the Treasury says it will be $305.3 billion.

On July 31 the Secretary of the Treasury estimates it will be $306.4 billion.

On August 31, the Secretary of the Treasury estimates it will be $310 billion; and beyond August 31, the Secretary of the Treasury has testified that the administration wants the Congress to legalize a Federal debt of $315 billion to $320 billion for the remainder of the fiscal year.

I am aware of the fact that obligations have been contracted, that the bills are coming due, and they must be paid. I am familiar with the contention that statutory leeway is needed to finance and manage this tremendous debt.

I know also that the administration proposes to increase expenditures and reduce taxes at the same time, despite its admission that the Federal Government would be on a deficit financing basis without tax reduction.

The argument about meeting the bills and the need for management leeway has been made for years. It has become chronic along with continuing increases in Federal expenditures, and with no effort or plan to hold down the public debt.

But the proposal to increase the debt to pay for tax reduction in combination with increased expenditures is something new. This is no 1-year temporary proposition. It opens the door for a policy of planned deficits throughout the foreseeable future.

Spokesmen for the administration, including the President, are unanimous in the view that expenditures should be increased; and they propose cutting taxes for 3 years to an ultimate total of some $10 billion a year.

The Secretary of the Treasury has testified that under proposals already made there would be no reason to expect a balanced budget before fiscal years 1966–67. And he says deficits this year and in the next 2 years will total up to $30 billion: $8 billion-plus in the present year ending next month; $11 billion to $12 billion in the year ending June 30, 1964; and $9 billion or more in the year ending June 30, 1965.

I predict the total deficit for the 3 years will be closer to $35 billion if taxes are reduced and expenditures are increased as proposed. The $6.4 billion deficit last year would run the deficit financing to $40 billion in this administration's 4-year tenure.

In his message of January 18, 1962, the President said the budget would be balanced with a $500 million surplus in the fiscal year now ending. The fact is: the year will close next month with a deficit in excess of $8 billion.

A year ago the Secretary of the Treasury said the Federal debt on June 30 this year would be $294 billion. Now he says it will be more than $305 billion. There will be $9 billion deterioration in the budget position, and $11 billion deterioration in the debt.

In testimony on this bill, the Secretary of the Treasury admitted that, except in World War II and its buildup, there is no series of deficits in the country's history comparable in magnitude to the $30 billion now planned for 3 years.

Total deficits for World War I did not come close; neither did the deficits for the Korean war. The total of all the deficits in the 10 fiscal years 1931–40—which included the depression period—did not reach $30 billion.

The net deficit in 15 years between the end of the World War II and the beginning of the present administration—including the Korean war deficits—totaled $27.6 billion; and that is considerably less than $30 billion for 3 years.

Deficits for national emergencies may be necessary. Temporary deficits resulting from unforeseen circumstances may be tolerated. But to plan deficits for an indefinite period, under conditions existing today, is outright irresponsibility in Federal fiscal affairs.

The contention that planned deficits are needed to eliminate unemployment, and they are safe because the so-called gross national product and the population have gone up along with the Federal debt, is not impressive.

If this theory were valid, we should have run out of people to employ before now. To bloat the gross national product with Federal deficits is not sound progress. Increased population does not reduce Federal debt, and the birth of a child certainly is not license to increase it.

Deficits totaling $40 billion in 4 years probably would raise the Federal debt by almost the same amount. On that basis the debt would be approaching $330 billion by June 30, 1965, and the interest would be approaching $11 billion a year.

The first two requests by this administration to raise the statutory limit on the debt were made for fiscal year 1962. It was contended that the need for them was created by situations which had been originated before its inauguration.

I accepted those requests, reluctantly. But the justification was plausible; and the new administration was promising a balanced budget. On July 25, 1961, the President even said he would ask for increased taxes if rising defense expenditures made it necessary.

I oppose the administration's third request to legalize up to $8 billion more debt during this fiscal year when I began to realize that its budget promises were not being fulfilled, and that it was moving toward planned deficits.

I shall vote against its fourth request today as an expression of my apprehension over the dangerous record the administration has made to date, and in vigorous protest against its admitted adoption of a planned deficit policy for the future.

The House of Representatives passed this bill—with the $309 billion limit expiring August 31—by the narrow margin of nine votes. The vote was 213 to 204. I can understand the anxiety which was clearly indicated by that vote.

Those who oppose the bill hold that there is no national emergency, and no one claims there is. None of the appropriation bills for the coming fiscal year, beginning July 1, has yet been finally enacted. All of them can be cut or vetoed.

If previous appropriations were too high, the Chief Executive—with responsibility to recommend, and power to veto—shares accountability with the Congress; and the executive branch alone must bear responsibility for administration.

The present statutory debt limit has been the law of the land for virtually a year. No effort has been made to comply with it. If bills coming due require borrowing in excess of the legal limit, they were contracted without due regard for the law.

The executive branch and all of its contractors must be presumed to have known the law and its limitation. There is ample administrative authority under other statutes and in the executive powers to control spending by Federal agencies.

Efficient, sympathetic administration could have complied at least with the spirit of the law without imposing hardship, or impairment of essential functions. This would have required: First, elimination of nonessential expenditures; and second, planning and timing the rate of expenditures in the interest of balancing the budget instead of deficit financing.

Under the law this is the primary purpose and function of the Bureau of the Budget as a staff agency for the President. The Bureau has not performed this function lately. And there is no indication that its performance will improve soon.

Instead, the Budget Director, the President's economic advisers, and all of his staff agencies—the Secretary of the Treasury and all of the Cabinet, have joined the President himself in advocating deficit spending in times they describe as good and improving.

If such attitudes as I have described continue and prevail, there is reason to doubt that the Federal budget will ever be brought into balance again. Under such conditions, interest in sound government justifies my vote against this bill.

Increasing the Federal debt with deficit financing in times of relative peace and prosperity cannot go on forever. It has got to be stopped at some point. And whenever it is stopped, fiscal discipline, and perhaps drastic action, will be required.

Now would be better than later. In my judgment the situation will continue to grow worse, as in the past, with more delay and procrastination. I submit, if there were a will to stay within a reasonable debt limit, the administration could find a reasonable way to do it.

A vote for this bill would condone a policy of planned deficits. I oppose it. It would condone nonessential Federal spending which I have consistently opposed. It would further impair confidence, at home and abroad, in the fiscal condition of this country.

For all of the reasons I have cited and others, I cannot support this bill; and because I believe it is right and sound to oppose the bill, I must vote against it.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the issue posed by this bill is among the most grave confronting this session of Congress. That issue involves the economic future of our Nation.

H.R. 6009 will authorize an increase in the ceiling on the public debt, which is now $305 billion, up to $307 billion for the period from now to June 30, and to $309 billion thereafter.

This particular bill, however, is merely a stopgap. Administration spokesmen concede that it will take care of their financial problem for only a few months.

It is a temporary expedient. The Secretary of the Treasury tells us candidly that before the end of August he must have authority for yet another increase in the debt.

That is only 3 months away. We have gotten to where we must push the debt ceiling up not just once a year, but every few months.

That August increase will have to be a big one, too. The Secretary cannot tell us how big, but it will be a good deal bigger than this one. He speaks of raising the debt ceiling to some figure between $315 and $320 billion.

I appreciate that changes in the debt are but a reflection of the shifting relationship between our revenues and our expenditures, and that no increases in debt are needed if income is raised up to match the height of the spending, or spending is held down to the level of income. I also recognize that we in Congress will be told that any excess of spending is our own responsibility. We will be told that the money could not have been spent if we had not first appropriated it—appropriated it in some sense, even though some of the obligations went first through a channel other than the Appropriations Committees as I believe they should.

In fact, Secretary Dillon, in his testimony to the Finance Committee, said:

> The debt limit is not, and cannot be made, a substitute for control of expenditures at the decisive stage of the expenditures process—in the decisions on appropriations.

That is part of the story, but it cannot truthfully be called the whole story. The truth is, the debt limit can be made into and used as a substitute for overall appropriations control, if we choose to use it in that manner.

Unfortunately, we appropriate by piecemeal, whereas the Treasury finances in the large. The Treasury receipts, expends, and borrows on an overall basis, whereas we pass on the action programs, which means the spending programs, one by one. Under our procedure of separate appropriation bills covering the various departments of the Government individually, the total spending program of the Government is never brought into focus all at once. This likely is a basic weakness of our appropriation procedure. Be that as it may, it is a fact that on one and only one occasion do we pass on the overall financial status of our Government—when we vote to change, that is to raise, the public debt ceiling.

I regard our financial situation as serious—and our present and proposed courses of action as threats to our economic future—because it seems to me that a new concept has crept into our thinking. We had deficits before—plenty of them—but we never before have had deliberately planned deficits. We have had financial dilemmas before from which, for a time, we could not find our way; but never before did we give up trying.

But now we are off on a new departure. When a deficit approaches, instead of fighting, we are supposed to relax and enjoy it. When the discipline of a balanced budget becomes irksome, instead of straightening our shoulders the better to carry our burdens, we seek out the easy way of evasion or unresisting retreat. That is the financial program we are asked to follow by this administration. And as we yield, step by step, to the temptations of this new departure, each year the deficit is larger than it was the year before, and each year's deficit is added on to all the deficits of all the previous years which, when totaled up, constitute the national debt.

Our deficit for fiscal 1962 was $6.4 billion. Our deficit for fiscal 1963 is now estimated at about $8 billion. For fiscal 1964 it is budgeted at $11.9 billion. Each year it is higher than the year before, and always the increase is due, not to a decline in revenues, but to an increase in expenditures. And each year these deficits go to build up still further the debt we are passing on to our children.

How many of us have paused to peer ahead along the path we are asked to follow? In June of 1929, our debt was $17 billion. By 1941, just before the war, it had increased to $55 billion; by 1946, it was $259 billion. Thereafter, it was reduced in some years, it increased in others; the Korean war boosted it some. At the end of June 1961 it amounted to $289 billion, still at least in the same order of magnitude as the figure we were left with at the end of World War II.

Now, however, we are asked to depart from our previous norms and enter on a course which may well carry us to a new level of debt burden entirely. The deficits we are facing are not a matter of $2 or $3 billion, up or down, each year. These new deficits are planned to be big. This fiscal year 1964 coming up—the year of the proposed tax cut—is also the year of the big spending and the big deficit—$99 billion and $12 billion, respectively.

But this is only the beginning. When can we expect to recover our balance, our equilibrium? No firm forecast is given us by the administration. Some administration spokesmen speak casually of "perhaps 1967." Dr. Arthur Burns, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, more realistically has pointed out that the national debt will probably go another $75 billion higher during the next 8 years and the budget will not be balanced again until 1972, if we embark on this new course by adopting the President's tax and expenditure programs. Seventy-five billion dollars of debt on top of $307 billion makes $382 billion. Another authority, Maurice Stans, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, forecasts additional deficits and additions to debt adding up to $100 or $150 billion if the President's expenditure and tax programs are adopted. That would carry the national debt up into the range of $400 to $450 billion.

The factual basis for the statements of Dr. Burns and Mr. Stans would make their conclusions quite inevitable as well as accurate. Consider that the present tax revenue base of $86 billion. With a tax reduction of approximately $10 billion, it would become $76 billion as against a new spending base of $108 billion, the amount requested for new obligational authority by President Kennedy in his fiscal 1964 budget.

Thus we see a $32 billion gap. It is true the receipts may increase as business improves, which we devoutly hope will occur soon. However, it is also true that the actual spending will increase even more than the $108 billion as time goes on. This is because of the built-in spending contained in the budget and being increased almost every week in the session.

Hence the gap cannot be closed sooner than another 10 years.

This points to a fiscal irresponsibility which is deeply disturbing to millions of Americans. Yet it is a philosophy and practice which is being followed by the New Frontier administration blithely and with abandon.

Often we are met with this question: What are the differences between the two major political parties of America? Certainly in the field of fiscal management we find the most vivid and emphatic difference. The Democratic Party considers heavy spending and great deficits as desirable. The Republican position has been one of much greater restraint, refusing to believe that it is a myth that continued large deficits are harmful or that they can on occasion be very desirable.

Mr. President, I shall not belabor the point. Some of these figures seem so fantastic as to be beyond comprehension. Yet they must be believed, because they are true. They are true and they are of fundamental importance. Unless we are willing to cast ourselves adrift entirely from all financial moorings of any kind, we must accept certain financial facts as basic guidelines. In his testimony this year before the Joint Economic Committee, Dr. Burns said further:

> I seriously doubt if we could have a protracted and substantial increase of the Federal debt without exposing our currency, and with it our economy and international prestige, to a very grave risk.

Dr. Burns concluded by saying:

> My belief is that the major problem facing the country at the present time is one of limiting the increase in the public debt.

Mr. President, I agree with that statement and I shall vote on that principle.

Mr. RUSSELL subsequently said: Mr. President, last year, on June 28, when the measure to increase the national debt was before the Senate, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] spoke, and I made a very brief statement as to my reasons for voting against the bill. Those reasons apply in every degree to the situation today. I ask unanimous consent that the brief statement to which I have referred may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

> Mr. RUSSELL. The principal reason why I shall vote against the proposed legislation is the fact that I attribute a great part of the necessity for increasing the national debt to the fact that we continue to increase our foreign-aid program from year to year. I have consistently voted against any increase in foreign aid; and, therefore, I feel no moral

obligation to support this measure, though I am sure that those who have danced to the foreign-aid tune will now be happy to pay the fiddler. The vast majority of Members of the Senate have voted not only for all the increases in foreign aid, but also for almost every other conceivable program involving huge expenditures which has been brought forward.

I have voted against increases in the foreign-aid program, and I have also voted against a number of other big-spend programs; and if a majority of the Members of the Senate had voted as I did, the budget would have been in balance every year since the Korean war. If the majority of Members of the Senate had voted in the way the distinguished Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD) has voted, our national debt would be a great deal less than it is at the present time.

Those who have voted for the spending programs which necessitate the increase in national borrowing will, I am sure, be glad to assume the responsibility that is properly theirs and will take care of the obligations they have incurred—at least to the extent of borrowing money to meet them.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER subsequently said: Mr. President, I voted against the increase in the debt limit on the last vote, not because I think we perhaps do not need the $309 billion limit, because of the force of circumstances, and because of the irresponsible fiscal spending policy that we have seen in effect for the last year or so, but I voted "nay" in protest against the various policies and extravagance of our administration against the total failure to reduce and curtail our expenditures as we should have and to begin some kind of financially sound fiscal policy. I do not question the fact that we must have the money. The only way that I know physically to protest is to vote "nay" and to serve notice that I shall do everything that I can to try to stop the invitation to more extravagance by the Government by constantly increasing the debt limit to meet all of the foolish spending that has been going on. I hope that it can be curtailed, and that at some time we can get back to a fiscally responsible program in government.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to add a comment for the able Senator. I am sure the Senator is aware that during the previous administration, in 8 years, we raised the debt ceiling 11 times. The Senator is aware of that, is he not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am aware of that. I am also aware of the fact that prior to the Eisenhower administration there had been absolutely nothing done on the missile program of this country, and the entire missile program and the billions of dollars that were required to put it into effect had to be provided under the Eisenhower administration. That was the basic cause, the result of the neglect of the previous administration in the whole missile program.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am certain the Senator would be fair and would take cognizance of the fact that if it were not for the defense program—which includes, of course, the missile program and space program—the appropriations which have been made in the past 2 years would actually be substantially less than they were in the preceding 2 years.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am not at all sure of that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware subsequently said: Mr. President, while I accept the decision of the Senate in connection with the recent bill, I regret that we did not extend to the Secretary of the Treasury borrowing authority for the $309 billion for the full year. We all know he is going to come here in August with another emergency request which he will want acted upon overnight. Under the terms of the bill passed by the Senate, on September 1 the debt will go back to $285 billion. To allow that to happen would mean that we would have repudiated about $20 to $25 billion of our outstanding national debts.

I recognize that he can come down in August again and go through the same stampeding process all over again to extend the ceiling. Certainly it would have been more of an act of fiscal responsibility to have faced the question squarely today and to set the ceiling for the full year. But, as stated, I abide by the decision of the Senate. However, foreseeing that another shotgun emergency will be brought here next August with the Treasury Department saying, "We have got to act on X debt immediately, or we will go bankrupt." Foreseeing that situation I desire to serve notice on the Secretary of the Treasury now that he make his request in plenty of time so that he will not again ask us, as he did this time, to hold hearings in a 2-hour committee session and vote the bill out the same day, steamrollering it through Congress.

Therefore, I am serving this notice on the Secretary of the Treasury, and at the same time I request both the majority leader and the minority leader that before any consent is given for the Finance Committee to meet during a Senate session I be consulted. I am not saying there will be blanket objections. I will try to be reasonable. But we are going to slow down this Boston steamroller, and I am serving notice to that effect now.

This notice goes for their tax bill as well. If they want these measures considered then, get them before our committee in time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator, of course, has a right to object to committees meeting, and, insofar as it will be possible to do so, his wishes will be observed. I desire to commend him for the considerate way in which he allowed the proposal to be handled today. Speaking personally, I would have been satisfied with either proposal, because I think they were both good. But circumstances being what they were, we were placed in a difficult position.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the position of the Senator from Montana. I do not want my remarks to be interpreted as a blanket objection, because I have and will continue to try to cooperate. But I do think the RECORD should be clear that I do not expect the Secretary to come down here, as he did this time, with merely 1 day's notice, have the committee report a bill, and have it passed in 1 day. If the Secretary does not know any more than that about what he will need in the management of the debt we had better get a new Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to add that I hope that the House will be a little more considerate in the future, too, and we would not receive such bills from our coequal body at the last moment, as we usually seem to do, so far as the Finance Committee is concerned, and we would have a little elbow room.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea" and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM]. If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 24, as follows:

[No. 100 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Anderson	Bayh	Bible
Bartlett	Beall	Boggs

Brewster	Inouye	Morton
Burdick	Jackson	Moss
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Muskie
Cannon	Johnston	Nelson
Carlson	Keating	Pastore
Case	Kennedy	Pearson
Church	Kuchel	Pell
Cooper	Long, La.	Ribicoff
Dirksen	Magnuson	Saltonstall
Dodd	Mansfield	Scott
Fulbright	McCarthy	Smathers
Gore	McGee	Smith
Gruening	McGovern	Sparkman
Hart	McIntyre	Symington
Hayden	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Hill	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Holland	Monroney	Yarborough
Humphrey	Morse	Young, Ohio

NAYS—24

Allott	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bennett	Hruska	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Simpson
Cotton	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Curtis	Lausche	Talmadge
Dominick	McClellan	Thurmond
Edmondson	Mundt	Tower
Goldwater	Proxmire	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—16

Aiken	Ervin	Miller
Clark	Fong	Neuberger
Douglas	Hartke	Prouty
Eastland	Kefauver	Randolph
Ellender	Long, Mo.	
Engle	Mechem	

So the bill (H.R. 6009) was passed.

The committee amendment to the title was rejected.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 162, H.R. 5279.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I will withhold my statement if I can obtain immediate recognition before other amendments are offered. I propose to move to recommit the bill.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the majority leader the program for the remainder of the week in the event that action on the Interior Department appropriation bill is completed this evening.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by my distinguished colleague, the minority leader, I had hoped that it would be possible to finish the pending business, which is the Interior Department appropriation bill, this evening. Then the Senate would go over to Friday, at which time a pro forma session would be held. From Friday the Senate would go over until the following Tuesday. However, I understand that there will be some amendments offered. I am not at all sure that consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill can be concluded tonight. If not, the Senate will meet tomorrow.

If it must meet tomorrow, I suggest that the hour of meeting be 10 o'clock so that, if possible, consideration of the bill can be finished in a reasonably good time, and thereby give as much leeway as possible to Senators over the Memorial Day weekend.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is a consent request pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I asked unanimous consent that the bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior be laid before the Senate, and the request was not granted. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 162, H.R. 5279. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5297) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

PRICE STABILITY ON SUGAR

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one of the purported reasons for the existence of the Sugar Act is price stability.

Over the years, until recently, the price of sugar in the United States has been relatively stable in the sense that it has slowly but constantly increased. As the House Agriculture Committee Special Study on Sugar, 1961, at page 6 says:

> The retail price of sugar since 1947–49 has been free of sharp movements. It has risen somewhat more than retail prices of food generally, mostly because prices to growers of sugar crops have been better maintained than prices of most other farm products.

We all know what has happened in recent months where the increase in New York spots rose from $6.62 on the first of the year to $12.70 on Monday, slightly below the peak price.

The goal of stability of the Sugar Act seems to work only on the upside. During a period of shortage and stress, apparently it fails to perform its function of price stability.

This failure is in spite of the fact that sugar production in this country is undoubtedly the most highly subsidized, protected, and controlled of all farm programs.

Now that the Sugar Act's goal of price stability is a failure, spokesmen for the beneficiaries of the act are contending that the so-called global quota provisions of the 1962 act are somehow responsible. It will be recalled that these provide that part of the former Cuban quota be purchased on a global market basis at world prices, rather than being allocated by the Congress to particular countries. Historically, during periods when the world price is less than the domestic price, this would have enabled the United States to acquire sugar on the world market and, by recapturing the so-called quota premium, provide funds for the Treasury which, at least to some extent, would offset the costs of the sugar program. It was never contended that the consumers would benefit directly but at least as taxpayers, they would have had the benefit of the capture of the quota premium for the Treasury.

This contention, that the global quota provisions of the 1962 act are responsible for the current domestic price situation, is demonstrably false. The Department of Agriculture has advised me that as of April 24:

> One hundred percent of the global quota, which is released on a competitive basis, had been assigned for importation * * * 100 percent of the deficits, which are also reallocated on a competitive basis to Western Hemisphere countries in accordance with the amendment you sponsored, has been committed for importation. In contrast only 38.9 percent of the total of country quotas had been assigned or charged for importation.

The State Department advised me on May 22, as follows:

> It has been alleged, in some quarters, that the 1962 amendments to the Sugar Act, which provided that the former Cuban quota be purchased on a global basis at world prices, have somehow made it more difficult for the United States to fill its needs for foreign sugar and have been a factor in the rapid price increase. However, the facts do not appear to support this view. On the contrary, both during the second half of 1962 and thus far in 1963 the global quota has been the most dependable source of prompt sugar supplies and has worked with great efficiency, whereas country quotas have been undependable as to time and, last year, some were never filled. An illustration of this is provided by a recent action taken by the Department of Agriculture when, in a press release dated April 24, 1963, it announced that the entire global quota of 1,504,341 tons had been committed for importation. In striking contrast, the press release called attention to the fact that, as of that date, only 38.9 percent of the foreign country quotas had been committed for importation. The Department noted that the failure of individual countries to offer their quota sugar more promptly was creating supply problems and that it was considering methods to encourage countries to ship their quota sugar more promptly.

The prime beneficiaries of the Sugar Act, the domestic producers and the quota countries, are those who have not filled their quotas.

The Departments of Agriculture and State both advise me that present high sugar prices result from a tight world

sugar supply situation. To quote the Department of Agriculture:

> During the past 18 months the world sugar situation has shifted from one of surplus supplies to one of tight supplies.

This results primarily from the failure of Cuban sugar production and bad weather which has reduced European beet sugar crops substantially. As a result, world stocks on August 31, 1962, were nearly 3 million short tons less than the preceding year and this year, due to a second successive poor harvest in Europe and further declines in European production it is anticipated that world carryover stocks will show another 3-million-ton decline. In the meantime, consumption has been increasing. It is also anticipated that the 1963–64 European sugar crop, to be harvested in the fall, will be another poor crop.

It is my hope that the Finance Committee and the other committees which are investigating the sugar situation might come up with some constructive measures of relief for sugar consumers. In the meantime, however, I believe most strongly that the prime beneficiaries of the Sugar Act, that is the domestic producers and the foreign countries holding quotas, have an obligation of restraint upon their prices and a further obligation to deliver their production as soon as possible.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENTS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I desire to offer a motion to recommit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Illinois that the Senator from Montana has made a motion to consider the bill. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to give to every Senator who is interested in economy an opportunity to save $49 million. The bill would provide $49 million more than the 1963 appropriations.

The President has indicated repeatedly and very specifically that he would hold the appropriations at the 1963 level. That is all the motion to recommit would accomplish.

I submit the motion to recommit in behalf of myself and the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. It requires no belaboring on my part.

The amount provided by the House was $928,625,200. The bill, as reported to the Senate, provides $43,415,600 less than the budget estimates, but $49,399,300 more than the fiscal year 1963 appropriations.

I know of nothing else I need to say, and on the motion to recommit I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I rise in support of the motion, which I cosponsor with the Senator from Illinois. The motion is in line with what the President told the Congress in the joint session on January 14th that he intended to do with respect to all domestic agencies. I quote the statement made by the President:

> I will shortly submit a fiscal 1964 administrative budget which, while allowing for needed rises in defense, space, and fixed interest charges, holds total expenditures for all other purposes below this year's level.
>
> This requires the reduction or postponement of many desirable programs—the absorption of a large part of last year's Federal pay raise through personnel and other economies—the termination of certain installations and projects—and the substitution in several programs of private for public credit.

The adoption of this motion will save $49,309,300 and will still leave the agency as much as it had last year.

The budget as submitted by the President for the Department of the Interior contains a request for 3,999 new employees more than last year's budget provided. I do not think those employees are needed.

Much has been said by many Senators regretting the necessity for increasing the debt limit. We shall be confronted with that same question in August, as to whether we can sustain a debt limit of $309 billion or whether it will be necessary to provide an additional $10 to $15 billion to cover additional expenditures.

This is the time to answer the question. I certainly hope the motion will be agreed to and that it will be only the forerunner of what will happen to all appropriation bills as they come before the Senate. We should insist on the amounts being held down to the appropriations provided last year for all these Departments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I express the hope that the Senate will not agree to the motion offered by the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I point out, as has the minority leader, that the bill now before the Senate for consideration, having to do with the Department of the Interior and related agencies, would provide $43 million less than the budget request made by the President.

I point out also that this measure was reported unanimously by the Appropriations Committee.

I hope that this meat ax approach will not become a precedent. I hope that the Senate will turn down vigorously the motion of the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], for himself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], moves that the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to amend the bill so that the total amount appropriated therein will not exceed the total amount of corresponding appropriations contained in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1963, and to report such bill, as so amended, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois, for himself and the Senator from Delaware. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Lousiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Lousiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Hawaii would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 56, as follows:

[No. 101 Leg.]

YEAS—22

Beall	Carlson	Cotton
Bennett	Cooper	Curtis

Dirksen	Jordan, Idaho	Simpson
Dodd	Lausche	Thurmond
Dominick	McIntyre	Tower
Goldwater	Pearson	Williams, Del.
Hickenlooper	Proxmire	
Hruska	Scott	

NAYS—56

Allott	Humphrey	Morse
Anderson	Inouye	Moss
Bartlett	Jackson	Mundt
Bayh	Javits	Muskie
Bible	Johnston	Nelson
Boggs	Jordan, N.C.	Pastore
Brewster	Keating	Pell
Burdick	Kennedy	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Kuchel	Saltonstall
Cannon	Long, La.	Smathers
Case	Magnuson	Smith
Church	Mansfield	Sparkman
Edmondson	McCarthy	Stennis
Fulbright	McClellan	Symington
Gruening	McGee	Talmadge
Hart	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Hayden	McNamara	Yarborough
Hill	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Holland	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—22

Aiken	Fong	Neuberger
Byrd, Va.	Gore	Prouty
Clark	Hartke	Randolph
Douglas	Kefauver	Robertson
Eastland	Long, Mo.	Russell
Ellender	Mechem	Young, Ohio
Engle	Miller	
Ervin	Morton	

So Mr. DIRKSEN's motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to H.R. 5279 be agreed to en bloc; that the bill, as so amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment; and that no points of order against legislation in an appropriation bill be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGOVERN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 10, to strike out "$43,292,500" and insert "$44,652,500".

On page 4, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "$750,000" and insert "$760,000".

On page 5, line 19, after the word "museums", to strike out "$88,350,000" and insert "$90,381,500", and after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided,* That not to exceed $477,645 may be available for assistance to the State of South Dakota or any political subdivision thereof for enforcement of State civil or criminal laws within the Indian country in said State where such laws are applicable."

On page 6, line 9, after the word "law", to strike out "$37,239,300" and insert "$38,147,900".

On page 6, line 20, after the word "contract", to strike out "$55,500,000" and insert "$60,448,000", and on page 7, line 10, after the word "Colorado", to insert a colon and the following additional provisos: "*Provided further,* That not to exceed $450,000 shall be for assistance to the Newtown, North Dakota, Public School District Numbered 1, for construction of an addition to the Newtown Public School: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $370,000 shall be for assistance to the Grants, New Mexico, Municipal School District Numbered 3, Valencia County, New Mexico, for construction of an addition to the public high school serving the Pueblos of Laguna and Acoma."

On page 7, line 23, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided,* That not to exceed $15,870 shall be available for reimbursing the city of Winslow, Arizona, for the cost of improvements to streets and appurtenant facilities adjoining property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs."

On page 8, line 19, after the word "which", to strike out "two hundred and fifty" and insert "two hundred and sixteen", and on page 9, line 1, after the word "over", to strike out "cetrain" and insert "certain".

On page 10, line 6, after the word "Secretary", to insert "except that tribal funds derived from appropriations in satisfaction of awards of the Indian Claims Commission and the Court of Claims shall not be further appropriated until a report of the purposes for which the funds are to be used has been submitted to the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and those purposes either have been approved by resolution of each of said committees or have not been disapproved by resolution of either of said committees within sixty calendar days from the date the report is submitted, not counting days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain", and in line 18, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out: "*Provided further,* That the Secretary shall not advance funds (other than for expenses of litigation) derived from appropriations in satisfaction of awards of the Indian Claims Commission and the Court of Claims, until a report of the purposes for which the funds are to be used has been submitted to the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and until such report has lain before the committees for sixty days (excluding the time during which either House is in recess for more than three days:"

On page 11, line 19, after the word "Basin", to strike out "$27,068,000" and insert "$27,375,000", and at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "$600,000" and insert "$650,000".

On page 12, line 3, after the word "Service", to strike out "$21,375,000" and insert "$21,758,500", and in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$180,000" and insert "$187,500".

On page 12, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5,300,000" and insert "$6,924,600", and in line 16, after the word "property", to strike out "$32,697,000" and insert "$36,395,200".

On page 13, line 1, after the numerals "203", to strike out "$28,000,000" and insert "$30,100,000", and at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$528,000".

On page 13, line 14, after the word "offices", to strike out "$2,120,000" and insert "$2,153,500", and in line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$103,000" and insert "$108,000".

On page 13, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "one hundred and fourteen" and insert "one hundred and twenty-four", and in line 21, after the word "vehicles", to insert "of which one hundred and fourteen shall be".

On page 18, line 16, after the word "activities", to strike out "$63,700,000" and insert "$64,808,500".

On page 19, line 22, after the word "substitutes", to strike out "$29,054,000" and insert "$29,926,500", and in line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$700,000" and insert "$746,000".

On page 21, line 17, after "(74 Stat. 337)", to strike out "$3,200,000" and insert "$6,575,000".

On page 22, line 12, after the word "gas", to strike out "$610,000" and insert "$621,000".

On page 23, line 4, after the word "law", to strike out "$17,175,000" and insert "$18,582,500".

On page 23, at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "$1,800,000" and insert "$4,458,000".

On page 24, line 4, after the word "offices", to strike out "$640,000" and insert "$653,000".

On page 24, line 25, after the word "Refuge", to strike out "$29,879,400" and insert "$31,685,400".

On page 25, line 6, after the word "therein", to insert "(including improvements of the county road from Brigham City, Utah, to the headquarters Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge)", and in line 8, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$3,678,000" and insert "$5,898,500".

On page 25, line 17, after the word "offices", to strike out "$1,325,000" and insert "$1,359,000".

On page 25, at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "ninety-eight" and insert "one hundred and eight", and at the beginning of line 22, to insert "of which ninety-eight shall be".

On page 27, at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$4,010,000".

On page 27, line 24, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$3,790,000" and insert "$3,983,400".

On page 30, line 18, after the word "lands", to strike out "$143,609,000" and insert "$150,147,000", and in line 23, after the word "than", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$1,162,000".

On page 31, line 6, after the word "law", to strike out "$23,948,000" and insert "$30,755,000".

On page 31, line 20, after the word "trails", to strike out "$60,000,000" and insert "$66,400,000".

On page 32, line 8, after "(76 Stat. 545–546)", to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$250,000".

One page 33, line 25, after the word "exceed", to strike out "one hundred and twenty-six" and insert "one hundred and forty-six", and on page 34, line 1, after the word "vehicles", to insert "of which one hundred and twenty-six shall be".

On page 35, line 14, after "(5 U.S.C. 55a)", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$70,000".

On page 36, line 14, after the word "act", to strike out "$58,750,000" and insert "$59,171,500".

One page 37, line 1, after "(42 U.S.C. 2004a)", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$5,676,000".

At the top of page 40, to insert:

"REMODELING OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION BUILDING

"For an additional amount for necessary expenses of preparing plans and specifications for remodeling the Civil Service Commission Building to make it suitable to house certain art galleries of the Smithsonian Institution, as authorized by the Act of March 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 68), including construction and not to exceed $25,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $5,465,000."

On page 40, after line 17, to insert:

"NATIONAL AIR MUSEUM

"For necessary expenses of preparing plans and specifications for the construction of a suitable building for a National Air Museum for the use of the Smithsonian Institution, as authorized by the Act of September 6, 1958 (20 U.S.C. 77b note), and not to exceed $60,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $511,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the committee, as indicated on page 1 of the report, considered budget estimates in the amount of $1,028,509,000, including indefinite appropriations of receipts and requested borrowing authorizations, for the agencies and bureaus of the Department of the Interior and for the related agencies listed on page 2 of the report. Excluded from this bill are the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The committee recommends definite appropriations of $985,093,400 for the programs and activities of these agencies, an increase of $56,468,200 over the amount allowed by the House of Representatives, and a decrease of $43,415,600 under the budget estimates.

The committee recommends the following major increases over the House allowances:

Bureau of Land Management, $1,370,000, which is $2,573,500 less than the budget estimates.

Bureau of Indian Affairs, $7,888,100, which is $281,600 less than the budget estimates.

National Park Service, $6,522,200, which is $7,573,800 less than the budget estimates.

Geological Survey, $1,108,500, which is $3,206,500 less than the budget estimates.

Bureau of Mines, $872,500, which is $7,344,500 less than the budget estimates.

Office of Coal Research, $3,375,000, which is $1,575,000 greater than the budget estimates.

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, $4,078,500, which is $1,782,500 less than the budget estimates.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, $4,060,500, which is $1,188,900 greater than the budget estimates.

Forest Service, $19,975,000, which is $6,678,000 greater than the budget estimates.

Smithsonian Institution, $5,976,000, which is $1,661,000 less than the budget estimates.

The committee feels that approval of these increases, as well as the decreases under the budget estimates, will be conducive to attaining the goals sought in accomplishing natural resources and research programs.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, once again the Senate is indebted to the dean of the Senate, our friend, CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona. I join with my colleagues in the Senate in congratulating him for guiding through the Senate once again a highly important budget bill. I wish to develop very briefly some legislative history. The committee has changed the amount to be appropriated to the Geological Survey in the field of marine geology and hydrology under the general title of surveys, investigations, and research.

In the House report there appears some language which I regard as regrettable. The House language in part in the report states that the committee has deleted an increase of $481,000 to initiate a new program on the west coast.

My question to the chairman is this: Is it not true that with respect to the money to be appropriated by Congress for the purpose of marine geology and hydrology, it will rest in the sound discretion of the agency involved as to where the money will be spent?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to offer for the RECORD a very interesting series of questions and answers entitled "High Importance of Proposed Study of the Marine Geology and Hydrology of San Francisco Bay, Calif., and Other West Coast Areas by the Geological Survey." I ask unanimous consent that that statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

HIGH IMPORTANCE OF PROPOSED STUDY OF THE MARINE GEOLOGY AND HYDROLOGY OF SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIF., AND OTHER WEST COAST AREAS BY THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

1. What is the impact of marine geology and hydrology upon the west coast?

Geology and hydrology have a greater effect on the growth of communities, development of industry and the welfare of people in the San Francisco Bay area than in any other rapidly expanding area of the United States. Earthquakes, including disastrous earthquakes like that of 1906 which destroyed the city of San Francisco, are common. Landslides and settling of land caused by earthquakes, frequent heavy rains and development result in appreciable damage and occasional castastrophes. Water flowing through the ground and down rivers to the bay, is used by the communities; the amounts and its composition determine its usability and are important factors related to health, recreation, and industry on and around the bay.

The U.S. Geological Survey has long cooperated with the State of California, other governmental agencies, many institutions and industry in investigations of land areas adjacent to the bay. Many of the investigations have led to the shores and floor of the bay where the need for additional geologic and hydrologic knowledge of the bay itself has become apparent and of vital and immediate importance.

2. Why are such studies important?

The water supply, stability of foundations, sources of some construction materials, beaches for recreation, and other factors related to continuing growth of San Francisco Bay communities, for example, are dependent on the distribution and properties of sediments and rocks beneath the floor of the bay, on the relations of fresh and salt water within the bay itself and in sediments beneath the bay, and on the effects within the bay of natural geologic and hydrologic processes and changes in the natural processes imposed by man.

3. What about the filling in of portions of the bay?

Development of industry requires new level land adjacent to the bay and a proposal is now being considered for dredging portions of the bay to obtain material which could be used to fill shallow, swampy areas along the shore. This brings to light several important, and as yet unanswered, questions. Would dredging the bay result in changing bay currents and sites of sedimentation that might in turn result in the destruction of the beach at the Golden Gate Park or increased erosion elsewhere along the shoreline? Would increased submarine slopes caused by dredging increase potential danger during earthquakes or submarine slides that might in turn result in greater loss of life and property to those who live along the shores? What effect would the addition of large quantities of material along the shores have upon the rocks and sediments below? Would the sediments support the added fill and the houses, industrial buildings, and possible nuclear reactor plants that rest on the fill? Or would it begin to settle, as similar fill at San Francisco has done, thereby causing drainage and many other problems? What would happen during earthquakes? What changes might be expected when rain water begins to replace salt water of the fill and sediments below?

