N.J., on the occasion of the completion of his term as a governor of District 16–A, New Jersey, Lions International.

Governor Orecchio is the owner of the Orecchio Agency, in Fairview, N.J., a well known and highly successful real estate and insurance business. During his entire life, Michael Orecchio has served his community with zeal and devotion. He sponsored and aided in the construction of his town's first playground. He equipped and set up a baseball league for youngsters. He was instrumental in organizing the town's first Boy Scout troop. He served for years on both the board of education and the planning board. For 26 years he was a volunteer fireman, serving also as fire chief. He served as president of the Fairview Chamber of Commerce. Every fund-raising drive has benefited from his help and leadership. He has had a lifelong interest in crime detection and crime prevention, which led to his service as chief of detectives for Bergen County, N.J.

During his years as a member of Lions International, Michael Orecchio has seen a need for some brief credo which would identify a Lion to the community, to the world at large, and last but not least, to himself.

In words that are brief but full of meaning, he has written a "Profile of a Lion." Those who have heard this wonderful description of a Lion have been deeply moved by it.

Lions International was established 46 years ago. Its Lions Club objectives and Lions code of ethics set the standard for Lions conduct. In a sense, this "Profile of a Lion," taken together with the Lions Club objectives and the Lions code of ethics could well form a trinity of lionism.

Mr. Speaker, because the philosophy so well expressed in the "Profile of a Lion" could be followed by all of us, under unanimous consent I insert it in the RECORD.

PROFILE OF A LION

He is a respected citizen of his community.

He is reverent to his God, loyal to his country and uncompromising in his devotion to both.

He raises his glass in the "Lions toast" and thereby acknowledges the concept of equality of all Lions the world over.

He recognizes authority, accepts responsibility and exercises self-discipline, realizing that only through proper organization can Lionism achieve its greatest goals.

He gives willingly of his time, energy, and substance to assist his community and the needy.

He meets regularly with his fellow Lions and through the common denominator of "friendship" confers, plans and carries out the objectives of his Lions Club.

He is an ordinary guy, enjoys fun and good fellowship, although not perfect he is ever mindful of human concern.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 10, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

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

O God, our Father, who desirest truth in the inward parts, in the white light of whose presence all our motives stand revealed, for this hallowed moment, turning aside from our divisive loyalties and our party cries, we would bow humbly in a unity of spirit with a vivid realization of our oneness in Thee.

Closing the door of prayer upon the outer world with its tumult and shouting and its unpredictable trends, and standing now in the searching light of Thy holiness, we know ourselves for what we are—petty and proud creatures who too often seek their own wills and whims, in spite of the polished courtesies and noble professions with which we approach Thee.

Cleanse the inner fountains of our hearts, we beseech Thee, from all defiling foulness and from the secret sin of pretense. In tense days, when the words that are uttered within these walls may affect the uttermost parts of the earth, fit us faithfully to protect the Republic from outward aggression and subversion, and from the treason of betraying the eternal principles which are the foundation stones of our national existence.

We ask it through riches of grace in Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 10, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 6, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On May 28, 1963:

S. 20. An act to promote the coordination and development of effective programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

On May 29, 1963:

S. 18. An act to change the name of Harpers Ferry National Monument to Harpers Ferry National Historical Park;

S. 247. An act to authorize survey and establishment of a townsite for the Juneau Indian Village in Alaska; and

S. 873. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada.

On June 4, 1963:

S. 386. An act to consolidate Vicksburg National Military Park and to provide for certain adjustments necessitated by the installation of a park tour road, and for other purposes.

On June 10, 1963:

S. 1409. 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 6754) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 6754) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

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

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF LABORATORY BUILDING AT COLORADO UNIVERSITY, BOULDER, COLO.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of a laboratory building at Colorado University, Boulder, Colo.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL RESEARCH FACILITIES AT UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, PA.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of additional research facilities at the University of Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligations of appropriations within that Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT, RELATING TO GRANT OF EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS AT AIRPORTS

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 308(a) of the Federal Aviation Act as it relates to the grant of exclusive rights at airports (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951, TO EXTEND THE PROVISIONS TO THE FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subsections (a) and (b) of section 103 of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 8), as amended (50 U.S.C., App. sec. 1213(a) and sec. 1213(b)) to extend the provisions of that act to the Federal Aviation Agency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON BALANCES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES ACQUIRED WITHOUT PAYMENT OF DOLLARS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars, as of December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MILITARY PERSONNEL AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES' CLAIMS ACT OF 1962

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

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

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 1575

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of a highway from the Florida Keys through the Everglades National Park to the west coast of Florida

"Whereas the Florida Keys are located but 90 miles from the coast of Cuba which is now a vast fortress under Communist domination where Russian and other Communist satellite nation troops are now massed; and

"Whereas the Key West naval complex has become the hub of United States defense to the mainland of our Nation, and the need for the movement of troops and equipment to and from the Key West naval complex is essential to our national defense system; and

"Whereas Hurricane Donna, in September 1960 destroyed the Tea Table Relief Bridge on Upper Matecumbe Key leaving the Florida Keys without access to the mainland of Florida; and

"Whereas utility service, the most important of which is the flow of fresh water, and the supply of other necessities of life were seriously disrupted; and

"Whereas the Florida Keys continue to remain vulnerable to destruction by natural elements; and

"Whereas the Inland Waterway ends at Cross Bank in the Florida Keys nearly 90 miles north of Key West and all shipping is exposed to the treacherous open waters of the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico and is subject to the dangers of a hostile nation and its allies using proximate shipping lanes; and

"Whereas no alternative route is available to provide for the flow of the necessities of life to the Florida Keys; and

"Whereas the Florida Keys are also completely dependent on the mainland of Florida for their supply of fresh water and the present source is located in proximity to a proposed oil refinery creating a water pollution hazard; and

"Whereas the populace of the Florida Keys and the Key West naval complex are desirous of obtaining an alternative source of fresh water which is readily available in the Everglades National Park; and

"Whereas the construction of a highway would link both coasts of Florida, provide an alternative aqueduct, and open up a new area for recreation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to authorize the construction of a highway from the Florida Keys through the Everglades National Park to the west coast of Florida; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States, to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the Florida delegation to the Congress of the United States of America."

Three concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION —

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

" 'SEC. 2. The judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy, relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission'; and be it further

"Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Attest:

"INEZ WATSON,
"Clerk of the House."

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION —

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Article V thereof

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

" ' "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

" ' "SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission" '; and be it further

"Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Attest:

"INEZ WATSON,
"Clerk of the House."

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION —

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following articles

as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Upon demand of the legislatures of five States, no two of which shall share any common boundary, made within 2 years after the rendition of any judgment of the Supreme Court relating to the rights reserved to the States or to the people by this Constitution, such judgment shall be reviewed by a court composed of the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States to be known as the Court of the Union. The sole issue before the Court of the Union shall be whether the power of jurisdiction sought to be exercised on the part of the United States is a power granted to it under this Constitution.

" 'SEC. 2. Three-fourths of the Justices of the Court of the Union shall constitute a quorum, but it shall require concurrence of a majority of the entire court to reserve a decision of the Supreme Court. In event of incapacity of the chief justice of the highest court of any State to sit upon the Court of the Union, his place shall be filled by another justice of such State court selected by affirmative vote of a majority of its membership.

" 'SEC. 3. On the first Monday of the third calendar month following the ratification of this amendment, the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States shall convene at the National Capital, at which time the Court of the Union shall be organized and shall adopt rules governing its procedure.

" 'SEC. 4. Decisions of the Court of the Union upon matters within its jurdisdiction shall be final and shall not thereafter be overruled by any court and may be changed only by an amendment of this Constitution.

" 'SEC. 5. The Congress shall make provision for the housing of the Court of the Union and the expenses of its operation.

" 'SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission'; and be it further

"Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Attest:

"INEZ WATSON,
"Clerk of the House."

APPORTIONMENT OF REPRESENTATION IN STATE LEGISLATURES—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] I send to the desk a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly memorializing the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States concerning apportionment of representation in State legislatures.

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

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 149

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States concerning apportionment of representation in State legislatures

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That this general assembly respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

"SEC. 2. The judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy, relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission"; and be it further

Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE V OF THE CONSTITUTION—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I send to the desk a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly memorializing the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to article V thereof.

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

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 148

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to article V thereof

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That this General Assembly respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.'

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission"; and be it further

Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION TO PROVIDE FOR A COURT OF THE UNION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I send to the desk a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly memorializing the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will provide for a Court of the Union.

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

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 147

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will provide for a Court of the Union

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That this general assembly respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following ar-

ticle as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Upon demand of the legislatures of five States, no two of which shall share any common boundary, made within two years after the rendition of any judgment of the Supreme Court relating to the rights reserved to the States or to the people by this Constitution, such judgment shall be reviewed by a Court composed of the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States to be known as the Court of the Union. The sole issue before the Court of the Union shall be whether the power or jurisdiction sought to be exercised on the part of the United States is a power granted to it under this Constitution.

"SEC. 2. Three-fourths of the justices of the Court of the Union shall constitute a quorum, but it shall require concurrence of a majority of the entire Court to reverse a decision of the Supreme Court. In event of incapacity of the chief justice of the highest court of any State to sit upon the Court of the Union, his place shall be filled by another justice of such State court selected by affirmative vote of a majority of its membership.

"SEC. 3. On the first Monday of the third calendar month following the ratification of this amendment, the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States shall convene at the National Capital, at which time the Court of the Union shall be organized and shall adopt rules governing its procedure.

"SEC. 4. Decisions of the Court of the Union upon matters within its jurisdiction shall be final and shall not thereafter be overruled by any court and may be changed only by an amendment of this Constitution.

"SEC. 5. The Congress shall make provision for the housing of the Court of the Union and the expenses of its operation.

"SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of any force or effect; and be it further

Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRAYER AND USE OF THE BIBLE IN SCHOOLS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a petition signed by a large number of Iowans requesting active support for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit a nonsectarian prayer to be used in the public schools and to permit the use of the Bible in the classrooms of the various States. I ask that the petition be referred to the appropriate committee.

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

PROTECT OUR HERITAGE

To the honorable Senators from the State of Iowa:

We, the undersigned, registered voters, do hereby petition for your sponsorship, or wholehearted and active support, of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit a nonsectarian prayer to be used in the public schools and to permit the use of the Bible in the classrooms of the various States.

(Signed by Jane Ringland, and 39 other citizens of the State of Iowa.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1643. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of Gregory J. Kessenich," approved October 2, 1962 (76 Stat. 1368) (Rept. No. 236).

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT "SELECTED REPORTS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES"

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 156); which, under the rule was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document "Selected Reports of the Administrative Conference of the United States", submitted by the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure to the Committee on the Judiciary; and that there be printed two thousand additional copies of such document for the use of that committee.