4. How are oceanographic studies important to present onshore development?

Steep slopes bounding portions of the bay appear to be desirable sites for homes, apartments and hotels; some are being developed at the present time. But construction modifies the slopes which owe their natural existence to a balance between weathering and erosion by rain and other agents on land and continual marine erosion by waves and currents along the shore. What effect will the change created by man have on the stability of the slopes? Can man control the marine forces and the slopes to assure safety of those who live there, especially during periods of heavy rains and earthquakes when landslides that will carry man's effort into the bay are most apt to occur? These subjects all need study.

5. What about the demand for fresh water?

As the population increases and new industry develops, the demands for fresh water and other resources continue to grow. Can more water be obtained from the ground below, the chief source of water for many communities today? Or will additional pumping cause salt water to enter the underground reservoirs from the bay? The State of California is now working on the problems for a small portion of the bay, but will need vast quantities of additional information before solutions can be obtained.

6. Do west coast industries need this type of information?

Lime used by cement companies, one of the larger construction industries which operate within the bay area, is derived from ancient oyster beds contained within sediments on the floor of the bay. Some of the companies have prospected in detail the areas which they are now developing and have found that their reserves are limited. They are searching for new areas which must be found soon, but are unable to support regional exploration with their limited funds and staff. They need the help that submarine geologic maps provide on the composition of bedrock and superficial deposits, just as mining companies operating on land need similar information to guide their prospecting programs.

Many similar problems face the economy and future long-range development of the San Francisco Bay area. How will wastes and pollutants discharged to the bay from surrounding communities and rivers, including the two longest rivers in California, affect fish and other resources of the bay and the health and welfare of those who live beside the bay? What proportion of sediments and water which carry the waste will move into the Pacific Ocean and how will it be disposed of there? We know much concerning foundation conditions for bridges, ports, and other facilities within small segments of the bay, but what are the conditions elsewhere? Intelligent planning requires adequate information for all parts of the bay.

7. What can be done to provide answers for these many questions?

Systematic studies of the marine geology and hydrology of San Francisco Bay and other areas on the west coast will provide answers to questions of the type posed above. Such studies will of necessity cover a broad range of subjects, such as the effects of mixing of fresh water and salt water, movements of sediments by currents of the bay, analyses of sediments and cores from the floor of the bay, and geophysical investigations of the distribution of rocks beneath the floor. The U.S. Geological Survey with support of existing headquarters and laboratories located at Menlo Park and Sacramento, has unique competence and capacity to accomplish the numerous requirements of an overall study of geologic and hydrologic conditions and processes which exist and operate within the bay and other coastal areas.

The report of the Appropriations Committee in transmitting the Interior bill to the floor of the House of Representatives

would preclude the Survey from using appropriated funds in 1964 to initiate any such project on the Pacific coast. Such restrictive language should be removed in the interests of industrial and residential development along the west coast. The important marine geology and hydrology work of the Geological Survey should be permitted along all U.S. shores and not restricted to the east coast.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator very much, because as this report, which I have included in the RECORD, demonstrates, there is a crucially important and growing need for suitable studies of marine geology and hydrology, not only in the Bay of San Francisco area, but throughout the west coast. I appreciate the comment of the Senator from Arizona indicating that the decision as to where the money shall be expended for this particular program rests in the discretion of the Department.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, Nebraska hunters are becoming more and more concerned with good cause about the declining numbers of ducks. Last year the duck kill in Nebraska declined almost 50 percent from the year before. In 1961, the total duck kill in Nebraska was 180,000, and in 1962 it was only 93,000. There were fewer hunters in 1962 than in 1961, and each hunter on the average shot fewer ducks.

The most critical problem in the conservation of waterfowl is that of maintaining sufficient wet lands for the needs of the birds. The acreage of wetlands has been declining as a result of drainage and filling for agricultural and other purposes. We have made large steps toward the solution of this problem with respect to the wetlands required for wintering and for migration. For some years we have been acquiring lands in this country under the Migratory Bird Conservation Act; this program has now been stepped up under the provisions of Public Law 87–383, passed about 2 years ago.

During the summer nesting period, however, the ducks do best in the area of small marshes or potholes chiefly found in the prairies of the southern parts of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, and in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota. We can, of course, acquire titles or easements to such of these lands as are located in this country. But ducks do not recognize international boundaries. Most of the birds are produced on the Canadian side of the border, and our Federal land acquisition program, of course, does not apply to the lands in Canada.

This is a glaring weakness in the whole program. The migratory and wintering wetlands will be of little value unless there are adequate breeding grounds for the birds. Ducks Unlimited, a private voluntary organization, has done a magnificant job of providing funds for the construction and development of primary duck breeding areas in Canada. For each of the past 2 years—this year and last year—its board of trustees has provided $600,000 for that purpose. Altogether, Ducks Unlimited has now appropriated $8,750,000 toward this work. However, it is apparent that the need cannot be met fully through voluntary contributions alone. Wetlands are being destroyed every year through drainage and filling. Once that has happened, the possibility of producing ducks on any such lands has been lost forever.

Of course, as a matter of international relations it would not be possible for the U.S. Government to lease or acquire title to lands in Canada without the prior approval of the Canadian Government. Neither would it be feasible for us to appropriate Federal funds for that purpose until we have an agreement with Canada as to how such funds would be expended, the respective shares of the financing, and so forth. As a matter of fact, there is now a statutory prohibition against the expenditure of duck stamp funds for the acquisition of lands outside the United States, and for that reason it would be premature and out of order under the rules to amend this bill by adding an appropriation for the purchase of lands in Canada out of the money in this fund.

I think it is clear that we must first make an agreement with Canada, and that this is a matter of the highest urgency. During the course of the hearings before the House Committee, Secretary Udall stated that a cooperative program with Canada would be very desirable. I have also been in contact with Director Janzen of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. According to Director Janzen, some progress is being made in negotiations to that end between representatives of the United States and Canada.

I believe such an agreement can be reached, and I intend to press for it very hard. The ducks to be produced in these Canadian breeding areas are of vital interest to our hunters. For that reason, while the initiative must rest with Canada, we should not forego any opportunity to press for early action. It is likely that this country will have to shoulder a share of the joint burden, but, as I stated, action on the Canadian end is absolutely essential for the proposed improvement in conservation of an adequate supply of waterfowl.

Assuming that we are successful in reaching appropriate cooperative agreement with Canada at an early date, and that the law is changed to permit expenditure of our funds through such a cooperative program of acquisition of lands or easements, it is my intention to request appropriation of funds for that purpose. Can the Senator from Arizona give me some assurance of his sympathetic consideration of such an appropriation request?

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course the two nations, it is obvious, must cooperate if the ducks are not to be destroyed. An attempt should be made to reach an agreement with Canada so as to make it possible for the ducks to breed and grow, and so they can fly south at a certain time of the year, and then back, as is customary. That is the way to handle the problem. The two governments must agree. The Migratory Bird Treaty between the United States and Canada is of long standing. I believe it has been in existence since 1917.

Mr. HRUSKA. My question is whether under those circumstances a request for an appropriation would receive sympathetic consideration by the chairman and the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. It seems to me that there is nothing else to be done under the circumstances, if an agreement is reached between the two nations.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Speaking of ducks, I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from Nebraska, and Senators generally, the fact that we have by no means exhausted the possibility of expanding the breeding and rearing places for ducks in the United States. We have had so-called wetland legislation before us for a long time. It has not been progressing as rapidly as the conservationists of the country would like to see it progress or as the duck hunters would like to see it progress. That is due primarily to the fact that it has been impossible to arrive at an accurate and appropriate basis for reimbursing the counties whose wetlands are acquired.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the problem.

Mr. MUNDT. Recently, in the Department of the Interior there has been a sharp acceleration toward achieving the same goal by the taking of easements or the leasing of land instead of the purchasing of land. This procedure permits the land to continue to pay taxes and to support local institutions of government, and gives the Federal Government exactly the same authority to utilize and set aside these lands as it would have if it owned the lands.

I call attention to page 19 in the committee report, where we encourage this acceleration, and point out that it is the hope of the committee that the Department will enlarge its use of these programs to replace to the greatest extent possible the fee acquisition of wetlands.

This procedure costs the Government less and it serves the local community better, and at the same time provides more ducks, which the country very badly needs.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thoroughly agree with the statement of the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am encouraged by this, by my friend from South Dakota, coming, as I do, from the State of North Dakota, which is the No. 1 duck propagation State. Unless something is done along these lines to compensate counties and other political subdivisions for lost tax revenue, we in North Dakota would rather have the Government spend the money for wetlands in Canada than in North Dakota.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my colleague and I would like to call attention to a provision that was deleted in the House. It amounts to $1,111,800. For the first time after its creation, 37 years ago, this national monument, the Glacier Bay National Monument, would have been provided some facilities to

make it possible for people to enjoy the scenic wonders of this great national park, even though it is called a monument. It is the second largest in the park system with an area of 2,274,595 acres. It was eliminated in the other body because a visitor count showed that only 1,100 visitors visited it last year. It is amazing that even this figure was achieved, in view of the fact that there were no facilities in the area to accommodate visitors and no roads over which to approach it. It would be quite remarkable that 1,100 people went there. Actually, of course, the number was several times larger than that, and probably not less than 5,000.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, with the permission of the chairman, a letter from the Superintendent of the National Park Service, pointing out that it is quite impossible to obtain an accurate account of the number of visitors to Glacier Bay National Monument because under procedures adopted in the park system, count is made only of those visitors who come in actual contact with a park ranger. There being only two rangers on duty in this vast monument, the rangers could not possibly find all the visitors who come to the area. Its coastline is over 1,000 miles long. People come in small boats, or in small planes and never saw either of the two rangers in that vast area, and the rangers never saw them. And since there were no accommodations these visitors could not stay. Let me now read the letter which the able monument superintendent L. J. Mitchell wrote in answer to my specific request.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, SITKA AND GLACIER BAY NATIONAL MONUMENTS,
Juneau, Alaska, May 10, 1963.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am very sorry that I was unable to more fully answer your questions regarding visitor count methods in Glacier Bay National Monument during our recent discussion aboard the M/V *Malaspina.*

Since returning to the office I have had an opportunity to refresh my memory by review of the files and perhaps can give you a more complete picture in this regard.

There has always been difficulty in counting visitors to Glacier Bay National Monument. Its 3,600 square miles of area is covered by two rangers, who obviously can observe only a small percentage of visitors entering the monument. The fact that visitors can enter by boat or float airplane anywhere along about 1,000 miles of coastline is contrasted to most parks and monuments where access is restricted to highway entrances, usually where checking stations are located. There are, of course, no highways making Glacier Bay accessible by car. Under these circumstances the two rangers, judging by the number of boats and aircraft observed in the area, made estimates (always carefully conservative) of the number of visitors to the monument. This method was used until 1959 when a new count method was begun. The last year's count, using this method, was 5,130 visitors.

In 1959 the National Park Service instituted a count method more or less standardized throughout the Service areas. This was devised to provide comparability among parks for purposes of reflecting for each park the size, character, and pattern of workload imposed, and the impact on the park by visitors. Thus, estimates were no longer acceptable. The first year's count under this new system for Glacier Bay was 1,340 visitors.

Present criteria for counting visitors is essentially as follows:

1. Visitors, to be counted, must be ashore or using park facilities when observed by park staff (two rangers). Thus, regardless of the number of boats or aircraft observed on waters within the monument, no count can be made unless the persons aboard are observed ashore.

2. Visitors may be counted only if they directly exert a perceptible workload upon the park staff, or upon facilities.

While we are currently making an attempt to improve the method for this particular area, there are a number of faults that render the above criteria of limited use.

(a) The number of visitors counted is roughly proportionate to the number of staff we are able to keep in the field and upon the mobility of that staff. An ability to keep our rangers mobile increases visitor count. Restriction of travel within the area, which frequently occurs, decreases visitor count. We are satisfied that increase of staff from the present two, to three rangers would show an increase of about 50 percent in visitor count.

(b) Lack of a developed visitor use site within Glacier Bay National Monument provides no incentive for visitors who might be counted to come ashore. For example, during June, July, and August of the first year using the new count method, there were over 4,000 that entered the monument by steamship alone. Yet, during the same 3 months we reported a total of only 514 visitors entering the monument under the new criteria.

(c) The two rangers are kept busy with duties connected with resource management and protection, research, and administrative work, and since these duties require very long workweeks (contributed time for all over 40 hours per week), they have a tendency to overlook the importance of counting visitors, with the result that many are missed.

You asked me specifically about the effect on accessibility of the monument created by the lack of visitor facilities.

It is my personal opinion that visitor accommodations are the key factor in making this area accessible. The entrance to Glacier Bay at Bartlett Cove is 90 miles from Juneau, which is the nearest city where boats, fuel and supplies are available, and the main arm of Glacier Bay is 60 miles in length. Ordinarily a visitor wishing to see Glacier Bay has to charter a boat from Juneau and travel a minimum of 300 miles on a round trip, involving at least 3 days travel to see even a portion of the monument. With no boat fuel available at Glacier Bay, a charter boat must be of the size that can carry its own fuel for a trip of 350 to 400 miles. It becomes obvious at once that only yacht owners, and the better well-to-do visitors can enjoy seeing Glacier Bay.

It has long been apparent that to permit family vacations to Glacier Bay certain facilities would need to be provided. These would be a lodge, where beds, meals, and supplies would be available; a boat which would operate from the lodge at Bartlett Cove into the bay on day cruises; facilities for the sale of boat fuel; and a taxi or bus service between the Gustavus Airfield (10 miles distance), and the lodge.

These facilities would permit visitors to arrive via scheduled air service, stay at the lodge, engage in fishing and hiking locally, and take cruises into the bay. With this in mind we issued a prospectus inviting private business to provide the facilities, but not a single proposal was received because of the record of such small visitation.

Prospective visitors to Glacier Bay have for many years faced a classic chicken and the egg impasse, where facilities could not be built because of the relatively few visitors of record, and where visitation could not increase because of no facilities to accommodate them.

Finally we were successful in being able to budget construction of some rather modest facilities, including a small lodge, a 50 passenger tour boat, and boat fuel facilities, for fiscal year 1964. According to local news media, however, these facilities have been eliminated from the budget by the House Appropriations Committee, for the reason that travel records to this area show only some 1,100 visitors per year.

We have never been able to answer inquiries with encouragement to visit Glacier Bay. We must, in fairness, point out to prospective visitors in effect, that unless they have independent means they should not undertake travel of this area. That to travel beyond Juneau they would have to be independent of any facilities whatever.

Glacier Bay National Monument has been said by many to be the most scenically spectacular of any of the national parks and monuments. Even so, as long as no facilities are provided there only a select few citizens can avail themselves of enjoying it. It will continue to be unavailable to the large number of citizens who inquire, but are discouraged by the difficulty of access.

If facilities were provided, both ship and air transportation companies have expressed interest in making regular stopover service available. Utilization of this outstanding area of the National Park System would contribute much to American culture, and incidentally would contribute substantially to Alaskan economy.

I believe I have discussed the questions you gave me, and I hope adequately.

Representative RIVERS expressed interest on these same questions, and I am taking the liberty of sending a copy to him.

Sincerely yours,

L. J. MITCHELL,
Superintendent.

Mr. GRUENING. It is a great pity, Mr. President, that through a misunderstanding of the special conditions surrounding Glacier Bay National Monument, that this item was totally deleted by the House Appropriations Subcommittee.

For the record it is necessary to explain why this monument has a unique situation.

It is located some 70 miles northwest of Juneau. It is inaccessible except by water and by plane. It is unlike any national parks or monuments in the 48 lower States, to which people can drive in their own automobiles or by bus or by train.

This year came the fruition, however, of an imaginative and courageous effort by the people of Alaska to attempt to meet, in part, the overshadowing problem of roadlessness. This problem exists in Alaska because while Alaska was a territory, a stepchild in the national family—indeed, a colony—it was for 40 years denied inclusion in the Federal aid highway program. From 1916 until 1956 every effort of our able but voteless delegates in the House to include us in the Federal aid highway program was defeated. All this time we were paying all

Federal taxes, and taxation without representation was no less a tyranny in the 20th century than it was in the 18th.

In 1956, when President Eisenhower proposed a throughway system, Alaska suffered further discrimination by being excluded from that program but included in the additional taxation on trucks, tires, trailers, and gas. Only with the coming of statehood have we been finally included in the Federal aid highway program, although not yet in the throughway program. Consequently, Alaska entered the Union in the unique situation, unthinkable in the 48 lower States, by which not merely a few but a majority of its communities cannot be entered or left by either highway or railway.

Starting with statehood, however, the people of Alaska made a tremendous effort to meet this situation. The Governor proposed, the legislature enacted legislation, and the people approved a $23 million bond issue to provide ferries in those parts of Alaska where roads could not be built for physical reasons. This is notably true in southeastern Alaska, which is composed of a rocky, mountainous and precipitous shoreline cut by deep fiords and therefore not traversable by highway, together with an adjacent archipelago of islands. The money which was obtained from the bond issue went to construct three huge ferries, each capable of carrying over 100 cars each, which, beginning this summer, will ply daily up the Inside Passage from Prince Rupert. Toward the upper end of this Inside Passage is Glacier Bay National Monument.

Alaska has thus, by its own efforts and its own cash, supplied additional means of transportation to Glacier Bay previously nonexistent. But the accommodations which have been so long awaited—for the monument was established way back in 1926—have now been denied us for this year. We shall hope that next year a better understanding will enable us to secure approval of this appropriation—an administration-sponsored and budgeted item—which would provide the following needed facilities:

Construction:	
Roads and trails	$217,500
Lodge building	447,800
Residence (building for national park services and maintenance personnel)	94,000
Equipment storage building	54,000
Materials storage building	18,000
Boat fueling facilities	12,000
Cruiser boat for 50 passengers	176,500
Ground improvement	18,000
Communications system	11,000
Water system	200,000
Sewer system	74,500
Power system	6,000
Total proposed construction, fiscal year 1964	1,111,800

Glacier Bay has been described as a Venice among national parks. It is crowned by the glory of the Fairweather Range, whose central peak, Mount Fairweather, rises to its full 15,300 feet directly from the sea. Nowhere else under the American flag except in Alaska can the full height of such a mountain be seen.

Elvind T. Scoyen, who retired last year after a lifelong dedicated career in the Park Service, ending up as its Associate Director, used to make it a practice, when asked—as he would be by countless visitors—"Which do you consider the most beautiful of the national parks?" to reply that he could not, in fairness, render an opinion. His official position, he felt precluded showing favoritism. But, on his retirement, he stated categorically his view that Glacier Bay National Monument was the grandest of them all.

I share that view, and I think it will be shared by many who have had a chance to compare and contrast the superlative wonders and varied beauties of our many national parks and monuments.

Mission 66, that constructive program to make our national parks and monuments available and ready for the increasing number of Americans and others who want to go there, has unfortunately not come to Alaska. Beginning last year, I am happy to say, the Park Service did move into Katmai National Monument and built there a 21-mile jeep trail with an observatory at the end, from which the previously inaccessible volcanic phenomena of the Valley of 10,000 Smokes can be seen. We are grateful for this start. But so far, that is all. The accommodations in that Katmai Monument and other facilities have been furnished wholly by the concessionaire, and they are excellent. That has not, however, been deemed possible in Glacier Bay, and after careful study over the years, the Park Service rightly decided that in this one instance, if people were to enjoy its unique splendors, the facilities had to be built by the Federal Government and then leased out to a concessionaire.

While it appears impossible to secure restoration of the appropriation at this time in this bill, I hope this record will help make it possible to obtain this appropriation at the next opportunity.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator from Alaska for his statement.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues from Alaska and to subscribe to his views concerning the desirability and the need for the construction of tourist facilities at Glacier Bay National Monument. These should be built at the earliest possible time.

In like manner, I support the words of the Senator from California. We all owe a debt to the chairman of the committee who has fashioned another progressive bill for the development of our natural resources. I would include, of course, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the ranking member of the subcommittee on the other side of the aisle, who has worked on this bill in a manner, both able and fair.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is my sincere hope that in another year this item can be presented to the House committee in such a way that, perhaps, it will not require as much money, but at the same time will enable a substantial start to be made on the work. That is my suggestion to the Senator.

Mr. BARTLETT. Those words from the chairman are comforting. We of Alaska are grateful to the committee for the language that was inserted in the report, directing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct cadastral surveys of land to be transferred to the State of Alaska in the manner intended by the Statehood Act, and not in the manner unilaterally adopted by the Bureau of Land Management, to the detriment of the State of Alaska and in contravention to the will of the Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think I understand the Senator's problem, because we have had it in Arizona for years. It is only by diligence that finally it has become possible to have the work progress; but there still is land to be surveyed.

Mr. BARTLETT. I know that is true of every Western State. As the chairman is so well aware, the Alaska Statehood Act struck out on a novel, and, I thought, responsible approach to the conveyance of Federal lands to the State attaining statehood. The Federal Government would be required to survey the exterior boundaries of tracts of land chosen by the State, with the State being required to perform the interior surveys. Upon the completion of the exterior surveys, the land was to be transferred to the State.

Unfortunately, the Bureau of Land Management indicated it would not survey the lands chosen by the State unless they were in parcels much larger than that provided by the Statehood Act. It is my conviction that the Bureau has no authority to make such a decision. Because of the resulting dispute arising over the Bureau's action the land selection program has been held up and Alaska's economic development slowed.

If title to the 103 million acres of land intended to go to the State of Alaska in the 25-year period designated by the Statehood Act are to be transferred in that time, 4 million acres of land would have to be surveyed every year. However, to date, Alaska having held statehood for a little more than 4 years, the rate of survey has lagged far, far behind. That is why I am especially glad that the committee added $300,000 to the amount provided in the House bill for Alaska cadastral surveys. I sincerely hope that this additional amount will be maintained in conference. I thank the chairman.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 24, line 25, it is proposed to strike out "$31,685,400" and insert in lieu thereof "$31,635,400." Deletion of $50,000 to organize and plan for operation of the national fisheries center and the aquarium.

On page 25, line 8, strike out "$5,898,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,638,500." Deletion of $260,000 intended to be used for preliminary design of the national fisheries center and the aquarium.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Ohio

intends to ask for the yeas and nays on his amendment?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. Mr. President, on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished Senator from Ohio and the distinguished acting minority leader, I should like to propose a unanimous-consent request to the effect that on the amendment, there be a limitation of debate of 20 minutes, 10 minutes to a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent proposal of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to remove from the bill an appropriation of $310,000 which is contemplated to finance the preliminary work for the construction of the fishpond on the Potomac River in Washington. It is anticipated that into the fish aquarium will be placed fish life from the deep sea and, I suppose, elsewhere. Eventually, the cost would be $10 million. The argument is that research work would be done in the aquarium, and that the aquarium would attract to Washington about 3 million men, women, boys, and girls who would avail themselves of the privilege of visiting it. It is contended that it would be the most expensive fishpond in the world; there would be nothing else like it. It is supposed that it would be the center of attraction for all people who are interested in ichthyology.

I remind Senators that a strong argument was made for the construction of the stadium in the District of Columbia. The cost of the stadium was $20 million. In the legislation authorizing the issuance of bonds, Congress obligated the U.S. Government to guarantee the payment of the delinquent interest instalments on the principal. A year ago the Government paid $700,000. The District of Columbia bill at this session will include a requirement to pay another $700,000, which will be due this year on interest and principal.

According to one of the newspapers published in Washington, the District of Columbia stadium is a $20 million white elephant. In the very first year of its operation, it became delinquent in the payment of interest and principal. I think that is an example of what will happen with respect to the proposed aquarium. I read from an editorial entitled "$10 Million for Aquarium," published in the Cincinnati Enquirer of last October 17:

Debt-ridden Uncle Sam, who seems to have more trouble keeping a million in his pocket as he gets older, is about to spend $10 million on an aquarium quite fitting for even a solidly 14 carat goldfish.

Some case has been made out for the expenditure in the name of research to help the ailing fishing industry.

The location of the aquarium, of course, is to be in Washington, the cultural center of the Nation—so the sponsors reminded Congress.

Mr. President, I submit the following information as an accurate status of the bond account in the management of the District of Columbia stadium:

There were issued $28,800,000 in bonds payable in 1980. Of course, none of the bonds have been retired up to this time.

The interest obligation is $415,800 every 6 months:

First payment, due December 1, 1960, was paid out of stadium fund.

Second payment, due June 1, 1961, was paid out of stadium fund.

Third payment, due December 1, 1961, was paid out of stadium fund.

Fourth payment, due June 1, 1962, the money was borrowed from the Treasury at a rate of 3 percent; there were not sufficient funds in the stadium fund to pay this interest installment.

Fifth payment, due December 1, 1962, was paid out of stadium fund.

Sixth payment, due June 1, 1963; letter is now on way to Treasury asking for loan since there are not sufficient funds in the stadium fund to meet the 1963 interest obligation.

There is no money in the sinking fund.

I submit that Senators who will be running for election in 1964 go back and justify their votes on this measure, if they contemplate improving it. Let them explain to the citizens of their States how they brought this fish bowl within the category and principle of being an essential expenditure for the preservation of our country. I defy an explanation of that question now. How will Senators explain that this is an essential expenditure, one that cannot be delayed?

It is anticipated that the Federal deficit will be $8 billion this year; $10 billion next year if everything moves in the most optimistic and favorable manner; the following year, another $10 billion; and the third year, another $10 billion. It simply cannot be justified.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a statement which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] on September 21, 1962. It shows the cost of construction of the various aquariums in the country and their cost of operation. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PROXMIRE

The spending of $10 million on the proposed aquarium is a double feature extravaganza since (1) no significant need for this aquarium has been established, and (2) there is no excuse for building it at this fantastic cost.

The Senate Public Works Committee, in its report on the aquarium bill, stated: "At a cost of $10 million the center would exceed the cost of any private commercial aquarium now in existence."

To the best of my knowledge, this statement applies to public as well as private aquariums and the cost would exceed any other by several million dollars. Among the major public aquariums in the United States are:

1. Steinhart Aquarium, San Francisco, built in 1923 at a cost of $300,000, according to figures supplied to the Senate Public Works Committee by Steinhart's superintendent-curator. This sum was donated by Ignatz and Sigmund Steinhart. The aquarium is now being entirely reconstructed at a cost of only $750,000.

2. John G. Shedd Aquarium in Chicago, described by its assistant director as "the largest building in the world devoted exclusively to aquarium purposes," built in 1929 at a cost of $4 million, $3 million of which was donated by John G. Shedd, former president and chairman of the board of Marshall Field & Co.

3. The New York Aquarium at Coney Island, built in 1957 by the New York Zoological Society and the city of New York at an initial cost of $1,500,000. Its total cost is estimated to be $6 to $7 million when all construction is completed.

Among the major private aquariums are: 1. Marine Studios at Marineland, Fla., built in 1937 at a cost of $1,500,000; (2) Marineland of the Pacific, Los Angeles, built in 1954 at a cost of $3,500,000; (3) the Seaquarium, Miami, built in 1955 at a cost of $3,250,000.

In comparison with these figures the proposed Washington aquarium would be the costliest fish bath in the country. Apparently the Washington fish will enjoy every advantage of a Fifth Avenue salon except Swedish masseurs.

The estimated annual operating costs and income of this goldplated aquarium are equally out of proportion to other existing aquariums. Figures supplied by the Department of the Interior show the Washington aquarium would cost $800,000 to operate a year. By comparison, Steinhart costs $300,000; Shedd, $250,000 and New York, $200,000. No operating costs were available for the private aquariums.

The prediction for the annual income for the Washington aquarium has been padded beyond all reality. It is predicted to be $1 million, with a proposed admission fee of 50 cents for adults and 25 cents for children. Steinhart Aquarium is free and has no income; Shedd charges 25 cents on Thursdays, Saturdays and Sundays and makes about $75,000 a year; New York charges 90 cents for adults, 45 cents for children and grosses an estimated $120,000; Marine Studios charges adults $2.20, children $1.10 and makes about $1,500,000; Marineland of the Pacific charges adults $2.20, children 70 cents and has an income of about $1,200,000; the Seaquarium, adults $2.20, children, $1.10, and grosses about $1 million.

The Department of the Interior has ballooned its estimate of revenue by assuming a fantastic attendance of 3 million. Top attendance among the other aquariums is 2,300,000 at Steinhart which charges no admission. Of the other aquariums which charge admission top attendance is 1 million with a low of 200,000 at the New York Aquarium and 700,000 at the Shedd Aquarium in Chicago, with populations respectively eight and four times that of Washington.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I also ask Senators to consider the fact that for their States they are asking for the same type of aid that will bring them economic advancement. Senators seek the establishment of projects which will attract visitors there. My query is, Why should it all be done in Washington? Six million visitors already are coming to Washington, D.C. What justification is there in the argument that a $10 million aquarium is needed in the city of Washington, D.C., in order to attract more visitors to this city? There is in contemplation the expansion of what is called the environmental health center. In Cincinnati there is a branch of it—the Taft phase. It is now said that there will be spent approximately $40 million for the purchase of land on which to develop that phase in Washington, D.C.

In short, it is planned to attract more and more people to the city of Washington, D.C.; and it is proposed that $800 million be provided for a mass transportation system for the District of Columbia.

I cannot bring my reasoning to subscribe to the idea of attracting more and more people to the District of Columbia and spending more and more money to accommodate them and to concentrate the population here. It is not sound; and I feel that this part of the bill should be stricken out.

Mr. President, I speak frankly and pointedly when I say that if this item is approved, I believe an issue should be made of it in every State in the Nation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the budget estimate which justifies this appropriation reads as follows:

National Fisheries Center and Aquarium, $260,000: Public Law 87–758 authorizes the Administrator of General Services to plan, construct, and maintain a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia for the display of fresh water and marine fishes and other aquatic resources for educational, recreational, cultural, and scientific purposes.

The Aquarium is expected to provide assistance to the people and the fishing industry in understanding conservation and prudent management of an important natural resource; outstanding opportunities for scientific research and education; and recreation for thousands of tourists as well as the inhabitants of the metropolitan area of Washington, D.C.

The estimate is for planning for the construction of the Aquarium, including site investigations, test boring, preliminary designs, and compensation of experts and consultants.

That was the finding of the Bureau of the Budget. That finding was made after the aquarium was authorized for construction by an act of Congress. After having committeed ourselves to this expenditure and after having received a budget estimate for it, I must defend it and ask that the Senate vote for the appropriation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield 1 more minute to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have no argument with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]; I respect him most deeply. Congress did authorize this project; and inasmuch as the authorization was made, I assume that the funds must be provided. But I think there is still time to repent and to make amends for the mistake which was made a year ago.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Hawaii would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 102 Leg.]

YEAS—22

Bennett	Hruska	Simpson
Byrd, Va.	Javits	Smith
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Talmadge
Cotton	Keating	Thurmond
Curtis	Lausche	Tower
Dirksen	Morton	Williams, Del.
Goldwater	Proxmire	
Hickenlooper	Scott	

NAYS—58

Allott	Gruening	McGovern
Anderson	Hart	McIntyre
Bartlett	Hayden	McNamara
Bayh	Hill	Metcalf
Beall	Holland	Monroney
Bible	Humphrey	Morse
Boggs	Inouye	Moss
Brewster	Jackson	Mundt
Burdick	Johnston	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Nelson
Cannon	Kuchel	Pastore
Carlson	Long, La.	Pearson
Church	Magnuson	Pell
Cooper	Mansfield	Ribicoff
Dodd	McCarthy	Robertson
Dominick	McClellan	Saltonstall
Edmondson	McGee	Smathers
Sparkman	Williams, N.J.	Young, Ohio
Stennis	Yarborough	
Symington	Young, N. Dak.	

NOT VOTING—20

Aiken	Fong	Mechem
Clark	Fulbright	Miller
Douglas	Gore	Neuberger
Eastland	Hartke	Prouty
Ellender	Kefauver	Randolph
Engle	Kennedy	Russell
Ervin	Long, Mo.	

So Mr. LAUSCHE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "District of Columbia Leads in Fish Killed by Pollution," published in the Washington Evening Star of May 27, 1963. The article has a bearing upon the desirability of locating a fish research center on bodies of water that are not so polluted as are the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEADS IN FISH KILLED BY POLLUTION

The District of Columbia had the dubious honor of leading the Nation in number of fish killed by water pollution last year, according to a Public Health Service report released today.

This was due to an exceptionally large kill of 3.2 million fish in the Anacostia on or about September 20. The fish kill was caused by discharge of raw sewage into the river from construction work on the Anacostia Freeway.

The Anacostia kill represented the greatest portion of the 7 million fish killed by water pollution throughout the Nation as reported to the Health Service.

There was one larger kill than that in the Anacostia—37.8 million just outside the harbor entrance at San Diego, Calif. The killing was blamed on a large amount of oil known to be toxic to fish which was dumped into the waters. This was not included in the pollution-caused fish kill report because "its very size would tend to obscure any conclusions that otherwise might be obtained * * * for the rest of the United States," the report said.

The unusual number of fish killed in the Anacostia was "probably due to the chance and coincidental migration downstream of a school of alewives or branch herring," according to the Regional Sanitary Advisory Board.

Fish kills were reported in 38 States and the District, a decrease of 6 from the 45 States reporting kills in 1961. This does not necessarily mean a decrease in pollution but more probably that kills "went unobserved or unreported," the Public Health Service report said.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I voted against the proposal to delay the appropriation for the aquarium, although last year I opposed the authorization of the aquarium. I was opposed to the aquarium. I thought it was a great mistake to authorize it at that time. But the Senate overruled those who opposed it, and the Committee on Appropriations this year, passing upon the subject, fulfilled its responsibility and appropriated the funds necessary to accomplish the will of Congress and of the President. So once the question had been decided substantially, I felt that we must go ahead and build the aquarium, although

I think it is a mistake to locate it in Washington. I believe the article I have just placed in the RECORD is further evidence that it is a mistake. In my opinion the aquarium should have been located on some body of water which is not polluted, such as the Great Lakes, including the Great Lake that washes the State of Ohio, or on some other body of water in any State of our Nation.

However, I desired to make this explanation as to why, although I was an opponent of the aquarium so far as its original authorization was concerned, I voted to proceed to appropriate the money to carry out the judgment of Congress, which was not my judgment.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN FORMER SENATE EMPLOYEES TO TESTIFY IN A CRIMINAL PROCEEDING IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR NEW JERSEY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I report an original resolution authorizing certain former employees of the Senate to testify in a criminal proceeding in the U.S. District Court for New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 149), as follows:

Whereas the case of the *United States of America* v. *Anthony Provenzano*, Criminal Action No. 429–60, is pending in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey; and

Whereas Messrs. Robert F. Kennedy, Jerome S. Adlerman, James P. Kelly, and Joseph F. Maher, all of whom are former employees of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, have been advised by the U.S. Attorney for the District of New Jersey that they will be called as witnesses and directed to bring with them at the aforementioned trial all of their notes, memoranda, workpapers, and records compiled by them in connection with this criminal action; and

Whereas the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, has in its possession, by virtue of Senate Resolution 255, section 5, 86th Congress, the records of the former Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field; and

Whereas by the privileges of the Senate of the United States no document under the control and in the possession of the Senate of the United States can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession, but by its permission; and

Whereas by the privilege of the Senate and by rule XXX of the Standing Rules of the Senate no document shall be withdrawn from its files except by the order of the Senate; and

Whereas information secured by staff employees of the Senate pursuant to their official duties as employees of the Senate may not be revealed without the consent of the Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Messrs. Robert F. Kennedy, Jerome S. Adlerman, James P. Kelly, and Joseph F. Maher, former employees of the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, are authorized to appear and testify before the aforementioned court in the aforementioned criminal action, or at any continued and subsequent proceedings thereof, and to take with them and produce such documents and papers called for by proper subpenas before said court where determined by the judge thereof to be material and relevant to the issues before him.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the resolution is requested by the U.S. Attorney for the District of New Jersey in the case of the United States against Anthony Provenzano. The resolution would authorize the Honorable Robert S. Kennedy, Jerome S. Adlerman, James P. Kelly, and Joseph F. Maher, present and former staff members of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, to appear in court and testify on behalf of the Government in that case. I ask that the resolution be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection the resolution was considered and agreed to.

TELSTAR LEGISLATION NOW NEEDS CAREFUL REEVALUATION—THE CONGRESS SHOULD HAVE LOOKED BEFORE IT LEAPED AS 16 SENATORS TRIED VAINLY TO POINT OUT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last year 16 Senators joined in a vain effort to point out to the American people the myriad dangers involved in the precedent-making establishment of the private corporation for private profit to be known as the Communications Satellite Corp. Those Senators joining in this fight were Senators Bartlett, Burdick, Carroll, Church, Clark, Douglas, Gore, Gruening, Kefauver, Long of Louisiana, McNamara, Morse, Moss, Neuberger, Proxmire, and Yarborough.

This year we again joined in opposing the perversion of the advice and consent provision of the Constitution in using it to advise and consent to the nomination of the corporation's incorporators and members of the Board of Directors. We cited this as but one more instance of the many inconsistencies with which we will be plagued until we undo our hasty action in establishing this private profit-making corporation.

Drew Pearson, the eminent national columnist, performed an outstanding public service in revealing in his column this morning a letter written to the corporation by Gen. David Sarnoff of the Radio Corp. of America discussing the future of the corporation and suggesting various defects in the existing legislation.

Those of us who sought some amendments to the bill establishing this corporation last year said that by placing the development of the satellite system of communications in the hands of a private corporation motivated, as the language of the bill spelled out clearly by profitmaking, we would be delaying the ultimate utilization of such a system. Great expectations were voiced of being able to utilize such a system in reaching the hearts and minds of the peoples of the underdeveloped countries. If such action must now await the obsolescence of existing and developing cables, then we will indeed have to wait a long time before the peoples of the underdeveloped countries can be communicated with in this way.