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. DIRKSEN:

S. 1686. A bill to amend section 375 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to the annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

S. 1687. A bill to approve the January 1963 reclassification of land of the Big Flat unit of the Missoula Valley project, Montana, and to authorize the modification of the repayment contract with the Big Flat Irrigation District; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1688. A bill to extend to State public assistance programs approved under titles XIV and XVI of the Social Security Act the special matching provisions presently in force with respect to certain Navajo and Hopi Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 1689. A bill to establish a Community Relations and Conciliation Service to preserve domestic peace and to help insure to all persons the equal protection of the laws under the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1690. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit the use of the term "mahogany" in connection with woods and other products which are not in fact mahogany; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 1691. A bill relating to the occupational training of youth, and the development and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. ENGLE (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1692. A bill to consent to the Goose Lake Basin compact between the States of California and Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 87. Joint resolution providing for the designation of the week commencing September 8, 1963, as "National Public Works Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

S.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution to bestow a Congressional Medal of National Honor on Carl Sandburg; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

RESOLUTIONS

MAINTENANCE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OF RECORDS RELATING TO APPOINTMENTS TO AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I think all of us are aware of a move by the Air Force to transfer from the District of Columbia area, in relatively close proximity to Capitol Hill, the records and other information maintained by the Air Force in regard to appointees and nominees to the U.S. Air Force Academy and to the cadets who are in training there. It is understood that the proposal is to move these records to the Air Force Academy itself. I believe the proposed move would be a mistake, and I have so informed the Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators MUNDT, CARLSON, HARTKE, MILLER, CURTIS, and METCALF, I now submit a resolution on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution remain at the desk for 3 days, to enable other Senators to join in sponsoring it. The resolution states that it is the sense of the Senate that these records should remain in the District of Columbia area.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Arizona.

The resolution (S. Res. 154) was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Whereas the Department of the Air Force presently maintains in the Greater Metropolitan Area of the District of Columbia certain information relating to appointees and nominees to the United States Air Force Academy; and

Whereas such information is and has been made readily accessible to and has been utilized extensively by Members of Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Senate that the Department of the Air Force should continue to maintain within the Greater Metropolitan Area of the District of Columbia the master control record relating to (1) all nominees to the United States Air Force Academy, (2) all cadets in training at such Academy, (3) all cadets discharged from such Academy, (4) all Congressional cadet quotas for such Academy, and (5) the status of those persons under consideration for appointment to each entering class of the Academy.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE BEYOND ADJOURNMENT OF SENATE TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 155) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 3 of rule I of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] be, and he is hereby, authorized to perform the duties of the Chair as Acting President pro tempore from today and during the temporary absence from the city of the President pro tempore [Mr. HAYDEN].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 155) was considered and agreed to.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT "SELECTED REPORTS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES"

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 156) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of "Selected Reports of the Administrative Conference of the United States," which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ANNUITIES OF WIDOWS OF SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1686) to amend section 375 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to the annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at times, in the rush of events, those who because of their age or their situation cannot speak out, are passed by. A case of this type has recently been called to my attention. Nine years ago when we were considering the question of annuities for widows of Supreme Court Justices, we passed a law providing that their annuity should be in the same amount as the annuity authorized for the widow of a President of the United States. We did this by incorporating in that law a reference to a statute which had been enacted in 1937 dealing with the annuity of a President's widow.

A few years ago, in 1958, it became apparent to us that an amount of money which might have been adequate for a widow in 1937 was no longer sufficient for her support in 1958, and we, therefore, provided for an increase in the annuity of a widow of a former President. However, because of a quirk in the law providing for annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices, which referred by name to the act passed in 1937, these widows were not caught up in the new law which provided for the increase in the annuities to the widows of Presidents. As a result, those fine ladies have been forced to make do on an amount which was determined in 1937 and there is not a one of us who does not know how inadequate such an amount is today.

I have been informed that there is some urgency about this matter because of the circumstances in which several of the widows of Supreme Court Justices now find themselves in their efforts to live in 1963 upon a stipend which was determined in 1937. Therefore, I have introduced a bill to bring these annuities into line with those we provided in 1958, and I hope that this bill will be accorded a most expeditious treatment.

CIVIL RIGHTS CONCILIATION SERVICE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, for myself and for the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Community Relations and Conciliation Service to help preserve peace in communities threatened by racial violence and to help insure to all persons the equal protection of the laws under the Constitution.

Mr. President, I offer this bill with the hope that it may be included in the overall legislation program on civil rights which I earnestly hope Congress will enact this year.

While no substitute for many other pressing legislative proposals I firmly believe this bill would represent a moderate and meaningful part of any well rounded legislative program in the civil rights field.

In my judgment, one of the most important lessons of the recent Birmingham crisis is the critical need and tremendous value of timely conciliation to establish lines of communication in our race-torn communities, preferably before intense antagonisms and inflamed passions are aroused.

In Birmingham, this administration scored a major success through wide-scale mediating efforts, in which Burke Marshall, the head of the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division, played a major role right on the scene.

These efforts were widely hailed, for they truly set the stage for meaningful civil rights gains in that torn city. As Revs. Martin Luther King and Fred L. Shuttesworth said of the Birmingham agreements:

Birmingham may well offer for 20th century America an example of progressive racial relations; and for all mankind a dawn of a new day, a promise for all men, a day of opportunity, and a new sense of freedom for all America.

This triumph of cooperation triggered by conciliation argues strongly, I believe, for the establishment of a national service with regional offices to work in communities on a regular, continuing basis for the goal of both racial peace and social justice.

Fortunately in Birmingham, when violence erupted, the mediators were rushed out and the flames extinguished. But next time we may not be so fortunate, unless moderating influences are brought into play before the house even starts smoking.

But peace alone is not the goal. There must be both peace and progress toward greater social justice.

The bill I have introduced would not only seek to preserve the peace when violence threatens. It would also seek in every voluntary way possible to insure to all persons the equal protection of the laws under the Constitution.

Working through a national agency and regional offices, the service would provide advice, information, and technical assistance to local communities. It would seek, encourage, and utilize the cooperation of all possible appropriate Government agencies, private institutions, industries, organizations, and individuals. It would be headed, I hope, by the most highly qualified person to be found in the United States.

I would emphasize the catalytic role of the service, for no single man or agency can do the whole job that needs to be done. Civic, business, labor, and especially religious leaders must play a far larger role, and this proposed service could be a tremendous help to the vitally needed broader effort.

In passing, it is worth noting that yesterday at the meeting of the U.S. Conferences of Mayors in Hawaii, the President recommended the establishment of biracial human relations committees in each city. And I think this national service could be of substantial help to local human relations committees in providing advice, guidance, and technical assistance for their efforts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk until Monday next for other Senators to join in sponsorship, and I also ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD together with several articles from the May 10 and 11 issues of the New York Times commenting on the mediating efforts made during the Birmingham crisis.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from New Jersey, and the bill, together with the articles, will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1689) to establish a Community Relations and Conciliation Service to preserve domestic peace and to help insure to all persons the equal protection of the laws under the Constitution, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Community Relations and Conciliation Service Act".

DUTIES OF THE SERVICE

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established as an independent agency of the Government a Community Relations and Conciliation Service (hereafter referred to as the "Service"). It shall be the duty of the Service, subject to the provisions of this Act, to—

(1) provide conciliation assistance in communities where disagreements or difficulties regarding the laws or Constitution or interstate commerce of the United States are disrupting, or are threatening to disrupt, peaceful relations among citizens of such communities, and

(2) provide advice, information and technical assistance to local communities, and otherwise seek by voluntary means to insure to all persons the equal protection of the laws under the Constitution.

(b) The activities of all officers and employees of the Service in providing conciliation assistance under this Act shall be conducted in confidence and without publicity, and they shall not be obliged to disclose any information acquired in the regular course of performing their duties.

COOPERATION WITH STATE, LOCAL, AND PRIVATE AGENCIES

SEC. 3. The Service shall whenever possible in the course of carrying out the purposes of this Act, seek, encourage, and utilize the cooperation of all appropriate Government agencies, industries, institutions, organizations, and individuals in such communities.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

SEC. 4. (a) The Service shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall serve for a term of four years and until his successor is appointed and qualified. The Director shall receive compensation at a rate of $20,000 per year.

(b) There shall be two Assistant Directors who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each Assistant Director shall serve for a term of four years and until his successor is appointed and qualified. Each Assistant Director shall receive compensation at a rate of $17,500 per annum. Each Assistant Director shall perform such duties and functions as may be assigned to him, or delegated to him, by the Director. The Director is authorized to delegate to the Assistant Directors such of his powers and duties as he deems advisable.

(c) The Director is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation, in accordance with the civil service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949, of such technical, clerical, and other assistants as may be necessary to carry out the duties and functions of the Service under this Act.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE; REGIONAL OFFICES

SEC. 5. The principal office of the Service shall be in the metropolitan area of Washington, but the Director may establish such regional offices as he deems necessary to carry out the duties and functions of the Service.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 6. Subject to the provisions of section 2(b), the Director shall, on or before January 31 of each year, submit to the Congress a report of the activities of the Service during the preceding fiscal year. Such report shall also contain information with respect to the internal administration of the Service and may contain recommendations for legislation.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

The articles from the March 10 and 11 issues of the New York Times are as follows:

WASHINGTON

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy has adopted a cautious strategy in the Birmingham conflict. He has rejected the provocations of the extremists there and here and bet everything on arousing the moderates in Alabama.

This will not be easy. Ironically, the President is being blamed in the conservative South for saying too much about Birmingham, and in the liberal North for saying too little, but in fact he is presiding over a very delicate attempt to find an effective compromise.

Very quietly in the last few days, literally hundreds of telephone calls have been made from here and elsewhere in the North and South to responsible private citizens and officials in Birmingham.

Officials here, beginning with Attorney General Robert Kennedy, have been on the phone to officials in the South who might have some influence in producing a truce. Secretary of the Treasury Dillon has been talking to bankers and other friends in Alabama. Leaders of large national businesses, with branch stores in Birmingham, have been talking to their branch managers there.

All this has had a single purpose: to mobilize the moderate elements in Birmingham and get them to work for peace at the local level, rather than leaving the field to the extremists.

The pressure on President Kennedy to follow a different course has been immense this week. With every story and photograph of violence in Birmingham, he has been pressed either to intervene with Federal troops or at least to issue a sharp public denunciation of the Birmingham police officials.

KENNEDY'S DILEMMA

It has not been easy for him to resist this course, for he has condemned the patient approach to such problems in the past. In 1960, he condemned President Eisenhower obliquely by saying that the American President in the sixties would "demand more than ringing manifestos from the rear of the battle."

"It will demand," he added, "that the President place himself in the very thick of the fight, that he care passionately about the fate of the people he leads, that he be willing to serve them at the risk of incurring their momentary displeasure."

All this has been recalled to him by his liberal friends this week in order to encourage his sharp intervention, but neither the President nor his brother the Attorney General, who is often accused of being the hothead of the administration, analyzed the problem that way.

The Birmingham case, in their view, was not like the University of Mississippi case, where a Federal court order was clearly being defied by refusing to admit James Meredith to the university. Nor was it the same as the Montgomery, Ala., case, where Negroes engaged in interstate commerce were in imminent danger.

ADMINISTRATION SENTIMENT

Accordingly, section 333 of title 10 of the United States Code did not seem to the administration to apply to Birmingham. Nor did it appear to be useful to express the strong feelings genuinely felt here. For while this would undoubtedly make Washington feel better, it might also influence the Alabama Supreme Court, which has been asked to decide whether the present Birmingham city officials be retained in office, or a more moderate group be established.

For all these reasons, a decision was made to reject both troops and manifestos and try quietly to appeal to the conscience, commonsense and self-interest of the moderate citizens of the city.

Burke Marshall, the quiet head of the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division, and Assistant General Louis F. Obderdorfer, an Alabaman, were sent to Birmingham to try to mediate in the dispute.

Meanwhile, the telephones started ringing. Chainstore executives were urged to agree to desegregate their branches in Birmingham when it was legal under local law to do so. Moderate ministers in the North and South called the Birmingham ministers to urge that the efforts at mediation be given time to work. Lawyers called on former classmates in Birmingham to speak out for moderation, and apparently all this has had some effect.

THE NORTH-SOUTH DIALOG

Nobody here is prepared to predict what will happen from hour to hour, but at least moderation is being given a chance. The Attorney General has been trying to open up an honest dialog with the South. He went to Alabama a few days before the riots started. He got nowhere with the Governor, but found others in the administration who, while disagreeing with the administration's views on desegregation, were prepared to support the law.

Thus a discussion of these questions was started before the rocks began to fly and it has been greatly widened ever since. Atlanta mobilized its moderates by itself, and Birmingham is now being urged to do the same. It is a much more difficult problem there, but at least a start has been made.

SANITY IN BIRMINGHAM

A precarious peace prevails in Birmingham, thanks to a unique experiment in collective bargaining between men of enlightenment in the white and Negro community. President Kennedy and his brother, the Attorney General, have played a skillful behind-the-scenes role in averting a racial explosion that could have reached frightful dimensions. Whatever faults extremists on both sides may find with the mode of Federal intervention, the overwhelming national sentiment

must be one of relief that the ugly passions of recent days have not found expression in civil war on Birmingham's streets.

The pledge of the city's businessmen to desegregate lunch counters and other store facilities and to abolish discriminatory employment practices represents a significant breakthrough. The foundation has been laid for amicable race relations based on mutual respect and cooperation. It would be delusive, however, to pretend that this cooperation can be made secure without much more display of patience and good will on both sides.

The business leaders who negotiated the accord spoke only for themselves in promising a leveling of the iron bars of segregation. The city's lame-duck mayor denounced them as "a bunch of quisling, gutless traitors." Governor Wallace of Alabama has been almost equally condemnatory. Even the moderate new Birmingham administration, headed by Mayor-elect Boutwell, does not consider itself bound by the agreement. Most shocking of all was the declaration of Safety Commissioner Eugene (Bull) Conner that he was sorry an associate of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., hospitalized after being hit by a jet from a high-pressure fire hose, had not been carried off in a hearse, instead of an ambulance.

The Negro leaders have now succeeded in focusing national attention on the abuses to which Negroes have been subjected in this citadel of repression. The President has put the prestige of his office behind the satisfaction of their justifiable needs. To spread more marches through Alabama at this juncture, as some Negroes have suggested, could only renew the danger of heavy casualties and irrepressible violence. The presence of hundreds of children among the marchers made all these marches especially perilous ventures in brinkmanship. The Nation will hope that the good beginning made in the present peace pact will ripen into a full recognition in Birmingham and the rest of Alabama of the need for equal treatment and equal opportunity, as guaranteed to all citizens by the Constitution.

RACIAL PEACEMAKER

(By Burke Marshall)

WASHINGTON.—For the last week the burden of preventing more serious violence in Birmingham and of starting long-term improvement in race relations there has rested largely on the slim shoulders of the Justice Department's civil rights chief, Burke Marshall. By outward appearances, Mr. Marshall is an unlikely figure for such a dramatic role. He is slight of build, unassuming in manner and soft of voice—uncommonly quiet and undramatic.

MAN IN THE NEWS

But it is inner qualities that make the man, or at any rate this man, according to his friends and colleagues. They regard Mr. Marshall as ideal for the peacemaker's role in Birmingham because of his qualities of intellect and style.

His very quietness, his lack of drama, fit him to be a negotiator in situations of great tension. His coolness—courage would be another word for it—inspires confidence. So does his lawyer's way of thinking, analytically and without sentimental confusion.

BEST MAN FOR JOB

Perhaps most of all, to those who know him, Mr. Marshall is the image of the ideal lawyer.

"Burke was the best man for this job," another Justice Department lawyer said, "because he is so clear and so gently persuasive.

"He takes things one at a time, separating out each issue, ones that you didn't even realize were there. By talking in that quiet way he gets people to do the right thing without forcing them.

"It's like the best kind of lawyer with a jury. When the trial's over, they go his way, and they tell you: 'It was not what he said—that was obvious.'"

Mr. Marshall got the job as head of the Justice Department's civil rights division by being a lawyer of exceptional reputation, not a man of experience in civil rights. His chief interest in the Washington firm of Covington & Burling was antitrust law.

There is a legend about Mr. Marshall's first meeting with Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, who can also be extremely laconic. When Mr. Kennedy first invited him over to be interviewed for the civil rights job, it is said, the two of them sat for minutes without saying a word.

But the Attorney General sensed strength in him and is today one of Mr. Marshall's greatest boosters. That is so although Mr. Marshall wholly lacks the extroverted, football-player qualities said to be admired by the Kennedys.

As Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Marshall has had to learn ways other than those of the litigating lawyer that he was. In this job he has had to deal with passions as intense as those of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Ross R. Barnett, Mississippi's Governor.

In Birmingham he has provided an essential line of communication between the protesting Negroes and the white community. Before he arrived there, it is reported, white leaders did not even know what the Negroes wanted.

His role has been the more difficult because he had no ultimate legal power to impose solutions. He could only reason with the two sides, holding back the frustrated Negro groups and trying to persuade the white leaders to accept inevitable change.

Always in Mr. Marshall's mind was the threat that has been with him always in this job—the possibility of racial tensions leading to death.

Mr. Marshall, who is 40 years old, comes from Plainfield, N.J. He went to Phillips Exeter Academy and Yale, then learned Japanese, was an Army linguist, and served in postwar Japan. He still doodles in Japanese characters.

In Tokyo he married Violet Person, who had worked with him as a Japanese linguist for Army intelligence. They have three daughters—Josephine, 11, Catherine, 7, and Jan, 4.

The Marshalls play bridge, and they have a farm at Berkeley Springs, W. Va. But Mr. Marshall has not seen much of it recently.

A DOZEN MEN FORGED ACCORD IN NEGRO'S HOME

(By Hedrick Smith)

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.—A dozen men hammered out the settlement of Birmingham's racial crisis on the living room floor of a Negro insurance executive's home.

Their meetings were frank, informal, hard-bargaining sessions. The negotiators worked in shirtsleeves, often without ties. Some even took off their shoes.

The sessions lasted until all hours, especially early in the week when the bargaining teams met twice until nearly 4 a.m.

Before dawn Wednesday, after a night-long session, the negotiators had produced the basic outline of the package announced today.

ACCORD ALMOST WRECKED

But their accord was nearly scrapped several times before they could complete the details.

The worst crisis broke Wednesday afternoon, less than 2 hours after President Kennedy had announced to the Nation that a settlement had been reached in Birmingham.

The difficulty sprang from the jailing of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the Reverend Ralph D. Abernathy, the group's secretary-treasurer.

While efforts were being made to raise the $5,000 bond needed to free them, other Negro leaders were threatening to resume mass demonstrations, which had been suspended.

The Reverend Wyatt Tee Walker, Dr. King's executive assistant, charged white leaders with bad faith. The Reverend Fred L. Shuttlesworth, head of the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights, put on his marching shoes to lead a demonstration.

HEADED OFF BY U.S. AIDS

The crisis was headed off by Justice Department officials, who played an important role in pushing the negotiations to their successful conclusion.

Joseph F. Dolan, a Deputy Assistant U.S. Attorney General, found Mr. Shuttlesworth about to leave his motel room to start a demonstration. He grabbed the Negro leader with one hand and telephoned Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy with the other.

The Attorney General persuaded Mr. Shuttlesworth to hold off further demonstrations until at least the following morning, to give the negotiators more time.

After Dr. King's release later that evening, the negotiations moved with even greater speed than before.

The negotiations this week actually marked the fourth major effort in the past 5 weeks to solve the racial dispute.

The first attempt was made by a number of clergymen early in April. Later, a group of student demonstrators from Miles College, a Negro school here, sought unsuccessfully to work out some agreement with downtown merchants on lunch counter desegregation.

A third effort was made by some of the same white and Negro leaders who helped to produce today's agreement. But their efforts fell through last month, shortly before the massive demonstrations began May 2.

After the major Negro demonstrations started, the Justice Department moved into the picture. Burke Marshall, Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, arrived last Saturday. Working with three assistants, he sought first to bring the opposing sides together once again, and later to help mediate the dispute.

The first key bargaining sessions were held Monday night at the brick and frame ranch-style home of John J. Drew, the Negro insurance executive.

The white business community was represented by Sidney W. Smyer, a real estate man and former president of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, and two young lawyers, David Vann and Erskine Smith.

Local Negroes were represented by Mr. Drew; L. H. Pitts, president of Miles College; Mr. Shuttlesworth; the Reverend Harold Long; Arthur D. Shores, a lawyer; and A. G. Gaston, a businessman.

Dr. King, Mr. Abernathy, and the Reverend Andrew Young participated on behalf of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The Justice Department's representatives were Mr. Marshall and Mr. Dolan.

CALLS LEADERS INTO SESSION

The business representatives left the meeting Monday at about 3 a.m., convinced that the Negroes' major demands would have to be met in at least general terms.

The following afternoon Mr. Smyer summoned the Senior Citizens Committee, a group of about 75 Birmingham industrial, commercial, and professional leaders, to an emergency session.

The meeting heard a report from Sheriff Melvin Bailey that the local enforcement agencies had been "strained to the utmost of (their) capacity," Mr. Smyer said. He said the sheriff had reported that unless the demonstrations were stopped and order restored the next step would be the declaration of martial law.

Faced with this alternative, the Senior Citizens Committee empowered a subcommittee composed of the three negotiators and several other business leaders, to come to terms with the Negro leaders.

The most important negotiating session of the week followed that evening, again in Mr. Drew's home.

The session was more friendly and more productive than the one the night before. At Mr. Drew's request, Mr. Smyer opened it with a prayer.

TEXT OF NEGRO LEADERS' STATEMENTS

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.—Following are the texts of a joint statement by the Reverend Fred L. Shuttlesworth, the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Reverend Ralph D. Abernethy announcing terms of an agreement reached with white Birmingham business and civic leaders, and a separate statement by Dr. King:

JOINT STATEMENT

The city of Birmingham has reached an accord with its conscience. The acceptance or responsibility by local white and Negro leadership offers an example of a free people uniting to meet and solve their problems. Birmingham may well offer for 20th century America an example of progressive racial relations; and for all mankind a dawn of a new day, a promise for all men, a day of opportunity, and a new sense of freedom for all America. Thusly, Birmingham may again become a Magic City.

Responsible leaders of both Negro and white communities of Birmingham, being desirous of promoting conditions which will ensure sound moral, economic and political growth of their city, in the interest of all citizens of Birmingham, after mutual consideration and discussion of the issues relating to the recent demonstrations in the city, have agreed to the following:

1. The desegregation of lunch counters, restrooms, fitting rooms and drinking fountains in planned stages within the next 90 days. Cooperative, prayerful planning is necessary to ensure smooth transition.