This, of course, is not new. This was pointed out during the hearings held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at the time the original satellite corporation bill was before the Senate.

I reiterate: whether or not Voice of America reaches the peoples of the underdeveloped countries should not depend on whether it is profitable to do so. Our purpose in an enterprise so fraught with such great potentialities for peace, for international understanding, for the dissemination of knowledge and much, much else, should be above the profit motive.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Drew Pearson's column entitled "Sarnoff Writes on Satellite Corporation" be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. However, rather than insert only Mr. Pearson's partial quotation, I thought it well to secure the letter itself which reveals the things we fought against in the last session of Congress are now coming to pass. Had we not been gagged by cloture before these vital shortcomings could be fully exposed, the present and prospective difficulties might have been obviated. General Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corp. of America, who is certainly as knowledgeable in this field as any human being on this earth says the whole enterprise "now needs careful reevaluation." Further on he points out his belief "that the satellite corporation is now confronted more seriously with the question as to when its operations can reasonably become profitable." He says this calls for "fundamental studies." Obviously, we tried to point this out and would have been successful in pointing this out had we not been steamrollered by cloture and motions to lay on the table.

General Sarnoff says he is in favor of private enterprise and thinks this corporation should continue as a private enterprise but he adds he favors private enterprise when it "can furnish the capital and facilities to render the necessary services." Query: Will the Communications Satellite Corp. furnish the capital? Obviously not. It will come to ask Uncle Sam to pick up the tab.

Now that the Congress rushed this legislation through in great haste it will be necessary now to repent—or to repair—at leisure. Perhaps it would be best to recall the whole enterprise and start all over again.

I ask unanimous consent that General Sarnoff's letter also be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, May 28, 1963]

SARNOFF WRITES ON SATELLITE CORPORATION

(By Drew Pearson)

Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the Radio Corp. of America and one of the most experienced communications experts in the United States, has thrown a blockbuster into the Communications Satellite Corp. He has written a letter to Leo Welch, chairman of the corporation, raising grave doubts as to whether the satellite is worth developing under the present setup.

Coming from a man who has spent 57 years in communications and who made radio and television a way of life in the United States, the Sarnoff letter has had more effect than a Senate filibuster. If it had been written at the time Senators KEFAUVER, GORE, GRUENING, BURDICK, et al., were fighting against the satellite corporation bill, the bill would not have passed.

The Sarnoff letter so far is confidential. However, this column can reveal that he makes the following points:

Transistorized cables being developed by A.T. & T. will carry double the existing transocean traffic and will handle all TV signals and other traffic for some time to come.

The present telephone and cable companies will not use the satellite because they already have money invested in their own cable facilities. They will not spend extra money to use the satellite.

The most practical solution to the satellite dilemma is to organize one large private company, under Government regulation, to operate all the present cables, all radio circuits, and all future satellite communications.

DOUBTS ABOUT FUTURE

The Sarnoff letter comes at a time when other directors of the satellite corporation, a private company set up by the Kennedy administration, have had growing doubts about their overglamorized establishment.

It also comes at a time when thousands of letters have been received from private investors wanting to know when they can invest in the new company. If the Sarnoff letter and the private view of several directors are any criterion, it will be a long time before the corporation will merit a public stock issue.

The Sarnoff letter was written in reply to an inquiry by Welch, asking for Sarnoff's views. In his unpublished letter, Sarnoff quoted statements by Fred Kappel, head of A.T. & T., and James E. Dingman, vice president of A.T. & T., that new transistorized cables would provide 720 telephone circuits alone, and that "one transistorized cable laid across the North Atlantic could connect areas possessing 90 percent of the world's present telephones."

"One new transistorized cable will have a capacity almost double that of all existing transoceanic cables," Sarnoff wrote, "and Mr. Dingman has expressed the hope that it will permit a lower cost per channel than the present facilities."

Quoting the Rand report that present and planned conventional cable and radio will be adequate to handle international traffic between now and 1965, Sarnoff continued:

"I believe the satellite corporation is now confronted more seriously by the question of when its operations can reasonably be expected to become profitable.

"On the basis of the present state of development in satellite communications 5 to 10 years may pass before any commercial satellite communications system will be able to offer reliable and continuous service on a global scale."

BRITISH COMPETITION

Sarnoff then pointed out that "in nearly all other countries, government monopolies own and operate their communications systems. * * * Presumably the principal foreign countries will utilize their cable facilities to maximum capacity before diverting any substantial amount of traffic to the American satellite corporation and paying for the use of its facilities."

Summarizing his solution to the difficult problem, Sarnoff said in his unpublished letter:

"We should now consider an amendment to the present law which would enable the satellite corporation to acquire, through purchase, the international telephone and telegraph facilities and operations, both present and planned, of all American carriers.

"The enlarged satellite corporation should continue as private enterprise. The new organization should operate as a public utility under appropriate Government regulation."

Sarnoff pointed out that this big communications combine would have the advantage of starting on "an immediate and solid revenue base" since the existing U.S. communications companies did a $160 million international business in 1962 and would be doing $350 million by 1970. Furthermore, this combine could deal with equal strength with foreign governments.

"The British General Post Office and its Commonwealth partners already operate one of the world's most extensive international communications systems. * * * In the absence of a unified U.S. enterprise, the British might well regain the dominant position they occupied in international comnunications prior to the First World War."

EXHIBIT 2

RADIO CORP. OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., April 2, 1963.

Mr. LEO D. WELCH,
Chairman, Communications Satellite Corp., Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WELCH: This letter is in response to your request for my views on recent domestic and foreign developments in the field of international communications and their likely effects on the future operations and earnings of the Communications Satellite Corp.

By way of background, I have from the beginning advocated the early establishment of a practical global communications satellite system operating as a private enterprise. For this reason, I welcomed the initiative of the administration and the Congress in establishing the legal foundation for the Communications Satellite Corp.—and I supported the legislation.

I share with your fellow directors a profound desire to see our country lead in the establishment of a practical, reliable, and successful global system of satellite communications under private operation.

RCA Communications, Inc.—a wholly owned subsidiary of the Radio Corp. of America—has applied to the FCC for permission to purchase stock in the Communications Satellite Corp.

RCA Communications, Inc., has provided international communications services for more than 40 years. And the contributions of the RCA organization to space technology include the uniquely successful series of Tiros television weather satellites and the Relay communications satellite built for NASA.

My own experience in communications extends over a period of 57 years.

The satellite corporation is now in the initial planning stage and I appreciate the complex nature of the problems you face. The existence of these problems, of course, should not halt or delay your planning effort.

However, I feel it is important to call attention to recent technical developments which can affect both your own plans and our Nation's policies in the field of international communications. I refer to the new technology of transistorized cables and their possible impact upon satellite communications.

Recently, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. reported its development of a transistorized submarine cable of vastly increased capacity. This achievement was cited by Mr. Frederick R. Kappel, Chairman of A.T. & T., in a talk on March 18, 1963, before the New York Chamber of Commerce. He said:

"The cables of today are much more effective and capable than those of a few years ago, and the cables of tomorrow will have far greater capabilities than the ones we have now. In fact, we are sure that in a few years their capabilities will fully equal those of satellites. We have a transistorized cable under development at the Bell Laboratories, for example, that will be able to transmit television and the scientists in other countries—I could name two countries—are not sitting on their hands either. They have a similar cable under construction."

In my view, the transistorized cable does not alter the fundamental premise that early development of an operational communications satellite system is vital to our national prestige and to continued U.S. leadership in both communications and space technology.

Nevertheless, a second premise—that the facilities of a global satellite system will be needed to meet the expected growth of commercial demand for oversea communications services beyond 1965—now needs careful reevaluation in terms of the possible effects upon the Satellite Corporation of this latest technological breakthrough.

According to testimony by Mr. James E. Dingman, executive vice president of A.T. & T., before the Senate Subcommittee on Communications on February 18, 1963, the new transistorized cable may be available for commercial use as early as 1966.

This new cable—which reflects great credit upon the scientists and engineers of A.T. & T.—is expected to provide some 720 telephone circuits alone.

One transistorized cable, laid across the North Atlantic, could connect areas possessing nearly 90 percent of all the world's present telephones.

It could furnish, for the first time, sufficient cable bandwidth to transmit transoceanic television signals on a regular basis.

It could provide facilities for every other form of traffic that a satellite can handle—telephone, telegraph, telex, sound broadcasting, facsimile, data processing and any combination of these services.

One new transistorized cable will have a capacity almost double that of all existing transoceanic cables, and Mr. Dingman has expressed the hope that it will permit a lower cost per channel than present facilities.

Because development of the transistorized cable was reported only recently, its potential impact on commercial satellite communications does not appear to have been evaluated.

The latest report on expected growth in international communications was made public in February 1963 by the Rand Corp.—an independent, nonprofit research organization.

The Rand report makes these pertinent points:

It indicates that present and planned conventional cable and radio facilities will be adequate to handle the volume of international traffic expected between now and 1965.

It states that "From 1965 to 1975 we look forward to a normal growth rate of 11.5 percent per year."

It estimates that, between 1965 and 1970, revenues for all U.S. international carriers will increase by $140 million annually.

It assumes that the Satellite Corp. will derive its revenues from the estimated growth in traffic beyond 1965. (This is the same period in which Mr. Dingman hopes the transistorized cable may become available for commercial use.)

It assumes that there will be "no substantial additions to the cable network after 1965. Any such additions would subtract revenues from a satellite system."

Earlier reports by others in this field vary substantially in their growth estimates. None, however, appears to have included transistorized cables in its estimates. This includes the Rand report.

In my judgment, it is likely that all forms of traffic, including television, will be passing through transistorized cables on a regular commercial basis before the Satellite Corp. is ready to provide such services on a global scale.

In view of this possibility, I believe the Satellite Corp. is now confronted more seriously by the question of when its operations can reasonably be expected to become profitable.

This important question presently calls for fundamental studies. Such studies should include estimates of expected traffic, revenues, and facilities; comparative capital investments, maintenance and operating costs of cables versus satellites—and any other relevant factors.

As in any new undertaking, studies of this type would normally lead to the development of a tentative balance sheet and profit and loss statement, based on the best estimates obtainable. A preliminary financial statement in this form, covering the decade immediately ahead, would indicate the amount of money that will have to be raised to establish, maintain and operate the Satellite Corp.

On the basis of the present state of developments in satellite communications, 5 to 10 years may pass before any commercial satellite communications system will be able to offer reliable and continuous service on a global scale. While the Telstar and Relay satellites have provided much valuable knowledge, they are, as yet, only initial experiments. We are far short of the technical reliability that will be essential for a continuously operating commercial satellite system.

There are others who estimate that only 3 to 4 more years are needed to achieve an operating global satellite system. Even if they prove to be right, the commercial questions raised by the introduction of the transistorized cable and the expansion of existing cable facilities will not resolve themselves.

One reason is the structure of international communications service, as it has evolved over the years. Any complete international service—whether cable, radio, or satellite—requires ground stations and domestic distribution networks on both sides of the ocean.

In nearly all other countries, government monopolies own and operate their communications systems and provide those facilities. At least two foreign countries, as Mr. Kappel indicated, already are moving toward transistorized cables. And other countries may follow. Presumably, the principal foreign countries—the largest centers for exchange of international traffic—will utilize their cable facilities to maximum capacity before diverting any substantial amount of traffic to the American Satellite Corp., and paying for the use of its facilities. The foreign governments have, or will have, a large financial stake in the cables reaching the main traffic centers of the world.

It is because the Communications Satellite Corp. faces circumstances without historical precedent that I believe it desirable to search for a firmer financial foundation on which to base this new enterprise.

Last summer in an address before a section of the American Bar Association in San Francisco, I advocated a comprehensive and impartial review of the Nation's overall policy in regard to international communications. Within that framework, I suggested unification of the international facilities and operations of the present U.S. carriers.

Today, in the face of all the implications of the transistorized cable, I feel that we must go beyond the proposal I made in my San Francisco address.

We should now consider an amendment to the present law which would enable the satellite corporation, to acquire through purchase the international telephone and telegraph facilities and operations, both present and planned, of all American carriers.

Unification of all the Nation's international communication facilities and operations—satellites, cables, and radios—would in my opinion assure the satellite corporation's commercial success, best serve our overall national interests, provide the most flexible and economical service to the public, and maintain America's leadership in world communications.

This enlarged satellite corporation should, I believe, continue as a private enterprise. I share the opposition of the vast majority of Americans to Government ownership and operation where private enterprise can furnish the capital and facilities and render the necessary public services. In the vital and sensitive field of communications, I feel it is especially important that the American principle of private ownership be maintained.

The new organization should operate as a public utility under appropriate government regulation. It should be safeguarded by law against any control or domination by any commercial carrier, or other organization, or any combination of them, or by any foreign interest—through stock ownership, directorships, or by any other means.

I believe that the new, unified enterprise could offer these benefits:

1. It could take maximum advantage of modern technology to achieve the most economical and efficient use of radio frequencies, cable facilities and satellites. The historic distinction among the various voice and record services already has been largely obliterated by technological developments. It would offer the user maximum flexibility in the choice of method of communications. The net result would be maximum efficiency at the lowest cost to the public.

2. It would start with an immediate and solid revenue base provided by the traffic of existing U.S. international communications carriers. In 1962, their total revenues were approximately $160 million. By 1970, their annual revenues are expected to reach $350 million, according to the estimates of the Rand Corp.

3. It could deal with equal strength, and on equal terms, with government monopolies in foreign countries. Mutual agreements must be reached with the foreign governments on locations, rates, services, and means of handling traffic. A divided front on the American side, and a unified front on the foreign side, place America at a great disadvantage.

It is pertinent to mention that the British General Post Office and its Commonwealth partners already operate one of the world's most extensive international communications systems. The British are further expanding their worldwide facilities and are reported to be planning transistorized cables. In the absence of a unified U.S. enterprise, the British might well regain the dominant position they occupied in international communications prior to the First World War.

What I propose today is not simply an organizational step to surmount an immediate problem. My proposal recommends a basic strengthening of our Nation's position in the field of international communications. It should therefore be considered within the framework of a broad study aimed at the formulation of an overall national communications policy. This policy should be designed to meet the new developments of our times.

I believe that out of such a program could emerge a strengthened American communications structure—one that would promote the interest of the public, protect those who will invest in the Communications Satellite Corp. and safeguard the employees and stockholders of the present international carriers.

I wish you all success in your new and important undertaking and assure you of the fullest cooperation of the RCA organization with the objectives of the Communications Satellite Corp.

Sincerely,

DAVID SARNOFF.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, line 20, it is proposed to strike out "$4,458,000" and to insert "$5,554,000."

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. The purpose of the amendment is to restore construction funds for the expansion of the Shellfish Research Center in Milford, Conn.

The Interior Department, in its budget request, asked for $1,165,000 for design and construction funds to complete the expansion of this vitally needed Center.

The House reduced this request to $70,000 for design only and the Senate Appropriations Committee concurred in the reduction. The basis for the reduction in the House was the new policy of the House Appropriations Committee not to consider fund requests until completed plans and detailed estimates are available for review.

I fear that a policy of this sort, laudable as it is, will cause protracted delays in the construction of many worthwhile projects. The delays in themselves may well have the effect of adding to the eventual cost of many proposed Department of the Interior facilities.

I have been informed by officials of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries that the reduction of $1,095,000 will retard contruction of the Center for 18 months to 2 years, and the Bureau is most anxious to have the funds restored, so that the project can go forward without further delay. Originally the 87th Congress authorized the sum of $1,325,000

for the entire project and $160,000 was appropriated last year by the Congress for site acquisitions and preparation.

Mr. President, my amendment would provide funds for the expansion of a facility which will benefit many States other than Connecticut. The shellfish research activities at Milford will be a value to all 17 States which border our oceans and their shellfish industries.

All these States, including Connecticut, are faced with decreasing shellfish production because of water pollution and the encroachments of industry and population as well as the effects of outmoded propagation and fishing methods.

The limited pilot studies conducted at Milford have proved most promising and I have been told that if funds are available to expand the facility it will provide research capabilities for the development of methods of artificial propagation of oysters and clams on a commercial scale, by scientific methods which would not be at the mercy of nature or chance.

I most strongly urge that my colleagues from the ocean-bordering States and others join with me in voting for these funds.

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

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to explain to the Senator that the reason the committee did not allow any money for construction was that the House did not allow it.

Mr. DODD. Yes, I know.

Mr. HAYDEN. The House has a policy that until planning has been done it will not appropriate money for construction. I suggest to the Senator that it would be useless for the Senate to agree to his amendment, because the House will not accept it. Ultimately nothing would be accomplished.

On the other hand, so far as next year is concerned, after the plans have been worked out, certainly we can get the needed money, without question. It is a policy of the House that it does not wish to appropriate money for construction until planning has been done. That is what the Senator is up against.

Mr. DODD. I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Arizona for his explanation. I am aware of this situation. It seems to me, however, that this is rather dictatorial on the part of the House. The project is underway. Initial funds have been appropriated, and land has been acquired. Now we are told to wait until all the plans are drawn, instead of allowing the work to go ahead. Because of this, I fear it may be a couple of years before we can get started with the actual construction work on this project.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senate added money last year for the acquisition of lands and initiation of planning.

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. That was done very properly. We persuaded the House to accept that provision. They are proceeding with planning now. In another year the Senator will have the project approved, I am sure. Frankly, I do not think it would be any advantage to the Senator to have the Senate accept his amendment.

Mr. DODD. As the Senator knows, I have great respect for his judgment in these matters, and I am grateful for his explanation and advice. I know of his good will toward projects like this one, and in view of his assurances I withdraw my amendment. I shall be back next year, on behalf of this fine project, and I hope at that time the full amount for design and construction of the Milford Center will be approved by both the House and the Senate.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I call the attention of Members of the Senate who are present to the last sentence of the pending bill, which appears on page 5, commencing with line 20:

Provided, That not to exceed $477,645 may be available for assistance to the State of South Dakota or any political subdivision thereof for enforcement of State civil or criminal laws within the Indian country in said State where such laws are applicable.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I feel constrained to raise a point of order upon the ground that this is substantive legislation. Before I do so, I wish to offer a few words in explanation.

Several years ago the Congress passed a law permitting States desiring to do so, to assume jurisdiction over civil or criminal affairs of Indians living on reservations within their boundaries.

Not alone the State of South Dakota, but a number of other States, have passed legislation—and I include among that number my own State of Idaho—which, to a greater or lesser degree, assumes State jurisdiction over Indian affairs for criminal or civil matters.

If I am not mistaken the State of Nebraska was the first State to do this. No Federal money was appropriated to the State of Nebraska to pay its cost for the assumption of that jurisdiction.

Nothing, to my knowledge, was contained in the original enactment of the Congress which provided that any State assuming jurisdiction should have the costs of that jurisdiction paid for out of the Federal Treasury.

There is no precedent for this action that I know of. Therefore, I feel that this is not only substantive legislation, but a new departure, which, if enacted for the State of South Dakota, must hereafter be enacted for other States that find themselves in comparable situations.

So this is properly a matter that should come before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. My subcommittee already has plans formulated to look into the whole question relating to the jurisdiction of States over Indian affairs.

Therefore, I feel it would be most unwise to establish a precedent here that imposes a new law which could become binding upon the Congress for many other Western States that have yet to face this question.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What would be the precedent that would be established?

Mr. CHURCH. If this language is not stricken, the precedent that will be established is that, after a State assumes criminal and civil jurisdiction over Indians within its boundaries, it may continue to look to the U.S. Treasury for the payment of costs of administering its laws.

This is a serious question of policy. It ought to be referred to the committee that has jurisdiction in these matters, the Interior Committee of the Senate.

For that reason, and because, in my judgment, this provision constitutes substantive legislation that is not properly a part of an appropriation bill, I raise the point of order.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho is correct when he says that this is legislation in an appropriation bill. It was for that reason that I filed the appropriate notice of 24 hours of my intention to make a motion to suspend the rule. But the Senator from Idaho is not correct when he said this would be establishing a precedent on a particular piece of legislation, in response to the question of the Senator from Ohio, because this does not indicate in any way that the State of South Dakota believes the Federal Government should assume the cost once it has made the transfer of jurisdiction from the Federal Government to the State.

We now face a transitionary period wherein the legislature not being in session, and the law having been passed, the State of South Dakota will take over the jurisdiction, which means henceforth they will have to assume the roughly $500,000 the Federal Government has been spending in this area.

If that legislation becomes final, this bill provides funds only for 1 year, or perhaps part of a year—funds which are necessary for the maintenance of law and order when the State takes over the enforcement of its civil and criminal law.

I quite agree that substantive legislation is needed over the long term. It will be a matter of national policy whether we want the reservations themselves and the States to maintain law and order or whether we will want to continue that in the U.S. Government. I may say that this issue before us is one without much significance because there is a great division of opinion in South Dakota, both among Indians and non-Indians, as to whether the State of South Dakota wants to assume the $500,000 cost.

Consequently, a referendum is being employed, which is a part of our mode of operation in South Dakota. I am advised there are sufficient signatures on the petition, and they probably will be certified. In the event the referendum is filed, then the question becomes moot, because the Federal Government will continue to pay these costs. This language provides a contingency, in the event the referendum is not filed, over the transitionary period, while we move from Federal jurisdiction to State jurisdiction. If the movement is made, it will, of course, result in a saving to the Federal Government of between $400,000 and $500,000 per year.

I do not deny that there is a point of order involved, and I ask for a division, recognizing it takes a 2-to-1 vote to override the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota concedes the point of order?

Mr. MUNDT. I concede it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MUNDT. I move, on the motion I have filed, that we have a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator move to suspend the rule?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. I filed the motion with due notice of 24 hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota to suspend the rule. [Putting the question.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Chair explain to the Senate the parliamentary significance of the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A two-thirds vote is required to suspend the rule after the Chair has sustained the point of order that the language is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MORSE. Is the parliamentary situation such that the question is still debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to suspend the rule is debatable.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make a few brief remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Idaho for raising the point, because as the Senator has said, in effect, this is an attempt to obtain favorable legislation for South Dakota to the discriminatory disadvantage of other States that have similar problems. This problem is not peculiar to South Dakota.

It seems to me the Senator from South Dakota, in his own comments, has made clear that time is not of the essence, even with respect to the State of South Dakota. It is not known what the State decision is going to be.

As the Senator from Idaho pointed out, this question should have been considered by the legislative committee; it should not have been brought to the Appropriations Committee. There is no great rush for time. The question can go to the legislative committee. Then we can decide whether or not a legislative policy should be established in this connection. If so, it should not be limited to South Dakota; it should be uniform as to all the States.

Furthermore, supplemental appropriations bills will come before us in due course of time. If some great hardship can be shown resulting to South Dakota and other States with Indian problems, we can cover them in blanket form. I only wish to say to the Senate that I believe it would be unwise to establish this kind of parliamentary procedure in the handling of appropriation bills. If we start such a practice, I do not know how we can close both the doors and windows. I sincerely hope the rule will not be suspended. This item should be eliminated from the bill, and that is what the Senator from Idaho seeks to accomplish.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I hope the motion to suspend the rule will not carry. This is not a frivolous objection I raise. It is an important question of substantive policy. When the Senator from South Dakota argues that no precedent would be established, that this is merely a 1-year proposal, he overlooks the fact that never before has Congress appropriated money to underwrite the costs of administering civil and criminal laws, once jurisdiction has been assumed by a given State.

Nebraska did this. We never appropriated Federal money to pay the State of Nebraska for administering civil and criminal laws in Indian territory there. The basic question that faces a State when it chooses to assume jurisdiction is the assumption of the financial burden.

If now, without any consideration by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without any proper hearings at all being held, and without making any inquiry into the situation that faces other Western States, we write into an appropriation bill special language, conceding it to be substantive in character which gives special consideration to South Dakota for the coming year, we are not only creating a precedent, but we are doing so in a most irregular manner. Therefore, I appeal to the Senate to uphold the proper jurisdiction of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in this substantive matter. I urge the Senate to vote down the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my own State, with respect to the Warm Springs Indians, the State of Oregon assumes all the cost.

Mr. CHURCH. That is correct. This is but another point that emphasizes the serious departure we would take if we included this proposed substantive language in the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have one other word to say on this subject. There is a difference between this transfer from any transfers which have taken place before. Congress has written a law making this possible. South Dakota is the first State with a large Indian population whose legislature has undertaken to take on this responsibility. There is a big difference in the cost factors between the transfer of several hundred or a thousand Indians and the transfer which involves some 35,000 Indians from being the responsibility of the Federal Government to becoming the responsibility of a single State insofar as law and order is concerned.

I am perfectly willing to rely on a division. I do not intend to ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota to suspend the rule. A division has been requested.

On a division, the motion was rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have a technical amendment at the desk, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, line 24, after the word "year" it is proposed to add the following: "; and purchase of not to exceed one aircraft."

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee approved funds with which to buy a plane, but did not provide an authorization for it. The airplane is necessary for the Park Service in connection with search and rescue work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, at this point I should like to make a few remarks about one area in which the pending bill is decidedly deficient. We have heard a great deal from the administration about the development of the great resources of the West. Last fall, on September 27, to be exact, H.R. 5423, a bill to amend the United States Code to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to take possession of the naval oil shale reserves and for other purposes, came before the Senate. This was a matter which had been a long time in resolution. Many people had worked for a long time to try to resolve the no man's land in which the title and control of the oil shale reserves in Colorado were located.

In looking through the RECORD of September 27, I noted that it required approximately 12 or 14 pages to resolve the legislative history of that bill. The distinguished majority leader said:

> I wish to state that in my 10 years here I have never seen as good legislative history as this one developed in connection with any other bill. This is the best legislative history in regard to any bill that has been before us on the floor.

Despite that statement, apparently the Department of the Interior has been dragging its heels toward the point of providing for research at the Rifle Shale Plant in Colorado.

The pending bill, the House bill, and the legislative record would have made it possible for the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior to have reached most or all of the facilities of the Rifle Shale Plant and one or more of the several entities, whether they were corporate or whether they were individual or whether they were educational or eleemosynary, for the purpose of finding ways of extraction of oil from oil shale economically. As a result, the Department of the Interior made certain offers and received four replies to the offers to promote the research project there.

One of these was made by an oil company. All of them were aboveboard. The terms were exposed to the public. One was tentatively accepted. It would have involved the expenditure of $600,000. The Department of the Interior let it be known it would try it, and intended to let this particular contract. But it has not done anything beyond making a formal request to the Bureau of the Budget to get the $600,000. Now the entire matter is in a state of limbo.

I make these remarks primarily for one purpose. I am not going to ask that

the Senate adopt an amendment for $600,000, because this has now passed that point. The people who made the offer are considering other methods of procedure, and the appropriation of $600,000 at this point would serve no purpose. I make these remarks for the purpose of calling to the attention of the Senate the fact that for some reason or other the Department of the Interior has particularly avoided going forward in this field.

The time has come when this Nation can no longer afford to ignore the 800 billion barrels of oil available in the high-grade reserves of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. I hope that when the Department of the Interior appropriation bill is considered next year, the Department of the Interior will be aware that members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and other Senators are vitally interested in the development of these reserves, and that we have directed the Secretary of the Interior to move forward in the development of research in connection with oil shale, which would represent the development of one of the greatest single, individual assets the country has.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I offer my amendment which is at the desk, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 14, it is proposed to strike out "$6,924,600" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,424,600."

On page 12, line 16, strike out "$36,-395,200" and insert "$36,895,200."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask that both amendments be considered as one, because they would accomplish the same purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered as one.

Mr. HOLLAND. The amendments would replace in the bill an item left out, at the markup. I was not present at the markup of the bill.

This is a budgeted item to supply $500,000 as the first Federal funds to be supplied for the purchasing of lands in the Everglades National Park.

State and private donors have given 1,291,000 acres to that park. In addition, the State of Florida has contributed $2,000,000 to its acquisition. The Federal Government has never donated a dime, and it is now being asked to spend $500,000 of the authorization of $2 million made in 1958. The need for these funds is particularly critical at this time, for the reasons stated by the Park Service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement of the Park Service printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EXCERPT FROM DEPARTMENT REQUEST FOR RESTORATION OF HOUSE REDUCTION

EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK, $500,000

A 5,000-acre tract of land which lies within a 22,000-acre area in the vicinity of the Royal Palm State Park cannot be acquired without the consent of the owner when being used for agricultural purposes or lying fallow. The tract is eminently suited for immediate subdivision. The owner has expressed a willingness to negotiate its sale to the United States. The 22,000 acres comprising the so-called "hole-in-the-donut" area are practically surrounded by lands donated to the United States by the Florida Federation of Women's Clubs and the State of Florida. It is astride the main entrance road into the Park where it is desirable to conserve the natural Everglades scenery, open the entire area for public use, and maintain the existing water table which extensive drainage will lower and thereby threaten the basic ecology of the entire area. The 22,000-acre area is either adaptable for immediate subdivision or, as is customary with low lands in southern Florida, can be developed by dug canals with the dredged material spread over the adjoining lands, raising the surface to an elevation suitable for construction of dwellings and business enterprise. The Service has received several requests, or demands, that we acquire private holdings or face the probability of new developments which are undesirable and would increase ultimate cost of the lands.

Another important tract in this area, comprising 4,300 acres and formerly devoted to agricultural purposes was recently acquired through foreclosure proceedings by the Farmers Home Administration. The FHA has agreed to recommend to the Department of Agriculture that this property be reported as excess real property to the General Services Administration so that the National Park Service can accept it by transfer upon payment of the FHA's investment therein. Total investment will approximate $440,000, which is considered less than the market value of the property. In the event the Service is unable to acquire this land, the FHA will advertise and sell it under the authority contained in 7 U.S.C. 1985.

The Dreamland Estates, a subdivision, also in this area, continues to sell house lots on a deferred basis.

The State of Florida's donation of lands and an additional $2 million for purchasing lands and the gifts by other friends of the original park vested title in the United States to all the lands in the original park as it existed prior to the 1958 act. The State of Florida has complied with the exchange provision of the act of July 2, 1958, as a condition precedent to the United States acquiring the remaining lands and waters within the authorized boundaries. This act authorizes an appropriaion of $2 million for the purchase of inholdings. No funds, however, have been appropriated to date for acquiring these lands. It is recommended that the Service be permitted to restore this item to the land acquisition program and that the $500,000 estimated be allowed for this program.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senate has approved this item in previous years. So far as I am concerned, the amendment is acceptable.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I was approached on this matter by the Senator from Florida and agreed that I would be willing to let the amendment go to conference.

So far as I am concerned, because the Senator from Florida was not present at the meeting of the full committee, I am willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very much obliged. Actually, the item is urgently needed for the reasons set forth. I should be glad to go into them in detail; but since I understand the chairman is ready to accept the amendment, I shall not do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Florida is agreed to.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is at the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, lines 4 and 5, in lieu of "$18,582,500" it is proposed to insert "$18,682,500".

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. It is intended to carry out the authorization in Public Law 87–580, an emergency authorization made late last year to promote the production of oysters by the propagation of disease-resistant strains.

As is well known, in 1957 and following years, a virus afflicted the oyster industry and devastated it. The oyster industry is a multimillion-dollar industry.

Scientists have been diligently working on the problem in the various States involved. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the Department of the Interior now has a plan whereby the Federal Government and the States, working together, believe that in this one-shot action they can propagate a disease-resistant oyster and put the industry back on its feet.

The amendment is offered in the nature of an emergency at this time because the next 3 months—June, July, and August—are very important to this industry and to the research project.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware makes a convincing argument. The project is authorized by law. I suggest that the amendment be accepted.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of a letter dated May 24, 1963, sent to me by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in justification of the amendment. I wish to thank the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] for accepting this amendment.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1963.

Hon. JAMES C. BOGGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BOGGS: This is in response to your telephone request of May 23, 1963, for information on our plans for implementation of Public Law 87–580, an act to promote the production of oysters by propagation of disease-resistant strains, and for other purposes.

After enactment of this public law in August 1962, representatives of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries met with representatives of the States of New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, to discuss means for implementing the law. At this meeting it was decided that the four States would develop a proposal for the needed research and submit this to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries for review. The proposal was received in February 1963. We believe this proposal adequately recognizes the types of research needed to develop oysters resistant to the blight (MSX) which decimated stocks in Delaware and lower Chesapeake Bays.

You, of course, realize that Public Law 87–580 was an authorization act and carried no

funds to finance this research. The fiscal year 1964 budget request for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, now before Congress, contains no funds for this purpose, because the program and justifications were not available when this budget was prepared. No other funds are presently available to us from which cooperative research by the States on the MSX problem could be financed.

We believe the necessary preliminary work has been done and we can implement this act rapidly if funds are made available. The four States have indicated to us that they will have the necessary funds available for their shares when Federal funds are obtained.

The proposed research program would select and concentrate individual oysters which have survived epidemics, breed their progeny, and test their susceptibility to infection. The work would also determine how the parasite is transmitted from oyster to oyster. Armed with this knowledge, State and Federal scientists can help the oyster industry to develop stocks that can survive future epidemics.

This kind of research has been highly successful in the livestock and poultry industries. It is of critical importance that this work get underway immediately, while a sufficient quantity of survivors still remains unharvested. Even a single year's delay will seriously reduce the chances of success. The total estimated cost is $149,000, one-third ($49,000) of which has been pledged by the States.

We hope this information will be useful to you. If we can be of further help please call us.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. MCHUGH,
Acting Director
(For Donald L. McKernan, Director).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I compliment the chairman and members of the committee on the bill they have brought before the Senate. Both the committee in the House and the committee in the Senate, along with their staffs, gave thorough and intensive reviews to the budget.

The printed record of the Senate hearings—some 1,700 pages—attests to the interest of the Appropriations Committee and the public in adequate funds for the basic conservation work of the Nation.

The statement I make today is also made on behalf of my colleague [Mrs. NEUBERGER], who is absent from the Senate today on official business.

FOREST SERVICE

I am particularly pleased by the action the committee took on the budget for the Forest Service.

Numerous conservation challenges confront us and they will only be met with adequate programs. I wish to cite just a few examples. Our domestic lumber industry is beset with problems and Forest Service programs are going to spell the difference between success and failure in meeting some of them. The industry is now, and will for some time be, heavily dependent on public timber; therefore, adequate funds for timber sales and roads are essential.

The committee has provided these funds, and I trust their view will prevail when they meet with the House.

Long-range problems of conservation and wood use require research. The bill significantly steps up all types of essential research.

Outdoor recreation needs continue to increase and additional facilities are still vitally needed. The bill meets this challenge.

The committee has accepted the budget estimate where it was realistic, made restorations where needed and provided additional funds where required—all without a substantial increase over the President's estimate.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

On the Bureau of Land Management budget the committee has wisely provided for a continuation of range development work in areas such as Vale.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA LANDS

For several years there has existed a most beneficial arrangement between the 18 counties of western Oregon and the Federal Government on the Oregon and California lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

The act of 1937, which governs the management of these lands, provides, among other things, that three-fourths of the receipts shall be distributed to the counties and one-fourth to the Federal Government. Under this law, after all expenses, the Federal Treasury, since 1950, has earned over $37 million. Oregon's 18 counties have contributed for road, reforestation, and recreation investments, from their share of revenues, almost $51 million, while the Federal Government's cost of operation has been only $27 million, compared to its profit of $37 million. Currently the counties are spending twice as much on these Federal lands as is the Federal Government.

The House committee, by a change in language in the bill, provided that the forestry budget for the Oregon and California lands be reduced by $540,000; and by adding the phrase, "expenses necessary for management, protection, and development of resources and for" to the indefinite appropriation of receipts item "Oregon and California grant lands," it has in effect, asked the counties to pay for some of the extra costs which have developed in harvesting timber blown down by last year's storm.

Historically the counties have contributed one-third of their income or 25 percent of gross receipts for capital investments, such as roads, reforestation and recreational facilities; and the Federal Government has paid the operating expenses, such as timber harvesting, land use, and similar programs. The result has been beneficial to the local and national economy.

I do not wish to detain the Senate now to explain the excellent cooperative local-Federal arrangement that exists and the way these two levels of government have worked to the mutual advantage of the people they serve.

The action taken by the House and accepted by the Senate committee poses a problem, because there was no prior consultation with the counties to obtain their agreement on the allocation of their moneys to timber harvesting.

In the short interval between the time when the House acted and the time when this bill came before the Senate, it has not been possible for the 18 counties to complete their review of the situation and to express a judgment. The Interior Department expressed its concern; and I ask unanimous consent that the appeal of the Department of the Interior before the Senate committee be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

(3) Forestry: The increase in funds of $522,500 provided in the bill will allow for all increases proposed for the forest management, forest protection, and Alaskan protection programs under the subactivity "Public Domain (excluding Western Oregon)," and for $159,200 of the requested increase of $699,200 for "Western Oregon Lands." However, only 18 of the 66 new positions needed for these programs are available within the House allowance. Restoration of 40 new positions for forestry work in western Oregon and 8 new positions planned for Alaskan fire protection work is requested.

Restoration of $540,000 is required to accomplish the work proposed by this amendment. The House reduction under "Forestry" is for work on the Oregon and California lands, but they propose the work be financed from the appropriation "Oregon and California grant lands." Thus, the entire forestry program has been authorized. While road projects which were planned under the Oregon and California grant lands appropriation, but which were initiated under the accelerated public works programs, have been deleted for the fiscal year 1963 program under the Oregon and California grant lands appropriation, these funds have been applied to other urgent needs—$190,000 is proposed for bridge and reconstruction work on the Nestucca Road where sections were washed out due to the collapse of a dam during heavy rainfall; $350,000 is proposed to grade 6 miles of the Upper Camp Creek Road, which is advantageous to the prompt disposal of blown-down timber.

The imposition of this $540,000 amount for forestry work upon the fiscal year 1964 program under the Oregon and California grant lands fund will adversely affect the overall road construction program. Lower receipts in recent years have led to the deferral of regular road construction work. The further deferral of access road projects in order to finance additional forestry work cannot be recommended.

Regardless of the method of financing finally selected, restoration of the 40 new permanent positions for western Oregon is essential to the conduct of the forest management program in the sale and removal of blown down timber.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Oregon & California Grant Lands

(House hearings, pp. 151–156)

(Senate hearings, p. 340)

Appropriation, 1963	$7,175,000
Estimate	7,325,000
House allowance	7,325,000
Restoration requested	----------

Page 2, line 15, after the word "For" strike out the following: "expenses necessary for management, protection, and development of resources and for".

House Report

The House report made no statement concerning this language.

Justification

Restoration of the $540,000 for forestry for work on the Oregon and California lands is being requested under the appropriation "Management of lands and resources." Therefore, the above language will not be

necessary if restoration under "Management of lands and resources" is approved.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is my hope that the Secretary of the Interior and the new Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Mr. Charles Stoddard, will be able to meet with the counties, exchange views, and devise a reasonable and proper interim program for this fiscal year.

I also point out that this is a 1-year budget provision and the matter can be examined again next year, after consultation between the Interior Department and the 18 counties—consultation which I believe to be very essential.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on page 7, beginning in line 10, the proviso extending down to and including line 18 on the same page; and also on page 7, beginning in line 23, the proviso extending down to and including line 3, on page 8, appear to be legislation. So I make the point of order against both those provisos.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order, on the ground that the provisos have not previously been authorized.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I understand that the Chair has sustained the point of order raised against the proviso on page 7, beginning in line 10 and ending in line 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, pursuant to notice given by me several days ago, I now move that paragraph 4 of rule XVI be suspended, so that an amendment to the effect of the proviso will be in order—namely, to insert the language now appearing on page 7 of the bill, beginning in line 10, after the word "Colorado," and ending with the word "Acoma" in line 18.

I recognize the correctness of the point of order, Mr. President. I merely point out that the Laguna Indians have had a great and wonderful windfall: They have been the recipients of the largest amounts of money from the urnanium developments which have been taking place there; and the Acoma Indians have also prospered. The result is that the children of these tribes have been placed in high school for the first time. Heretofore it has been impossible to provide high school facilities for them. The Laguna Indians now have a trust fund in excess of $10 million, although at the moment they do not have sufficient income to make possible the provision of the needed high school facilities. They have been trying to educate their children and have been trying to have the high schools developed there.

In 1959, the Grants, N. Mex., Municipal School District, with the full assistance of the tribal councils of the Laguna and Acoma Pueblos, obtained funds from the Goverment under the authority of Public Law 815 and constructed a junior-senior high school facility on the Laguna Indian Reservation. The facility was modern and up to date, and was designed to house 350 students.

As of March 4, 1963, there were 363 students in the school. It is esimated by school authorities that this will increase to 548 by June 1964. The reason for this increase is because of the addition of a senior class and the location on the reservation of an industrial development.

I point out that these Indians have never known what a senior class in high school was. But now they have these trust funds, and they have hopes of being able to send their children to high school, and also of being able to provide scholarships, as the Navajo Indians have done.

I point out that in the bill there is a similar provision relative to the facilities at Ignacio, Colo. That provision was included in order to make the necessary funds available for the construction of additional classroom facilities there; and this proviso was included by the Senate committee in order to make this necessary provision for the Indian children in the Pueblos of Laguna and Acoma.

This development is strictly an Indian project, and is scheduled to get underway this year. A building is being constructed, and an on-the-job training program has already begun. The result is that a large number of Indians who have been away from the reservation are now returning for employment in this area.

The Indians filed an application with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for additional funds under Public Law 815, but the application was disapproved. The tribal officials then tried the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and found that no funds were available there. Therefore, the only solution to the problem seems to me to be an amendment to the Bureau of Indian Affairs appropriation, to include funds for construction of the addition to the Laguna school.

I recognize the correctness of the point of order. I simply point out that this school system has been established in an effort to provide these children with a chance to obtain an education.

The interesting thing is that of the approximately 400 able-bodied men now on the Laguna Pueblo, nearly all of them, with the exception of about 15, are employed by the Anaconda Mines in the development of uranium. So in time these people will be self-sustaining; but at the moment it is necessary to provide this amount, in order that this addition to the school system may be made, so as to provide these children with an opportunity to obtain a high school education.

Therefore, I hope paragraph 4 of rule XVI will be suspended, so that this item may be considered; and if that is done, I hope this item will be approved.

I shall be glad to yield for any questions which the Senator from Delaware may wish to ask.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, unquestionably there may be much merit to this proposal; but I believe it would be the orderly procedure first to provide the authorization. Therefore, I have made the point of order.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I hope the Senator from Delaware will not insist on the point of order, because there has been pending for several years proposed legislation designed to bring about this development. I tried to obtain an authorization of this appropriation, for the benefit of the education of these Indian children; and these schools are badly needed for their education.

A little later I shall discuss the item for assistance to the community in North Dakota.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I appreciate the situation; but I feel that the authorization should first be made. Therefore, although I regret the necessity to make the point of order, I do make it and do insist on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order, on the ground that the project referred to is not authorized.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, would it be permissible for me to modify my motion to suspend the rule, so as to make possible the consideration of both the New Mexico item and the North Dakota item? Both of these schools are desirable. The Senator from North Dakota and I have explained the need; and I am trying to save time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico can thus move to suspend the rule.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then Mr. President, I move that paragraph 4, rule XVI, be suspended, in order to make it in order for the Senate to consider the provision now appearing on page 7, in line 10, beginning with the words *"Provided further,"* and including the following text dowr to the end of line 18 on the same page.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico. [Putting the question.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division has been requested.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I hope that the motion to suspend the rule will prevail. I should like to say a word about the merit of the proposal. Indian children are educated in the little town of Newtown, N. Dak., who otherwise would have to be educated on the reservation. The Bureau of Indian Affairs would be required to build one additional school, which would be a much more costly undertaking. Schools operated by the Federal Government cost more than those operated by the political subdivisions of the State. The overall cost is higher. It is much better to educate Indian children along with white children in town schools than to keep them on the reservation. There would be a saving of money. The children would be provided with a better education. The white people are perfectly happy to educate the children there. In the case of Newtown they are already

educating about 174 children. The school officials have already served notice that they cannot take any more. Unless the Federal Government can help them to build a school, one will have to be built on the reservation. The choice is between keeping the children back on the Indian reservation and building a new school there or helping the city of Newtown to build a new school.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from North Dakota. What he has said is quite true. For example, in 1962–63, out of an enrollment at Newtown of 735, 174 are Indian students. It is estimated that based upon the enrollment projected for 1963–64, they may have to drop 50 Indian pupils from the northern segment of the reservation, 30 pupils from the western segment, and another 25 pupils from the reservation at large. It is certainly more economical to have an integrated school at the present time than to build separate facilities for the Indian students. I hope that the rule will be suspended.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I associate myself with what both Senators from North Dakota have said. I point out that Navajo Indian children are being shipped as far as Los Angeles, Phoenix, Tucson, and Bingham, Utah. That is an expensive way of educating children.

We can send high school students to California, if we desire to do so, but it will cost the Government a great deal more money. It is preferable by far to do the simple thing that has been suggested by the Senators from North Dakota.

I hope that the rule will be suspended, and the money appropriated in the bill for the purposes stated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, there is much merit to what the Senators have said, but the more orderly process would require authorization to be reported by the appropriate committee, the authorization to be approved by the Congress, rather than having the proposed legislation included in an appropriation bill.

Much as I regret to take the position I do, I hope that the point of order will be sustained, and the rule not suspended. However, if the project were included in a bill introduced in a regular legislative way, I would be inclined to support the measure at the proper time.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, legislation authorizing the school is pending. We have been waiting 2, possibly 3 years, for action on the measure. Meanwhile, it would cost the Federal Government more money to provide poor education for the Indian children than would otherwise be available to them. Such will be the case unless the rule is suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] that paragraph 4, rule XVI, be suspended. A division has been requested, and the Senate will proceed to divide.

On a division, the motion was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 10, it is proposed to add the following language: *"Provided further,* That not to exceed $450,000 shall be for assistance to the Newtown, North Dakota, Public School District Numbered 1, for construction of an addition to the Newtown Public School: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $370,000 shall be for assistance to the Grants, New Mexico, Municipal School District Numbered 3, Valencia County, New Mexico, for construction of an addition to the public high school serving the Pueblos of Laguna and Acoma."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the economic revitalization of my State of West Virginia must come through research programs which will find new uses for the natural resources with which the Mountain State is so richly endowed. With this purpose in mind, I have amended the fiscal year 1964 budget requests of the Office of Coal Research, the U.S. Forest Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service, to provide these agencies with funds needed for basic research purposes, or for the acceleration and expansion of current research programs.

For example, recently undertaken coal research projects hold hope for an increasingly bright future for coal—a future which also could mean a substantial strengthening of the economy of West Virginia, for "coal" and "West Virginia" are almost synonymous terms.

Within the space of a few years, synthetic gas, produced in West Virginia from the State's tremendous coal reserves, may be heating homes and firing industrial boilers in New England and in the Middle Atlantic States. At about the same time, automobiles may be "tanking up" at filling stations on high octane gasoline made from coal.

These forthcoming new uses for coal can be attributed to scientific breakthroughs in coal technology, spurred in the main by congressional appropriations. I am happy to say, in this respect, that as a member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, I was successful in advancing two specific coal research efforts—Project Bootstrap and Project Gasoline.

When fiscal year 1963 budget requests of the Office of Coal Research were being considered by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, I offered an amendment adding $450,000 to enable that Agency to initiate research on "Project Bootstrap." At the same time, I offered an amendment adding $1 million for the purpose of advancing research and to begin the planning and engineering of a pilot plant for "Project Gasoline." Both amendments were adopted.

This year in the same subcommittee, during a review of fiscal year 1964 budget requests, I again amended the appropriation bill to include an additional $1 million with which to accelerate the development work being undertaken on three coal gasification projects. By hastening the research work on these projects, it is entirely possible to combine them, for feasibility testing purposes, with the pilot plant operation being planned for Project Bootstrap. I also urged the subcommittee to restore a $2 million Office of Coal Research budget request, most of which would be for Project Gasoline, and which the House of Representatives had deleted from the fiscal year 1964 appropriation bill.

Mr. President, research on Project Bootstrap centers on extracting the equivalent of natural gas from coal for commercial and domestic home use. Results from benchwork experiments show that the low-cost process involved in the gasification of coal could have commercial application.

Should pilot plant operations of Project Bootstrap prove that coal can be converted to gas at a price which would be competitive with that being paid for natural gas in eastern urban population centers, then large tonnages of coal would have to be mined for such a venture.

By the same token, Project Gasoline, a process which would manufacture high-octane gasoline from coal, could mean a vast new use for this natural resource if pilot plant operations demonstrate commerical feasibility on a competitive basis.

The coal industry is not only the economic backbone of West Virginia, it is also the living sinew of our rail and water transportation systems. If the coal industry can be made to prosper, West Virginia by and large will prosper. The liquification and gasification of coal, if feasible on a large-scale commercial undertaking, could mean that the economy of the Mountain State would go forward in seven-league boots.

Another natural resource with which West Virginia is abundantly blessed is timber. Hardwood forests cover about 90 percent of my State. Through mismanagement, misuse, and neglect, the percentage of good grades of timber suitable for cutting is relatively small.

It is my feeling that all timber is usable. With this in mind, I asked the U.S. Forest Service, back in January of 1961, if a Wood Utilization and Marketing Laboratory could be established in West Virginia. After that agency made a survey of the State, and reviewed the comparable timber resources in other Appalachian areas, I was informed that such a laboratory would be highly useful and that it could make continuing contributions toward advancing the economic potential of the forest products industry of West Virginia and the rest of Appalachia.

Thus, when the fiscal year 1962 Forest Service budget requests were being considered by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, I added $450,000 with which to initiate planning and construction of

a facility at Princeton, W. Va., the site selected by the Forest Service for the Laboratory.

In the short space of its existence, Mr. President, the work of the Princeton Laboratory has indeed been purposeful, and gratifying. As a result of the "missionary" work on the part of the personnel of the Laboratory, 43 new or expanded wood products facilities, representing an investment of more than $11 million, were either put in operation in West Virginia, or were placed under construction, or were in the final stages of planning and financing during 1962. These new facilities will make available more than 5,000 new jobs, and will add about $14 million annually to industrial income in the Mountain State.

These new or expanded facilities include pulp-chip operations, which utilize log slabs, and other wood refuse, as well as those parts of poor quality logs from which good quality bolts have been taken. Pulp-chips are used in the manufacture of particle boards, hardboards, and paper products. It has been estimated that the 11 new pulp-chip facilities in West Virginia will produce about 100,000 tons of chips annually, and that this production will have a value of about $500,000.

Other new facilities, as well as old facilities which have been expanded, are utilizing good quality logs, and good quality bolts taken from poor quality logs, for the manufacture of hardwood flooring, plywood, furniture, and various kinds of wood products for industrial and home use. In all, 10 new wood products manufacturing plants and 5 others which have been expanded will utilize an estimated 100 to 120 million board-feet of lumber and about 50,000 cords of roundwood annually, for a total material value of about $10 million.

This upswing in the utilization of West Virginia's timber resources has proven the value of a rather modest investment on the part of the Federal Government in research, and in providing professional guidance, technical advice, and assistance to industry. Personnel of the Princeton Laboratory are working with many private and Government groups, as well as with individuals, to interest them in the potentials of West Virginia's forest resources.

I cannot overstate the satisfaction which I personally feel with respect to the progress that has already been achieved by the Princeton Laboratory in the short time of its existence. Mindful of these encouraging results, and eager to help effect an acceleration and expansion of important research work being undertaken at the facility, I added $300,000 to the $100,000 which was requested in the fiscal 1964 budget for the laboratory. I feel confident that this small additional sum of money will be repaid tenfold to the Government in the form of taxes from a growing wood products industry throughout Appalachia.

But as we work for an expansion of our wood products industry we must also be conscious of the need for both upgrading and preserving the young growing stock in our forest lands. Unfortunately, years of neglect of those timbered acres has resulted in increasingly heavy tolls by diseases of hardwood timber growing stock. Further neglect could be disastrous. Consequently, after discussing the matter with Forest Service officials, I concluded that an immediate research program in Appalachian region tree diseases is vital.

I am pleased that other members of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies were sympathetic to my proposal that the sum of $31,500 be added to the fiscal year 1964 budget requests of the U.S. Forest Service for preliminary planning of a forestry sciences laboratory, to be constructed at West Virginia University, at Morgantown.

The facility would concern itself with the engineering aspects of logging on steep hillsides, and with the control of soil erosion resulting from logging operations. Additionally, the laboratory would do research work in wildlife habitat, because there is a need to encourage wildlife growth both for fur-bearing purposes and for increasing the use of Appalachia by sportsmen.

Locating the proposed forestry sciences laboratory at West Virginia University would serve a dual purpose. U.S. Forest Service scientists and engineers could advantageously undertake cooperative forestry research programs with the university's agricultural and engineering schools, and at the same time the laboratory would offer excellent opportunities for graduate students to participate in research programs of the U.S. Forest Service.

Our forest lands are a rich natural resource in several respects. Not only do they provide timber for our wood products industry, they also hold great potential for recreational values—for the fishing and hunting sought by sportsmen, and the kinds of attractions sought by tourists: picnicking, hiking, camping, and the like. A good example of this is the 1,641,981-acre Monongahela National Forest, in West Virginia, where planned multiple use has not only resulted in a yearly increase in the allowable cut of good quality timber, but where growing numbers of sportsmen and tourists are finding recreational pursuits of a rewarding nature. Indeed, the Monongahela National Forest is an economic asset of progressive value, contributing to the enrichment of the nine counties included in its acreage, and to my State as well.

Having made an inspection of the Monongahela National Forest, early in February of 1961, and having noted the work done by the U.S. Forest Service in the way of reforestation, conservation, and recreation, I explored with officials of that agency the possibility of extending the forest westward to include areas in eight counties where rugged terrain and submarginal farming have been a cause of long-term chronic and persistent unemployment.

Over a half million acres in parts of Braxton, Fayette, Greenbrier, Lewis, Nicholas, Randolph, Upshur, and Webster Counties would be included in an addition to the Monongahela National Forest, to be known as the Mountaineer unit. During fiscal year 1963 budget reviews of appropriations requested by the U.S. Forest Service, I successfully amended the Interor and related agencies appropriation bill to include $250,000 with which to initiate land purchases for the new unit. The Senate approved my amendment, but in a subsequent Senate-House conference on the appropriation bill, the amendment was deleted. The bill before us again carries my amendment adding $200,000 with which to plan for and initiate the purchase of land for the Mountaineer unit in fiscal year 1964.

I feel certain that under the husbandry of the U.S. Forest Service, the terrain to be encompassed by the new addition to the Monongahela National Forest will become productive. A carefully planned resources renewal program, coupled with a planned development of recreational potentials should contribute to an economic upsurge in the area and bring new monetary returns to local, county, and State governments as well as to the Federal establishment.

.The economic possibilities for West Virginia which are inherent in potentials for tourism and recreational pursuits are vast indeed. Millions of Americans live in nearby metropolitan population centers. Some of these people will be attracted to the Mountain State by its breathtaking scenic grandeur; others will want to come to our high country for hunting and fishing both of which are excellent.

The reason hunting and fishing are good in West Virginia is that careful attention has been given to developing natural habitats for game animals and birds and to the stocking of our mountain streams and lakes with species of fish sought by anglers.

The White Sulphur Springs National Fish Hatchery has played an important role in supplying both cold and warmwater species of fish to 27 counties throughout West Virginia. In fact the work of this hatchery in helping to keep our streams and lakes well stocked with fish has contributed to the growing popularity of the Mountain State among sports fishermen.

But the concrete rearing facilities of the White Sulphur Springs Fish Hatchery are approximately 60 years old and in advance stages of deterioration. A program for the replacement of these facilities should have been undertaken many years ago. When the matter was called to my attention earlier this year I immediately ascertained what was required in the way of moneys to rehabilitate this hatchery so that it could continue its excellent services to our West Virginia counties. I was informed that $138,000 would be required for this work.

Therefore, when the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies was considering the fiscal year 1964 budget requests of the U.S. Bureau of Fisheries and Wildlife, I amended the appropriation for that agency by adding the needed $138,000 for the White Sulphur Springs Fish Hatchery. At the same time, I also amended the appropriation bill to include $30,000

to establish a fishery management project in the Elkins area of West Virginia.

As I have previously stated, recreational fishing ranks high as a tourist attraction in my State, and there are many opportunities for improving the potential of this sport in West Virginia. The establishment of a fishery management project would concern itself with increasing the potential of this sport. It could do this by developing conservation programs in cooperation with the West Virginia Department of Natural Resources, the U.S. Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Area Redevelopment Administration.

In all, restoration of the $2 million for Project Gasoline, and my amendments to the fiscal year 1964 budget requests of the Department of Interior and Related Agencies—the $1 million to accelerate gasification research projects; the $300,000 for the Princeton Wood Products Laboratory; the $31,500 with which to initiate the Forestry Sciences Laboratory at West Virginia University; the $200,000 to begin the development of the mountaineer unit of the Monongahela National Forest; the $138,000 to rehabilitate the White Sulphur Springs National Fish Hatchery; and the $30,000 to initiate the fishery management project at Elkins—will mean $3,699,500 worth of new Federal activity in West Virginia or of interest to West Virginia.

The importance of my amendments to the fiscal year 1964 appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies lies not so much in the immediate employment opportunities which they may afford to West Virginians, but in what the projects will mean to the Mountain State in the years to come. Each project by itself is of enduring and growing economic value. Together, they hold the hope of a brighter future for the forestry and coal industries in West Virginia and the Nation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am most pleased that the Appropriations Committee approved a small $53,400 item to provide two additional resources program field committees in the Office of the Secretary of Interior. While this is a small item, it will bring important benefits in a number of resource areas.

In any given area of the United States the Department of the Interior is engaged in a multitude of field operations affecting not only other projects within the Department but the activities of other Federal departments and State agencies as well. Coordination is essential—as has been shown again and again in our experience with river basin development projects—if the operations of one bureau or agency are not to cancel out the work of the other agencies in the field. Interior's resources program staff was brought into being to supply this coordination. Its varied responsibilities include program planning and provision of specialized advisory staff service on new problems for the Secretary, but the ultimate objective of all its labor is to insure that there will be consistency in the use of our natural resources.

If one looks at a map of Interior's field committee regions, one will see that they now cover a very large portion of the continental United States. In two areas of this country, however, there is no institutionalized coordination of the operations of Interior and other field agencies. One of these areas comprises the entire Southeast; the other includes the western Great Lakes region and the upper Mississippi valley.

Speaking from knowledge of the problems of my home State, I can testify to the great need for regularized communication and cooperation among the agencies with activities in our area. Right now comprehensive river basin planning in the upper Mississippi region has brought in field representatives from several bureaus and offices of the Department of the Interior, and has required constant liaison with the Department of the Army, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The rapidly burgeoning responsibilities of the Area Redevelopment Administration have increased the importance of coordinating field operations.

The appropriation is needed to provide for a field committee chairman for each of the two regions, for two secretaries, and for office rent, equipment, travel, and other necessary expenses. It appears in the President's budget estimate for fiscal 1964. Although it was eliminated without specific reference by the House as part of a general cut in personnel expenses, the Appropriations Committee of this body recommends that it be restored. I urge that the Senate approve this item. I express the hope that our distinguished chairman, Senator HAYDEN, will be successful in retaining the item in conference.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I would like to say that the passage today by this body of the Interior appropriations bill will be an event long remembered in Wyoming and the West.

This bill contains many vitally needed projects that will do much to provide us with the firm foundation for growth and development that will be so urgently needed as our area reaches the full development of its potential.

Among the items I should like to mention here is the initial year's appropriation for the Big Horn Basin rehabilitation project. This is a multiuse project which will create in one of the major and most beautiful valleys in my State a program to rehabilitate the vast potential for grazing lands, to create new and scenic recreation areas, to develop roads to serve this beautiful area and to begin the basic soil and water conservation program so necessary to the efficient growth of such an area.

Another item in this bill, Mr. President, provides for the first year's construction program at the Fish Genetics Laboratory near Sundance, Wyo. The sum involved here, $210,000, will provide for initial construction of a laboratory which should do much to apply the science of genetics to the production of game fish. It would not only greatly reduce hatchery costs for all states which now transplant these fish, but will provide more hardy strains to delight the fishermen in Wyoming and the West. And I might add that the fishermen play a large role in the tourist industry in the West.

Another item which will do much for my area of the country is the appropriation of $100,000 for asphalt research at the asphalt laboratory in Laramie, Wyo. Wyoming is one of the prime producers of asphalt and also uses much of this material in its highway program. It is imperative this highway paving material be improved in order to hold down the mounting cost of road construction and maintenance which now face our local and State units of government. Road construction in a state such as mine, where there are sizable extremes in temperature and precipitation, depends a great deal upon a suitable material and if more desirable paving materials can be found, the West, and indeed the entire Nation will benefit.

I would note also that the language of this bill as reported by the committee contains a specific injunction against the condemnation of private land within the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park without the express consent of Congress. This provides protection for the small number of private land owners in the Park who have come to feel that they are being unduly harassed by the Government in an attempt to take over their land.

The projects named here are but a few in this bill, Mr. President, but they illustrate the fact that the Senate has endorsed progress in Wyoming and the West and I am extremely gratified at the passage of this bill.

SPORT FISH RESEARCH FOR THE OAHE RESERVOIR

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in 1958, while a Member of the other body, I introduced legislation to initiate sport fish research keyed to the kind of large reservoirs which have been developed by the Missouri River dams and similar installations. Senator FULBRIGHT introduced a similar bill in the Senate and though these measures were not enacted by the Congress, subsequent appropriations provided clear authority for the Federal construction agencies to provide for the improvement and development, as well as the protection, of fishery resources in their planning of water development projects. This places an even greater importance on the need for developing methods for managing reservoirs so that their fishery potentials may be realized.

The North Central Reservoir investigations was established by the Bureau in late 1961 to conduct studies on the mainstem reservoirs of the Missouri River. These reservoirs will encompass about 1,100,000 surface acres of water by 1964. Headquarters for this investigation are at Yankton, S. Dak., but field laboratories will be established at other locations. The initial study was confined to the area from Gavins Point Dam to Fort Randall Dam. Oahe Reservoir, by far the largest in the Missouri River complex, will be the next body of water in need of intensive study.

The overall purpose of this investigation is to relate different types of water management in reservoirs to fish populations, both sport and commercial. Ecological conditions, life histories of individual fish species, and the dynamics of the fish populations must be studied. This information will be related to reservoir discharge rates, water level fluctuations, water chemistry and water exchange rates. Eventually, it should be possible to operate reservoirs for greater benefit of sport fishing and to predict how different types of water management will influence the fish populations. Management techniques will be developed to improve fishing.

The Fishery Research Station at Yankton conducted valuable studies which showed that a real danger has developed in the field of fish stocking in these reservoirs. Fish sampling in 1962 on Lewis and Clark Lake, in a total of over 83,000 fish, showed that almost 54 percent belonged to the carp family. If we do not act immediately, this and other of the Missouri Great Lakes will become "carp sanctuaries," completely populated by nonsport fish. It is well known that carp can, by multiplying unchecked, ruin vegetation on lake beds and destroy spawning areas of more desirable fish breeds.

The tremendous Oahe reservoir in central South Dakota will soon store 20 million acre-feet of water—almost equivalent to 1 year's flow of the entire river. At the present time there is no programing for fishery research on this lake. This vast area desperately needs research in fish life to fully develop its potential as a recreation and fishing center for the Midwest.

The Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources of the 86th Congress said that "benefits may accrue to fish and wildlife resources as a result of reservoir construction" and "foremost among these benefits is the tremendous expansion of fishing opportunities which these reservoirs afford."

If we are to expand these fishing opportunities, we must study the fish population of the pools; we must study the reproducing habits and food sources of the fish; we must put biologists to work and have the reports to insure a generous fish population which will attract sport fishermen.

A generous fish population can be an important factor in the promotion of tourism and recreational development.

In 1962, in my State, of a total of 152,301 fishing licenses, tags, permits, and stamps issued, 43,226 were sold to nonresidents—almost 1 in 3. The real potential of fishing as a recreation on the Missouri River reservoirs has only budded. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife estimates that there are 25 million sport fishermen in the United States. We must continue programs of research and biology to develop areas on our reservoirs leading to an expansion of facilities for these anglers.

To me, Mr. President, it is self-evident that starts must be made immediately on the Oahe Reservoir in South Dakota for a research program administered by the Branch of Fishery Research of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to save this lake from becoming infested and overrun by nonsport fish life.

I am informed by Bureau officials that $150,000 is urgently needed to administer this project and that such sum is not a part of the bill under consideration. For this reason I had intended to offer an amendment to H.R. 5279, the appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year 1964, providing such funds. I have decided after consultation with the managers of the pending bill to withhold this amendment because of the certainty that it would not be accepted by the other body at this time. I will renew my efforts in the coming year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On that question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. LONG], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 4, as follows:

[No. 103 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Allott	Hill	Moss
Anderson	Holland	Mundt
Bartlett	Hruska	Muskie
Bayh	Humphrey	Nelson
Beall	Inouye	Pastore
Bible	Jackson	Pearson
Boggs	Johnston	Pell
Brewster	Jordan, N.C.	Proxmire
Burdick	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Keating	Robertson
Cannon	Kuchel	Saltonstall
Carlson	Long, La.	Scott
Case	Magnuson	Simpson
Church	Mansfield	Smith
Cooper	McCarthy	Sparkman
Curtis	McClellan	Stennis
Dodd	McGee	Symington
Dominick	McGovern	Talmadge
Edmondson	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	McNamara	Yarborough
Goldwater	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Hart	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Hayden	Morse	
Hickenlooper	Morton	

NAYS—4

Cotton	Tower	Williams, Del.
Thurmond		

NOT VOTING—26

Aiken	Ervin	Long, Mo.
Bennett	Fong	Mechem
Byrd, Va.	Gore	Miller
Clark	Gruening	Neuberger
Dirksen	Hartke	Prouty
Douglas	Javits	Randolph
Eastland	Kefauver	Russell
Ellender	Kennedy	Smathers
Engle	Lausche	

So the bill (H.R. 5279) was passed.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon; and that the

Presiding Officer appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. STENNIS obtained the floor.

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan if I may do so without losing my right to the floor, and I ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MCNAMARA. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

EQUAL PAY ACT OF 1963

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate the House amendments to S. 1409.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1409) to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Equal Pay Act of 1963".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

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

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

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

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

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

(5) constitutes an unfair method of competition.

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

SEC. 3. Section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. et seq.), is amended by adding thereto a new subsection (d) as follows:

"(d)(1) No employer having employees subject to any provisions of this section shall discriminate, within any establishment in which such employees are employed, between employees on the basis of sex by paying wages to employees in such establishment at a rate less than the rate at which he pays wages to employees of the opposite sex in such establishment for equal work on jobs the performance of which requires equal skill, effort, and responsibility, and which are performed under similar working conditions, except where such payment is made pursuant to (i) a seniority system; (ii) a merit system; (iii) a system which measures earnings by quantity or quality of production; or (iv) a differential based on any other factor other than sex: *Provided*, That an employer who is paying a wage rate differential in violation of this subsection shall not, in order to comply with the provisions of this subsection, reduce the wage rate of any employee.

"(2) No labor organization, or its agents, representing employees of an employer having employees subject to any provisions of this section shall cause or attempt to cause such an employer to discriminate against an employee in violation of paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(3) For purposes of administration and enforcement, any amounts owing to any employee which have been withheld in violation of this subsection shall be deemed to be unpaid minimum wages or unpaid overtime compensation under this Act.

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

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect upon the expiration of one year from the date of its enactment: *Provided*, That in the case of employees covered by a bona fide collective bargaining agreement in effect at least thirty days prior to the date of enactment of this Act, entered into by a labor organization (as defined in section 6(d)(4) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended), the amendments made by this Act shall take effect upon the termination of such collective bargaining agreement or upon the expiration of two years from the date of enactment of this Act, whichever shall first occur.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act 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."

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, at the conclusion of these brief remarks, I shall move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 1409, the Equal Pay Act of 1963.

While there are some problems raised by the House amendments, they are not of such a serious nature as to warrant the further delay which would result from a request for a conference.

However, before making that motion, I do want to discuss several questions which have arisen during congressional deliberation on this bill.

It is most important that the Senate intent be made clear as to language in the bill which is the same in both the Senate and House versions.

For example, a question has been raised as to what degree of discrimination based on sex would result in a violation of this new act.

There has been some discussion that an employer would have to demonstrate a conclusive "pattern of violation."

It is inconceivable that this Congress should write legislation that would permit selective discrimination which, without doubt, would occur mostly against those individuals who are least able to protest.

It is certainly the intent of the Senate that an employer will have violated this act if he discriminates against one employee, just as he will violate it if he discriminates against many.

Under the present Fair Labor Standards Act, an employer must pay all of his employees a minimum wage, he must pay overtime to all of them if they work beyond 40 hours, and he will have to pay all of them a wage rate that does not discriminate on the basis of sex.

Another question that has arisen relates to the burden of proof.

There is no question that under the Fair Labor Standards Act the Secretary must show that an employer has violated the act, and the same will hold true for the enforcement of the new equal pay provision.

This does not mean that the Secretary or the courts must accept a plan or system that has been devised to evade the new provision.

The employer's defense, if it is based on an employer's plan, must be a bona fide one; and the burden of demonstrating the legitimacy of that defense will rest upon the employer.

The discussion that surrounded the congressional consideration of this bill has somewhat clouded the question of the definition of "equal skills, efforts, and responsibilities."

There is a rather lengthy discussion in the Senate Report No. 176 on the methods and procedures which the Department should utilize to determine which jobs do involve equal skills, efforts, and responsibilities.

That report discussion makes it clear that it is not the intent of the Senate that jobs must be identical. Such a conclusion would obviously be ridiculous.

Based on some of the discussion which has taken place, these jobs would not be considered equal because they are not identical, and such a conclusion would be obviously ridiculous.

As is the case with so much legislation enacted by this Congress, the Equal Pay Act of 1963 will have to be interpreted precisely by the Secretary before its enforcement can be effective.

Finally, I would like to point out that we have enacted a desirable addition to the Fair Labor Standards Act, the guarantee of equal pay for equal work, regardless of sex.

There can be no question that the implementation of this new guarantee will thrust an additional burden on the Department of Labor and its Wage and Hour Division, which will administer the new provision.

Unless this Congress intends to make a mockery of its action, obviously additional personnel will be required to administer the new law.

It was pointed out throughout the debate on S. 1409 that no new governmental structure would be needed to enforce this law.

That does not mean that new personnel will not be needed, and I trust that congressional intent is clear on this important subject.

Mr. President, I consider it a privilege to be able to make at this time the motion that will bring to a conclusion legislative fulfillment of the long desired goal of equal pay for equal work, regardless of sex.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 1409.

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

Mr. MCNAMARA. I yield to the distinguished Senator, a member of the committee.

Mr. TOWER. I commend the distinguished Senator from Michigan for his efforts in facilitating the passage of this measure. I should like to read into the RECORD some of the debate that occurred in the House of Representatives on this measure on the 23d of May, as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I quote from what Mr. THOMPSON, from New Jersey, the distinguished chairman of the subcommitttee that considered the measure, said:

There will not be any capricious or arbitrary action on the part of the Secretary. He cannot communicate with an employer and say "You cease and desist this immediately on the payment of some penalty." The only means by which enforcement is possible under this act, as I said, and I reemphasize it, is before the Federal district court.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that as under the Fair Labor Standards Act if there is a proven discrimination and a determination is made by the Federal district court the guilty party is liable to double damages—liquidated damages—under the existing law.

I should like to subscribe to the statement made by the distinguished Representative from New Jersey, Mr. THOMPSON, because I believe it is in keeping with our English common law system, which holds that no one is guilty until so proven; that the burden of proof of guilt falls on the accuser, and not on the accused.

With that understanding, I yield the floor.

Mr. MCNAMARA. I subscribe to the statement made by the Senator from Texas. Certainly, the burden of proof, as it now is, is on the Secretary at the outset. If the Secretary has brought his charge and the employer disagrees with him, the burden of proof would shift to the employer at that point. I think the Senator will agree with that. For 25 years that is how the act has functioned, and we intend no change in that procedure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I have discussed this question with Senators who normally would have been the conferees on our side had the bill gone to conference. It has also been my privilege and honor to confer with Members of the House who probably would have been the conferees on the minority side. There is a general agreement that the House language is quite preferable to the language contained in the Senate bill. For that reason, I fully subscribe to the motion to concur in the House amendments.

Mr. MCNAMARA. I thank the minority leader for his cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan to concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

THE AMERICAN LUMBER INDUSTRY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on May 9, I made rather extensive remarks regarding the critical situation facing the domestic lumber industry and its relations with the Canadian lumber industry.

I said then that—

There is now evidence which suggests that instead of constantly flailing away at the Canadian lumber industry the domestic industry of the United States should join hands with its Canadian counterpart to determine a course of action which will protect and develop markets for lumber.

Since that time President Kennedy has met with Prime Minister Pearson and in my judgment this meeting will produce a new understanding in Canadian and American relations.

On May 24, Mr. Mortimer B. Doyle, executive vice president of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association addressed the Northern Interior Lumbermen's Association at Prince George, British Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that his comments entitled, "Canadian and United States Lumber: The Common Future" be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 1.

Mr. Doyle suggested that the proper course for Canadian and American lumbermen would be to devote their "energies and good will toward the accomplishment of our mutual purposes." Mr. Doyle pledged himself to do so.

In his speech he suggested three positive steps that should be mutually undertaken to improve lumber markets. One was wood promotion, the second was industry standards and the third was grading and grade marking. He stressed the need for Canadian-American cooperation in these activities but his talk also pointed out the domestic difficulties in getting industrywide participation. I assume that the same problem exists in Canada.

On May 22, I received a most thoughtful letter from Mr. Doyle, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 2. One of the concerns he expresses is that the provisions of domestic antitrust laws may pose problems in resolving issues requiring international industry cooperation. I recognize that this may be true. I would hope that the administration would make every reasonable effort to assist in improving international cooperation to develop an expanding and vigorous forest products industry.

If the answers to the problems which exist were easy the solution would have been found long ago, but obviously, they are difficult.

Possibly it could be helpful to have governmental assistance in the form of supervision which would assure uniform grade marking by a method similar to that used for standards for wood and other products.

It might also be that some special action is needed to provide for international cooperation in developing markets abroad and in assuring adequate promotion by all segments of the industry. In many ways the dilemma faced by the lumber industry is analogous to the problems faced by labor unions. Today no lumber company is required to join in a trade promotion effort but it reaps the benefits obtained by those who finance these ventures. In short, there is no union shop in trade promotion in this industry. I point out this significant fact because the lumber trade associations do not represent all who produce lumber.

It is not my purpose today to discuss what needs to be done but rather to urge that the administration move vigorously to develop a working agreement on ways to meet the challenge of promoting the economic welfare of the Nation by assuring that our lumber industry will best serve the national and hemispheric interest.

On May 15 I discussed briefly national strategic trade with Red China and at that time I pointed out that the Northwest once enjoyed trade relations with China which provided a significant market for lumber, wheat, and flour. This is a lost market and perhaps we should consider whether it is a market we should endeavor to serve.

Since my May 9 speech I have received several other letters and I ask unanimous consent that three of these be included at the close of my remarks as exhibits 3, 4, and 5. One is from the National Association of Home Builders, another is from David Winton of the Winton Lumber Co., and the third is from Mr. Corydon Wagner. In addition, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the May 17 issue of Random Lengths, dealing with the American Lumber Standards Committee be printed at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 6.

Mr. Doyle's letter of May 22 indicates that he does not believe Mr. Corydon Wagner speaks for American lumber interests. It is my understanding that Mr. Wagner has substantial interests in both American and Canadian firms, has held high office in several important lumber trade associations, has a lifetime of association with the workings of the industry and is held in high esteem in the industry.