2. The upgrading and hiring of Negroes on a nondiscriminatory basis throughout the industrial community of Birmingham. This will include the hiring of Negroes as clerks and salesmen within the next 60 days, and the immediate appointment of a committee of business, industrial and professional leaders for the implementation of an area-wide program for acceleration of upgrading and the employment of Negroes in job categories previously denied to Negroes.

8. Our movement has made arrangements for the release of all persons on bond or their personal recognizance. Our legal department is working with further solutions in this problem.

4. Through the Senior Citizens Committee, or the chamber of commerce, communications between Negro and white will be publicly reestablished within the next 2 weeks. We would hope that this channel of communications between the white and Negro communities will prevent the necessity of further protest demonstrations such as have been conducted.

DR. KING'S STATEMENT

I am very happy to be able to announce that we have come today to the climax of a long struggle for justice, freedom, and human dignity in the city of Birmingham. I say the climax, and not the end, for though we have come a long way, there is still a strenuous task before us and some of it is yet uncharted.

Nevertheless, it can now be said that after a great struggle this day is clearly the moment of a great victory. The greatness of the triumph is measured by this one fact: it is a victory that cannot possibly be confined to the limited area of one race. Indeed, the agreements which have been reached over the last few days are signal accomplishments which redound to the credit of all of Birmingham's citizens. As a matter of fact, I believe sincerely that this victory cannot even be confined within the limits of this sprawling metropolis, for Birmingham now stands on the threshold of becoming a great, enlightened symbol, shedding the radiance of its example throughout this entire Nation.

Credit for what has been done must go to many persons. Without question, of course, the name of Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth stands clear as the magic name in this magic city. He has walked a long and often lonesome road to reach this day—and even now his health is impaired—but he has just reason to be thankful and glad for all of his great sacrifices. Moreover, the many men and women who worked with him, by his side and behind the scenes, in the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights must also be praised. And, without a doubt, the world will never forget the thousands of children and adults who gave up their own physical safety and freedom and went to jail to secure the safety and freedom of all men.

PRAISES WHITES

I must say this, too: In these recent days, I have been deeply impressed by the quality of the white persons of the community who worked so diligently for just solutions to our mutual problems. They must also be given real credit. They are men of good will. However, when all is said and done, when this situation is seen in perspective of eternity, ultimate credit and glory and honor must be given to Almighty God, for He has clearly been at work among us. And it is He alone who has finally gained the victory for all His children.

Under His guidance, we now enter into a new day for Birmingham people, a day when men will no longer fear to speak the truth, when citizens will no longer cringe before the threats of misguided men. We look forward now to continued progress toward the establishment of a city in which equal job opportunities, equal access to public facilities, and equal rights and responsibilities for all of its people will be the order of every day.

However, even these needful things are not our final goal. The deepest hope that surges up within our hearts in this: that Birmingham is on its way to the creation of a new kind of community—not simply a new image, but a new reality. We are looking forward to that moment—so nearly upon us—when this metropolis will truly become a magic city again. This time filled with the beautiful magic of a new brotherhood where men are free to know, respect, and love each other. We seek ultimately a magic city where color will no longer be the measure of a man's worth, where character will matter more than pigmentation.

I cannot close without saying the Negro community must accept this achievement in the right spirit. We must not see the present development as a victory for the Negro: It is rather a victory for democracy and the whole citizenry of Birmingham—Negro and white. Our growth in nonviolence has been such that we cannot be satisfied with a "victory" over our white brothers. We must respond to every new development in civil rights with an understanding of those who have opposed us, and with an appreciation of the new adjustments that the new achievements pose for them. We must be able to face up honestly to our own shortcomings.

This is the time that we must evince calm dignity and wise restraint. Emotion must not run wild. Violence must not come from any of us, and if we be victimized with violent acts or intent, the pending daybreak of progress will be transformed into a gloomy midnight of retrogress. As we stand on the verge of using public facilities heretofore closed to us, we must not be overbearing and haughty in spirit. We must be loving enough to turn an enemy into a friend. We must now move from protest to reconciliation. This, too, is our hope for Birmingham. It is a hope that will cause us to look at the signs which say "It is nice to have you in Birmingham," in a new way. Now, we will know that these words are meant for all men, and we will know they are sincere. Then, and only then, will all the citizens of this community be able to say in joyful response: "Thank you. It is great to be in Birmingham—a city of honor, respect, and brotherly love."

ACCORD PLEASES ROBERT KENNEDY—MARSHALL CALLS AGEEMENT GREAT GAIN FOR SOUTH

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON, May 10.—Justice Department officials hailed the settlement of the Birmingham racial dispute as "a tremendous step forward for Birmingham, for Alabama, and for the South generally."

Burke Marshall, Assistant Attorney General, made that comment at a news conference after returning from a negotiator's role in Birmingham. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy was at his side.

Mr. Kennedy said the great lesson of the Birmingham crisis was the importance of whites and Negroes, sitting down together and talking—"the importance of getting a dialog."

"The alternative [to discussion] is going to be great violence," Mr. Kennedy said, "and it is going to be turning these matters over to extremists on both sides."

He said the white extremists were those who "think Negroes should not wear a tie and can't discuss them without using a swear word," and Negro extremists those who "think that white people have mistreated the Negroes for such a long period of time that violence should be used against them."

"All of us in all sections of the country have a great lesson to learn," he continued, "the importance of getting a dialog going between people in the North and the South.

"We really have to start having greater exchanges so that a southern Senator can talk to Burke Marshall or the Attorney General to a southern Governor and not lose votes for him, and a (northern politician) can say something nice about some southern leader and not feel that that is going to lose him the next election.

"That is, in our judgment, what is missing at the present time in the United States."

Mr. Marshall, who played a key part in bringing white and Negro leaders together in Birmingham, also emphasized the importance for the entire South of the fact that there had been biracial discussions in a city with troubled race relations.

"The important thing" Mr. Marshall said, "is that the settlement was reached by the people down there."

"For a city like Birmingham, with a history of difficult race relations, to reach a settlement like this after only a few hours of discussion in a most tense atmosphere is a tremendous step forward for Birmingham, for Alabama and for the South generally."

The Attorney General gave Mr. Marshall high commendation for his efforts in Birmingham in the week that began when the

Assistant Attorney General flew there last Saturday.

Mr. Kennedy said he had talked with the white and the Negro leaders in Birmingham, and it was "the unanimous feeling on both sides that if it hadn't been for his (Mr. Marshall's) efforts and the work that he did the settlement would not have been possible."

"We couldn't have gotten the people to sit down," he said, "couldn't have gotten the people to exchange their views, couldn't have gotten an agreement—and the situation in Birmingham would be far different tonight.

"It thinks he has performed a real function for Alabama, Birmingham and our people."

Those familiar with the tense week in Birmingham said today that lack of communication was one of the major problems. Financial and other leaders in the white community had no idea what the Negro demonstrators really wanted.

At first, it was said, the white leaders took the position that the whole episode was the work of "an outside agitator," the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. But gradually, over last weekend, they came to realize that the Negro community felt it was the victim of injustice and wanted change.

"There was a growing recognition," one Birmingham leader said, "by a lot of people when they thought about it, that the Negroes were demanding something that wasn't so unreasonable—to have a cup of coffee at a lunch counter, to get a decent job."

In addition to this greater understanding of the Negro complaints, the financial community began to fear the economic setback that Birmingham would get from a real outbreak of violence or military intervention.

If steps toward a settlement had not been well under way by the middle of this week, the feeling was that violence was inevitable. It was also believed that Gov. George Wallace, an extreme segregationist, was about to take over the city with National Guard troops.

The general feeling at the Justice Department today was one of optimism, although no one thought that Birmingham was entirely out of danger.

OPPORTUNITY FOR YOUTH

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill which seeks to get at the heart of the problem of our unemployed youth.

Mr. President, this proposal is an effort to assist those young people who find it difficult or impossible to acquire employment today because they do not possess those skills which are required by our more sophisticated, complex labor market. Without exception administration witnesses, and, indeed everyone else who has written or spoken on the subject, have stressed a necessity for training young people in appropriate skills.

This is the second time that I have offered this proposal. When the Senate was considering S. 1, I offered an amendment to strike title I, the so-called "Youth Conservation Corps," and a very large minority of the Senate, 41 to 47, agreed with me. Then, I offered the idea contained in this bill as a substitute. A considerable minority of the Senate agreed with me. I thought that it was eminently to be preferred to the Youth Conservation Corps. Because this substitute was defeated at that time, however, I do not for a minute believe that it is inappropriate for consideration by the Senate now. The President's Committee on Youth Employment, in its report of April 24, has endorsed the substance of this proposal. I am confident that if we do not adopt it this session, it will have to be considered again next year.

The YCC has been approved by the Senate. I do not know what will happen to it in the House. But, if it is passed, I suppose it will be signed. In dollars, we will be $50 million poorer as a nation, but the training of our youth will not have been enhanced one iota as a result.

The watchword which should be our guide in all these matters is training. A bill must train young people if it is to be effective to cope with the problems of ill-trained, unemployed youth on our street corners.

It makes little difference in this day whether a youth genuinely wants to work or not; he cannot do so if he is not trained.

We were unable to do much to advance our training programs when the Senate was considering S. 1. The massive push for something "popular" prevented effective legislation in that instance.

However, my bill would provide an opportunity for the Senate to do something constructive for unemployed youth. The testimony on S. 1 indicated great satisfaction with the Manpower Development and Training Act. That act has, indeed, done good things for our adult populations.

The Manpower Development and Training Act, however, has not done very much for our young people. The reason for this is that only 5 percent of the funds for allowances under that act are available to train young people. The program and its accomplishments, however, have demonstrated their worth. The Manpower Development and Training Act can be of great benefit to our unemployed youth. I submit that the country can ill afford to get along without it.

Mr. President, our Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is now considering S. 580, the administration omnibus bill, containing some seven titles relating to various facets of the Nation's education. Title five of that bill deals with vocational education. It provides some $70 million to be authorized for expenditure on State plans for vocational education.

I have long argued that vocational education has been treated as the stepchild in American education. It has had to take a back seat to academic courses, and the students who sought to pursue vocational courses were regarded as something less than the best students.

Our present labor requirements are rapidly changing that picture. The needs of our economy are crying out for skilled young people to operate our marvelous economic machine.

Last November, the Committee on Vocational Education, appointed by the President, reported on the state of vocational education. It recommended, as a matter of some urgency, that an adequate program of vocational training would necessitate an expenditure of some $400 million.

With everyone in agreement that training in the vocational arts and crafts is one of the most necessary programs with which the Government should concern itself, the administration proposes in title V of S. 580 a paltry $70 million for strengthening vocational education. And out of this, any vocational education facilities to be constructed must be paid for.

Roughly, only one-twelfth of the funds in S. 580 is earmarked for vocational education purposes. This, in face of the testimony of Secretary of Labor Wirtz before the House committee this year that 80 percent of the students now in school will not acquire a college degree, and will thus have to be prepared for vocational training positions in industry which our complex society now require. We are, therefore, providing 80 percent of our young people with only 8 percent of the funds under S. 580.