I am well aware that Mr. Wagner has investments in Canada and some may disagree with him, but these are not the important points.

The issue is what course should be charted.

In charting a course we cannot ignore the fact that some one-third of the capital in Canada's forest industries is reputed to be from the United States. The hard fact is that some in other nations, as we have in times past, view as harmful the fact that foreign capital comes into their country. This is not necessarily so. Americans, as people and through their Government, have a responsibility to American capital that goes abroad—and those who invest abroad have a responsibility to their Nation.

Men like Mr. Wagner and Mr. Winton, both long on the National Lumber Manufacturers Association boards, can contribute much. One of the great

things they can do is help to translate our domestic concerns into terms Canadians can appreciate and inform us at home of the problems confronting the nations where they have invested. In lumber they can help achieve international cooperation on the three points Mr. Doyle so well covered in his British Columbia address.

It is well to note here that when concern about Canadian lumber imports was first voiced the solution advanced to me by our lumber spokesmen was to curtail Canadian lumber imports by either executive or congressional action. This was the official industry position and this strategy necessarily forced them to take their case before the Tariff Commission.

The climate in Canada, too, at that time seemed to be one which may have led some in the domestic industry to think it unproductive to attempt to resolve the issues on a more amicable and mutual basis.

The Kennedy administration, however, preferred the amicable course then as it does now. The difference is that now there seems to be a better chance that many issues can be settled along the historic patterns of Canadian-American relations—with understanding at the conference table.

We should take advantage of improved circumstances. To my way of thinking the present and foreseeable climate forecasts the real possibility that our two countries and the lumber industry of our two nations can work in better harmony than would have been possible in the recent past. I think we have a responsibility to pursue this course and to hold in abeyance for a reasonable period restrictive lumber import measures which really treat only symptoms.

I would much prefer to see methods devised to achieve bilateral procedures and standards for lumber grading and marking. I would much prefer to see cooperation in serving oversea markets. I would much prefer to see joint participation to finance product promotions. These are the steps which will advance lumber use, create new jobs, promote labor's welfare, protect capital invested and assure adequate profits.

Mr. President, I close by asking unanimous consent that a column written by Peter Edson, entitled "Lumber Import Test," which is distributed to some 700 newspapers by Newspaper Enterprise Services, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 7.

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

EXHIBIT 1

CANADIAN AND UNITED STATES LUMBER: THE COMMON FUTURE

(Address by Mortimer B. Doyle, executive vice president, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, before the Northern Interior Lumbermen's Association, Prince George, British Columbia, May 24, 1963)

Gentlemen of the Northern Interior Lumbermen's Association, I come before you today in the interest of amity and opportunity, and I have been moved by the graciousness of your invitation to do so.

The difficulties we have experienced to a marked degree during the past 2 years are not new to Canadian and United States lumbermen.

Lumber, abounding as it does in both our countries, has served as both a bond and a barrier to understanding for over a century.

For myself, I take heart in this historic struggle between free progressive men for both markets and protectionist attitudes.

It is evidence of a vitality and determination inherent among lumbermen.

It may, indeed, be such vitality and determination as can be mobilized to win not a victory for one of us against the other in this commercial struggle, but the greater victory of improved markets for all.

Despite the earnestness of both sides in every trade controversy over these hundred years, and there have been many, there has never been an open rift between our nations; nor has there been any lasting animosity between our respective industries.

Canada did not break off relations with the United States, for instance, in 1864 when my nation canceled the reciprocity treaty so laboriously negotiated by Lord Elgin 10 years earlier to allow Canadian lumber and farm products free entrance to the American market.

Nor did the United States break off relations in the times of Sir John Macdonald who was avowedly a spokesman for a national policy for protection of Canadian industries from American competition.

The Rush-Bagot Treaty, providing us with the longest undefended international border in the world, has never been breached by either party to it. It never will be, I am confident—as I know you are.

An accident of nature or the divine hand of providence, gentlemen, call it what you will, has bound these two nations of ours together inextricably and eternally. Canada and the United States share a destiny and a devotion to basic neighborly principle which no foreign power, no opportunistic domestic government, no transient economic disorder can long set aside.

The natural bonds of geography have been strengthened by the national origins of the predominant portions of our respective populations and, by the common pattern of national development westward as we hewed an orderly, productive civilization out of the wilderness.

We are further bound together by basic cultures, by language, by common national and continental aspirations.

We are free men in a world where freedom is hard bought. We have defended our own freedom and the freedom of each other. We have stood side by side and fought and bled together in two world wars and in Korea. Our women have wept together and comforted one another. Like it or not, we are brothers living under the same roof, fashioned by the same hands, and despite family quarrels which inevitably occur in all families, we will resolve our differences for the good of the entire family, and for the peace of our continental neighborhood.

Although I have already demonstrated the ties of respect and affection and common purpose which bind all Canadians and Americans together, we must recognize that the union between our forest industries makes lumbermen on both sides of the border even closer than most of our fellow citizens.

We share species, we share financing, we share methodology, we share the ambition to succeed and to operate at a profit; we share, to our occasional mutual irritation, I fear, markets for lumber and wood products. As might be expected, it is in the marketplace where our sharing becomes a source of antagonism, of suspicion, and of potential economic warfare. In any free economy the marketplace is, inevitably, the battleground.

And yet, it is in the marketplace where Canadian and United States lumber producers have the principal opportunity to find the means to sustain themselves, and each other, against their common enemies—substitute materials, halfhearted promotional efforts, meaningless and confusing industry standards, inferior lumber produced by opportunistic operators on both sides of the border, those lumbermen who want markets but won't pay the cost of association dues which promote such markets, and increasing inroads on the market we share by producers on other continents.

It has been said of the Irish that they all love to fight so much that when they have no common enemy to fight they will fight each other just for the fun of it. As an Irishman, I am privileged to observe that we have enough Irish in the lumber industry on both sides of the border to satisfy this ethnic trait. I can say as well, however, that we must stop fighting each other for the fun of it and agree that the common enemies I have just enumerated deserve our undivided attention in the marketplace while we work to resolve the differences remaining between us internationally.

I state, unequivocally, that the lumber industry of North America must unite its efforts to keep and expand its present markets in the face of serious opposition or it may well cease, within our lifetimes, to survive as an industry of significance.

Let us examine today our areas of mutual interest so that we can undertake dialogs leading to a mutual course of action which will sponsor cooperation and convert negative energy into positive results of benefit to us all.

It is clear to the U.S. lumber industry that retention and development of North American markets for lumber and wood products depends upon aggressive promotion of those products. It is equally clear that the Canadian industry, with limited markets at home, would naturally look to the nearest available markets for an outlet.

It has been increasingly unclear, however, to our producers why the Canadian industry, while vigorously seeking to satisfy the requirements of what it considers to be its fair share of the U.S. lumber market, has been demonstrably unwilling to assume a collateral fair share of the cost of promoting that market.

More rankling than any single difference between the Canadian and United States lumber industries has been the bafflement of American producers as to how the Canadian industry can sincerely expect to sustain its opportunity for sales in the U.S. market while making only a token contribution to the exploitation of that market while American lumbermen in our national and regional lumber and wood products associations are spending $12 million each year to develop lumber and plywood markets. There are American producers who have become extremely sensitive when they contemplate the loss of sales of their own lumber to Canadian lumber in markets which they have rigorously developed through the investment of thousands of dollars and countless man-hours of talent and energy.

This paradoxical situation may, in fact, be unique in international marketing. In practically every field where Canada and the United States are competitive in markets, whether they be Canadian or American, the normal obligation to promote a given product in a given market is observed. You will note this particularly in the automotive and appliance businesses when a strong Canadian market exists for U.S. products. This is the essence of the private-enterprise system. It should maintain in the lumber industry as well as all others.

Our single greatest stride in the maintenance and extension of the lumber market

in the United States has been that we have achieved through the aggressive, authoritative national wood promotion program.

The Canadian Wood Development Council has consistently provided modest financial support to that program over the past 5 years. I certainly do not intend to minimize the significance of that support although you would agree that it is not representative of the volume of lumber moving into the U.S. market. Neither should any of us minimize the value derived from those Canadian dollars invested in our promotion program.

I am sure that both Bob DeGrace and his predecessor as staff head of CWDC would attest that the materials provided for Canadian use by the national wood promotion program have been among the most effective wood promotion advertisements, technical studies, and merchandising aids available in the Dominion.

It is to your industry's great credit, I might add, that at the height of the controversy raging between Canadian and American lumber producers concerning imports, the CWDC not only continued but slightly increased its subscription for wood promotion.

We have had a similar experience with one of our own regional associations, which, while at one time seriously opposed to our program of national standardization, voted unanimously to continue its participation in the wood promotion effort.

It would appear, therefore, that the responsible elements within the lumber industry on both sides of the border recognize that without promotion of our products, regardless of where and by whom manufactured, we will have no markets to dispute about.

We have, then, attained a state of maturity which warrants further exploration of the feasibility of marshaling all of the financial means at our disposal to strengthen our promotion efforts as a means for joint resistance to the market inroads by substitute materials.

We have demonstrated to our international satisfaction that a unified North American lumber industry can undertake positive programs of advertising and merchandising which will revitalize the appeal of our product to the architect, builder, specifier, and ultimate consumer so effectively that our mutual share of the total building materials market will be substantially increased.

That our national wood promotion program is responsive to changing situations and constantly infused with new vitality is evident in the enthusiasm demonstrated by our own industry for the projected advertising approach for 1964 revealed to the committee early this month at its spring meeting.

Our advertising agency and staff have proposed, and the industry has agreed, that 1964 advertisements directed to the consumer and home buying public will take on an entirely new look and incorporate more specific advantages and benefits of lumber and wood products used for residential construction. The suggested new consumer program is soundly based on the following communications ideas: (1) Selling the value of individual homeownership; (2) selling the benefits of owning and living in a home of wood; (3) selling the specific advantages of individual lumber and wood product items that are involved in the construction and livability of a home made of wood.

This concept has been presented to the National Association of Home Builders and has received a most favorable reaction which will enable the lumber industry to merchandise its products and services right down to the local builder activity level.

Based on the theme, "Build or Buy a Home of Wood Now," this program of advertising, described by our agency as "a motion picture in print" will detail the structural, finish and furnishing aspects of a new wood home in such a way as to reveal the integrity, versatility, warmth and beauty of wood as always while buttressing the values of the product as revealed through our growing store of technical information concerning its insulation, acoustical, strength, and quality characteristics.

The staff, the agency, the responsible committee, the entire National Wood Promotion Committee, and the leaders of the industry have demonstrated an enthusiasm for this new advertising approach which surpasses any which I have seen in the 5 years of the promotion program.

We are sustaining the thrust of our marketing program for wood and will be limited in the impact on the market only by the funds at our disposal.

In striving for this case for international understanding which we are building, let us enter wood promotion as exhibit I. Promotion of a product, however, is not enough in this technological age, gentlemen. The product we provide in the marketplace must perform. It must meet and surpass the claims made for competitive materials. It must afford the buyer, specifier, and user maximum simplicity in terminology, ease of understanding and installation, and flexibility and efficiency in design and service if it is to compete on an even footing with engineered items which are rolled, extruded, cast, hammered, or squeezed to sizes, dimensions, and shapes which are predetermined on a computer and measured electronically to assure that they meet industry standards.

Our lumber industry, Canadian and American alike, must adopt standards, grades, and sizes which will win the respect and understanding of every potential user of lumber and wood products.

The U.S. industry took a major step in that direction, May 3 at San Francisco, when, after 3 years of effort and determined adherence to sound engineering principles, the first phase of a grade simplification and standardization program for all domestic softwoods won approval by the American Lumber Standards Committee.

Acceptance of and implementation of this standards program will unquestionably constitute an eternal landmark in the history of our industry. It will mark the day when the lumber industry for the first time can be said to have overcome the advantage which it had consistently provided freely to its competitors.

It is obvious, however, that a good deal needs yet to be done in winning conformity to established standards among producers. We can no longer expect that variations will be adjusted at the building site or modified in the shop. Labor costs prohibit this laziness on our part; building codes and performance standards are rigid in this regard—we, as lumber manufacturers, must comply or fall by the wayside.

If we fail to develop compliance with grade standardization and simplification to a point where we can afford the same assurances to our customers that other products can give, we face either the imposition of arbitrary requirements by Government or other engineering and standards bodies or total rejection in the marketplace. This is a job which we must do for ourselves if we would not have others do it for us.

As the principal suppliers of softwood lumber in the world, and with the forest resources, to sustain us in this position forever, Canada and the United States can certainly develop joint standards for softwood lumber which will be recognized as world standards. And they must stand rigid examination at the job site. Production of items to an accepted world standard should materially enhance development of markets throughout the world for the products from both our vast forests.

Let us introduce industry standards as exhibit 2 in the case for Canadian-American lumber industry cooperation.

Giving substance to any product or standard, however, implies ready identification of quality for the ultimate consumer. This means that items manufactured to conform to rigid standards must be properly identified so that the buyer can rely upon every piece for the intended use. If we are to stand against the giant industries intent upon wresting our traditional markets from us and depriving us of entry to new and developing markets, our industry must undertake, as a matter of policy, to extend both grading and grade marking of our lumber. We all know the homely saying, "One rotten apple can ruin a barrel." It is equally true when applied to one inferior piece of lumber in terms of acceptance of all lumber. If a 2 by 4 or a board is improperly graded, illicitly grade marked, or not graded or marked at all and fails in service, all lumber suffers in the mind of the consumer. It is our responsibility, as just and honorable men, to offer our customers assurances that if they buy graded and grade-marked lumber they will get exactly what they pay for. We must band together to establish ethical practices in grading and grade marking which will oblige opportunistic operators to join us in protecting our customers as well as our industry's reputation for quality products. Proper policing of our grading personnel and grading agencies will pay significant dividends to the entire industry.

I enter grading and grade marking as exhibit 3 in support of the case for international cooperation.

Aggressive promotion, meaningful standards, and quality control will inevitably provide the springboard for consolidation of gains in our present markets and development of new markets both in our continental areas and abroad. Gentlemen, there is truly a renaissance at work for wood throughout the world. In the past several months I have been privileged to visit Western Europe twice, from Scandinavia south to Italy and east to Germany. I have lately returned from Australia where I met lumber and wood products people from the Orient and the Pacific Ocean areas, and your fine BCLMA representative, Cyril Maplethorpe, with whom I enjoyed so many pleasant visits and conversations. In every place I visited and in every conversation, halfway around the world, I found new interest in wood, new determination to reestablish it as the world's premier building material * * * new life, new hope, new interest in tomorrow and the day after. We must organize ourselves, intellectually as well as industrially to exploit these opportunities. If we divert ourselves by indulging in continental strife we will muff our chance to improve our respective national positions and our mutual industrial positions by serving these untapped markets.

It is my contention that by gearing ourselves to face marketing challenges of our times together in a positive, contributive fashion we may dispel the gloom which besets both our countries when we look upon the unhappy spectacle of charges and countercharges concerning the cause and effect of the struggle for a single softwood lumber market.

We are, I fear, both being diverted from the larger task of developing a softwood market in North America which will be of such volume as to tax our total productive capacity.

You are, of course, aware that a number of bills have been introduced in the Congress of the United States designed to alleviate the economic impact of the constantly increasing volume of Canadian softwood lumber exports to the United States. Certain of these bills are being actively pushed; others are not, and the White House informed me only last week that President

Kennedy and Prime Minister Pearson have set up a committee to study the problem. Members of both parties have concerned themselves with the plight of our domestic industry and have offered assurances that corrective legislation is the order of the day.

Our industry has, as you know, been working actively for the passage of certain of these bills. We have, at the same time, been working to counteract the effect of what might be referred to as "legislative fallout." This phenomenon is the spontaneous development of local and State actions related to public issues before the national legislature. It may take the form of State laws restricting articles produced outside its own borders; it may manifest itself in unilateral actions by boards, commissions, county governments, municipal bureaus, and other governmental bodies empowered to act on matters affecting the use of building materials, most of which we, as an association, oppose.

It is readily apparent that while it is relatively simple to initiate legislative action, it is extremely difficult to predict either the course or extent of resulting "legislative fallout." The modification of administrative law, at any level, is an extremely difficult undertaking.

It might be appropriate for some of you at this point to nudge your neighbors and remind them that it is administrative law which lies at the root of many of the problems of the U.S. lumber industry. This has been the contention of many in the Canadian industry.

We cannot deny that a comparison of policies concerning the disposal of public timber in our two countries would certainly substantiate the fact that American lumbermen are victims of administrative laws which do not adversely affect Canadian lumbermen. At the same time I might caution that as governments become increasingly sophisticated, as governments consider what they do, they tend to withdraw from reality and impose new restraints on their people and their industries. It is altogether possible that the struggle being fought for equitable timber policies in the United States today might well be faced in Canada 10 years hence.

As a friend of justice I could not, in good conscience, wish that upon you—but it could happen. If we have won our fight by then, the marketing shoe might be on the other foot.

The delicacy of our own situation with respect to softwood lumber has been heightened by the Columbus Day blowdown in the Pacific Northwest last October.

Our industry has had imposed upon it the burden of salvaging 11.6 billion board feet of timber, a major portion of which would not otherwise have been harvested in 1963, 1964, or 1965. Our Federal Government has already demonstrated its interest in making it possible for the loggers and manufacturers to deal with this additional responsibility efficiently in the interest of reducing further losses through beetle infestation.

If our industry converts these downed trees into lumber it will be necessary to market that lumber promptly to avert further future dislocations in our domestic timber operations, employments, and distribution.

Faced with the prospect of absorbing much of this 11.6 billion board feet into U.S. markets during the next 3 years, in addition to the normal production, it should be obvious that it is going to require a maximum effort on the part of all elements of the industry to achieve a significant increase in the total market so that the total industry will not suffer economic depression. Increasing a market to this extent demands all-out promotion—there is no other way open to us.

Leaders of both Canadian and U.S. lumber interests must come forward to meet their respective obligations to themselves and their fellows—and, I might add, to each other.

It has long been my contention that true leadership is emergent only in time of crisis and controversy. There is a tendency in each of us to sit back in periods of calm and let our leadership qualities atrophy. Those of us who sit thus too long are also the ones who crawl further into our shells when the storms begin. But the true leader, the man who gets things done, responds to challenge and rises to face the onslaught of unpopular positions and critical times. Your industry and mine need such leaders now.

It is because I believe we must communicate if we are to understand each other and approach a satisfactory resolution of our mutual problems that I accepted the invitation to this meeting extended by Bob Gallagher. It will afford us an opportunity to renew our friendships and our quest for responsible talks among our leaders.

I have not commented here upon the Tariff Commission hearing because it would avail little to do so. I will say, however, that our lumber industry interests, both in the United States and Canada, would have been better served had we spent the time, money and energy, expended in that hearing by both sides, in striving toward achievement of effective lumber promotion, meaningful standards, and quality control. Together we spent untold sums to prove that we disagreed as to the effect of Canadian softwood lumber imports on the health of the U.S. industry. Now, we are faced with the necessity of undertaking the discussion at the governmental level once again of solutions to a problem which existed even before the Tariff Commission hearings * * * simply stated it is, "What percentage of the U.S. market can properly be filled by Canadian production without damaging both the domestic industry and the acceptance of lumber in the marketplace?"

If the U.S. industry suffers further damage, gentlemen, it will be unable and unwilling to finance promotion, standardization, product improvement or any of the associated benefits which inevitably follow upon a prosperous, progressive industry which supports industrywide improvements. Denied this effective program before the public, markets will inevitably be surrendered to other materials. The net effect will be that Canadian lumber will face the fight against competitive materials almost alone. Your industry will then be obliged to undertake the programs now supported by our industry with the net effect of substantially increasing your costs. If this happens, our industry will once again be able to compete on an equitable basis. But the damage suffered by the lumber industry in the North American continent will be irreparable.

We will have effectively destroyed our power to compete against steel, aluminum, clay products and other substitutes. I know that no lumber producer either here or at home wants this to happen. The present restraints imposed upon our opportunity to develop more extensive markets must be overcome mutually if we are to survive as an economic force in North America. No problem, however, defies solution if the need for solving it becomes urgent enough.

I am sure you will agree with me that our mutual market development problem is urgent. It can be solved because it must be solved. The principal means toward its solution involves the simple expedient of assuring that a percentage of the sale price on every thousand board feet of lumber produced and sold in North America is applied to product promotion, market development and associated industry technical advancement.

If that seems oversimplification, let me reply that it represents a stated opinion. It is only from stated opinions that discussion can begin.

I sincerely believe that the national wood promotion program and U.S. regional association promotions have proved their worth as a means to arouse a continuing desire among consumers, architects, builders, and other specifiers to become reacquainted with and use lumber and wood products. I believe that when a breakthrough has been achieved it should be exploited to the maximum extent. I believe that the desires and potentialities of Canadian and American lumbermen are not necessarily mutually exclusive. I believe that every lumberman, Canadian and American alike, can in good conscience, devote his energies and good will toward the accomplishment of our mutual purposes. I pledge myself to do so.

And, in so pledging, I would remind you that American children know little of Chippewa, Lundy's Lane, Queenston Heights, or the burning of York. The history of the bloody differences between Canada and the United States has been overshadowed by the history of our genuine friendship over the past century and a half. Can we in this giant North American industry do less than to emulate our historians and set aside the memories of our differences of the past in the interest of the agreements of the present and the future?

I know that together we can resolve existing differences. I know that together we can displace substitute materials in the marketplace. I know that given the means and the will and the sense of common urgency, the Canadian and American softwood lumber industries can achieve the marketing miracle of the century—and make a profit for every responsible lumberman who has the vision and the determination to make it happen.

EXHIBIT 2

NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
Washintgon, D.C., May 22, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your May 2 letter reflects the very careful thought that you have given to not only the problems of the American lumber industry, but to the difficulties confronting the entire wood products industry in the North American Continent.

Beginning with the lumber industry's request of the Secretary of Commerce in March of 1962, we have always felt that the long-term solution of our import problem depended upon mutual agreements of producers of lumber in both Canada and the United States that would satisfy both parties and provide positive results in the common problem of competing with substitute materials for wood. Because you know the frustrations that we met with in dealing directly with the Canadians on this subject, I will not recount the history of efforts over the last 12 months that add up to very little progress in this area. However, I have received an invitation to speak to the Northern Interior Lumbermen's Association in Prince George, British Columbia, on May 24. I anticipate that this will afford an opportunity to at least air some of the difficulties confronting the lumber industry in this country of which our friends in Canada may not be completely aware. Because of the limitations imposed by our domestic antitrust laws, I am sure that you recognize that private discussions dealing with quotas or pricing policies are denied to individuals in the business community. However, I do believe there can be an open and frank expression of viewpoints which could be helpful in obtaining a better understanding.

Because of the comments which you made before the Senate on May 9 it occurs to me that you may have some misconceptions about the efforts of this association on behalf of the American lumber industry. The lumber industry annually expends through

this association a little more than $2 million on the various programs designed to improve its competitive position in our economy. Of that sum, 96 percent of our resources are allocated to the promotion and development of markets for lumber in the United States and the improvement of our competitive position with regard to substitute materials.

For an industry comprised of between 20,000 and 40,000 individual producers, this voluntary expenditure of wood promotion funds is one of the finest examples, in my opinion, of the operation of the private enterprise system. Our work with architects, builders and other specifiers of lumber, our consumer advertising program, our work to eliminate unfair fire insurance regulations, our work to remove building code restrictions against the use of lumber and our research and development program to improve the utilization of lumber, are all part of a self help program which is carried on by those lumber producers who are far-sighted and believe that lumber's role in America's future will depend upon lumber's ability to compete successfully with other products. Unfortunately, there are lumber producers who do not want to participate in industry self help promotion programs. For reasons best known to these individuals, perhaps a lack of faith in the future of the lumber industry, none of their monies are spent in the development of the total wood market in this country which we believe to be of benefit to all lumber producers.

Perhaps the most devastating impact of the unfair competition of the Canadian lumber manufacturers is the effect their pricing practices has upon the willingness of U.S. lumber manufacturers to continue to spend hard-earned dollars to improve their product and promote the markets without reasonable opportunity for a return of such expenditures. Those companies which can look forward only to liquidation because of their inability to sell their lumber at a profit in the United States are certainly not going to be willing to waste their resources on wood promotion programs. Those who criticize the American lumber industry for not expending more money in the field of research and development might well ponder this problem.

I noted that you quoted Mr. Corydon Wagner on the question of the reason for the shut-down of one of the mills of the Georgia-Pacific Corp. I am sure that you recognize that Mr. Wagner has his major financial interests in the Canadian lumber industry at this time and, as revealed before the Tariff Commission last October, does not speak for any American lumber producer on this issue. I am sure the industry was surprised to read your use of Mr. Wagner's remarks. Nevertheless, I do believe it is significant that Mr. Robert B. Pamplin, president of Georgia-Pacific Corp., clearly set forth the current complaint of virtually the entire American lumber industry with regard to the pricing practices of Canadian lumber manufacturers who are selling their products in the United States.

Officials of the Georgia-Pacific Corp. also told us that the Canadian problem clearly was one of the reasons they closed the sawmill operation of Booth-Kelly.

The inability of domestic lumber producers to sell their products at a profit in the United States is directly attributable to the fact that Canadian lumber is sold in this country at a price below the cost of manufacture of many domestic lumber producers. I am sure that your investigation of the facts has indicated to you that the financial advantages enjoyed by Canadian producers as a result of currency devaluation, transportation advantages, and stumpage prices, enables Canadian producers to show a healthy profit at the time that our lumber industry is receiving an average annual rate of return on sales of 2.4 percent after taxes, as compared to an average return of 4.8 percent on all manufacturing sales in this country.

It has been my observation that the flight of capital across international boundaries is much easier to accomplish than is the transfer of job opportunities of employees involved in industries affected by import competition.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

MORTIMER B. DOYLE.

EXHIBIT 3

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOME BUILDERS,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept our thanks for your kind attention and insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the news stories on our new research house.

We have taken the liberty of reproducing all of the pertinent pages from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and mailing copies to our 381 affiliated associations and all our national officers. Six copies of our legislative report and the attached excerpts are enclosed for your use and information. Please let us know if you should desire more copies.

We concur in your judgment that the lumber industry faces increasing and determined competition from other industrial products and processes. This is evident in some of the new materials used in the research house in Rockville, Md. We hope soon to arrange an inspection trip of the research house so that you and other interested Members of Congress may take a look at some of the new uses of metals and plastics as well as improved uses of lumber and wood products.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH B. MCGRATH,
Director, Governmental Affairs.

EXHIBIT 4

THE WINTON CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 20, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A report of your speech in the Senate made last Thursday on lumber has just come to my attention. While I have not seen what you said, I am deeply impressed by what I hear about your remarks. They lead me to feel you have put the situation in sound perspective, as you often do.

You made a great point on the competition that lumber gets. A large portion of lumber is used for encasing. Other encasing materials have made important competition for lumber and their production has gone up, up, up. And lumber production has stood still. I am speaking, of course, of plywood, aluminum, gyp board, brick, hardboard such as Masonite, softboard such as Celotex, particle board, as well as concrete, steel, and many others. I don't know what the total of these items used for encasing comes to in square feet, but I would hazard the guess that it is many times the square footage of lumber produced in the United States, and has increased in every case.

Why the increase? Largely because the substitutes for lumber spend large amounts of money in research and on trade promotion, and very little in fighting each other, while lumber spends a great share of its energies in family fights.

I am sure you remember the Walker family from your days in Minneapolis. When old T. B. Walker saw his first barbed wire fence, he reported to his sons, Willis, Clint, Fletcher, and Archie, that he had seen wire with sharp things fastened to it that day. He said, "What in the world is going to happen to our 6-inch fencing lumber?"

Years later Willis said to me, "If it hadn't been for barbed wire fences there wouldn't be a tree big enough to make a 1 by 6 left in the United States today." He then proceeded to tell me there had been a substitute for every lumber use except the baseball bat.

The attached quotation is from Marple's Business Roundup, published in Seattle, dated April 11. I thought you would be interested in seeing the strong position taken by them on the overcut our forests are faced with.

I have sent for a copy of your speech and look forward to reading it with great relish.

One of these days I hope to have a chance to say hello to you when you aren't too busy.

This carries many sincere good wishes to you.

Sincerely,

DAVID WINTON.

"Far and away the fastest growth among the metals is forecast for aluminum. In the second half of the century aluminum will displace copper as the most widely used nonferrous metal. Demand for aluminum is expected to jump more than threefold from 1.6 million tons in 1960 to 5.6 million in 1980, followed by another jump to 14.7 million tons by 2000. Even under the least favorable circumstances, the report concludes, demand will more than double by 1980.

"The report does not single out Alaska but any such growth as is forecast for aluminum is almost certain to see development of Alaska's very substantial hydroelectric resources, such as the Rampart project on the Yukon, for aluminum smelting.

"Gains for aluminum are seen in construction, both for conventional items like doors, windows and trim, and for newer items like framing, paneling, roof trusses, and transmission line towers. Use of aluminum in transportation (trucks, buses, autos, etc.) will expand even faster and become the No. 1 market for this metal.

"In forest products, as in nonferrous metals, demand will outrun available resources. Lumber used in construction fell from 32.5 billion board feet in 1950 to 28.3 billion in 1960; by contrast, consumption is forecast at 46 billion in 1980 and 76 billion in 2000. The curve for western softwood plywood—a product on which few have been bold enough to forecast anywhere near actual growth—goes through the roof. Output rose from 3 billion in 1950 to 8 billion in 1960 (hit 9.5 billion in 1962, Douglas Fir Plywood Association reported last week); now demand is forecast at 27 billion in 1980 and an unbelievable 63 billion in 2000.

"Requirements for paper are seen as sharply higher—doubling by 1980 and doubling again by 2000. Requirements for pulp (mainly for paper) are placed at 25.7 million tons in 1960, 55 million in 1980, and 109 million in 2000.

"Can domestic forests supply the expanding needs of the United States? Definitely not, the report concludes ominously after examining various combinations of supply and growth rates in the West and East. The report sees several consequences:

"Fuller utilization of residues, both of logging and of sawmills and other processing plants; better growing practices; use of more hardwood in place of softwood for pulp; and substitution of other materials, such as brick, concrete, aluminum, glass and plastics in construction, sugar bagasse and other nonwood fibers in pulp, and aluminum foil and plastics in packaging.

"The United States will have to import more, particularly from Canada, which undoubtedly remains the most promising source of supply in the future. New forest resources, notably in South America and Africa, will have to be sought.

"What the report does not say but is obvious for the Pacific Northwest: Ownership of timber and mineral resources will become

of increasing value in the years ahead. But there's also the hazard that substitute materials, designed for new mass markets, may make deep inroads on conventional wood products. In broader terms, the forest and mineral resources of the Pacific Northwest cannot sustain growth comparable to that expected for the United States; hence the urgent need for diversification and broadening of the region's industrial base."

EXHIBIT 5

TACOMA, *May 24, 1963.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your kind letter of May 14 is much appreciated. I am pleased that my comments on the softwood lumber issue were of value and that they reached you at an appropriate time. Your clear and forceful presentation of this controversial matter on the Senate floor May 9, I understand, is being widely discussed and applauded. My thanks for mailing me the copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing your remarks, which I have read with interest.

I am sure that the price-cost squeeze which is being felt in varying degrees by units of the forest products industry, both in lumber and plywood, is due more to evolutionary changes in manufacturing methods and product uses than to any increase in lumber imports. That a day of reckoning was approaching has been evident for some years.

The voluminous detail which you presented indicates that you have been giving much attention and doing considerable research on this subject. As the senior Senator from the leading State in timber wealth and forest industry that might have been expected, but the country as a whole needed just this informed opinion and courageous expression in view of the misconceptions which have been widely publicized.

You have made an invaluable contribution in pointing out the constructive course to follow in solving the problem.

Yours truly,

CORYDON WAGNER.

EXHIBIT 6

MAY 17, 1963.

The recent decision of the American Lumber Standards Committee, recommending a 1½-inch lumber size at 19 percent maximum moisture content, brings the lumber size issue one step nearer a final decision but is, by no means, the final word on this controversy. Interindustry conflicts aside, the final acceptance or rejection of a new set of lumber sizes would rest with an amorphous group known as the "acceptor list" which will take part in a Commerce Department-conducted vote on the question. Considering the controversies which have developed within the industry over the proposals, it is safe to assume the entire wood-making, wood-using industry will be treated to substantial hard-sell pressure in the next few months from all sides, and that the subject will be high on the agendas of industry trade association meetings.

The NLMA, meeting last week in Las Vegas, fully endorsed the program and instructed its staff to devote time and money to its promotion among dealers and users. The basic program was initiated under the auspices of the national more than 2 years ago.

This week, directors of the National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association (formerly the NRLDA) voted to take a neutral position on a change in standards because there still is such a sharp division of opinion on the proposal at the manufacturer and distributor levels. This decision was reached on a 51 to 37 vote after a heated debate. The retailer representative on the ALS Committee cast one of the two votes opposing adoption of the proposal at the recent San Francisco meeting. The other dissenting vote was cast by the representative of independent grading agencies. As a result of the board action this week, NLBMDA is asking ALS to change the recorded "No" vote of the retailer to one of abstention if this can be done legally. Last November, the NLBMDA board voted "qualified opposition" to the program; this week's rather indefinite action appears to represent a shift in thinking on the board.

Some west coast manufacturers, primarily green lumber producers, are organizing to strengthen their opposition to the present proposal.

In view of all of this, it is extremely important that the industry at large fully understands the procedural steps involved in establishing a new standard:

ALS has appointed an editorial subcommittee to devise the exact wording for a new standard. A first draft of this is expected to be ready for distribution to members of the full committee in early June; committee members will have about 30 days in which to review the wording and either indicate their acceptance or propose changes. The ALS Committee then will have a special meeting in late July or early August at which time the final draft of a recommended standard will be worked out. This final draft will be submitted to the Commodity Standards Division of the Department of Commerce. During this same period, it is expected that a draft also will be presented to the Justice Department for legal review. The Commerce Department also will review the form of the recommendation and may make changes before submitting the recommended new standard to its "acceptor list." This list is made up of manufacturers, traders, dealers, architects, engineers and users of lumber and, in this instance, is expected to cover a wider segment of the lumber and building industries than ever before. The approval of a "substantial majority" of those on the list will be required before a new standard can be promulgated. It appears that the earliest possible date this could be accomplished would be January 1, 1964.

Since there are more dealers and users of lumber than there are manufacturers, this procedure puts the final decision on the question in their hands—probably in as close an approximation of a marketplace test as can be devised. Up to this point, the size standard has been basically a technical question for manufacturers and one which has not been wholly resolved. When it goes before the acceptor list it should stand or fall on the question of whether it really offers an improvement in the merchandising and use of lumber.

EXHIBIT 7

LUMBER IMPORT TEST

(By Peter Edson)

First test for the new era of improved relations between the United States and Canada may come over a proposal now before Congress to require that all U.S. lumber imports be labeled to show country of origin.

This is a hangover from a U.S. Tariff Commission unanimous decision of last February, finding that imports were not injuring the U.S. lumber industry and denying requested relief through increased customs duties. This was the first case heard under the new U.S. Foreign Trade Expansion Act.

Rebuffed here, American lumbermen sought redress in Congress. Over 40 bills have been introduced by Congressmen with lumber interests in their States. They call for import labeling, inclusion of lumber as an agricultural commodity which would entitle it to AAA protection against imports, restrictions on the use of foreign lumber in Federally financed housing and construction projects.

The proposal that has advanced furthest is an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930, introduced by Senators LEN B. JORDAN (Republican, Idaho), WARREN MAGNUSON (Democrat, Washington), and others. It would include "sawed lumber and wood products" with "new packages of imported articles" which would be required to carry a label showing country of origin. Hearings have been completed before the Senate Finance Committee and a report is expected soon.

But the always original WAYNE MORSE (Democrat, Oregon)—who has consistently supported his State's considerable lumber interests in the past—recently took the floor to question the Jordan-Magnuson approach. He argues that the reported declines in domestic lumber production and employment are not caused by import competition.

He blames a combination of new building materials and a shift from sawed lumber to plywood and other wood products which bring the mills higher prices. Senator MORSE calls for a conference of Northwestern United States and British Columbia lumbermen, who cut from the same Pacific coast forests, to find new markets.

Mortimer B. Doyle, executive vice president of the U.S. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, which originally sponsored the Canadian lumber labeling, is now advocating this same line of cooperation to compete with nonwood materials.

As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator MORSE goes even beyond this to line up as an internationalist supporting the best possible relations with Canada. In this stand he backs up the Kennedy administration, in which not only the Tariff Commission but also the Departments of State, Treasury and Commerce have opposed lumber import labeling.

Practically all the attention to President Kennedy's Hyannis Port conference with new Canadian Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson was focused on the Dominion's acceptance of U.S. nuclear warheads for mutual defense missiles. But trade, shipping and other economic issues were also discussed. And the desirability of giving Prime Minister Pearson's new government strong support is considered important at this time.

Most of Canada's lumber exports formerly went to the British Isles. But the postwar increase of Russian lumber exports to Western Europe have cut this trade. And the great increase in U.S. construction has created heavy demands.

Nearly 80 percent of Canada's lumber exports—principally softwoods—now come to the United States. Though this is only about 15 per cent of the U.S. lumber use, it is an important U.S. dollar earner for Canada.

Over 40 percent of Canada's exports to the United States are forest products. About the same percentage of the U.S. exports to Canada are iron and steel products. U.S. investments in Canada and U.S. trade with Canada are now larger than they are between the United States and all six European Common Market countries. Even so, Canada has an unfavorable trade balance with the United States of over $1 billion a year.

Curing U.S. lumber imports from Canada would only make this balance worse. Furthermore, according to U.S. lumber dealers, it would increase lumber prices. For this reason it is also opposed by the U.S. National Association of Home Builders.

ALASKA STATUTORY REVISION ACCOMPLISHED

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, much progress has been made by the State of Alaska since our territorial status was heightened to statehood. One of the more outstanding accomplishments has been a total revision of the Alaska statutory law. In territorial days we relied

upon a combination of State and Federal law. When statehood arrived the incomplete territorial statutes required a total revision. This has been done in a very careful and deliberate manner by the Alaska Legislative Council with the full cooperation of the executive and judicial branches of the State government and the Alaska Bar Association.

I am personally convinced, Mr. President, that the manner in which the Alaska statutes have been prepared and presented is far superior to that followed in most States and certainly represents an improvement over our own Federal system of statutory revision. The Alaska statute is the law, not just prima facie evidence of the law. With the decimal system of numbering and the use of loose pamphlets for each title, the State will not be forced into the costly practice of a total formal revision every 5 to 10 years.

This accomplishment is very ably described by a leading article in the January 1963 Alaska Law Journal, which is a publication inaugurated this year as the official newspaper of the Alaska Bar Association and the Alaska Supreme Court. I ask that the article, "Alaska Statutes," by Jane F. Asher, reviser of statutes, be printed in the RECORD along with a list of those primarily responsible for the initiation of the Alaska Law Journal, including the board of governors, the journal board of directors, and the journal staff:

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

ALASKA STATUTES: REVISION OF ALASKA LAW

(By Jane F. Asher, reviser of statutes)

A revision of Alaska law, as found in Alaska Compiled Laws Annotated 1949 and all subsequent session laws through the 1962 legislative session, has been completed. This revision is contained in five volumes, is entitled "Alaska Statutes," and is the result of 5 years of planning and work. There are some differences and many advantages in using the Alaska Statutes as compared with Alaska Compiled Laws Annotated 1949 and the session laws. The purpose of this article is to acquaint you with the format and use of the Alaska Statutes in order that it may be used immediately with maximum efficiency.

BULK FORMAL REVISION

The bulk formal revision of Alaska law which resulted in the Alaska Statutes was a revision of the entire body of statutory law consisting of collecting the laws according to subject matter and arranging them in a logical system of positive law without making substantive changes such as correcting legislative errors, clarifying the law or trying to make it more workable. Specifically, the ends sought were to:

1. Determine what statutes were in effect by eliminating the obsolete, unconstitutional, and unnecessary sections of the law;

2. Organize the live law according to subject matter into a logical classification system of titles, chapters, and sections;

3. Restate the law in clear and simple language with uniformity of expression, capitalization, spelling and punctuation, and with redundancies removed, misspelled words corrected, poor grammar reconstructed, and frequently used and critical terms defined and consistently used; and

4. Establish a numbering system which provides immediate identification and access to the subject matter and which is sufficiently flexible to accommodate future enactments.

FORMAT

The Alaska Statutes is five volumes of looseleaf binders which contain the bound title pamphlets. The first pamphlet in volume 1 includes nonstatutory material such as the table of contents, U.S. Constitution with index, treaties, and conventions, Organic Act, Statehood Act, Presidential statehood proclamation, Omnibus Act, and the Alaska Constitution with index and annotations.

ANNUAL CONTENTS CARD

The annual contents card follows after the first pamphlet. The card shows the date each title pamphlet was published. A new card will be published each year with the cumulative supplement pamphlet and any other pamphlets that are reprinted. If you wish to know when a pamphlet containing a particular title has been reprinted, you look at the annual contents card. If it shows "Title 14—December 1962" you look on the cover page of the pamphlet containing title 14 and if your statutes are current the cover page will have the same date as that listed on the card. This simple method assures the user of the Alaska statutes that he is using the current law.

LAW

The 47 titles of law (such as title 11, criminal law) follow the annual contents card. Each title is in one or more bound pamphlets depending on the size of the title. The maximum size of any pamphlet is 240 numbered pages, and if a title includes material in excess of this figure, the material is divided into more than one pamphlet, each of substantially equal size. Page numbering is by title.

The chapters in a title are listed at the beginning of the title. Articles in a chapter are listed immediately after the chapter title, and the section numbers and titles follow after the article title. If the chapter is not divided into articles the section numbers and titles follow the chapter title. This is the same format used in the Alaska Compiled Laws Annotated 1949.

DECIMAL NUMBERING

The numbering system used in the Alaska statutes is a three-part number separated by decimal points. The first two digits is the title number. Title numbers are consecutive from the number "1" through "47."

The second two digits of the number is the chapter. Most chapters are numbered at intervals of five so that new chapters can be inserted between the existing chapters. However, chapters are numbered at intervals of two, three, or four in those titles which contain 20 or more chapters.

The last three digits of the number is the section number. This portion of the complete number is in most instances numbered at 10-unit interavls which may be divided further at 1-unit intervals. For example: .001, .002; .010, .011, .012; .100, .101, .102, etc.

Under this system the first section in the Alaska Statutes is AS 01.05.010, which is title 1, ch. 5, sec. 10. This numbering system is very similar to that in the Alaska Compiled Laws Annotated 1949 where the first number is sec. 1–1–1, which is title 1, ch. 1, sec. 1. However, the Alaska Statutes system permits the insertion of an almost unlimited number of chapters and sections as well as flexibility in section numbering. Properly spaced numbering with room for expansion also makes it possible to avoid reusing a number if the law in a particular section is repealed or substantively revised. No one can anticipate where growth will come in the law and the more intervals that are left at the beginning the less distortion of the pattern occurs with the passage of time and laws.

INDEX

Each title has an index at the end of the text. The index is one of the most important if not the most important part of the revision. It is a detailed and exhaustive index with adequate cross indexing but with no cross index referring to another one. The index is based not upon the section heading but upon the contents of the section. In addition to the index to each title there is a concordance index which is the last pamphlet in the last volume. The concordance index is used only when you do not know which title index you should use. The concordance index refers you to a particular title rather than to a section. For example if you looked up "Alaska Statutes, amendment" the concordance index would refer you to "Title 1." Then the same designation in the index to title 1 would refer you to AS 01.05.030. The grouping of the law into titles which are for the most part self-explanatory, such as Title 4, Alcoholic Beverages or Title 15, Elections, and frequent use of the Alaska Statutes will almost totally eliminate the need to use the concordance index.

SOURCE OF SECTION

Following the last word of each section the source of the section is cited in parentheses. The citation shows the original source as well as all amendments. If the source of the section is complicated, an additional explanation is found in the reviser's note.

REVISER'S NOTES, ANNOTATIONS, AND REFERENCES

Annotations and collateral references appear at the end of a section. Case notes are prepared from the cases rather than from the headnotes and cover all cases involving Alaska law, such as cases in the U.S. Supreme Court, circuit court of appeals, district court for the territory of Alaska, U.S. district court, and the superior court. Cross-references are added where helpful such as cross-references to the court rules in title 9, Civil Procedure, and title 12 Criminal Procedure. Annotations are prepared to all published opinions of the attorney general since statehood, from January 3, 1959 to June 1962. Collateral references to American Jurisprudence, American Law Reports, and Corpus Juris Secundum are included where appropriate. Reviser's notes and editor's notes cover explanatory material affecting a section and include executive orders of the Governor having the force of law. The executive orders are indexed in the same manner as the law, though they appear only in a note.

TABLES

After the 47 title pamphlets there is a pamphlet containing tables. One table indicates what has happened to each section of Alaska Compiled Laws Annotated 1949 and the subsequent session laws. If a section of law has been repealed, the table will give the repealing citation. If a section is in the Alaska Statutes, the number of the section will be listed. If a section is not in the Alaska Statutes, the table will show it as deleted. There are varied reasons for deletions. The revision contains only general and permanent law so special, local or temporary laws, laws making appropriations, and laws affecting a bond issue or authorizing a bond issue are deleted. In addition laws which are obsolete because of statehood, executed, or held unconstitutional by the State supreme court are also deleted.

There is a second table based on the first Alaska code which was published in 1900, Carters Annotated Alaska Code. The code contains five parts: Part 1—The Penal Code; Part 2—Code of Criminal Procedure; Part 3—The Political Code; Part 4—The Code of Civil Procedure; and Part 5—The Civil Code. The table indicates if a section of Part 1—The Penal Code, and Part 5—The Civil Code, is

essentially the same as a section of the Alaska Statutes and the Alaska Statutes section number is listed. Since most of the sections in Carters Annotated Alaska Code were derived from some other State, the derivation of the sections are shown. Finally, the table shows whether or not the State from which a particular section was derived has that law today and if so the section number is listed. For example, AS 09.55.010 is derived from Carters Annotated Alaska Code, part 5, section 32, which was in turn derived from Hills Oregon Code, section 2947, which today is Oregon Revised Statutes section 33.310. By comparing AS 09.55.010 with ORS 33.410 and shepardizing the latter, an attorney can quickly tell if there are any Oregon cases which can be of assistance to him, or he can ascertain if a section of the Alaska Statutes was the same in 1900 so that Alaska cases from that date forward can be researched.

No section of Part 3—The Political Code, exists in today's law. The table has not yet been prepared for Part 2—The Code of Criminal Procedure, and Part 4—The Code of Civil Procedure. This will be completed and included in a cumulative supplement pamphlet. It is hoped that later cumulative supplements can contain annotations to cases on other States which have practically the same law today and from which we derived our law as shown by this table.

ANNUAL CUMULATIVE SUPPLEMENT PAMPHLETS

At the close of each legislative session a cumulative supplement will be prepared which will include all statutory changes, supplemental annotations and collateral references made in all titles in the Alaska Statutes, and amendments or annotations to the Alaska constitution, tables and indexes. If, for examples, titles 1 to 10 are in volume 1, then the cumulative supplement pamphlet for that volume will include changes or additions to items in the first pamphlet (such as to the Alaska constitution) and to the first 10 titles. The cumulative supplement pamphlet for the last volume would cover changes in the titles in that volume as well as tables and the concordance index. The supplement will also contain a table of sections which will reflect which sections have been added, amended, or repealed.

A blue dividing page will separate the material supplementary to one title from the material supplementary to the next title. If a section is added or amended and again amended by a subsequent legislature, this fact will be reflected in the table of sections and the nature of the amendments will be indicated in a note at the end of the section, but the section itself will be written as last amended. Thus, the user of the statutes need look in only two places to find the current law year after year. He looks first in the title pamphlet and then one place in the Annual Cumulative Supplement Pamphlet.

If a section is repealed, the cumulative supplement will indicate this in a reference at the appropriate section number and in the table of sections. When a replacement pamphlet is issued, the repealed sections will be noted in the replacement pamphlet, but not the notation of the section or the repeal citation.

REPLACEMENT PAMPHLETS

A replacement of a title by reprinting the pamphlet or pamphlets containing the title will be made when the supplemental material, including amendments, annotations, collateral references, and notes exceeds one-third of the pages in the original pamphlet or pamphlets of the title. When replacement pamphlets are needed they will be published at the same time as the cumulative supplement and the annual contents card at no additional cost to those purchasing the cumulative supplement.

BINDERS

The binders have two important features. A lever inside the front cover releases the lock and allows the top cover to be lifted up and pamphlets extracted. The top cover does not need to be pushed down against the pamphlets to lock the binder. If extra space is left between the front cover of the binder and the pamphlets the volume will lie flat when open for use.

The binder has a plastic picture insert frame. A card slipped under the plastic indicates the volume number and the material it contains. When expansion is required, an additional binder is used and new cards are inserted indicating the material then contained in the six volumes. Also, if the material in only one volume becomes excessive, the pamphlets can be redistributed between volumes at the time of the publication of the cumulative supplement pamphlet and new cards prepared for insertion in the plastic frames. This simple maneuver allows for expansion of the statute without having to replace all the binders.

EFFECT

Under chapter 16 SLA 1962 (AS 01.05.010 and 01.05.020) the Alaska Statutes were adopted as prima facie evidence of the law of the State and "In all courts, tribunals, and public offices of the State, the matter set out in the Alaska Statutes establishes prima facie the laws of the State of Alaska of general and permanent nature." Chapter 84, SLA 1962 (AS 01.05.030) allows the Alaska Statutes to be cited, amended or repealed after January 1, 1963, and any amendment, including the entire context set out in the amendatory act, shall, as amended, constitute the law. A bill will be introduced in the 1963 session of the legislature to adopt the Alaska Statutes as the law of the State.

LEGISLATION

Formerly, a bill could act upon existing law, as by amending Alaska Compiled Laws Annotated 1949 or a session law, or it could create new law without reference to existing law. The Alaska Statutes, however, codify all general and permanent law, and amendments and additions to and repeals of general and permanent law may be made only by specific reference to the Alaska Statutes. For example: "Section 1. AS 26.15.100 is amended to read:" or "Section 1. AS 26.15 is amended by adding a new section (or new sections) to read:" or "Section 1. AS 26 is amended by adding a new chapter to read:" The section to be amended or the section or sections to be added are then set out.

Legislation which is not of a general and permanent nature has not been affected by the publication of the Alaska Statutes. Bonding laws, appropriation laws, and laws of a local, special or temporary character may therefore be enacted, amended, or repealed without reference to the Alaska Statutes.

The "Manual for Legislative Drafting" published by the Alaska Legislative Council contains sections on legal drafting and clerical drafting which specifically describe legislative drafting methods for the 1963 legislative session.

ERRORS

A bulk formal revision is a monumental task requiring many months of careful work. But regardless of how carefully it is done errors are inevitable in a work of this magnitude. Users of the Alaska Statutes are therefore invited and requested to report errors or suspected errors to the Reviser of Statutes, Alaska Legislative Council, Post Office Box 2199, Juneau, Alaska. Corrective legislation will be introduced immediately so that the Alaska Statutes will become a more perfect product.

ALASKA LAW JOURNAL

Official newspaper of the Supreme Court and Alaska bar.

Published monthly by the Alaska Bar Association, Box 279, Anchorage, Alaska. Subscriptions: $12 a year.

Correspondence regarding the Journal and subscriptions—Alaska Law Journal, Box 1481, Juneau, Alaska.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

William V. Boggess, Fairbanks, president.
David H. Thorsness, Anchorage, first vice president.
Robert H. Ziegler, Ketchikan, second vice president.
Stanley J. McCutcheon, Anchorage, secretary.
W. C. Arnold, Anchorage.
Fred O. Eastaugh, Juneau.
John E. Havelock, Juneau.
Michael A. Stepovich, Fairbanks.
Karl L. Walter, Fairbanks.

JOURNAL BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Robert Boochever, Juneau.
Richard R. Cole, Fairbanks.
Lester W. Miller, Anchorage, chairman.

JOURNAL STAFF

Donald L. Craddick, Robert C. Ely, Avrum Gross, Michael M. Holmes, Jerry Kurtz, Shirley F. Meuissen, James N. Wanamaker, Lester W. Miller, Frank Nosek, Helen D. Simpson.

Stanley Howitt, editor.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR McINTYRE BEFORE YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Young Democrats of New Jersey were fortunate enough to be hosts on May 25 to Senator THOMAS J. MCINTYRE, of New Hampshire. At their annual conference in Atlantic City, the Young Democrats heard Senator MCINTYRE give a vigorous analysis of some of the problems that face our Nation and other nations today. His comments were timely and welcome, and they show that the Senator from New Hampshire has a keen understanding of the need for the creativity and the initiative to deal with social and economic problems as they arise. His words to the New Jersey Young Democrats should be shared with other citizens; I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY U.S. SENATOR TOM MCINTYRE, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, ANNUAL CONVENTION, YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUB OF NEW JERSEY, ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., MAY 25, 1963

My fellow Democrats and friends, I am always particularly pleased to have the opportunity of joining with the Young Democrats on occasions such as this, for having been a Young Democrat once myself, I feel a special bond and a special indebtedness to the Young Democrats.

Since becoming a U.S. Senator, I have—as you may imagine—received many requests to speak at a variety of functions. Most of them I am delighted to accept, when my schedule allows. Frankly, however, I'm a little worried about an appearance I'm to make this Memorial Day observance back in New Hampshire. When I received the invitation, it was worded this way: "The program will include a welcome by the mayor, a concert

by the local band, your address and then the firing squad."

I first became a member of the Young Democrats in September of 1936 at Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H. It was the year of Franklin D. Roosevelt's bid for reelection and I came under the spell of a young man from Kentucky by the name of Bill Clay. Bill was a young orator and a fervent Democrat. Our group was small, about 20 to 25 in number, but what we lacked in size we made up in inspiration. Our president, Bill Clay, got all of us so excited about the qualities and the leadership of F.D.R. that we decided to take our cause into the surrounding hills of Hanover. Up and over the dirt roads of the adjoining towns Lyme, Orford and Enfield and down and around the banks of the Connecticut River we carried our important message. We had no full realization then of what kind of alien territory we were trying to convert. But no group of missionaries ever journeyed into the dark reaches of Africa with more fervor than about a dozen of us Young Democrats. The territory we encountered, while not overly populated, was almost 100 percent Republican. It was the roughest sort of territory for a bunch of political neophytes. In fact, I talked to one old gal who still held the definite opinion that Herbert Hoover was the President of the United States. We couldn't help the local county Democratic candidates because there were none. I don't have to tell you who won the presidential election but privately and secretly, we the Young Democrats of Dartmouth took credit for the fact that New Hampshire in that year of 1936 came over to the Democratic column with its electoral votes.

Last June while attending my 25th reunion at Dartmouth College, I saw Bill Clay for the first time in 25 years. I told him I had a mind to run for the U.S. Senate and Bill, still a Young Democrat at heart, made the first contribution to my campaign.

For many years, New Jersey Democrats, have had ample cause to be proud of their Young Democrats, as you are known as one of the most active and able groups in the country. The Democrats have done well here in New Jersey—men like Bob Meyner, Pete Williams, and now Gov. Dick Hughes have been the result. You the Young Democrats have contributed your share to these well-earned victories. So I salute you as soldiers in the ranks today and leaders of the Democratic Party in New Jersey and in the Nation tomorrow. For certainly this has been true in New Hamshire where the victory was, in many respects, fashioned by an outstanding Young Democrat who rose to become our national committeeman, Mr. William Dunfey, of Hampton, N.H.

As you might suspect, from the fact that we had not until last fall elected a Democratic Governor in 40 years or a Democratic Senator in 30 years, our State organizational strength was to say the least very spotty. It was therefore, a real thrill for me as a candidate to witness a Young Democratic organization come into existence in the city of Portsmouth, N.H., for example. This group, numbering in all about 100, did a truly bangup job. It helped one successful Democratic candidate carry not only the city of Portsmouth, but the strong, hardcore Republican county of Rockingham. Its leadership was centered around three or four young men from the University of New Hampshire and Boston University. Its enthusiasm knew no bounds—its will to win was infectious.

To give you an idea of some of these Young Democrats' activities:

They opened and manned a Main Street headquarters.

Conducted a series of barbecues and raised money for their activities.

Increased their membership by leaps and bounds.

Volunteers on weekends rode trucks all over our State putting out homemade signs.

Organized and led bumper sticker campaigns at supermarkets and trading centers with unbelievable results.

Elected two of their members to the State legislature.

The sincerity and numerous activities of the group drew editorial praise from the local press.

In fact, the whole city was caught up in their enthusiasm. We had about a half dozen other Young Democratic groups in the State, but during the closing days of the campaign I often silently wished that the zeal, optimism, and hard work of the Portsmouth Young Democrats could have been duplicated in every city in New Hampshire. For I truly believe that if this had been true we would have also elected a Democrat to the First Congressional District. I can truthfully say that when you are lucky enough as a candidate to have young men and women working for your candidacy with all the energy that youthful groups can generate, you are a fortunate candidate indeed.

New Hampshire, as you know, is my home State and recently it has been very much in the news. The passage of a State lottery law has raised more than one eyebrow across the Nation.

Let me try to place this law in some form of perspective for you. After years and years of Republican leadership, New Hampshire's tax system remains primitive. We have no general sales tax, no individual or corporate income tax except a negligible tax on interest and dividends. The bulk of State income is raised by excise taxes on such things as cigarettes, alcoholic beverages, parimutual racing, and gasoline. The communities are staggering under heavy property taxes. Our State is 50th, or last, in the Nation in aiding towns and cities with the problems of education. Something had to be done. New Hampshire is a small but honest State. I can think of no better place to conduct this experiment. If it works, I imagine other States will follow. If you look at it in this context, you may be better able to understand how it happened. But make no mistake, the lottery bill became law because of the genuine and overwhelming endorsement of it by the average men and women of New Hampshire. It had strong bipartisan support. Currently in New Hampshire just about everyone is claiming credit for its enactment.

All of us are fortunate that we are members of the Democratic Party, a party which despite the fact that it represents a coalition of many minority groups and of many regional viewpoints is nevertheless the party that has dominated the national scene for the last 30 years. The fact that it dominated this scene has been no accident. It is because our choice as a party was made 30 years ago and our President, John F. Kennedy, has and is keeping us in full pursuit of that choice, the choice of anticipating the future rather than clinging to the fading institutions of the past. The folly of the Republican Party, the fatal defect in its thinking all these years has been its consistent habit of doing its utmost to stop our progress along what Tennyson called "The ringing grooves of change."

The Republican Party's opposition today to the President's program is not particularly effective, but where this opposition deals in the scare headline technique with respect to Cuba and again where it calls for economy in the form of budget slashing and gouging, I will have to admit it does score some miserable, irresponsible points. The prize issue of the conservatives is Cuba. Here, as always, they are debasing the currency of political debate, for as you know, the wages of rightwing hysteria are fear. They take a woefully exaggerated view of the present military danger posed by Cuba, which is a third-rate military power by modern-day standards of defensive capacity against the vehicles of nuclear attack. Constant surveillance has prevented and will continue to prevent any further use of the island as a base for Soviet strategic weapons as a deterrent screen giving Castro any freedom for military movements in the Caribbean. His capacity for overt action and nuclear blackmail was stifled by our prompt action in October, and cannot be regained without a direct reply from the United States.

What should concern us, my friends, is to destroy Castro's capacity for covert subversion, and to replace his regime with one that will restore freedom to Cuba. A series of strong economic counterpressures have caused drastic reductions in trade, until Cuba's trade with the free world today is but 15 percent of what it was in 1960. The annual norm for the Cuban sugar crop has been on the order of 6 to 7 million tons. In 1962 it was 4 million tons. Furthermore, Castro's stock among university-trained people and other Latin American opinion makers has never been so low as it is right now. Yet the weaker Castro becomes, the more shrill are the cries of danger from the ever-vocal right wing.

The principal difficulty in articulating an adequate response to the real threat of Cuba, which is to the rest of the hemisphere rather than to ourselves, has been to make an effective unit out of the differing national interests of Central and South America. We must go further toward harassment of the regime and toward effective quarantine on travel. But unless such action is taken in concert with our allies it increases disunity and widens the breaches through which subversion may enter other lands of the hemisphere. But above all, let us remember that communism will not cease to threaten South America when Castro is gone. The Alliance for Progress offers a permanent solution to what Secretary of Defense McNamara has called the danger of "discouragement, disillusionment, and despair" in this hemisphere.

The problems, including Cuba, with which we deal today are difficult ones. There are rarely easy answers.

For the first time, we as a nation which has historically suffered from a shortage of labor, have had to deal with the problem of chronic unemployment since 1957; the unemployment rate has passed 5 percent in all but 1 month.

For the first time, we as a nation of abundant land and rich resources have had to deal with problems of congested cities, misuse of resources and water, and air pollution. In the 1960's 75 percent of our people live on only 2 percent of our land.

We have passed through a period of nuclear superiority wherein our overwhelming first-strike capability formed the basis of defense policy. We now enter a new and troubling period where neither of the great powers has a clear advantage because each has emplaced missiles in hardened sites which can reply even after a nuclear attack.

Because the programs which we have proposed are new, we are told that they are unneeded. Because they involve the spending of funds, we are told that they are unwise. The prophets of doom and disaster wring their hands and cry of the paternalistic state. They charge that we are coddling the citizen from cradle to grave. They warn that we would destroy that independence and self-reliance upon which America was founded.

In reply I need only ask: Who is the more independent—the unemployed, who hat-in-hand must beg for work where none exists? Or the employed, who through retraining have learned useful skills and secured productive jobs?

Who is the more independent—the elderly citizen who must rely upon public charity

to pay the costs of hospital care? Or the citizen who has saved through social security for such an emergency and thus can pay with his own earnings?

Who is the more independent—the consumer who is victimized by false packaging and misleading advertising? Or the consumer who can choose from a variety of goods, secure that he will get that for which he pays, and safe from harmful or damaging merchandise?

I for one—and I think that you as Democrats will agree—feel that these human needs are the proper province for government concern. And we must make sure that these changes represent blessings rather than burdens. If we are to assure this, we must allow ourselves the freedom, and demand of ourselves the creativity and the initiative to deal with social and economic problems as they arise.

As the 1964 campaign gets underway the Presidency is but part of our task. We must also elect another Democratic Congress. In New Jersey this will mean returning to office one of the finest Senators I have had the privilege to know—Senator PETE WILLIAMS. It will also mean sending Democrats to the House of Representatives.

In 1964 the issues will be on our side. Our side will also have the candidates. But this, alone, is not enough. You—the members upon whom our Party depends—must make sure that in addition to the issues and the candidates, we have the organization, the teamwork and the popular voice with which we can win.

We depend on you—the young members of a youthful Party to carry the message of the Democratic program to the people of New Jersey. For the future at which our program aims is your future and that of your children. And the America which we wish to see in that future can only be as strong as our efforts of today.

One fact we know—our candidate for the Presidency has already shown his metal, already proved his calibre, already given us the start we need.

This man—John Fitzgerald Kennedy—will lead the way.

PROPOSED BAN ON ATMOSPHERIC AND UNDERWATER NUCLEAR TESTING

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have read with a great deal of interest Senate Resolution 148 which was introduced in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and others on May 27. This resolution proposes that the Senate go on record as supporting a renewed U.S. offer to the Soviet Union of an agreement banning all tests that contaminate the atmosphere or the oceans and that, in the event of the rejection of such offer, we commit ourselves unilaterally to a moratorium on such testing.

I recognize that it is the objective of the resolution to bring to bear upon the negotiations in Geneva the prestige and influence of the U.S. Senate in the hope that these so far futile talks might finally succeed in achieving at least one small, faltering step in the direction of slowing the arms race.

I am sympathetic with the objectives which the Senator from Connecticut has in mind. I am not one of those who would oppose any test ban agreement at all times and under all circumstances. I am one, however, who insists that any such agreement be ironclad and be fully adequate to protect our security, safety, and survival. In this crucial area—upon which the very survival of our country might depend—we must be certain, not only beyond all reasonable doubt, but to the exclusion of every reasonable hypothesis of a doubt.

Therefore, as much as I sympathize with the objectives of the Senator from Connecticut and those of my colleagues who joined him in sponsoring the resolution, I must give expression to my conviction that we cannot afford to act in this vital field until we are in full possession of all facts which bear on the question of whether any cessation of atmospheric nuclear testing by us—whether unilaterally or as the result of an agreement—is truly in the national self-interest.

I think that we will all agree that in the past it has been necessary for us to conduct nuclear tests, despite any hazards and disadvantages that might accompany them, for the purpose of insuring that this Nation had at its disposal the means to insure our survival. From atmospheric testing have come all of our major nuclear weapons developments and our knowledge of the means to employ them most effectively in the defense of our country if it should become necessary. For my part I would support an atmospheric nuclear test ban only if I was entirely convinced that there is absolutely no relationship between continued testing by this country and the ability of our retaliatory or second strike forces to survive a surprise nuclear attack.

I am sure that we would all agree that a nuclear test ban would not be in the national interest if we were at a substantial qualitative disadvantage to the Soviets in the field of the development of nuclear weapons. While I do not believe that such a qualitative disadvantage exists it is clear that, if it did exist, a cessation of testing by us might be a prelude to national suicide. It is clear that we need hard and cold facts in this area.

We also need hard and cold facts in the area of nuclear effects, in determining what effect an enemy's nuclear explosions would have upon our ability to survive and respond. If there are real, tangible, and substantial doubts and unresolved questions in this field which cannot be resolved without further atmospheric testing, then, as President Kennedy said on March 2, 1962, "until we measure the effects of actual explosions in the atmosphere under realistic conditions, we will not know precisely how to prepare our future defenses, how best to equip our missiles for penetration of an antimissile system, and whether it is possible to achieve such a system for ourselves."

These are some of the questions which must be asked and answered before the necessary unqualified assurance in this field can be acquired:

Are atmospheric nuclear tests required to provide our Nation with an effective defense against Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles?

Are atmospheric nuclear tests required to provide our Nation with a certain capability to penetrate a Soviet missile defense employing nuclear warheads?

Are atmospheric nuclear tests required to assure the immunity of our second strike missile systems to a surprise enemy nuclear attack?

Are atmospheric nuclear tests required to develop specialized nuclear warheads to defend our Nation against satellite bombs and other terror weapons with which the free world has been threatened?

President Kennedy in his statement of March 2, 1962, said that, until we have the necessary testing, we cannot be certain how much of our preparation in the field of nuclear weapons "will turn out to be useless: blacked out, paralyzed, or destroyed by the complex effects of a nuclear explosion." Nothing less than certainty in this area will suffice.

That statement was made by the President some time ago, but I am reliably informed that we have not yet completed an evaluation of the tests to which he referred at that time. That evaluation is still in progress and has not been completed and its effect fully determined.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri, who has very extensive knowledge of this complex problem, as well as a very keen interest therein.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I congratulate the able Senator from Mississippi for bringing to the attention of the Senate the fact that he, with great preparation and care, is attempting to obtain the facts with respect to this all-important subject. The future of the United States and the free world could possibly depend upon decisions made in this field.

Has the Senator not been disturbed by some of the detailed technical information which has been presented to the subcommittee in the many days and weeks of hearings by the experts in their particular fields with respect to what could happen to certain aspects of our defense structure if the Soviets were to continue tests in secret and at the same time this country should decide to enter into another moratorium comparable to the 34-month moratorium between 1958 and 1961.

Mr. STENNIS. Based upon the sincere testimony taken under oath, which we have heard from competent witnesses, I am greatly disturbed by the things we have learned with reference to the possibilities—even in some cases probabilities—as to what would be our situation should we be caught short, so to speak. The Senator from Mississippi believes that there must be a thorough consideration of these questions immediately. I believe that a more thorough consideration will bring out the certainties and uncertainties, so that a real evaluation can be made.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe that the Senator from Mississippi is performing a great service this evening in making these observations, in his typically quiet and thorough manner.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. Unfortunately, most of the testimony

that we have received is of the highest security nature, and cannot be published now.

I do nothing more than state the simple truth when I say that the U.S. Senate does not now have full, complete, and unequivocal answers to these fundamental questions. It is easy to ask them; it is difficult to acquire the answers. I, for one, am convinced that the answers must be forthcoming before the Senate commits itself to any course of action, or to any recommendation, on a matter which bears so directly on our ability to survive.

It was for the purpose of acquiring the answers to these and similar questions that the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, of which I am privileged to be chairman, last September commenced hearings on our nuclear test ban proposals, one of which was substantially identical to the agreement proposed by Senate Resolution 148. This was rejected out of hand by the Soviets.

The subcommittee resumed its hearings on this matter early this month. The hearings have not been overly publicized partially because we have not sought publicity and partially because the sensitive matters involved made it necessary that they be conducted behind closed doors. Nevertheless, we have made and will make an earnest, determined, and conscientious effort to develop all of the facts and arrive at answers to the many difficult questions which are involved.

As evidence of the scope of the hearing, let me point out that we have thus far received testimony from officials of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, from the Department of State, from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, from the Air Force Technical Applications Center, and from the Director of Central Intelligence. Before we conclude we will receive further testimony from the Atomic Energy Commission, the Defense Atomic Support Agency, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, other senior officials in the Department of Defense, and eminent members of the scientific community. I believe I am correct in saying that an inquiry of this scope and scale into this subject matter has not previously been undertaken by a congressional committee, directed particularly with reference to a nuclear test ban.

When our investigation has been completed the results will be made available to the Senate and, to the extent permissible by security considerations, to the American people. My only regret is that the sensitive nature of the information will prevent our making public all of the facts which we develop and on which we will base our conclusions and recommendations.

I wish only to add that on this matter of a nuclear test ban the Senate of the United States, in my opinion, has a very special responsibility. We have been assured repeatedly and consistently by the highest officials of the executive branch that any agreement reached with the Soviet Union on this matter would be in the form of a treaty. I sincerely hope that the phraseology of the resolution which was introducted yesterday calling upon the U.S. Government to again offer the Soviet Union an immediate agreement banning atmospheric tests is not subject to any other interpretation. A nuclear test ban in any form is so intimately related to the problem of national survival that there must be a court of last resort responsive to the needs and to the wishes of the people. Where a treaty is involved that court is, by constitutional requirement, the U.S. Senate. I believe that, in passing upon the question, the Senate should have available to it essentially the same body of detailed evidence which is available to the Executive branch in reaching its policy decisions.

We are now in the process of receiving the advice and information which we hope will lead ultimately to informed judgment on the question of whether the proposed nuclear test ban agreement or, indeed, any cessation of nuclear testing is in the national interests. Until that process is completed I believe we should act with caution and with full awareness of the fact that the subject of a nuclear test ban—any nuclear test ban—has serious security implications for the nearly 200 million Americans who rely upon our judgment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota, who is well versed in this field and has been working in it for some time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the effort of the Senator from Mississippi to give the Senate his very learned and informed presentation on the subject of the resolution submitted yesterday by the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and myself, and other Senators.

The resolution was of a very limited nature, as the Senator from Mississippi has pointedly informed us. It relates only to tests in the atmosphere and under water.

I believe I may say without question that there is no doubt as to our ability to direct tests in either the atmosphere or under water. I have yet to hear any testimony that would indicate doubt as to the reliability of being able either to identify or to ascertain tests which take place in the atmosphere or under water.

There is honest disagreement over the efficacy and adequacy of the monitoring and identification system of underground tests; and there is some doubt as to the capacity to identify or monitor or detect tests in outer space.

But the resolution does not pertain to those phases of testing. There are those who feel that a resolution such as the one which has been submitted should not even be offered, because it might weaken the administration's position on the comprehensive test ban. As the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Missouri know, the senior Senator from Minnesota has supported a comprehensive test ban as proposed at Geneva. However, I have not supported it without recognizing that some risks were involved.

I have, in my own judgment, agreed with the position of the administration—not only of this administration, but of the previous administration—that the risks in the test ban proposal were less than the risks of continued testing. But that is a question involving an honest difference of opinion.

However, in this situation I do not feel that our national security could be adversely affected, because the resolution provides that there must be a constant state of readiness and alert for our testing facilities; and that there must be no letdown. It further provides that at the first sign of Soviet testing, we would immediately feel free to test, because we would be in a constant state of alert with our testing facilities and would not be subject to the delay which occurred a year ago.

Before the last series of tests, the Senator from Minnesota was concerned over what he believed would be a Soviet breach of faith. I said so in the Senate; and in the month of June—almost a year ago—I wrote to the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and asked the question: Are we prepared or are we making preparations to renew testing in case of a Soviet breach of understanding? I went on to say that I expected that breach to come; that I expected the Soviet might well indulge itself in further testing; and that I hoped we would be prepared promptly. Regrettably, we were not so well prepared as we should have been. There was some delay. I do not know whether that has adversely affected our security position or not; but the fact is that there was a delay.

Half a dozen times I studied the resolution submitted by the Senator from Connecticut before it was presented, because I recognized the delicacy and sensitivity of the issue. We made certain that there would be a ready alert on testing. That is why I feel that the statement of the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Missouri are so applicable. I hold both Senators in the highest respect, not only in this instance, but in others, as well.

The Senator from Connecticut and I believe that testing in the atmosphere and underwater is readily detectable and therefore not subject to cheating. The danger in the test ban proposal—if there is a danger—is that the Soviet Union might undertake some clandestine tests which would not be subject to adequate monitoring or adequate identification. If that were the case, we could be in serious jeopardy. We do not want to let ourselves get into that situation.

I shall not prolong the discussion, because what we are doing is really one of the purposes for which the Senate exists. I said so yesterday. It is not so much a question whether we all agree; it is the fact that we bring out issues and state our points of view, based upon all the experience we have.

I know that the Subcommittee on Preparedness, of which the distinguished Senator from Mississippi is the chairman, has been performing a statesman-

like service investigating the whole subject of nuclear tests and the capacity of the U.S. Government or any other government properly to monitor and identify those tests.

Mr. STENNIS. On behalf of all of the members of the committee, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his compliment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Such an investigation is required. I believe it is being conducted in the most careful and honorable manner. There has been no fanfare; there has been no effort to gain headlines or to make emotional statements. The work of the subcommittee has been very carefully done, and I believe it is important that the work be done. It is a service to the country.

I am sure the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Missouri know, from our private conservations, that I believe the administration's proposals are sound. I do not believe any of them should be accepted carte blanche. I do not believe any of them should be adopted without proper scrutiny.

Furthermore, I believe in the treaty process. We have had a commitment from the President of the United States and from Mr. Foster, the head of the Arms Control Agency, that no test ban agreement would be presented unless it were presented in the form of a treaty. Why should that be? Because of what is taking place now. There are differences of opinion on this question. There are minds in this country that must be brought to bear on the subject. They should be enlisted. Surely that is true in the Senate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not even say that there are necessarily differences of opinion. I do say that for the first time the whole subject is being packaged to the experts on the staff of the Subcommittee on Preparedness. It is being thoroughly investigated. I would hope that before the facts as developed by the Subcommittee on Preparedness are finally developed, there would not be an expression of opinion by the Senate on this question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In recent days, in the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Mississippi is the chairman, I have been disturbed about some of the testimony that has been given; and I think the testimony should be reviewed before we reach any conclusion in respect to this matter. We seek the truth, and should take our position based upon the truth.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Missouri; and I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his fine statement.