Mr. President, this present proposal will help to fill the enormous gap between what the President's committee recommended and the amounts contained in S. 580 for use in vocational education.

The proposal which I now offer would amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of last year by removing the 5 percent limitation on availability of funds for training allowances for youth. It also would increase the authorization for the Manpower Development and Training Act by $45 million for fiscal 1964, and such sums as Congress may appropriate during the succeeding 4 fiscal years. In addition, this bill will lower the age limit for participation in the Manpower Development and Training Act to include youths from 16 to 22 years of age.

As I said at the outset, I offered this proposal as an amendment to S. 1, the Youth Conservation Corps bill. That was on April 9 of this year. I noticed this morning with some satisfaction that the President's Committee on Youth Employment in its report dated April 24, 1963, has agreed with me. That report endorses my concept of expanding the youth portions of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

It is my hope that the administration will give full support to the recommendations of its own committee—even if that does mean that it will give support to an idea which originated on this side of the aisle.

It will be nothing short of disastrous for our youth and our Nation if we continue to refuse to regard with the importance they deserve the warnings of educators, labor, management, and, indeed, the Government witnesses themselves on this program.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1691) relating to the occupational training of youth, and the development and use of the manpower re-

sources of the Nation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROUTY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF NATIONAL HONOR TO CARL SANDBURG

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference—and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD—a joint resolution the purpose of which is to see to it that one of the foremost historians of our time, Carl Sandburg, receives a Congressional Medal of National Honor. This measure is a companion to House Joint Resolution 443, introduced by my distinguished colleague, Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, of the First Congressional District of Iowa.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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. 88) to bestow a Congressional Medal of National Honor on Carl Sandburg, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas, since 1913, the genius of Carl Sandburg has illumined and celebrated the heart, the mind, and the soul of our people and the spirit of our land through poetry, history, biography, song, and speech; and

Whereas he has placed us before ourselves and the world as we were, as we are, and as our highest aspiration would have us be and thereby added ponderably to our progress at home and imperishably to our repute abroad; and

Whereas he was on February 12, 1959, and March 4, 1961, invited by the Congress to address its Members and all Americans and did deliver before the joint session and before the multitude assembled on the east front two of our most memorable and distinguished addresses about our most American American, Abraham Lincoln: Now, 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 of America bestow upon Carl Sandburg a Congressional Medal of National Honor and therewith the assurance of great admiration and profound respect and the deep affection in which he is held by the Congress, by the people of the United States, and by literary and cultural authorities everywhere for his half century of devotion to letters and his genius for disseminating interest in the American heritage; and be it further

Resolved, That there be an appropriation for $2,500 for the purpose of paying for the medal and incidental expenses in connection with a presentation; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States along with a Cabinet member appointed by him and a bipartisan committee of four Members of the House and four Members of the Senate be appointed by the Speaker and by the President of the Senate, and that the Librarian of the Library of Congress, the Director of the National Gallery of Arts, and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution form a committee on presentation of the medal, who, in consultation with the accepted leaders of arts, sciences, and humanities, arrange for an appropriate program of presentation and to make the presentation to Carl Sandburg.

ADJUSTMENT OF WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN PRODUCTION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate bill 1617, commonly referred to as a bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, that my name be added as a cosponsor.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of May 23 and May 28, 1963, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

S. 1590. A bill to protect the right of all qualified persons to attend public schools, and for other purposes: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey; and

S. 1591. A bill to prohibit discrimination against any person on account of race or color in the furnishing of the advantages, privileges, and facilities of any business or business activity affecting the public which is conducted under State license: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS LIMITATIONS ON COMMERCIAL TIME

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters met in Lawrence, Kans., on May 8 and adopted a resolution expressing their views on the proposal by the Federal Communications Commission that the National Association of Broadcasters codes' time limitations on commercial time be adopted as a Government regulation.

As the resolution indicates, Kansas broadcasters feel that the Commission's proposal is unnecessary, unwise, and unfair. It strikes at the very heart of the public's right to censor.

The Kansas broadcasters have led the entire Nation in the voluntary subscription to the National Association of Broadcasters code of good practices, and I am proud of their record of service.

It is my hope that these broadcasters can and will continue to improve their service through individual initiative and enterprise, rather than by directives from Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED BY THE KANSAS ASSOCIATION OF RADIO BROADCASTERS AT ANNUAL MEETING MAY 8, 1963, AT LAWRENCE, KANS.

Whereas the Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters feels that voluntary self-regulation is the best regulation; and

Whereas the National Association of Broadcasters has formed the code authority with responsibility to set maximum commercial limitations for the broadcasting industry; and

Whereas the KARB endorses membership by all stations in the NAB code; and

Whereas KARB feels that any station following a policy allowing overcommercialization will ultimately suffer because of listeners' rights of free choice: Therefore be it

Resolved (1) that the Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters opposes any Federal regulations concerning the amount of commercial material on broadcasting stations.

PROPOSED NUCLEAR TEST BAN AND CONFERENCE WITH SOVIET RUSSIA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a United Press International dispatch of 10 a.m. which appeared on the news ticker this morning. It reads as follows:

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy announced today that the United States will not hold any further nuclear tests in the atmosphere "so long as other states do not do so."

Mr. President, I think this is a dreadful mistake. I serve on the Preparedness Subcommittee; and the testimony our subcommittee has heard indicates that we have been put back by abandoning testing once. So I do not think it wise that we abandon it again. I do not think we have to be promiscuous in the tests we make, but I think we should make tests—whether the tests are on the ground, under the ground, or in the atmosphere.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the ticker also includes the following item:

Kennedy issued the pledge in announcing that the United States, Russia, and Britain will begin high-level talks in Moscow soon in an effort to rescue a general nuclear test ban treaty.

The President said soberly that "the hopes of all mankind" go with the meetings, which are expected to start in mid-July under an agreement reached by Kennedy, Soviet Premier Khrushchev, and British Prime Minister Macmillan.

The President then said in this connection that the United States will prove "our good faith and solemn convictions" by holding off any further nuclear tests in the atmosphere "so long as other states do not do so."

"We will not be the first to resume," the President declared. "Such a declaration is no substitute for a formal binding treaty—but I hope it will help us achieve one."

The President revealed the "two important decisions" in a speech prepared for delivery at commencement exercises at American University here.

The Moscow talks also were announced in London and in Moscow. While Kennedy gave no date, these reports said the talks would start in July. Competent sources said

they would not involve a summit meeting for sessions at the Foreign Ministers' level.

Instead, these sources said, the discussions will be conducted by representatives of the three countries who have "the highest confidence" of the national leaders. These will not necessarily be persons in official positions.

In announcing the Moscow talks and his decision to refrain from atmospheric tests as long as other nations do so, Kennedy called on all Americans to "reexamine our attitude toward peace and freedom here at home."

I think we are again walking on very dangerous ground. We began by calling for approximately 120 on-site inspections as the specific for any treaty to which we might agree. We have now decreased the number to seven, and I understand that the number can go to as low as five. What are we to gain from such high-level talks, Mr. President, except to reduce the number of on-site inspections to zero?

Such talks are not really high level, but are low level, and even that designation is a compliment to the Russians. They have not kept their word to us or to any other country since they began to make promises after World War II; and I believe we should remain at home, and should let the Russians come to us when they are ready to talk about any test ban.

I believe the President is wrong in announcing that there will be no further nuclear tests, and I think he is also wrong in stating that he will discuss this subject—or, for that matter, any other subject—with the Soviets, our announced enemies.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Is it not true that Russia began, years ago, to insist on three tests, and has continued, all these years, to insist on only three tests, and still is insisting on only three tests, even though we have now decreased to seven the number we request? It is my personal opinion that even if we were to agree to three tests, the Russians would not sign such a treaty.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think the Senator from Kansas is correct. The testimony presented before the Preparedness Subcommittee indicates that without on-site inspections, the idea of a nuclear test ban is foolish, because despite what some persons think, it is impossible to identify a nuclear blast by some seismic means. Instead, it is necessary to have someone proceed to the site and see whether such a device was actually detonated.

THE BEST JOB IN WASHINGTON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the New York Times magazine section yesterday contained an excellent article by R. Sargent Shriver telling of his challenging and rewarding experiences as Director of the Peace Corps. It has indeed proven to be a most difficult, but satisfying position.

As the chief sponsor of the Peace Corps legislation in the Senate, I take special pride in the success this program has met with and the assistance it is giving to people and governments in all parts of the world. I repeat what I have said so often, that much of the credit for the huge success of the Peace Corps must go to Mr. Shriver for his tireless and outstanding contributions. He and his most able staff richly deserve our commendations.

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

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

"I HAVE THE BEST JOB IN WASHINGTON"—THE DEEP SATISFACTION AND SHEER ADVENTURE OF RUNNING THE PEACE CORPS, SAYS ITS DIRECTOR, CANNOT BE MATCHED IN ANY OTHER JOB ON THE NEW FRONTIER

(By Sargent Shriver)

WASHINGTON.—Carol Byrnes, one of 5,000 U.S. Peace Corps volunteers, wrote from the Philippines: "The important thing we are doing here is not that which can be measured with a camera. People in other projects can photograph a bridge they've designed, a road they've helped to build, or a toilet they constructed. But who can photograph the mind of a child? Our rewards come from the satisfaction in seeing a child's face light up when he has learned."

A tribal chief in Sierra Leone, in the midst of a ceremony celebrating the construction by the Peace Corps of a road which, for the first time in its thousand-year history linked his village with the outside world told me: "Your Peace Corps has shown us a world we never knew existed. We had never seen a truck, or people from the outside who wanted to help us. We had heard of America, but now we know what it means."

A volunteer from the Midwest said: "For the first time in my life I feel that I'm not just sitting, letting the world go by. I have a chance to do something that is meaningful to people, and when I go back I'll be a better American because of it."

These stories have their counterparts in every continent of the developing world. The Peace Corps has brought learning to tens of thousands of children, opened up new worlds for hundreds of villages, brought new meaning and perspective into the lives of thousands of Americans, showed the face of an America which many never dreamed existed. These are satisfactions surpassed in no department of Government. They are some of the reasons why running the Peace Corps is the best job in Washington.

Of course, other people—some of them even relatives of mine—have more powerful and influential jobs. But somehow I can't help feeling that, once in a while, they, too, wish they were running the Peace Corps. For nowhere in this vast Capital City can be found the combination of excitement, satisfaction and sheer adventure which is the happy prerogative of the Director of the Peace Corps.

One of the greatest of these satisfactions has been the joy of creation—of exploring new problems and unsolved questions—of attempting to do what no one had ever done before.

When we started the Peace Corps 2½ years ago, we had a hotel room, a half-dozen people, the unfaltering support of the President and Vice President of the United States—and a new idea. It was that volunteers, drawn from every segment of American life, could serve their Nation and themselves by serving the welfare of others in every corner of the developing world. It was the idea that Americans mobilized in a national effort, voluntarily making personal sacrifices, undertaking to use their skills in the development of other nations, could make a substantial and important contribution to world understanding—to the cause of peace.

There were, of course, plenty of worrisome questions.