In response, let me say that I believe the most immediate danger in connection with this subject is that we might overlook some material facts and might not obtain the full facts, whereas the Senate should have all the facts, in order to be able to make an enlightened judgment in connection with this matter. That is the purpose of our committee hearings and the investigation; and we shall continue in that direction.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I concur in the statement that we should consider this matter carefully and should not take precipitate action, but should await the report of the Subcommittee on Preparedness.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator; and I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT OF SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF ACT OF 1940—INCREASED PROTECTION AGAINST EVICTION OF DEPENDENTS FROM PREMISES RENTED FOR DWELLING PURPOSES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 172, Senate bill 384.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. 384) to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, in order to provide increased protection against eviction of dependents from premises rented for dwelling purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (1) of section 300 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 530), is amended by striking out "$80" and inserting in lieu thereof "$135."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 191), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

This bill amends section 300 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, regarding eviction of dependents of servicemen, drafted or involuntarily called into service, from a rented dwelling place, by increasing the present monthly rental limitation of $80 to a rental limitation of $135 a month.

Because of the rise in the costs of rent since 1940, the $80 per month limitation does not afford today the protection for servicemen and their families intended by the original act. The new monthly rental limitation of $135 takes into account the increased rental costs, as gaged by the Business Consumer Price Index.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The first Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act was enacted on March 8, 1918, and provided a $50 per month rental limitation on the rented dwelling under the act. In the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, the House report pointed out that the increase to $80 per month for a dwelling place was based upon the difference in the value of the dollar in 1940 as compared to 1918.

PRESENT NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The committee believes that as long as individuals are liable for induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and as long as individuals are subject to involuntary recall to active military duty from military Reserve status, a need exists to bring the dwelling rental value designated in 1940 up to present-day equivalent value.

AGENCY REPORTS

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF
THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., March 12, 1963.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This will reply to your letter of January 23, 1963, with respect to your request for the comments of this Bureau on S. 384, a bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, in order to provide increased protection against eviction of dependents from premises rented for dwelling purposes.

The Bureau of the Budget would have no objection to the enactment of S. 384.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

DEPARTMENT OF THE
AIR FORCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 12, 1963.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request to the Secretary of Defense for the reviews of the Department of Defense with respect to S. 384, 88th Congress, a bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, in order to provide increased protection against eviction of dependents from premises rented for dwelling purposes. The Secretary of Defense has delegated to the Department of the Air Force the responsibility for expressing the views of the Department of Defense.

The purpose of S. 384 is to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to provide increased protection against eviction of dependents of military personnel from premises rented for dwelling purposes.

Current law provides that where dependents of a person in the military service occupy a dwelling for which the rent does not exceed $80 per month, they are protected from eviction from such dwelling during the period of military service except upon court order. S. 384 would extend this protection to the dependents of servicemen who occupy dwellings for which the rent does not exceed $135 per month. This increase in the maximum rent for which protection is afforded recognizes the increase in current rental prices over those in effect at the time of enactment of the present law. This proposed amendment to the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act would increase the number of service families protected by law. Current law which establishes $80 per month as the maximum rental for which protection is afforded significantly limits the number of families protected.

The Department of the Air Force, on behalf of the Department of Defense, recommends that favorable consideration be given to the enactment of S. 384.

This report has been coordinated within the Department of Defense in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this report for the consideration of the committee.

Sincerely,

EUGENE M. ZUCKERT.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., March 12, 1963.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your request for a report by the Veterans' Administration on S. 384, 88th Congress.

The bill, if enacted, would increase from $80 to $135 the maximum monthly rental of servicemen's dwellings which are subject to the protective provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 530).

At the present time section 300 of such act provides generally that in the absence of judicial consent it shall be a misdemeanor to evict the wife, children, or other dependents of a person in military service from any premises occupied chiefly as a dwelling for which the agreed rent does not exceed $80 per month. No change in this amount has been made since 1940 when the section was originally enacted. The comparable figure in the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1918 was $50 per month.

The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act was designed to afford broad protection to persons while in military service. Except for article IV, relating to the guarantee of certain commercial life insurance premiums, the provisions of the act are not administered by the Veterans' Administration, although our loan assistance activities are sometimes affected if the veteran has reentered the service. Most of the provisions of the act, including section 300, are construed and enforced by the courts in additional cases.

The Department of Defense and the Department of Justice would appear to have considerable interest in the type of legislation proposed by S. 384, and the committee may desire to obtain their comments on the bill. Under the circumstances, the Veterans' Administration defers to the views of those Departments as to the merits of the proposed legislation.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,
J. S. GLEASON, Jr., *Administrator.*

LIBERALIZATION OF CODE PROVISIONS RELATING TO AUTOMOBILES FOR DISABLED COLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 173, Senate bill 449.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 449) to liberalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to automobiles for disabled veterans, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment, on page 2, after line 3, to strike out: "and for each veteran who suffered the loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet due to disability incurred in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service during the induction period, if such disability was incurred or aggravated in line of duty (1) as a direct result of armed conflict, or (2) while the veteran was engaged in extrahazardous service (including such service under conditions simulating war)."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert: "and for each veteran who is suffering from any of the disabilities described in clauses (1), (2), and (3) above as the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service during the induction period, if the injury was incurred or the disease was contracted in line of duty (1) as a direct result of armed conflict, or (2) while the veteran was engaged in extrahazardous service (including such service under conditions simulating war)."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1901 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) By striking out clause (3) in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) Permanent impairment of vision of both eyes of the following status: Central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye, with corrective glasses, or central visual acuity of more than 20/200 if there is a field defect in which the peripheral field has contracted to such an extent that the widest diameter of visual field subtends an angular distance no greater than twenty degrees in the better eye;

and for each veteran who is suffering from any of the disabilities described in clauses (1), (2), and (3) above as the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service during the induction period, if the injury was incurred or the disease was contracted in line of duty (1) as a direct result of armed conflict, or (2) while the veteran was engaged in extrahazardous service (including such service under conditions simulating war)."

(2) By amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'World War II' includes in the case of any veteran, any period of continuous service performed by him after December 31, 1946, and before July 26, 1947, if such period began before January 1, 1947; and

"(2) the term 'induction period' means the period beginning on February 1, 1955, and ending on the day before the first day thereafter on which individuals (other than individuals liable for induction by reason of a prior deferment) are no longer liable for induction for training and service into the Armed Forces under the Universal Military Training and Service Act."

SEC. 2. Section 1905 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by striking out at the beginning of the first sentence thereof "The benefits", and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the benefits", and (2) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) In the case of any veteran who suffered any of the disabilities specified in section 1901 of this title as the result of service during the induction period and who was discharged or released from active military, naval, or air service before the date of enactment of this subsection, any applicable time limitation contained in subsection (a) of this section which otherwise would have begun to run prior to the date of enactment of this subsection shall not begin to run until that date."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 192), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

This bill, as amended by the committee, authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make grants toward the purchase of an automobile to certain seriously disabled service-connected veterans of the cold war on the same basis that such grants are now available to seriously disabled veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict under chapter 39, title 38, United States Code. These grants, which would not exceed $1,600, would be available only to a cold war veteran with service-connected disability that has resulted in—

(1) Loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet;

(2) Loss or permanent loss of use of one or both hands;

(3) Permanent visual impairment to the degree prescribed.

Veterans made eligible for automobile grants by this bill must have suffered one of the indicated disabilities in military service during the period beginning February 1, 1955, and ending on the day before the first day thereafter on which individuals are no longer liable for induction into the Armed Forces under the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

It is noted that the standard contained in the bill has direct precedent in the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act which contains an identical standard in regard to the conditions under which a cold war serviceman must incur death to qualify his child for educational assistance.

The bill contains a savings provision concerning eligible veterans who would be barred from actual receipt of benefits under the bill by reason of the length of time since separation from active service. The basic time limit for the automobile grant is 5 years after the date of the veteran's discharge or release from active service. The Veterans' Administration pointed out that there are some veterans who suffered the requisite disability after January 31, 1955, who have already been discharged from service more than 5 years. To assure that all eligible cold war veterans will be afforded an equitable period of time in which to file for this benefit, this bill amends section 1905 of title 38, United States Code, so as to delay, until the date of enactment of this amendatory act, the start of the running of the time limitation in this section.

Mr. Charles L. Huber, testifying for the Disabled American Veterans, stated that the DAV in convention adopted a resolution asking Congress to grant all wartime benefits to the class of veterans covered by this bill. That organization recommended that the disability provided for by this bill be extended to include the loss or loss of the use of one or both hands, as well as visual impairment to a prescribed degree. The committee concluded that the loss of a hand, a foot, or impairment of vision to the prescribed degree, under requisite conditions in Vietnam today justifies entitlement to this auto grant to the same extent as it did for those same disabilities when suffered during World War II and the Korean conflict. Therefore, the committee adopted the foregoing amendment, by Senator Kennedy, which adds the loss or permanent loss or use of one or both hands, and the permanent visual impairment to the degree prescribed in the bill, under requisite conditions, as disabilities which would warrant the grant.

BACKGROUND OF THE BILL

An automobile or other conveyance was first authorized in 1946 (Public Law 663, 79th Cong.) as a rehabilitative measure and prosthetic aid for World War II veterans who were receiving compensation for the loss or loss of use of one or both legs at or above the ankle. Its price could not exceed $1,600. In 1950 (Public Law 798, 81st Cong.) the law was amended to permit the purchase of cars costing in excess of $1,600, the Government paying that amount and the veteran paying the difference.

After the start of the Korean conflict, the Congress in 1951 (Public Law 187, 82d Cong.) extended the program to Korean conflict veterans and broadened it to include veterans of both periods of service who had suffered the loss or permanent loss of use of one or both hands or permanent impairment to the vision of both eyes to a prescribed degree.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The committee believes that the benefit in its recommended bill should now be extended to veterans of the present cold war who suffer the requisite disability in service between January 31, 1955, and the date when individuals are no longer liable for induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act. These cold war veterans are undergoing compulsory military service and are engaging in duty which is quite comparable to much of the service rendered during the Korean conflict period.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me say that all these bills have been cleared with both sides.

MEDICAL CARE FOR FISHING BOAT OWNERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 176, Senate bill 978.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. 978) to provide medical care for certain persons engaged on board a vessel in the care, preservation, or navigation of such vessel was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (h) of section 2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201(h)) is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The term 'seamen' includes any person employed or self-employed on board in the care, preservation, or navigation of any vessel, or in the service, on board, of those engaged in such care, preservation, or navigation;".

SEC. 2. Section 322(a)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 249(a)(1)) is amended by inserting immediately after the word "employed" the following: "or self-employed".

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 194—explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF BILL

The purpose of S. 978 is to restore to self-employed U.S. fishermen eligibility for medical care in hospitals, outpatient clinics, and other medical facilities of the Public Health Service in the event of illness or injury incurred while engaged in their hazardous but essential occupation.

For 156 years—from 1798 to 1954—such eligibility did exist. The Federal Government during this period rightfully recognized that the fisheries industry is made up largely of fishermen who own fishing craft individually or jointly with other fishermen and who share the same toil and dangers at sea as do those working with them who receive wages.

In times past many employee fishermen aspired to acquire their own vessels and many succeeded in doing so, thus strengthening the American fishing fleet and the fishing industry. One incentive for this was that all were entitled to the same medical or hospital benefits.

An administrative ruling in 1954 differentiated between wage-earning fishermen and their coworkers who held ownership or part ownership in the craft from which they fished. Under this ruling medical benefits formerly enjoyed by all were retained for the former but denied to the self-employed, although both risk the same disabling misfortunes and perils at sea. The ruling arose out of claims for medical care in 1951 by owners of pleasure yachts and by a housewife living aboard a houseboat who was "employed on board in the care, preservation, or navigation" of the vessel to the extent of turning on the navigation lights each evening. It seems obvious that such persons were not intended as beneficiaries of the Public Health Service Act, but the ruling, unfortunately, also had the broad effect of barring the fishermen owners, or part owners, of small fishing vessels to whom such medical and hospital care had traditionally been extended.

Your committee considers that this ruling created an unfortunate inequity which imposes present or potential hardship on perhaps as many as 10,000 industrious and courageous men who in their own or cooperatively owned small craft gain their livelihood and that of their families from the sea, and who supply the Nation with a substantial portion of its high-protein food. S. 978 is designed to correct this inequity.

Enactment of the bill, it is the consensus of your committee, also would contribute an incentive to rehabilitation of a historic but declining industry, an industry which has contributed men and ships in every war fought, both during the colonial period and throughout the Nation's independence.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

A similar bill to S. 978 was passed by the Senate in the last Congress but was not brought to a vote in the House. There was an objection to the definition of the term "seaman" in that bill which has been corrected in S. 978.

The bill was introduced in March 1963 by Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON (chairman of the committee), Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, and Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

Hearings were held on April 24–25, 1963, before the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Senator BARTLETT presiding.

* * * * *

Mr. Boisfeuillet Jones, representing the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare at the hearing, opened his testimony by reading the official report on the bill, which read in part:

"The legislative history of this program suggests that the participation of the Federal Government in providing medical care to merchant seamen rests primarily on a national interest in assuring the effectiveness of the labor force required for an adequate merchant marine.

"A fishing boat owner who performs duties related to the care, preservation, or navigation of a documented vessel of the United States is, in effect, fulfilling the same purpose as the employed seamen on board the vessel. Since such persons are in fact applying their maritime skills, they are essentially adding to the maritime labor force.

"The purpose of the bill is to remove an apparent inequity in present practice by amending the act to include a certain class of seamen who formerly enjoyed the privilege of receiving medical care in Public Health Service hospitals, and not to expand the program in any substantial manner.

"Although statistics are not available on the additional number of persons who would come within the provisions of the law under the present bill, we believe that neither the number nor cost would significantly affect the present program, and that enactment of this bill would pose no serious difficulties for this Department as a provider of services."

Dr. Donald L. McKernan, Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, told the committee that there are today approximately 123,000 persons engaged in commercial fishing activities. Of this number, he said, 80,000 serve on undocumented boats of limited fishing range and are therefore not eligible for free medical service. About 32,000 serve aboard documented vessels and can be considered presently eligible, Dr. McKernan added, and not more than 10,000 additional fishermen who are owner-operators on documented vessels, including about a thousand who are employed solely as fishermen, will become eligible upon enactment of S. 978.

The BCF Director stressed that owner-fishermen, as other fishermen, are obliged to go to sea, often for long periods, that they may be injured or become ill far from their home port and be obliged to seek medical relief in places "where they are unknown and where there are no facilities for their aid except those which may be furnished by the U.S. Public Health Service."

Compelling arguments for enactment of the bill were presented by Mr. Harold E. Lokken, manager of the Fishing Vessel Owners Association with headquarters in Seattle, Wash.

Members of the association, Mr. Lokken testified, operate approximately 200 vessels engaged in fishing halibut, sablefish, albacore, king crab, shrimp, and bottom fish such as rockfish, sole, and ling cod. The association has members ranging from San Diego, Calif., to Kodiak, Alaska, and fish waters of the Pacific from Mexico to the Bering Sea.

Ten reasons why both self-employed and employee seamen should be equally eligible for Federal medical care benefits as provided in the bill were outlined by Mr. Lokken as follows:

1. The roving nature of the seaman's work requires special consideration. The seaman finds himself often in distant parts of the world where he is out of touch with the medical facilities to which the shore worker has easy access.

2. The hazardous nature of his work merits primary attention. The seaman is often exposed 24 hours a day to exceptional hazards due to extraordinary weather conditions not faced by the shore worker or from which the seaman cannot escape as can the worker on land.

3. The seaman's work is seasonal. This seasonality is often caused by decisions of the U.S. Government. The marine worker is affected to a greater degree by actions of the Government than is his land counterpart.

4. The seafaring industry provides an outpost for the United States of value for military purposes. Seamen are usually the first to provide surveillance for their country in time of crisis.

5. The seafaring industry is of extreme importance to the Nation in times of crisis. It provides trained and experienced personnel for the Navy and merchant marine in wartime.

6. The seafaring industry is characterized by economic insecurity due to its transient

nature and to its seasonal cycles. Again this insecurity is caused in large part by governmental decisions.

7. The Government is dependent upon the maritime industry in so many ways that the Government has a special obligation in the interests of its own security to see to it that the maritime industry is kept in healthy condition at all times.

8. The seamen in our maritime industry literally work elbow to elbow with workers from foreign lands, giving their occupation an international character deserving of the same consideration as that given seamen of other countries by their governments.

9. The maritime industry—and this is especially true of the fishing fleet—serves as an auxiliary to the U.S. Coast Guard and performs many of the tasks carried on by the Government-supported service. Were it not for the vessels of the fishing fleet, the cost of operating the U.S. Coast Guard would be much higher.

10. The maritime industry vastly extends the economic and political influence of the United States into areas where the ordinary protection enjoyed by shore citizens is not found.

Management and labor have taken a unified position in support of the proposed legislation, according to Earl W. Clark, codirector of the Labor-Management Maritime Committee, who submitted a statement in which the American Marine Institute participated.

"This is one of those pleasant times, Mr. Chairman, in which labor and management can jointly support legislation which they feel is in the interest of the merchant marine."

Mr. Clark said he had checked with numerous organizations throughout the country, adding that "there has not been one single objection filed with us on the part of any shipping association, either labor or management."

"This statement," said Mr. Clark, "is supported by three organizations—the American Merchant Marine Institute, which widely covers the steamship industry; the AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, which composes a large body of our seagoing labor in this country and the Labor-Management Maritime Committee, of which I am cochairman, which represents major steamship industries and seagoing labor."

COSTS

Mr. Boisfeuillet Jones, Special Assistant to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Health and Medical Affairs, was questioned on the additional financial burden that would be imposed on the Government by restoration of eligibility for Public Health Service care to fishing vessel owners. He stated: "We feel that there will be no significant increase in the financial burden if this group is added as suggested." He cautioned against attempting to anticipate additional costs on a per capita basis because the small number involved would be absorbed into the Public Health Service hospital and medical care system at relatively less cost to the Government. The hospital accommodations already are available, as other witnesses at the hearings pointed out.

Although your committee concurs in Mr. Jones' position that costs cannot be projected accurately on a per capita basis, the committee staff did prepare such an estimate which shows that the maximum increase that could be anticipated by restoring eligibility of fishing boat owners, as set out in S. 978, to Public Health Service medical care is $1,733,210 per annum. The staff estimate, prepared in the form of a table, follows:

Facility	Present seamen load [1]	Additional load	Cost per unit	Total additional annual cost
Inpatient (average daily patient load):				
Public Health Service general hospitals	1,612	139.0	[2] $26.11	$1,325,555
Public Health Service neuropsychiatric hospitals	257	22.0	[2] 10.58	84,272
Non-Federal hospitals	37	−.3	[2] 42.00	4,172
Federal hospitals	43	−.4	[2] 23.00	3,090
Outpatient visits:				
Public Health Service hospitals	265,000	22,636.0	[3] 8.00	171,088
Public Health Service clinics	176,000	15,000.0	[3] 8.00	120,000
Public Health Service offices	33,000	2,635.0	[3] 9.50	25,033
Total cost				1,733,210

[1] Estimated fiscal year 1962 workloads.
[2] Per diem cost.
[3] Cost per outpatient visit.

AMENDMENT OF INLAND AND WESTERN RIVERS RULES CONCERNING ANCHOR LIGHTS AND FOG SIGNALS IN SPECIAL VESSEL ANCHORAGE AREAS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 177, Senate bill 1036.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. 1036) to amend the inland and western rivers rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That article 11 of section 1 of the Act of June 7, 1897, as amended (33 U.S.C. 180), is further amended to read as follows:

"ART. 11. (a) Except as provided in paragraph (c) of this article, a vessel under one hundred and fifty feet in length when at anchor shall carry forward, where it can best be seen, a white light in a lantern so construed as to show a clear, uniform, and unbroken light visible all around the horizon at a distance of at least two miles.

"(b) Except as provided in paragraph (c) of this article, a vessel of one hundred and fifty feet or upward in length, when at anchor, shall carry in the forward part of the vessel, at a height of not less than twenty feet above the hull, one such light, and at or near the stern of the vessel, and at such a height that it shall be not less than fifteen feet lower than the forward light, another such light.

"(c) The Secretary of the Army may, after investigation, by rule, regulation, or order, designate such areas as he may deem proper as 'special anchorage areas'; such special anchorage areas may from time to time be changed, or abolished, if after investigation the Secretary of the Army shall deem such change or abolition in the interest of navigation. When anchored within such an area—

"(1) a vessel of not more than sixty-five feet in length shall not be required to carry or exhibit the white light required by this article;

"(2) a barge, canal boat, scow, or other nondescript craft of one hundred and fifty feet or upward in length may carry and exhibit the single white light prescribed by paragraph (a) of this article in lieu of the two white lights prescribed by paragraph (b) of this article; and

"(3) where two or more barges, canal boats, scows, or other nondescript craft are tied together and anchored as a unit, the anchor light prescribed by this article need be displayed only on the vessel having its anchor down."

SEC. 2. Subparagraph (d) of article 15 of section 1 of the Act of June 7, 1897 (33 U.S.C. 191), is amended to read as follows:

"(d) A vessel when at anchor shall, at intervals of not more than one minute, ring the bell rapidly for about five seconds, except that the following vessels shall not be required to sound this signal when anchored in a special anchorage area established pursuant to paragraph (c) of article 11:

"(1) a vessel of not more than sixty-five feet in length; and

"(2) a barge, canal boat, scow or other nondescript craft."

SEC. 3. The rule numbered 13 in section 4233 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (33 U.S.C. 322), is further amended to read as follows:

"RULE NUMBERED 13. (a) Except as provided in paragraph (c) of this rule, a vessel under one hundred and fifty feet in length, when at anchor, shall carry forward, where it can best be seen, a white light in a lantern so constructed as to show a clear, uniform, and unbroken light visible all around the horizon at a distance of at least two miles.

"(b) Except as provided in paragraph (c) of this rule, a vessel of one hundred and fifty feet or upward in length, when at anchor, shall carry in the forward part of the vessel, at a height of not less than twenty feet above the hull, one such light, and at or near the stern of the vessel, at such a height that it shall be not less than fifteen feet lower than the forward light, another such light.

"(c) The Secretary of the Army, may, after investigation, by rule, regulation, or order, designate such areas as he may deem proper as 'special anchorage areas'; such special anchorage areas may from time to time be changed, or abolished, if after investigation the Secretary of the Army shall deem such change or abolition in the interests of navigation. When anchored within such an area—

"(1) a vessel of not more than sixty-five feet in length shall not be required to carry or exhibit the white light required by this rule;

"(2) a barge, canal boat, scow, or other nondescript craft of one hundred and fifty feet or upward in length may carry and exhibit the single white light prescribed by paragraph (a) of this rule in lieu of the two white lights prescribed by paragraph (b) of this rule; and

"(3) where two or more barges, canal boats, scows, or other nondescript craft are tied together and anchored as a unit, the anchor light prescribed by this rule need be displayed only on the vessel having its anchor down."

SEC. 4. Subparagraph (d) of rule numbered 15 in section 4233 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (33 U.S.C. 331), is further amended to read as follows:

"(d) A vessel when at anchor shall, at intervals of not more than one minute, ring the bell rapidly for about five seconds, except that the following vessels shall not be required to sound this signal when anchored

in a special anchorage area established pursuant to paragraph (c) of rule 13:

"(1) a vessel not more than sixty-five feet in length; and

"(2) a barge, canal boat, scow or other nondescript craft."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 195—explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

The purpose of S. 1036, as stated at the subcommittee hearing by Rear Adm. Oscar C. Rohnke, Chief of the Office of Merchant Marine Safety, U.S. Coast Guard, would be twofold:

(1) To simplify requirements for lights and fog signals for barges when anchored in specifically designated areas; and

(2) To provide for uniformity in requirements for lights on anchored vessels.

There would be no sacrifice of safety, the admiral declared, adding that the changes to be effected would be beneficial to the Coast Guard, the barge owners, and the general public.

Special anchorages are designated by the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, as mooring areas for barges, scows, and other such type of crafts. They are apart from the immediate vicinity of navigable channels or fairways, and are clearly marked and publicized. The Coast Guard is the agency whose function it is to enforce the rules of the road on navigable waters of the United States, including the rules requiring lights at night on barges, etc., which are anchored, and rules requiring sound signals to be made by barges anchored during periods of low visibility. These barges and other craft often are unmanned, which makes it difficult for their owners to provide for the required lights and sound signals. This bill would relax these light and sound signals without, it is believed, sacrificing safety.

The question of barge lights was studied by the Western Rivers Panel of the Merchant Marine Council during 1961, and its recommendations were adopted by the council as a proposed change to the statutory rules of the road. The Coast Guard, Rear Admiral Rohnke testified, considers standardization of the rules of the road extremely important, as there are four sets of such rules incorporated into U.S. law. Enactment of this bill, the subcommittee was told, would make the western river rules on anchor lights conform to the inland rules, and bring them into general conformity with the international rules. It would be a step toward making rules of the road the same everywhere.

Under existing provisions of the rules of the road concerning anchor lights and fog signals, vessels anchored in special anchorage areas are required to carry the same lights and sound the same fog signals as vessels anchored elsewhere (except that vessels of 65 feet in length or less are not required to display an anchor light). The western rivers rules differ somewhat from the inland rules requirements. S. 1036 would ease the present requirements as to lights and sound signals under both rules. Individual vessels that anchor in special anchorage areas would be required to carry a single anchor light instead of the two lights where now required; vessels tied together and anchored as a group would be required to show only a single light on the vessel with its anchor down, and all would be relieved of the requirement for sounding a fog signal. Vessels of any type, 65 feet or less in length, would continue to be exempt from all requirements as to lights and under this bill would be exempt from fog signal requirements. Enactment of S. 1036 thus would relieve the barge and towing vessel industry of a burdensome requirement without, all proponents declared, impairing safety of navigation.

No opposition was received by the committee from any source. Letters favorable to enactment were received from many sections of the country.

The Department of the Army, on behalf of the Department of Defense, recommended favorable consideration of the bill.

EXTENSION OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY RELATIONSHIP WITH THE ARMY AND NAVY TO INCLUDE THE AIR FORCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 178, Senate bill 583.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 583) to amend certain provisions of existing law concerning the relationship of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Army and Navy so that they will apply with similar effect to the Air Force, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after "1917", to strike out "chapter 20,"; on page 2, at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "of war," and insert "of war or national emergency,"; and in line 17, after the word "its", to strike out "duties in war," and insert "duties in war or national emergency,"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 16 of the Act of May 22, 1917, as amended (33 U.S.C. 855, 858), is amended as follows:

(1) The first paragraph (33 U.S.C. 855) is amended—

(A) by striking out the words "of the Department of the Army, or of the Navy Department," and inserting the words "of a military department" in place thereof;

(B) by striking out the words "of the Department of the Army or Navy Department" and inserting the words "of a military department" in place thereof; and

(C) by striking out the words "Army or Navy" and inserting the words "Army, Navy, or Air Force" in place thereof.

(2) The last paragraph (33 U.S.C. 858) is amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Commerce shall jointly prescribe regulations governing the duties to be performed by the Coast and Geodetic Survey in time of war or national emergency, and for the cooperation of that service with the military departments in time of peace in preparation for its duties in war or national emergency, which regulations shall not be effective unless approved by each of those Secretaries, and included therein may be rules and regulations for making reports and communications between a military department and the Coast and Geodetic Survey."

SEC. 2. Section 10 of the Act of January 19, 1942, chapter 6, as amended (33 U.S.C. 868a), is amended by inserting the words "Air Force," after the word "Navy,".

SEC. 3. Section 1 of the Act of December 3, 1942, chapter 670, as amended (33 U.S.C. 854a–1), is amended—

(1) by amending clause (1) as follows—

(A) by striking out the words "of the Department of the Army or of the Navy Department" and inserting the words "of a military department" in place thereof; and

(B) by striking out the words "Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Navy" and inserting the words "Secretary of the military department concerned" in place thereof;

(2) by striking out the words "of the Department of the Army or Navy Department" in clause (2) and inserting the words "of a military department" in place thereof; and

(3) by striking out the words "to the Department of the Army and Navy Department" in clause (3) and inserting the words "to a military department" in place thereof.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 196), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

S. 583 would amend certain provisions of various existing laws which set forth the relationship of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Army and Navy in order to apply these provisions with similar effect to the Air Force. Involved are provisions which authorize the transfer of personnel and equipment of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Army and Navy in times of emergency, the promotion and replacement of personnel transferred, purchase of commissary and quartermaster supplies, et cetera.

The statement forwarded to the Senate by Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Joseph S. Imirie, along with the request for introduction of the bill, gives the purpose of the proposed legislation as follows:

"Section 1 of the bill extends the authority of the President, under section 16 of the act of May 22, 1917, chapter 20, as amended (33 U.S.C. 855), to order transfers of vessels, equipment, stations, and personnel of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Departments of the Army and Navy in time of national emergency, so as to permit him to order similar transfers to the Department of the Air Force. The section would also amend the act of May 22, 1917 (33 U.S.C. 858), to provide for joint regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (instead of the Secretary of the Army and Secretary of the Navy) with the Secretary of Commerce, thereby placing the responsibility on an executive department level. These joint regulations are to cover the duties to be performed by the Coast and Geodetic Survey in time of war, and provide for the cooperation of that service with the military departments in time of peace in preparation for those wartime duties.

"Section 2 amends section 10 of the Act of January 19, 1942, chapter 6 (33 U.S.C. 868a), to permit commissioned officers, ships' officers, and members of the crews of vessels of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to purchase available commissary and quartermaster supplies from the Air Force at the prices charged officers and enlisted men of the Air Force. Under present law these officers and members of the Coast and Geodetic Survey may purchase commissary and quartermaster supplies from the Army, Navy or Marine Corps, but not from the Air Force.

"Section 3 amends section 1 of the Act of December 3, 1942, chapter 670, as amended (33 U.S.C. 854a–1), which provides for the temporary promotion of certain personnel of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in time of war or national emergency. Specifically, the proposed amendment would confer on the Department of the Air Force the same authority now possessed by the Departments of the Army and Navy to promote, temporarily, commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey who are under its jurisdiction. It would also permit temporary promotions of commissioned officers in the service of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to fill

vacancies in rank and grades caused by transfer of commissioned officers to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Air Force. This provision parallels that now pertaining to the filling of vacancies caused by transfer of such commissioned officers to the Departments of the Army or Navy.

"In addition, regularly appointed deck officers and junior engineers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey may be temporarily appointed to ensign, but the total of such temporary appointments may not exceed the number of officers transferred to the military departments (instead of to the Departments of the Army and Navy, as at present)."

When the various provisions of law which this bill would amend were enacted, in 1917 and 1942, the Air Force had not been established as a separate military establishment. Despite the lack of formal authority, facilities and personnel of the Coast and Geodetic Survey have been utilized by the Air Force in emergencies, through informal arrangements. However, the formal authority now sought is deemed highly desirable, in order to avoid possible delay and misunderstanding in any future emergencies.

In accordance with the suggestion of the Comptroller General of the United States in his report on the bill, section 1(2) has been amended by adding the words "or national emergency" after the words "in time of war" to conform with the wording of 33 U.S.C. 855.

MEDICAL CARE FOR CERTAIN COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY RETIRED SHIPS' OFFICERS AND CREWMEMBERS AND DEPENDENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 179, Senate bill 969.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 969) to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crew members and their dependents, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 10, to insert "or on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later,"; on page 2, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "before July 1, 1963." and insert "before July 1, 1963, or on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later."; in line 9, after the word "whether", to insert "such ships' officers and members of crew are"; in line 17, after "1963", to insert "or on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later,"; in line 21, after "1963", to insert "or on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later,"; and in line 25, after the word "or", to strike out "before July 1, 1963." and insert "before July 1, 1963, or on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, subject to regulations of the President, retired ships' officers and retired members of the crews of vessels of the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall be entitled to medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization at facilities of the Public Health Service: *Provided,* That the ships' officer or crew member, (1) was on active duty as a vessel employee of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on July 1, 1963, or on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later, and his employment as a vessel employee was continuous from that date until retirement, or (2) was retired as a vessel employee of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on or before July 1, 1963, or on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

(b) Subject to regulations of the President, dependent members of families (as defined in such regulations) of ships' officers and members of crews of vessels of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, whether such ships' officers and members of crew are on active duty or retired, shall be furnished medical advice and outpatient treatment by the Public Health Service at its hospitals and relief stations and, if suitable accommodations are available, they shall also be furnished hospitalization at hospitals of the Public Health Service: *Provided,* That the ships' officer or crew member (1) was on active duty as a vessel employee of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on July 1, 1963, or on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later, and his employment as a vessel employee has been continuous from that time, or (2) was on active duty as a vessel employee of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on July 1, 1963, or on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later, and his employment as a vessel employee was continuous from that time until retirement, or (3) was retired as a vessel employee of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on or before July 1, 1963, or on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later. When dependent members of families are hospitalized, a per diem charge, at such uniform rate as may be prescribed from time to time for the hospitalization of dependents of members of the uniformed services at hospitals of the uniformed services pursuant to section 1078(a) of title 10, United States Code, shall be made.

(c) The Coast and Geodetic Survey shall furnish proper identification to those persons entitled to medical treatment under the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 326(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 253(b)) is repealed.

(b) Section 326(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 253 (c)) is amended by inserting the words "or Coast and Geodetic Survey" after the words "Coast Guard" both times the words appear in the subsection.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 197), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

The bill provides that, subject to regulations of the President, retired ships' officers and retired members of the crews of vessels of the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall be entitled to medical, surgical, and dental treatment, and hospitalization at facilities of the Public Health Service, providing that the officer or crewmember was on active duty as a vessel employee of the Survey on July 1, 1963, or the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later, and such employment was continuous from that date until retirement, or was retired as a vessel employee of the Survey on or before July 1, 1963, or the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later.

Section 1(b) of the bill provides that, subject to regulations of the President, dependent members of families (as defined in such regulations) of ships' officers and members of crews of vessels of the Survey on active duty or retired, shall be furnished medical advice and outpatient treatment by the Public Health Service at its hospitals and relief stations and, if suitable accommodations are available, hospitalization at hospitals of the Public Health Service, provided that such ships' officer or crewmember was on active duty on July 1, 1963, or the date of enactment of this act and continuously since that time or until retirement, or was retired from such employment on or before July 1, 1963, or the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later. In cases of hospitalization of dependent members of families, it is provided that a per diem charge shall be made, at such uniform rate as may be prescribed from time to time with respect to dependent members of the uniformed services at hospitals of the uniformed services pursuant to section 1078(a) of title 10, United States Code.

Section 1(c) of the bill provides that the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall furnish proper identification to those persons entitled to medical treatment under the provisions of this act.

Section 2(a) provides for repeal of section 326(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 353(b)), inasmuch as medical care for dependents of vessel employees on active duty on July 1, 1963, or the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later, whose service is continuous since that date, would be provided under section 1(b) of this bill.

Section 2(b) amends section 326(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 253(c)) by inserting the words "or Coast and Geodetic Survey" after the words "Coast Guard" both times the words appear in the subsection.

This would authorize the Public Health Service to supply for the Coast and Geodetic Survey the same auxiliary services, including medical examinations for promotion, retirement, etc., as are now available to the Coast Guard, and would give Public Health Service officers aboard Coast and Geodetic Survey vessels authority to render medical aid to crews of fishing vessels as such officers assigned to Coast Guard vessels now enjoy.

REASON FOR THE BILL

When the Public Health Service Act was amended, in 1960 (Public Law 86-415), to provide parity of treatment between members of the various uniformed services, section 5(d) of that law inadvertently repealed the authority for retired Survey vessel employees and their dependents to receive Public Health Service medical care. The 1960 law was intended to affect only members of the uniformed services, and Coast and Geodetic vessel employees are not members of a uniformed service—they are civil service employees. Since 1960 medical care for these retired vessel employees and their dependents has been provided on an annual basis by a provision in the Public Health Service appropriation act.

Restoration of the authority for provision of medical care for these retired vessel employees and their dependents is considered important by the Department of Commerce, because it has been a recruiting inducement much prized by these employees. To permit it to be eliminated now, the Department feels, would be failing to keep faith with these employees who would thereby be saddled with expenses for services which they were told the Government would provide.

The amendments made by the committee would (1) clarify the intent of section 1(b), and (2) assure time to get word to all field stations of the Survey that the repealed medical care provisions would be made available again.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the case of the first two bills, the minority members wholly concur, and these bills

have the unanimous support of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

In the case of the last four bills, these have the unanimous concurrence of the minority members of the Committee on Commerce.

SECOND-CLASS CITIZENSHIP

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in a speech on February 11, 1963, before the International Institute in Providence, I cited the need for legislation to wipe out the distinction between naturalized and native-born citizens.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], I shall introduce a bill which will help to eradicate these discriminatory laws and will impose a reasonable statute of limitations on deportation proceedings.

My bill would repeal section 352 of the Immigration and Nationality Act—the section that calls for the loss of nationality of any naturalized citizen who lives continuously for a period of 3 years or more in the foreign country of his former nationality or birth. My bill would also disallow any deportation proceeding against an alien lawfully admitted to permanent residence in the United States who has been physically present in this country for a period of not less than 10 years. It would disallow, too, such proceedings if the conduct for which an alien might be deportable occurred more than 10 years prior to the institution of proceedings against him. Finally, my bill would strike out that portion of the act which allows as grounds for revocation of naturalization a person's refusal within a period of 10 years to testify as a witness before a congressional committee concerning his subversive activities if that person is convicted of contempt for such refusal.

The case of Angelika L. Schneider, brought vividly to our attention in an editorial, in the May 28 edition of the Washington Post, entitled "Overly Harsh Penalty," is a striking and dramatic example of the discrimination in our immigration laws—a discrimination which makes second-class citizens of those who are naturalized. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

OVERLY HARSH PENALTY

Why should a naturalized citizen be deprived of American citizenship for staying 3 years or more in the country in which he formerly lived? Loss of citizenship is a very severe penalty to apply to one who has committed no offense whatever and has merely chosen to live abroad for a time, doubtless for a very good reason. That penalty has recently been inflicted on Angelika L. Schneider who came to the United States from Germany as a child. She went abroad to study and since 1956 has been living in Cologne with her husband who is a German national.

The decision of a three-judge court that Mrs. Schneider has lost her citizenship seems to be out of key with the reasoning followed by the Supreme Court in several cases in recent years. The Court has ruled that citizens who desert from the Armed Forces in time of war and those who leave the country to avoid military service may not be deprived of their citizenship by way of punishment. Should a citizen who merely lives abroad to avoid a breakup of her family pay a price that was adjudged too high in the case of draft evaders and deserters?

There have been some indications that the Court may overturn its 1958 ruling that a man may be deprived of his citizenship for voting in an election in another country. If the Schneider case is carried to the Supreme Bench, it may be persuaded by the same logic to restore her citizenship. But the primary fault lies with Congress. It has provided by statute, not only that a naturalized citizen will lose his rights in this country by returning to his former home or place of birth for 3 years, but also that continuous residence of a naturalized citizen in any foreign state for 5 years, with certain exceptions, will cost him his citizenship.

Why the unreasonable haste in repudiating citizens who have thought enough of this country to undergo the tedious naturalization process? If a naturalized citizen should indicate an intention to live permanently abroad or should actually stay in another country without returning for, say, 25 years, there would doubtless be good cause for revocation of the previous grant of citizenship. But 3 years or 5 years abroad may be only an interval of convenience without any meaning as to the citizen's basic allegiance. Congress ought to repeal this arbitrary restraint upon naturalized citizens living abroad without waiting for the Supreme Court to pass upon its constitutionality.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, Mrs. Schneider came to this country as a very young girl. She eventually became a naturalized citizen—a citizenship that she obviously prizes very much. In 1956, while studying abroad, she married a German national, and settled in Cologne. She was denaturalized in 1959, under the provision in our Immigration and Naturalization Act that stipulates a naturalized citizen may not live abroad continuously for more than 3 years, the penalty being loss of citizenship. As I said, Mrs. Schneider obviously prizes her U.S. citizenship because she immediately petitioned the courts for reinstatement. The latest action in her case is the 2-to-1 decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals upholding the denaturalization determination.

The majority opinion makes two points: that such proceedings are a valid exercise of the foreign-relations power, and that there is not in the exercise of this power any violation of the due-process rights of a naturalized citizen, for, as Judge Matthews said, "Due process does not require that all citizens be treated in the same way."

Mr. President, this line of thinking strikes me as being grossly unfair. It freezes into law the inequities of our immigration statutes, even though there is yet the possibility of review by the Supreme Court. In a very vigorous and logically constructed dissent, Judge Fahy pointed out that Mrs. Schneider engaged in no embarrassing activities, as others whose denaturalization was upheld had done. Her only offense, the judge noted, was that "as a young American she met and married a man whom makes his living in Germany."

It is a distressing thing when a citizen of this country is faced with the choice of relinquishing her citizenship or leaving her husband. It is an anathema to the Democratic process and a contradiction whose only raison d'être is that it is there.

The Schneider case dramatically highlights the need for this legislation. I believe it is our duty to set guidelines which the courts can follow, rather than wait for decisional law to mark the framework.

Mr. President, the text of our bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"LIMITATION ON DEPORTATION

"SEC. 293. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence shall, on or after the date of enactment of this section, be deported (1) if such alien has been physically present in the United States for a continuous period of not less than ten years at any time after being lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or (2) if the conduct for which such alien is deportable occurred more than ten years prior to the institution of deportation proceedings against him."

(b) So much of the table of contents of the Immigration and Nationality Act as describes the contents of chapter 9 of title II of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 293. Limitation on deportation."

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (a) of section 340 of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by striking out the following: ": *Provided,* That refusal on the part of a naturalized citizen within a period of ten years following his naturalization to testify as a witness in any proceeding before a congressional committee concerning his subversive activities, in a case where such person has been convicted of contempt for such refusal, shall be held to constitute a ground for revocation of such person's naturalization under this subsection as having been procured by concealment of a material fact or by willful misrepresentation".

(b) Subsections (c) and (d) of section 340 of such Act are hereby repealed.

(c) Subsection (f) of section 340 of such Act is amended by striking out the following: "subsections (c) or (d) of this section, or under the provisions of".

(d) Sections 352, 353, and 354 of such Act are hereby repealed.

(e) Section 355 of such Act is amended by striking out "or 352".

SEC. 3. Paragraph (2) of section 350 of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by inserting the following immediately before the semicolon: "as such paragraphs existed immediately prior to the date of the enactment of the Immigration and Nationality Amendments Act of 1963".

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

The bill (S. 1641) to provide a statute of limitations with respect to the deportation of aliens lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, and to remove certain distinctions made in the Immigration and Nationality Act between native-born and naturalized citizens, introduced by Mr. PELL (for himself and Mr. HART), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CENSUS COMPILATION OF FIGURES ON DENIAL OR ABRIDGMENT OF THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I understand that earlier today a brief comment was made on a most unusual civil action which was filed this morning in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. The action was brought by some 25 individuals who are residents of some 9 States, and is directed against the Secretary of Commerce and the Director of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce. The action highlights, I think, the long road we have yet to follow in order to end denial of the right to vote or the limitations imposed on groups in their efforts to vote. This situation undoubtedly will remain with us for some time as a responsibility to be borne and a problem to be solved, even though—as some of us now hope—this body soon will adopt strengthening amendments to the basic voting rights laws in this country.

Anyone who may be interested in the subject would benefit from a reading of the pleadings filed in the action. Basically, the action cites the constitutional obligation that congressional representation be reduced in those situations in which individuals in a particular State are denied their right to vote. Interestingly, a projection is possible, based upon some of the figures that are contained in the pleading as to what effect the application of the rule sought to be obtained might have upon the composition of the Congress of the United States. The effort is directed toward assuring that the 1970 census and the apportionment of the Congress based upon that census will truly reflect the voice of the persons who in fact are represented and who have an opportunity to participate in the selection of their representatives in the Congress.

At the outset I said that this was an unusual step. I am sure it will be watched with the greatest interest by all of those concerned in the effort to obtain equal protection of the laws, the assurance that the franchise is in fact broadly available, and that the votes of no American shall be diluted by congressional apportionment which fails to account for denial or abridgment of the right to vote.

The energy and the persistence of those who have brought the action will redound to the benefit of the entire Nation as the litigation proceeds.

WIDE SUPPORT FOR NATIONAL ARTS AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last month I introduced the National Arts and Cultural Development Act that would establish a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation.

The National Council on the Arts would be situated in the Executive Office of the President and would be composed of 25 members representing various aspects of our artistic and cultural life. The President's Special Consultant on the Arts would serve as Chairman of the Council.

The Council would be charged with the responsibility of recommending ways to maintain and increase the cultural resources of the United States, of proposing methods to encourage private initiative in the arts, of advising and consulting with private and public groups and organizations concerned with the arts, and of conducting research and surveys in the arts.

The National Arts Foundation would be an independent Federal agency under the supervision of a Board of Trustees of 21 members. The Foundation would provide financial support for artistic and cultural activities undertaken by the several States and by private groups. Grants to private groups could not exceed one-half of the total cost of any project or production. A small percentage of the Foundation's funds would be set aside for nonmatching grants in those few cases where all efforts by a private group to raise matching funds had failed. Grants to States or State agencies could never exceed 50 percent of the total budget or cost of a production. The bill authorizes annual appropriations not to exceed $10 million.

I must emphasize that all artistic and cultural activities assisted by the National Arts Foundation would be undertaken by private nonprofit groups demonstrating the highest professional standards and by appropriate State agencies concerned with the arts. The Federal Government would never be directly involved in any of the artistic endeavors that might receive support; the board of trustees could make no suggestions or recommendations as to these private or State cultural activities. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a short summary of S. 1316, the National Arts and Cultural Development Act be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. At the time this legislation was introduced, I noted that the United States held the dubious distinction of being the only major nation of the world where the Government offers no support, assistance, or encouragement to artistic and cultural activities. In such nations as Great Britain, France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Austria, and Spain the Government has assumed an active and direct role in support of symphony orchestras, opera, the theater, and the motion pictures. Art has not been stifled or subjugated in these lands and neither would it be in the United States.

Following the introduction of the National Arts and Cultural Development Act, I have received a number of highly gratifying letters. I would like to share portions of them with my colleagues.

L. Quincy Mumford, the Librarian of Congress, writes:

> Both the National Council on the Arts and the National Arts Foundation would serve very useful purposes. The provision for making matching grants to groups and States seems to me an essential step and a proper assumption by the Federal Government of a measure of responsibility for the encouragement of the arts throughout the country with a view to enriching the lives of our citizens.

Allen P. Britton, dean of the University of Michigan School of Music, reinforces my argument about the position of the United States in relation to other countries. He writes:

> To my mind the most important kind of national leadership is artistic rather than militaristic. The United States now ranks last among all civilized nations in the support given artistic affairs by our National Government. Passage of your bill will serve to begin to correct this unhappy state of affairs.

John F. White, president, National Educational Television and Radio Center, writes:

> The National Arts and Cultural Development Act is one of the most important opportunities facing us as Americans, and I assure you of my desire to be helpful in any way possible in furthering its enactment.

Jean Dalrumple, general director, New York City Center Light Opera Company & Drama Company, also writes:

> I read the entire reprint (including all very small print) with enormous interest, and my only comment is that I agree with and applaud every word. How can I be of some active assistance and give some actual support?

William Schuman, president, Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, writes:

> We at Lincoln Center are encouraged and heartened by your interest in the arts and your desire to develop support through congressional action. Certainly it is of the utmost importance to bring the resources of the Federal Government into more meaningful relationship with the cultural and artistic life of this country.
>
> If we are to reach a 20th century American solution to the problem of financing the arts, it is clear that there should be a balanced collaboration between private giving and governmental support.
>
> Without attempting to express an opinion on the details called for in your proposed legislation, it is certainly a challenging and provocative reminder to the body politic concerning the obligations to the arts.

Walter G. Robinson, president, Minneapolis Society of Fine Arts, emphasizes the importance of including the museum profession in this legislation. He writes:

> I was very pleased to note in reading your remarks and the bill itself that "practicing artists, civic and cultural leaders, members of the museum profession, and others who are professionally engaged in the arts" are included. This is very reassuring to the many thousands who are engaged in the care and development of our art museums and to the millions who enjoy the inspiration provided by the fine arts. On behalf of the trustees of the Minneapolis Society of Fine Arts and the whole community which participates in our activities, may I express our appreciation for the foresighted and profound understanding which you have lent to cultural organization in making this presentation to Congress.

Joseph Papp, producer of the New York Shakespeare Festival, writes about the legislation's one possible weakness, its extremely modest scope:

> I have read your proposed bill thoroughly and please be assured of my unstinting sup-

port on its behalf. While I may quibble with this or that point, I feel that on the whole it is a workable scheme. Though the funds to be allocated are miniscule when placed side by side with the mammoth job to be performed, the acceptance of your bill would be most meaningful.

I find these and many other letters most encouraging. They reflect many of the concerns that initially prompted the preparation of this legislation. An example of the type of nonprofit private enterprise that would warrant support by the National Arts Foundation is the immensely successful Tyrone Guthrie Theater in Minneapolis. I already have commented on this outstanding theatrical venture located some 1,500 miles off Broadway. I believe the Guthrie Theater demonstrates that first-rate theaters can be available throughout the United States. The one ingredient usually lacking in most communities is adequate financial resources. The unusual combination of the generous support of the Ford Foundation, the Walker Foundation, John Cowles, Jr., Sir Tyrone Guthrie, and thousands of Minnesotans brought the Guthrie Theater to Minneapolis. It is not possible to duplicate this combination in every American city; therefore, most cities are totally without legitimate theater.

The National Arts Foundation would supplement existing private sources of funds. Rather than have to bear the entire financial burden for any one artistic or cultural project, the private resources could be matched with a grant from the Foundation, thereby freeing private funds for use in other communities. In fact, I believe the Foundation would serve as an effective stimulus to develop entirely untapped private financial resources.

Mr. President, in order to understand the tremendous impact the Guthrie Theater has had on the cultural life of the Twin Cities, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article by Howard Taubman, the distinguished drama critic of the New York Times, that appeared in May 19 issues of the Times be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that Mr. Taubman's review of Tyrone Guthrie's production of "Hamlet" and a short biography of Tyrone Guthrie be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TAKING CHANCES—NEW MINNEAPOLIS THEATER AND GUTHRIE BEGIN WITH NOVEL PRODUCTIONS

(By Howard Taubman)

Having invested more than $2 million in its brightly hued, attractively asymmetrical Tyrone Guthrie Theater, Minneapolis has staffed it with people from the top. Unlike more modest theatrical ventures, which have nowhere to go but up, Minneapolis may have the problem of keeping up with its glamorous beginning.

For Tyrone Guthrie, the artistic director of the Minnesota Theater Co., resident repertory group organized for the theater that bears his name, is at the summit of his profession. One may differ with him about a production or its details, but one admires the freshness of his attack and the largeness of his vision of theater as an art and a way of life.

The very existence of the new Minneapolis theater owes more than one can guess to Mr. Guthrie, who is becoming a theatrical Johnny Appleseed. His participation was vital to the founding of the Shakespeare Festival in Stratford, Ontario, and his name was an indispensable asset in launching the Guthrie Theater and Minnesota Theater Co.

It would probably be useful to nominate Mr. Guthrie a roving commission of one with instructions to incite other American cities to create their own professional theater companies. But he is committed, one understands, for 3 years to Minneapolis, and no doubt he has a wealth of extracurricular projects on his agenda.

Fortunately, the growth outside New York of self-contained theaters of professional caliber and artistic aspiration is well underway. Next fall Seattle will join the parade at the Playhouse, built for the 1962 fair. A grant of $300,000 from fair profits has been made for the establishment of the stage company, and Stuart Vaughan has been engaged as artistic director.

DEDICATED COMPANIES

In some cities dedicated companies have had to struggle without all the support they deserved. San Francisco has not yet done so well as it should by its Actors Workshop, though there are signs of improvement. Houston has awakened to the value of the Alley Theater and is providing it with a new home. The Arena Stage in Washington achieved an impressive new theater in 1961. The Theater Group in Los Angeles expects to have a house of its own within a few years.

The professional theater beyond New York is growing in importance, and it is eminently desirable that fresh ideas in theater organization, management and production as well as new playwrights and performing talent should be tested in many communities rather than in one city. New York should rejoice at the competition; its preeminence will not be endangered.

On the contrary, New York will gain from decentralization. A large reservoir of talent will be developed. A young, gifted actor like George Grizzard who plays Hamlet one night in Minneapolis and a mime's trifle like the clerk in Molière's "The Miser" the next is bound to widen his range.

If we New Yorkers were less parochial than so many of us are, we would realize that decentralization offers us unexpected opportunities to enhance our theater experience. Why not, for example, a trip to Minneapolis to see what Mr. Guthrie has done with "Hamlet" and Douglas Campbell with "The Miser" and what the former will accomplish later on with Chekhov's "The Three Sisters" and the latter with Arthur Miller's "Death of a Salesman"?

FEW CLASSICS

Considering the size of New York and its role as our theater capital, we cannot be proud of what it offers in the way of theater classics. How many professional "Hamlets" have we had since the end of the war? If my figures are correct, two. One briefly, by the Old Vic; the other, a spirited version, by the Phoenix Theater. As for Molière, we get him—in French—when we are lucky enough to have a visit by the Comédie Francaise. Chekhov has been relegated to off Broadway. And a play like "Death of a Salesman," once it has completed its run, is consigned to limbo.

Mr. Cohen's point is worth discussion. I feel that Mr. Guthrie's modern-dress "Hamlet" goes wildly overboard in details and whole scenes. In the exuberance of its sheer theatricalism it allows itself to be diverted at times from the grand dramatic line of Shakespeare's tragedy. But I do not believe that a traditional "Hamlet" is necessarily the answer for Minneapolis or any public without a backlog of many "Hamlets."

The main thing is that the Minneapolis "Hamlet" keeps one alert throughout the span of its almost uncut 4½ hours. Mr. Guthrie's theatrical imagination is never at rest. He has the daring to elect foolish options. Laertes with a belt and holster over his trenchcoat looks like a spoof of private-eye fiction, and his poking a pearl-handled pistol into Claudius' ribs is a ludicrous cliche of TV and films.

ILLUMINATING INSIGHTS

On the other hand, the Guthrie approach makes for illuminating insights. To show the court at Elsinore in the semiformal and formal garb of modern state—never mind the extravagantly booted, cuirassed and helmeted soldiery—is to stress anew Shakespeare's penetration of the mean aand confused motives of the powerful and their servitors. To rivet the audience's attention during the play within the play on Claudius' reactions and on Hamlet's intense scrutiny of Claudius is to make certain that the drama's turning point is grasped by all.

Any "Hamlet" is the sum of the director's conception and the actors' powers of communication. In Minneapolis the dominant force is Mr. Guthrie. George Grizzard as Hamlet achieves moving moments, and so do Lee Richardson as Claudius, Jessica Tandy as Gertrude, Ellen Geer as Ophelia, John Cromwell as the Player King and Ed Preble as the first gravedigger. Tanya Moiseiwitch's costumes are both riotously colorful and full of pompous protocol. But the imprint of the Guthrie personality is everywhere.

Mr. Campbell, assistant artistic director, has approached "The Miser" with equal freedom. He has staged Molière in the spirit of commedia dell'arte with its mixture of the delicacy of the dance and the exaggeration of slapstick. Moving with the grace and control of a dancer, Hume Cronyn plays Harpagon, the miser, with a marvelous blend of broad farce and cruel human weakness. He is joined by Zoe Caldwell, who plays a raffish matchmaker with earthy humor, in a delightful comic scene.

In "The Miser," as in "Hamlet," the director's viewpoint predominates. Mr. Campbell, of course, is his own man, but surely it is partly Sir Tyrone's merit that "The Miser" could be staged with so much inventive imagination.

Minneapolis has every reason to be pleased with its new theater and company. Whatever one's reservations about the productions, one must applaud their willingness to take chances. If Minneapolis has any worry, it is about the future. What happens when "Johnny Appleseed" Guthrie must be off to the next State or country?

[From the New York Times, May 9, 1963]

THEATER: NEW MINNESOTA PLAYHOUSE—"HAMLET" OPENS CAREER OF THE TYRONE GUTHRIE

(By Howard Taubman)

MINNEAPOLIS, May 8.—What a delightful variation on the popular American theme of civic boosting. The Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce invites you to share its pride in "Hamlet."

How often, do you suppose, do drama critics receive cordial letters of greeting from anyone, let alone chambers of commerce? Rarely, very rarely. The notable thing about the Minneapolis Chamber's proud welcome to a city about to "reach another milestone in becoming an outstanding culture center" is not vainglorious.

The Tyrone Guthrie Theater, which opened here last night, is a cause for celebration. So is the Minnesota Theater Company, the resident repertory troupe, which has been installed in it. So is the repertory for the first 20-week season: "Hamlet," naturally the inaugural drama; Molière's "The

Miser," Checkhov's "The Three Sisters" and Arthur Miller's "Death of a Salesman."

The theater, designed by Ralph Rapson of the University of Minnesota's Department of Architecture, adjoins the Walker Art Center, and faces on open, green space. Its exterior, not quite finished, is a light, graceful blend of glass, wood and concrete.

Inside, it is a gem. The 1,437 seats sweep around the outthrust open stage in an arc of slightly more than 180 degrees. The auditorium walls and ceiling are battleship gray and the seats have gay multicolored upholstery. Shaped like the Shakespearean Festival house in Stratford, Ontario, the Guthrie Theater gives the impression of greater intimacy, because it is smaller.

The stage also resembles the one in Stratford, Ontario. At the rear there are a small balcony supported by pillars and a wall of dark wood, as polished as the stage floor, with a number of doors and windows.

Using this playing space with the virtuosity of a man who loves its freedom, Tyrone Guthrie has staged a vividly theatrical "Hamlet." Its theatricalism is often so vigorously underlined that it tumbles over into flamboyance. This "Hamlet" is by turns startling and ludicrous, illuminating and merely flashy, but never commonplace or dull.

It has pleased Mr. Guthrie's modern court—as he did in previous Shakespearean productions, including an earlier "Hamlet" in London. In Tanya Moiseiwitch's joyously unhibited designs, the place at Elsinore seems to be inhabited by royalty and courtiers who compensate for the modesty of their kingdom's political position by the extravagance of the regalia. Indeed, they look a little like figures in comic opera.

The soldiers on the battlements who first see the ghost of Hamlet's father wear the ankle-length greatcoats of Hussars. Other soldiers wear breastplates over scarlet tunics, high boots and plumed helmets. Claudius, the King, is contemporaneously regal in the daytime in morning coat and Ascot tie and in the evening in white tie, tails, ceremonial sash and decorations.

Polonius is always in formal diplomatic garb. He signs papers distractedly as he gives Laertes the familiar platitudinous counsel. Laertes, off for France, is as sharp as a young man about town in his tan suit and fawn waistcoat. Ophelia comes to see him off, carrying a couple of tennis rackets. And Hamlet soliloquizes on suicide in a snazzy blue smoking jacket.

What is the value of this modern setting? At worst, when Laertes returns from France with a holster conspicuously attached to a belt worn over a trenchcoat, it is silly. When Laertes jabs a pearl-handle pistol into Claudius' ribs, we have a "Hamlet" caricature in the style of a western.

At best the exaggerated modern dress reminds us that "Hamlet," in its ironic comment on venality, stupidity and wild unreason, is enduringly true. For Shakespeare's account of the intrigue in a distant Elsinore does not seem distorted in a modern context.

With his fondness for theatricalism, Mr. Guthrie has filled the stage with movement and effect. The arrival of the players in garish clothes and with their much-traveled luggage is lively and colorful. The play within the play shifts from animation to feverishness, with the spotlights manned by uniformed flunkies turned suddenly to rake the audience.

After the killing of Polonius, Hamlet is tracked down by a posse that uses flashlights eerily. Ophelia's funeral is a somber procession in black coats, veils and open umbrellas. And during the swordplay near the end, when Hamlet seizes Laertes' sword with its envenomed tip, I swear I heard a uniformed courtier exclaim in a fruity English accent, "Most irregular."

There are other excesses, like the melodramatic way in which the skewered Polonius plunges from behind the arras and the dying Claudius falls back, overturning a table. Yet the substance of "Hamlet" is not neglected.

George Grizzard, a pale young and handsome Hamlet, plays with shining intelligence. You never forget that here is a noble prince of shrewdness, wit, and passion. He reads the great soliloquies with the casualness of a modern man, yet he does not cheat the poetry.

Lee Richardson is a tautly energetic Claudius, a worthy adversary for a tragic hero. Jessica Tandy's Gertrude is gentle and confused. Ellen Geer, madly scratching the ground near the end, is an Ophelia who wears her rue with a difference. Robert Pastene is an amusingly stuffy Polonius. Ken Ruta as the ghost, Nicholas Coster as the ardent Laertes, John Cromwell as the Player King, and Ruth Nelson as the Player Queen, deserve mention.

Clayton Corzatte as Osric invites Hamlet to a test of blades with such grossly distorted foppishness that he gets the expected laugh. An able actor, Mr. Corzatte no doubt follows orders. But there are laughs and laughs. Ed Preble, a simple and wise first gravedigger, gets the right kind.

The comedy is typical of this individualistic "Hamlet." You never know from one scene to the next whether you will be surprised for the sake of surprise or genuinely stirred. You will not, however, be indifferent. The chamber of commerce is right, after all, to puff out its chest over Minneapolis' new acquisition.

THE CAST

"Hamlet," a revival of William Shakespeare's tragedy. Staged by Tyrone Guthrie; presented by the Minnesota Theater Co.; production designed by Tanya Moiseiwitsch; music by Herbert Pilhofer; costumes supervised by Ray Diffen; production stage manager, Rex Partington. At the Tyrone Guthrie Theater, Minneapolis.

Horatio	Graham Brown
Marcellus	Paul Ballantyne
Ghost	Ken Ruta
Claudius	Lee Richardson
Gertrude	Jessica Tandy
Laertes	Nicholas Coster
Polonius	Robert Pastene
Hamlet	George Grizzard
Ophelia	Ellen Geer
Rosencrantz	Alfred Rossi
Gildenstern	Michael Levin
Player King	John Cromwell
Player Queen	Ruth Nelson
Osric	Clayton Corzatte
Fortinbras	Claude Woolman
First gravedigger	Ed Preble
Second gravedigger	Ken Ruta

WILLIAM TYRONE GUTHRIE—1,000 MILES OFF BROADWAY

A magical ritual, a mirror hung before man, a gold mine for those who seek the poetical, the fanciful, the unusual—this is the meaning of theater to William Tyrone Guthrie.

The founder and director of the Tyrone Guthrie Theater, which opened a 20-week repertory season Tuesday night in Minneapolis, is left unmoved by the realistic style that has dominated the American stage.

As an articulate critic against this style, he has been one of the most hardened advocates of theater-in-the-round and one of the sharpest opponents of the conventional proscenium stage.

The director has also been strongly in favor of repertory theater, far from the traditional stage centers.

"I'm very interested in places that aren't the central marketplaces of theater," he once said. "We all tend to stick around New York, London, and Paris, which are the places for the great press notices."

At the moment he is 1,000 miles from Broadway, opening, for the upper Midwest, the most important cultural event since the first concert by the Minneapolis Symphony 60 years ago.

JOURNEYS TO FRONTIERS

His journey to a new cultural frontier is not surprising. In 1953, he went to Stratford, Ontario, "to give advice" when the Shakespeare Festival was being organized. His productions made the festival internationally famous. Now his work in establishing the first important repertory theater outside New York may alter the furrowed brow of the American theater.

A British subject of Irish and Scottish extraction, Mr. Guthrie was born on July 2, 1900, in Tunbridge Wells, an English village. "I come by the stage quite honestly," he said. "On my mother's side there was a long line of actors and I am a grandson of Tyrone Power (the British actor who died in 1931. He is a cousin of Tyrone Power, the late actor). On my father's side, there was a long line of Scottish Presbyterian ministers."

While he studied at Oxford, his fascination with the theater took form after he was asked to join the dramatic society. Repertory theater and apprenticeship at the British Broadcasting Corp. followed. He began his career as a director in 1926 and by the time he was 33, he had become the youngest director the Old Vic ever had.

His fresh approach to plays and his attention for details punctuate the career of a man who rightfully called his autobiography, "A Life in the Theater" (McGraw-Hill), published in 1959. His experiments have not all met with the critics approval. But he has preferred experiments that do not quite come off—to no experiments at all.

His versatility was demonstrated one season in New York when he staged "The Matchmaker," a farce; "Candide," a comic operetta, and "Troilus and Cressida," a tragedy. Earlier, at the Metropolitan Opera, he had pumped fresh blood into an aging production of "Carmen."

After 40 years in the theater, Mr. Guthrie has learned that "the best plays and the best productions rarely succeeded; and that the greatest successes rarely seemed to me interesting or of lasting value."

The director, who had an honorary LL.D. conferred on him by the Scottish University of St. Andrews, is a 6-footer with shoulders as broad as a French farce. He has the physique with which to frighten actors, but he prefers to persuade them. He was knighted December 30, 1960.

HE SPEAKS, THEY LISTEN

When Mr. Guthrie speaks, everyone listens. For even the most hardened producer knows that his startling flow of the English language is supported by intelligence, honesty, and dedication, traits frequently missing among members of a profession where art is often measured by the weekly box-office receipts.

During rehearsals, he may burst into song to simulate an orchestra. He may bound about the stage in a pair of carpet slippers to show how he wants a battle scene done. If a script calls for drums, he beats out the rhythm on a metal waste basket. He directs every part as if it were the star role. He is almost fanatically demanding in having everything right as he sees it. And he gets his results by dipping into an apparently bottomless well of patience and good humor.

His attire is as careless as his plays are precise. He has wandered about Times Square in clashing jacket and trousers, blue-canvas half sneakers, and no socks. His wife, the former Judith Bretherton, sometimes chases after him with a tie he has forgotten to put on.

The Guthries make their home in Newbliss, Ireland, where they recently began the production of violet plum, bramble jelly, and ginger jam, to help the town's economy.

"One cannot be afraid to be thought a little odd, a little bit of a freak," he said. "I greatly admire people who aren't always asking, 'What will the neighbors say?'"

Mr. HUMPHREY. In closing, Mr. President, I express the sincere hope that we can find time during the 88th Congress to consider this and related legislation most carefully. I am hopeful that it will be possible to hold several days of hearings on the various bills dealing with arts and culture sometime during the first session.

The United States can take pride in its artistic and cultural achievements. But we should also recognize that as a Nation we have just begun to utilize these resources of creative inspiration and pleasure. Congress has a clear responsibility to assist in the process of tapping these resources to the fullest.

EXHIBIT I

THE NATIONAL ARTS AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT—SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS

On April 11, 1963, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, assistant majority leader, introduced S. 1316, the National Arts and Cultural Development Act. The bill contains two titles: title I establishes a National Council on the Arts; title II establishes a National Arts Foundation. A summary of S. 1316 follows:

TITLE I—NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

1. Members: The National Council on the Arts shall be established in the Executive Office of the President. The Council shall be composed of a Chairman and 24 members appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. There shall be an appropriate distribution of membership among the major art fields. The Special Consultant on the Arts shall serve as Chairman of the Council.

2. Functions: The Council shall perform the following functions: (a) recommend ways to maintain and increase the cultural resources of the United States, (b) propose methods to encourage private initiative in the arts, (c) advise and consult with other public and private bodies, and (d) conduct studies and make recommendations. The Council shall submit an annual report to the President and the Congress.

3. Staff: The Council shall be provided with an executive secretary and a staff to carry out its responsibilities. The Council shall meet at the call of the Special Consultant but at least twice each calendar year. Most of the Council's studies and projects will be undertaken through special panels and committees of professionally qualified persons.

TITLE II—NATIONAL ARTS FOUNDATION

1. Trustees: The National Arts Foundation shall be established as an independent agency in the Executive branch of the Government. A Board of Trustees consisting of 21 members shall formulate general policy and supervise the operation of the Foundation. Trustees shall be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate.

2. Grants to groups: The Foundation shall conduct a grant-in-aid program to nonprofit professional groups and nonprofit groups meeting professional standards to enable these groups to provide (a) productions and projects of substantial artistic and cultural significance, (b) projects that will encourage and assist artists in the United States, (c) projects that will encourage the appreciation and enjoyment of the arts by our citizens, and (d) other relevant projects including surveys, research, and planning in the arts.

Grants-in-aid shall not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of any production or project except that 20 percent of the total funds allotted to the Foundation will be available for special grants not limited by the matching requirement.

3. Grants to States: The Foundation shall also conduct a grant-in-aid program to assist the States in supporting artistic and cultural projects and productions and in developing projects and productions in the arts in order to furnish programs, facilities, and services in the arts to all the peoples and communities in the States.

Grants to the States shall not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of any project or production.

4. Staff: The President shall also appoint a Director of the Foundation who will serve as principal administrative officer and who will sit as an ex officio trustee. Special panels and committee may be appointed to assist the trustees with respect to their duties of the Foundation.

5. Funds: The act authorizes an appropriation not to exceed $5 million for the fiscal year 1964 and not to exceed $10 million thereafter. The Foundation shall not itself produce or present any project or production.

COMMENDATION TO SENATORS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as this session draws to a close, on behalf of the leadership, I extend thanks and appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for his excellent work in bringing forth from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the mental health and mental retardation legislation. I believe it is one of the most significant pieces of legislation adopted by any Congress in this century.

It seems to me that the measure commences a program that could bring great benefits to thousands of people and relieve the anxiety and the heartache of thousands—yes, hundreds of thousands—of families. As I said the other evening, the President of the United States is to be commended for his leadership on this program. And the distinguished Senator from Alabama has again demonstrated for all to see his remarkable capacity for leadership on vital issues of public health, and the whole subject of the healing arts and medical research.

I wish to compliment him and the members of the committee who worked so diligently in processing this important legislation.

I should add a word of compliment to the entire Senate for the expeditious manner in which the legislation was handled.

Today we have had some extraordinarily good work on the part of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. He, along with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], did a fine job on the debt ceiling legislation. I wish to extend the thanks of the leadership also to the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for his cooperation in completing action on the legislation today.

There was an issue among us here, an item of controversy, but it was resolved, and the proposed legislation is now on its way to the President for his signature. It was an important measure, and we faced a time limit that necessitated prompt action.

Today there was also action on the appropriations for the Department of the Interior. Again I wish to compliment the able, distinguished and beloved chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], for his splendid work in bringing the appropriation bill to the Senate and for his methodical, efficient and expeditious handling of the appropriation.

Also I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the minority member of the committee, for his cooperation in relation to the measure.

I know that pictures cannot be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But in case there are any doubters among us, I have in my hands a photograph of the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] taken in the year 1912. It is not hard to see why he was elected. He must have received the unanimous support of the ladies, because he is a fine looking gentleman. The picture which I hold in my hand reveals those qualities of character which years have made even more precise, understandable, and meaningful to all of those who have known him.

I think we should take a moment to express our appreciation to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] for his remarkable achievement in bringing to fruition the equal pay bill. That measure has been before the Congress for 20, 25, or 30 years. At long last we have been able to see it passed and become a public law. It now awaits the signature of the President of the United States. I am sure that the signing of the bill will be a very important and historic occasion.

By his qualities of perseverance, patience and dogged determination, plus legislative skill, the Senator from Michigan has brought the proposal to legislative achievement.

PRAYER FOR POPE JOHN XXIII

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senate would desire to take note of a very serious situation that faces the entire world. The whole world, Catholic and non-Catholic, turns its heart to Rome in prayer for the life of Pope John 23d.

Since his ascension to the papacy he has given mankind an image and a voice of hope, of fellowship, of humane respect for the value of every life. Old walls that have divided men have fallen before the simple goodness and deep wisdom of Pope John. The Ecumenical Council and his great message, "Peace on Earth," are his monuments; we pray that he may live to leave still other works that testify to the unity of mankind and power of each man for good.

I am confident that the words I have spoken represent the thought, the prayer, the hope, and the will of every Senator—yes, every Member of the Congress—and, indeed, our prayers go out most reverently for the life of this good, gracious, and courageous man. May he

be spared, because the world needs him. He has been a great force for good, for peace and for humanity.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate today, the Secretary may receive messages from the House of Representatives and the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign enrolled bills duly passed by the two Houses and found to be truly enrolled.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY; AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MAY 31, 1963, UNTIL TUESDAY, JUNE 4, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Friday next; and that immediately after convening on that day the Presiding Officer shall, without the transaction of any business or debate, declare the Senate adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday, June 4, 1963.

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

ASSISTANCE TO STATES IN PROVIDING DAY-CARE SERVICES FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 181, S. 522.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 522) to amend the act establishing a Children's Bureau so as to assist States in providing for day-care services for children of migrant agricultural workers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Act of April 9, 1912 (37 Stat. 79), is amended (1) by redesignating section 5 as section 6, and (2) by adding after section 4 the following new section:

"SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such sums, not to exceed $750,000 for any year, as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to public and nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations for paying part of the cost of establishing and operating day-care facilities for children of migrant agricultural workers. No grant under this section shall be made for the establishment or operation of any such facility unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is satisfied that such facility (including private homes) and its mode of operation will meet any standards established for facilities of this type by the State wherein such facility is, or will be, located.

"(b) In no case shall a State receive Federal financial assistance with respect to the same expenditure under this section and the provisions of part 3 of title V of the Social Security Act.

"(c) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'migrant agricultural worker' means an individual (A) whose primary employment is agriculture, as defined in section 3(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(f)), or performing agricultural labor, as defined in section 3121 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 3121(g)), on a seasonal or other temporary basis, and (B) who establishes for the purpose of such employment a temporary residence; and

"(2) The term 'child' means a child who makes his home with his parent or the individual who stands in loco parentis to the child.

"(d) No funds appropriated under subsection (a) shall be payable to any entity for the purpose of establishing or operating within any locality any day-care facility if such entity imposes, as a condition of eligibility for day care for children of migrant agricultural workers, any residence requirement which excludes any otherwise eligible child who is physically present in the locality."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, S. 522 will be the pending business when the Senate convenes on Friday next, as well as on Tuesday, June 4.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, under the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Friday, May 31, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 28, 1963:

U.S. COAST GUARD

To be rear admiral

Capt. Albert J. Carpenter, U.S. Coast Guard, for promotion to the permanent rank indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Pressure To Hire Negroes Undermines Merit System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I am most concerned and distressed about repeated reports I am receiving from Birmingham that the Justice Department and the Civil Service Commission are tampering with the merit system.

Within the last few days, I have received reports from workers at the Social Security Administration, the Birmingham Veterans' Administration Hospital, the post office and other Federal agencies in Birmingham that pressure is being put on local agency administrative officers, who are charged with the responsibility of hiring workers under the merit system, to hire Negroes for jobs coming open in their agencies.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, the Justice Department has influenced the Civil Service Commission to order a step-up in the hiring of Negroes in Federal agencies in Birmingham. Although this has been denied by civil service officials, there has been no explanation of the secret meetings of Civil Service Commission officials and local hiring officers. This action to influence the hiring of a specific group or class of people is plain tampering. It is all the more alarming and distressing because civil service officials are actually participating in the efforts to show favoritism to a specific group of applicants. This undermines the entire concept of the merit system.

I have very strongly and repeatedly protested this pressuring of agencies by the Civil Service Commission. I have asked for a complete investigation and explanation of the Birmingham meetings and the apparent pressures being exerted on Federal Government officials.

Mr. Speaker, it would be unconscionable, and a violation of all ethical standards as an infraction of civil service regulations, if, in the name of equal rights and opportunities, special privileges were granted Negro applicants for positions or promotions.

The 45th Anniversary of Armenian Republic Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, Americans of all faiths and national origins again pause this year to celebrate the anniversary of the independence of the Armenian Republic. May 28 marks the 45th anniversary of that declaration, which in turn was a culmination of the legitimate national desires and political aspirations of the Armenian people. Despite initial diplomatic recognition, the Soviet Union, as is its frequent rule,