Would Americans respond to this challenge and opportunity? Or were they, as many had said, too cynical, too self-indulgent, too preoccupied with material things? We thought they would respond. We gambled on it, and we found the answer. In 1961 the Peace Corps received 12,000 fully completed applications for service. This year applications are coming in at the rate of 40,000 a year.

Were Americans hardy enough to serve in remote places, lacking many of the conveniences they had always enjoyed? Would they work where malaria, yellow fever, cholera, and dysentery were enemies? We soon learned that our volunteers were more than tough enough, that the complaints about physical hardship were insignificant. Far more important to the volunteers are the day-to-day frustrations, the ambiguous tempo of progress and achievement, the gap between expectations and realization.

Would other countries really want Peace Corps volunteers? Today volunteers are working in 47 countries. Every one of these countries has specifically requested them—and, in fact, has asked for more—often far more than we can ever hope to supply. And almost two dozen countries where we have not yet gone have requested a Peace Corps program.

It is such challenges, and the contact they have brought with almost every aspect of American life, that have made the Peace Corps such an exciting place to work. Take the problems of training. We found that we had to choose men and women of differing backgrounds, occupations and education and in 90 days, equip them to contribute their skills effectively within societies and cultures far different from anything they had ever known. Men ranging from university presidents and professors to labor leaders, mountain climbers and veterans of African safaris streamed into Washington to help us develop radically new and intensive curriculums. We had to teach languages as rapidly and intensively as had ever been attempted. Some of the languages were so exotic that we found ourselves writing our own textbooks and dictionaries, to teach, for example, Somali, Tshi and Pasar Malay.

Soon we found ourselves working with 58 universities from Puerto Rico to Hawaii. The vast range of America's educational resources was brought to bear on the problems of training and preparing volunteers. We trained volunteers for the Himalayas at campsites high in the Rockies. Others worked on Indian reservations in New Mexico before they went to work among the Indians of the Andes. At the New York School of Social Work, volunteers prepared in New York slums for their work among the underprivileged urban dwellers of Bogotá, Colombia.

One of the greatest challenges was the establishment of programs to assist the agricultural development of other nations. Everyone knows that improved agriculture is one of the most critical elements in the growth of developing nations, most of which are 60 to 70 percent rural. We know also that America has evolved the most abundant agriculture in the history of the world. And so we turned to our own farm organizations for the people to transmit some of our knowledge to those who needed it. Here again we met a gratifying response. Organizations such as the National Grange, the National 4–H Club Foundation, and the National Farmers Union "joined" the Peace Corps.

Everywhere we asked for help in American society we got the same kind of answer. Labor unions, technical schools, groups such as CARE, the Experiment in International Living and many others made contributions.

These things have all been part of the job—the challenge of new problems; the richness of contact with the mainstream of ideas, institutions, and people in American society; the satisfaction of making a contribution to the welfare of other countries and to the interests of my own.

The working conditions, even the fringe benefits, also contribute much to making my job the best in Washington. It is the atmosphere, the pace, the people, which make working conditions at the Peace Corps unusual.

A special kind of person is attracted to this kind of operation. They came at the beginning and they continue to come: mountain climbers, ex-boxers, even ex-smugglers, as well as Ph. D.'s and M.D.'s.

Around the table at our daily staff meetings sit former members of State legislatures, union leaders, newspaper editors, farmers, college presidents, lawyers, psychiatrists, psychologists, doctors. I come into daily contact with diplomats, electricians, and all-American athletes, in a continuous dialog concerning how their skills and experiences can be brought to bear on the multifarious problems of developing societies.

There is another side to the job, a side of which my passport is a symbol. Probably that passport has more visas and stamps in it than the passport of any other person who entered Government with the Kennedy administration. And each of those stamps represents experiences and adventures, and a chance to learn about other lands and people that is unique in government.

In the last two years I have traveled more than 500,000 miles visiting Peace Corps volunteers throughout the world. I have gone by plane, ship, Land Rover, jeep, longboat, dugout canoe, helicopter, raft, and horse. I have slept in villages where no official of any national government has ever been. A few weeks ago I was the guest of honor at a state dinner given by the President of Liberia on one night, and participated in tribal dances in Asankagra in western Ghana on the next.

I have had a chance to meet and to talk with most of the leaders of the developing world—men like Nehru and U Nu, Nkrumah and Tubman, Sékou Touré, Lleras Camargo, Betancourt, Azikiwe, Ayub Khan, Tengku Abdul Rahman, Sukarno, Bourguiba, Haile Selassie, Goulart and many others equally distinguished and well known. I have even managed to contract dysentery three times, and during my last appearance before Congress was swallowing pills to counteract an amoebic disease brought home from Africa.

My house, itself, is a trophy chamber of leopard and python skins, ritual dolls, Thai cloaks, and Kenti cloth, plus a live and energetic Managabee monkey named Tom-Tom. And on each of my trips I have had the supreme satisfaction of receiving, on behalf of the United States, the gratitude and appreciation of villagers, slum dwellers, schoolchildren and government ministers for the help and hope which individual volunteers have brought to their lands. I have felt that sense of making a real contribution to human welfare which suffuses our entire organization from volunteer to director.

All of these things have made me believe that this is the best job in Washington. But I also believe that there is something more to it than this; that although we work in foreign lands we are demonstrating something basic about America itself. We are reaffirming a fundamental premise of American democracy—that hard-headed, realistic, practical programs are consistent with the highest ideals and the noblest of motives; that pragmatic problems can be solved without ever yielding firm convictions and high purpose. We are helping to demonstrate that given the chance to dedicate themselves to meaningful work worthy of freemen, Americans are willing, even eager, to give up the deadening comforts of a too easy affluence.

The vitality, the drive, the imagination and the intellect which have been liberated by society are ready today to shape the future as they have so largely shaped the past. And I believe that the Peace Corps symbolizes the fact that, afforded the opportunity, Americans, working in a world community, will show that our first 175 years of history were only the beginning.

This is also part of the reason why the Peace Corps is the best job in Washington. And when my successor takes over, no matter what I may be doing or where, I will always envy him.

RECENT ADDRESSES BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this morning the President of the United States addressed the commencement exercises at the American University in Washington, D.C.

The President's speech gave a message of hope and encouragement to people not only in the United States and at the university, but throughout the world.

This is the President's most important statement on world peace since his historic peace race address to the United Nations in September 1961. He has rededicated the Nation to peace as a realistic and imperative goal.

By emphasizing the mutual vulnerability of the Soviet and American peoples in the nuclear age, he has appealed to the most constructive and enlightened elements of Soviet society.

This was a courageous statement. The role of the peacemaker requires as much or more courage as the role of the warrior.

The President will find broad support in the Congress for his decision. This support was indicated on May 15, with the introduction of the Dodd-Humphrey resolution, which was cosponsored by 34 Senators of both parties.

I agree with the President that this ban on atmospheric tests is a first step only. There is no real substitute for a comprehensive test ban treaty. Until one is secured, the danger of nuclear weapons proliferation will remain.

Mr. President, it is once again to the honor of the American people that the leader of the most powerful, most mighty, and richest nation on the face of the earth has declared forthrightly to the peoples of the world that in our strength as well as in our recognition of the dangers that confront the world the President of the United States announces that we shall refrain from nuclear testing in the atmosphere as long as other nations do likewise.

The President's message singled out a few precepts that everyone would do well to recognize. He said:

> Genuine peace must be the product of many nations and the sum of many acts. It must be dynamic and not static, changing to meet the challenge of each generation, for peace is a process and way of solving problems.

It seems to me that the President has laid down the formula for securing a just and enduring peace.

The President's speech, though concise, was comprehensive in its treatment of the issues of peace and nuclear war. He took a fresh approach to problems which have confounded diplomats and embittered journalists down through the years. To President Kennedy, peace is more than an alternative to self-annihilation. Peace, in the President's words, is "the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living—the kind that enables men and nations to grow and to hope and to build a better life for their children—not merely peace for Americans but peace for all men—not merely peace in our time but peace for all time." Peace is tangible; it is beneficial; it is a positive goal rather than a pious formula. The President sums it all up in a simple phrase that is earth shaking in its implications:

> Our problems are man made; therefore they can be solved by man.

If we ever needed a reply to some of the fatalistic, deterministic, defeatist doctrine of our day, the President has supplied it.

Let us, as the President urges, try to deal with the world as it is and not "as it might have been had the history of the last 18 years been different." We have no need to adopt the totalitarian methods of our adversaries in order to defend ourselves.

President Kennedy, in his address at the American University, has spoken words which have long needed saying at the highest levels of our Government. They are bound to be unpopular in certain quarters. There is nothing in them, however, which can be misconstrued as a confession of weakness or as blind acceptance of Soviet good faith. On the contrary, the President's speech of June 10 should go down in history as the attempt of a great world leader to restore sanity to the conduct of international affairs. Whether others will act accordingly is beyond our capacity to know. Whichever way the dice come up, the United States is psychologically and materially prepared.

In the past few days President Kennedy has delivered several memorable addresses. His address before the conference of mayors in Hawaii was a masterpiece and a call to action in the field of human rights and civil rights.

The President indicated how the Federal Government had its responsibility to provide adequate legal tools to secure full civil equality for every American. While fulfilling our obligations in this regard will not be accomplished easily, I have the utmost confidence that Congress will enact civil rights legislation this session. The President went on to say that fundamentally the challenge of civil rights rests with each local community across this land, communities of North and South, East and West. He listed five areas for immediate local action: One, the establishment of a biracial commission to mediate racial problems before they reach the boiling point; two, the necessity for every community to see that local ordinances are in conformity with constitutional law; three, the need for communities to follow nondiscriminatory practices in the employment and promotion of its municipal workers; four, the enactment of equal opportunity ordinances on the local level; and

five, a crash program to lessen unemployment among the unskilled of both races by reducing school dropouts.

These are steps totally within the jurisdiction of local community officials. I commend the President for emphasizing the obligation that all governments, Federal, State, and local, and all peoples bear in this crisis. No one segment of society can assume burdens that rest with the entire country.

The President has spoken in a most timely and forceful fashion. I commend the speech to every American.

Mr. President, on Thursday, June 6, President Kennedy also spoke at the commencement exercises of San Diego State College. It was a most noteworthy statement concerning the responsibility of the leaders of this country, present and future, to provide the best education possible for all Americans.

Three basic questions were posed by the President. First, does every American child have an equal chance for a good education? Second, is the quality of American education adequate to our current needs? Third, can our existing educational system meet the demands of tomorrow?

These are questions most worthy of the attention of a college graduating class. They are, moreover, questions to which all members of the 88th Congress should attempt to find meaningful answers through comprehensive legislation in behalf of our educational system. The time has come to stop giving primary attention to areas of disagreement and to direct our energies toward solutions of the basic challenges of education.

Within the past few days, then, the President of the United States has spoken out courageously and wisely upon three of the most important subjects of our time—indeed, of all times. First, he has spoken out on the need of education for everyone, for every American in particular. Second, he has spoken out as to the importance of the protection of those basic constitional and human rights for which this country stands and to which this Nation has been dedicated since its founding.

Finally, he has spoken out in the cause of genuine world peace. He has not talked in terms of platitudes or of panaceas, but rather in terms of the process of peace itself and the meaning of a just and enduring peace.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's addresses on the subjects that I have mentioned be printed at this point in the RECORD. They are entitled to a part of the great history of this Nation, and all Americans should have access to them through the pages of the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 10, 1963]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S SPEECH TO MAYORS

I am here to discuss with you a problem which is both national and local—where Federal and municipal governments must act in concert—the problem of race relations.

This is not a southern problem—it is a national problem. And I would ask any mayor who believes there is no problem in his city to talk to those who once believed the same, and then look at his own unemployment, delinquency, housing, and other indicators.

Federal action—including additional Federal legislation—can help to meet this problem. State action can help. But, in the last analysis, what happens in Birmingham or Chicago or Atlanta or Los Angeles depends in large measure on the leadership in those communities. We will back you up—we will work with you in every way we can—but the mayor of every major metropolitan city in every section of America must be aware of the difficult challenge he faces.

I am asking you to be alert, not alarmed. The demonstrations of unrest in Birmingham, Boston, Jackson, Greensboro, Nashville, Philadelphia, and elsewhere can be expected in many other cities in the next few months, North and South. Students will then be out of college and high school. Large numbers of Negroes will still be out of work. The events in Birmingham have stepped up the tempo of the nationwide drive for full equality—and rising summer temperatures are often accompanied by rising human temperatures on all sides.

PEACEFUL REMEDIES

The Federal Government does not control these demonstrations. It neither starts them, directs them, nor stops them. What we can do is to seek, through legislative and Executive action, to provide peaceful remedies for the grievances which set them off—to give all Americans a fair chance to a full life.

I would hope that every mayor here would recognize the assistance they would be provided by those legislative proposals which would help move these disputes from the streets to the courts, erase all doubts as to the validity of conflicting legal arguments, require all merchants in all cities to take similar action at the same time, so that none can hang back for fear of being penalized for moving first, and, finally, meet the rising tide of discontent with appropriate nationwide action, without waiting for city-by-city, case-by-case solutions.

Such legislation is, therefore, in your interest—and I hope it will have your support.

But the final responsibility, both now and after such legislation is enacted, will still rest with you at the local level. The problem is growing. The challenge is there. The cause is just.

The question is whether you will do nothing, thereby inviting pressure and tension and possible violence—or whether you will anticipate these problems and move to fulfill the rights of your Negro citizens in a peaceful and constructive manner.

WISDOM AND FORESIGHT

I ask that you act with wisdom and foresight in these matters—not merely for the peace of the country, but for the good of your own community. The financial history of those communities which have been beset with racial disturbances shows that they attract less capital and do less business. As a Birmingham businessman said, after investment in new plant and expansion had declined 80 percent in the last few years: "We've become known as a city of reaction, rebellion and riot—and because of that we're not gaining industry as fast as we should."

It is not enough to say that these are difficult problems in many parts of the country. The Vice President and I have been impressed in the last 2 years—and particularly in the last few weeks—by how much can be done by those determined to get it done. We have met with employers who were pleasantly surprised by how peacefully their hiring practices could be integrated.

We met last week with merchants from all sections of the country who had, without delay or difficulty, desegregated their public accommodations, including lunch counters, hotels, and theaters. We shall be having more meetings—with labor and religious leaders, with Government and business leaders.

It is clear to me that the time for token moves and idle talk is over—that these rights are going to be won—and that our responsibility, yours and mine, is to see that they are won in a peaceful and constructive manner.

ACTION IN FIVE AREAS

I would suggest at least five areas where you can take important action:

First: Every city can and should establish, preferably through official action by the mayor over governing body, a biracial human relations committee—to identify community tensions before they reach the crisis state, to improve cooperation and communication between the races, and to advise local officials, merchants and organizations as to what steps can be taken to insure prompt progress.

Second: Every local government can and should make certain that its own ordinances and practices are in accordance with constitutional law. The Supreme Court has made it clear beyond dispute that no local ordinance requiring segregation is constitutional—whether it applies to schools, zoning, restaurants, or places of amusement, either privately or publicly owned. Nor can segregation be required without ordinance at a municipal golf course, playground, swimming pool, or other city-owned facilities. In short, every instance or institution of segregation sanctioned by local legislation or public action is clearly invalid—and you should move to abolish it.

There will be a difficult period of transition for some. But "the basic guarantees of our Constitution," the Supreme Court said less than 2 weeks ago, "are warrants for the here and now * * * not merely hopes to some future enjoyment."

Third: Every local government can and should follow nondiscriminatory practices in the employment and promotion of its municipal workers. No group of taxpayers or voters should be excluded from the payrolls of your police, fire, school, and other departments. No city government can expect to understand the views of its Negro citizens—and no community can be expected to look favorably on its city government—unless men and women of all races are employed at all levels, supervisory as well as custodial, in all parts of that government.

Fourth: Every local government can and should enact equal opportunity ordinances to spell out the civil rights of all who live in that community; ordinances on equal employment opportunities, equal housing opportunities, and equal access to public accommodations. Such measures are not the exclusive concern of the Federal Government. On the contrary, where local leaders have assumed this responsibility, there has been remarkably little difficulty with racial problems. Where local government has abdicated this responsibility and left it to the Federal Government, there has been too much difficulty.

Fifth: I urge each of you personally to undertake a special campaign this summer in your own community to lessen unemployment among the unskilled of both races by reducing school dropouts. Tell your young people to stay in school. Tell them their chances for steady, gainful employment will be far better for every year of schooling. Tell them that unemployment among 16- and 21-year-olds is already at the million mark, with more on the way for, as the number of

young jobseekers grows, the proportion of unskilled jobs has dropped to 1 out of 20.

STEPS ON FEDERAL LEVEL

I have not proposed to you any step that the Federal Government is unwilling to take in its own area of jurisdiction. We have undertaken to eliminate segregation and discrimination in Federal employment, in federally financed housing and construction, in Federal recreation areas, in our cafeterias, and other facilities. The proportion of Negroes holding Federal jobs in many areas is still distressingly low, particularly in the higher grade jobs. But we aim to change this as quickly as possible and, nationwide, have increased the number of Negroes in the higher grades by more than a third.

We have supported equal rights in the courts and the Congress, and will shortly prepare further steps.

Your responsibilities, of course, are more localized—but we are responsible for a city: The District of Columbia. Much has been written about crime and race relations in Washington—much of it untrue—but we are concerned about the District's problems, though they are less than those of some other cities and, more importantly, we are doing something about them.

All places of public accommodation in the Nation's Capital have been opened, with little difficulty, to customers of all races. Equal employment is the policy of the District government as well as the Federal Government. There is no racial bar to any public school in Washington. The District Commissioners have announced their intention to enact a fair housing ordinance unless the Congress itself does so promptly.

We are actively intervening to open up more employment opportunities in the building trades union. And we have urged the Congress to provide home rule for the District in order that all the citizens of Washington may participate more actively and effectively in accomplishing needed improvements.

PROGRESS IN WASHINGTON

Moreover, by striving to improve the quality of life for the residents of the District, Negro and white alike, we are helping to ease the economic and other pressures which would otherwise increase tensions. We are prepared to work with you on similar Federal-local programs—to improve public welfare, to root out juvenile delinquency, to eradicate urban blight, to increase youth employment, to assist urban mass transit, to promote mental health, to provide more recreational and health facilities and to war on organized crime.

These measures—some of which are barely underway—have been effective in the District of Columbia, and I know that, on a nationwide basis, they have, for the most part, been supported by this conference in the Congress. The elevation of all these urban development problems to a higher level of consideration by the creation of a new Cabinet post is already long overdue.

In conclusion, my fellow chief executives, may I say this: Improvement of race relations and the fulfillment of human rights is a continuing problem and challenge. I do not propose to limit our mutual concern to this one brief address. I hope to meet with many of you in the White House in the near future.

But justice cannot wait for too many meetings. It cannot wait the action of the Congress or even the courts. We face a moment of moral and constitutional crisis—and men of generosity and vision must make themselves heard in every part of the land. I do not say that all men are equal in their ability, character, and motivation. I do say that every American should be given a fair chance to develop in full whatever talents he has and to share equally in the American dream.

On your return from this conference, you can set an example in your communities to which the timid can rally and which those clinging in the past cannot ignore. I ask you to join with me, here and now, in recognizing the rights of all Americans—in guiding along constructive channels the attainment of a peaceful revolution, a peaceful revolution which will not only avoid disaster but fulfill our highest obligations.

[From the Washington, (D.C.) Post, June 7, 1963]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS AT SAN DIEGO STATE COLLEGE

This is a proud moment—proud for me as a recipient of this honorary degree, proud for those of you who have earned your degrees with hard labor, proud for your families and communities who also labored hard for this achievement. Only a small portion of the world's population can share and understand that pride. In fact, only a small portion of our own population have completed four years of college.

You are the fortunate ones. You will be the leaders, the doers, the contributors to our society and progress. You will, on the average, earn nearly twice as much in your lifetime as high school graduates and over three times as much as grade school graduates.

Yes, you are the fortunate ones, the educated, the elite, the only aristocracy our system permits. But I am not here merely to congratulate you, to remind you of your future riches. I am here to remind you of your responsibilities—and particularly your responsibility toward education, toward those who should follow in your footsteps.

THREE BASIC QUESTIONS

However proud we may be, and have a right to be, over the past achievements of our education system, it is time the whole Nation faced up more frankly to the answers to three basic questions: First, whether every American child has an equal chance for a good education; second, whether the quality of American education is adequate to our current needs; and third, whether the educational system we have today can meet the demands of tomorrow.

First, does every American child today have a fair educational opportunity? Let me cite a few facts:

1. In this fortunate State of California, the average current expenditure for a boy or girl in the public schools is $515. But in the State of Mississippi it is $230. The average salary for classroom teachers in California is $7,050, while it is only $3,610 in Mississippi.

2. Nearly three-quarters of the young white population of our Nation have graduated from high school, but only about two-fifths of our nonwhite population have finished. In some States, almost 40 percent of the nonwhite population has completed less than 5 years of school contrasted with 7 percent of the white population.

3. In one American State, over 36 percent of the public school buildings are over 40 years old. In another, only 4 percent are that old.

TWO REASONS CITED

Such facts—and one could prolong this recital indefinitely—make it clear that American children today do not yet enjoy equal educational opportunities, for two primary reasons: one is economic, and the other is racial.

If our Nation is to meet the goal of giving every American child a fair educational break, we must move swiftly ahead in both areas. We must put more resources into the undernourished sectors of our education system. And we must recognize that segregation in education—and I mean the de facto segregation of the North as well as the proclaimed segregation of the South—brings with it serious handicaps to a large percentage of our Nation's population.

Our goal must be an educational system in the spirit of the Declaration of Independence—a system in which all are created equal, a system in which every child, whether born a banker's son in a Long Island mansion or a Negro sharecropper's son in an Alabama cotton field, has every opportunity for an education that his abilities and character deserve.

SECOND QUESTION

The second question relates to the quality of our education. Does our system effectively educate our boys and girls to meet the needs and problems of our contemporary society?

Again let us look at some facts:

1. One out of every three students in the fifth grade will drop out before high school graduation. And only 2 out of every 10 will graduate from college—unless we do something about it. In the meantime, the occupations and professions which require increased education and training continue to grow, while employment in unskilled jobs continues to decline.

2. Of Americans 18 years of age or older, more than 23 million have had less than 8 years of schooling, and over 8 million less than 5 years. As a result, many of these fellow citizens lack the ability to read or write with ease or to do simple arithmetic. They are termed "functional illiterates," and it is no accident that they constitute the hardest "hard core" of our unemployed and those on welfare.

One out of every ten workers who fail to finish elementary school is unemployed today as compared to 1 out of 50 college graduates.

3. Even students who finish elementary school or high school often lack a solid grounding in the humane and classical disciplines which are the heart of our civilization.

NEEDS ARE CITED

In short, our current educational programs do not meet our current needs. We need a major effort to eradicate adult illiteracy, for the man who cannot read a "help wanted" ad or write a letter is beaten before he starts. We need to improve our programs of technical and vocational education, both in school and after school. We need to combat the dropout problem.

Finally, we need to strengthen the freedom of research, inquiry and judgment which is the glory of our civilization. Our schools must present our children with all the facts about their world and their heritage, not just those which support a single viewpoint or party line. For education is the instrument of freedom, and indoctrination the weapon of tyranny—and the difference between education and indoctrination best sums up the difference between ourselves and our adversaries abroad.

The third and final question we must ask is: What of the future? Four million boys and girls are born each year in the United States. Our population is growing each decade by a figure equal to the total population of the country at the inauguration of Abraham Lincoln. Is our educational system adequate to meet the needs of an expanding population, and expanding technology and an expanding culture?

Here are some facts:

1. By 1970, the number of students in our public elementary and secondary schools will have increased by 25 percent over that of 1960. Nearly three-quarters of a million new classrooms are needed during this decade, but our present construction rate will not provide them.

2. By 1970, we will have 7 million students in our colleges and universities, nearly 3 million more than we have today. This will require over $2 billion a year for facilities—a billion dollars more than we are devoting today.

3. By 1970, we will need 7,500 Ph. D's. each year in the physical sciences, mathematics and enginering if we are to continue our economic growth and preserve our military security—but in 1960 we graduated only 3,000.

Such facts make it clear how far out present effort falls below our future need. We must take rapid measures to enlarge our educational facilities, to extend our program of fellowships, to improve our teacher training and our libraries and our laboratories, and to work in every way to keep our education abreast of our population growth.

TASK FOR ENTIRE NATION

Education, historically and necessarily, is the responsibility of the State and the local community. Those who are willing to make the necessary investment—in approving bond issues, in building modern facilities, in paying salaries sufficient to attract and retain talented teachers, in encouraging freedom of discussion and dissent—will receive rich dividends on that investment. Their communities will prosper, their horizons will expand.

But this is a task for the entire Nation, for every citizen, and for government at every level. Your own State has shown what a difference forward-looking leadership can make, under Governor Brown, your legislation, and the master plan for education.

But education is also a national responsibility. Not every State can do what California has done. But California has a stake in what every State does—or fails to do. People move freely from one State to another; these are not 50 separate States.

The role of the Federal Government is not to take over the responsibility of the States; it is to give the States the means to fulfill that responsibility, which they owe to themselves and the Nation.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

For this reason, I have recommended to the Congress a comprehensive education improvement program. It is designed to help meet the needs of higher education by assisting the construction of college academic facilities, junior colleges, graduate centers, and technical institutes, and by stepping up existing programs for student loans, graduate fellowships and other student assistance programs.

It is designed to improve educational research and to authorize increased training of teachers of the gifted, the handicapped, and the culturally deprived. It is designed to strengthen public elementary and secondary education through grants to the States for better teacher salaries, to relieve critical classroom shortages, to meet the special educational problems of depressed areas and to continue and expand existing programs for vocational education, guidance, and counseling.

Finally, this program is designed to meet the continuing education needs of our communities by a massive attack on illiteracy, by an expansion of university extension courses and a major effort to improve library services in each community as well as in our schools and colleges.

AWARE OF OBJECTIONS

I am well aware of all the objections which have been raised for more than 50 years to any kind of Federal effort in education—objections involving States rights and civil rights, objections involving race and religion, objections to including this item or not including some other item.

But the time has come for the American people of every party and section to realize the immensity and the necessity of this challenge, to realize that no solution will please everyone, and to mobilize their aroused support behind a program such as the one I have sent to the Congress. And I hope that those of you who have received the blessings of education will be in the forefront of that fight.

This is no novel or subversive idea. "By far the most important bill in our whole code," wrote Jefferson, "is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people. No other sure foundation can be devised for preservation of freedom and happiness."

Jefferson truly spoke the American faith. As a nation, we have no deeper concern, no older commitment and no higher interest than a strong, sound, and free system of education for all. In fulfilling this obligation to ourselves and our children, we provide for the future of our Nation—and for the future of freedom.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT AMERICAN UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 10, 1963

"There are few earthly things more beautiful than a university," wrote John Masefield, in his tribute to the English universities—and his words are equally true here. He did not refer to spires and towers, to campus greens, and ivied walls. He admired the splendid beauty of the university, he said, because it was "a place where those who hate ignorance may strive to know, where those who perceive truth may strive to make others see."

I have, therefore, chosen this time and this place to discuss a topic on which ignorance too often abounds and the truth is too rarely perceived—yet it is the most important topic on earth: world peace.

What kind of peace do I mean? What kind of peace do we seek? Not a pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war. Not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave. I am talking about genuine peace—the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living—the kind that enables men and nations to grow and to hope and to build a better life for their children—not merely peace for Americans but peace for all men—not merely peace in our time but peace for all time.

I speak of peace because of the new face of war. Total war makes no sense in an age when great powers can maintain large and relatively invulnerable nuclear forces and refuse to surrender without resort to those forces. It makes no sense in an age when a single nuclear weapon contains almost 10 times the explosive force delivered by all of the Allied air forces in the Second World War. It makes no sense in an age when the deadly poisons produced by a nuclear exchange would be carried by wind and water and soil and seed to the far corners of the globe and to generations unborn.

Today the expenditure of billions of dollars every year on weapons acquired for the purpose of making sure we never need to use them is essential to keeping the peace. But surely the acquisition of such idle stockpiles—which can only destroy and can never create—is not the only, much less the most efficient, means of assuring peace.

I speak of peace, therefore, as the necessary rational end of rational men. I realize that the pursuit of peace is not as dramatic as the pursuit of war—and frequently the words of the pursuer fall on weary ears. But we have not more urgent task.

Some say that it is useless to speak of world peace or world law or world disarmament—and that it will be useless until the leaders of the Soviet Union adopt a more enlightened attitude. I hope they do. I believe we can help them to do it. But I also believe that we must reexamine our own attitude—as individuals and as a Nation—for our attitude is as essential as theirs. And every graduate of this school, every thoughtful citizen who despairs of war and wishes to help bring peace, should begin by looking inward—by examining his own attitude toward the possibilities of peace, toward the Soviet Union, toward the course of the cold war and toward freedom and peace here at home.

First, let us reexamine our attitude toward peace itself. Too many of us think it impossible. Too many think it unreal. But that is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable—that mankind is doomed—that we are gripped by forces we cannot control.

We need not accept that view. Our problems are man-made—therefore, they can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants. No problem of human destiny is beyond the reach of human beings. Man's reason and spirit have often solved the seemingly unsolvable—and we believe they can do it again.

I am not referring to the absolute, infinite concept of universal peace and good will of which some fantasies and fanatics still dream. I do not deny the values of hopes and dreams but we would merely invite discouragement and incredulity by making that our only and immediate goal.

Let us focus instead on a more practical, more attainable peace—based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions—on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the interest of all concerned. There is no single, simple key to this peace—no grand or magic formula to be adopted by one or two powers. Genuine peace must be the product of many nations, the sum of many acts. It must be dynamic, not static, changing to meet the challenge of each generation. For peace is a process—a way of solving problems.

With such a peace, there will still be quarrels and conflicting interests, as there are within families and nations. World peace, like community peace, does not require that each man love his neighbor—it requires only that they live together with mutual tolerance, submitting their disputes to a just and peaceful settlement. And history teaches us that enmities between nations, as between individuals, do not last forever. However fixed our likes and dislikes may seem, the tide of time and events will often bring surprising shifts in the relations between nations and neighbors.

So let us persevere. Peace need not be impracticable—and war need not be inevitable. By defining our goal more clearly—by making it seem more manageable and less remote—we can help all people to see it, to draw hope from it, and to move irresistibly toward it.

Second, let us reexamine our attitude toward the Soviet Union. It is discouraging to think that their leaders may actually believe what their propagandists continually write. It is discouraging to read a recent authoritative Soviet text on military strategy and find, on page after page, wholly baseless and incredible claims—such as the allegation that "American imperialist circles are preparing to unleash different types of wars * * * that there is a very real threat of a preventive war being unleashed by American imperialists against the Soviet Union * * * (and that) the political aims of the American imperialists are to enslave economically and politically the European and other capitalist countries * * * (and) to achieve world domination * * * by means of aggressive wars."

Truly, as it was written long ago: "The wicked flee when no man pursueth." Yet it is sad to read these Soviet statements—to realize the extent of the gulf between us. But it is also a warning—a warning to the American people not to fall into the same trap as the Soviets, not to see only a distorted and desperate view of the other side, not to see conflict as inevitable, accommodation as impossible and communication as nothing more than an exchange of epithets and threats.

No government or social system is so evil that its people must be considered to be

lacking in virtue. As Americans, we find communism profoundly repugnant as a negation of personal freedom and dignity. But we can still hail the Russian people for their many achievements—in science and space, in economic and industrial growth, in culture and in acts of courage.

Among the many traits the peoples of our two countries have in common, none is stronger than our mutual abhorrence of war. Almost unique among the major world powers, we have never been at war with each other. And no nation in the history of battle ever suffered more than the Russians suffered in the course of the Second World War. At least 20 million lost their lives. Countless millions of homes and farms were burned or sacked. A third of the nation's territory, including nearly two-thirds of its industrial base, was turned into a wasteland—a loss equivalent to the devastation of all this country east of Chicago.

Today, should total war ever break out again—no matter how—our two countries would become primary targets. It is an ironical but accurate fact that the two strongest powers are the two in most danger of devastation. All we have built up, all we have worked for, would be destroyed. And even in the cold war—which brings burdens and dangers to so many countries, including this nation's closest allies—our two countries bear the heaviest burdens. For we are both devoting cast sums to massive weapons that could better be used to combat ignorance, poverty, and disease. We are both caught up in a vicious and dangerous cycle in which suspicion on one side breeds suspicion on the other, and new weapons beget counterweapons.

In short, both the United States and its allies, and the Soviet Union and its allies, have a mutually deep interest in a just and genuine peace and in halting the arms race. Agreements to this end are in the Soviets' interest as well as ours—and even the most hostile nations can be relied upon to accept and keep those treaty obligations, and only those treaty obligations, which are in their own interest.

So, let us not be blind to our differences—but let us also direct attention to our common interests and to the means by which those differences can be resolved. And if we cannot now end our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity. For, in the final analysis, our most basic common link is the fact that we all inhabit this planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal.

Third, let us reexamine our attitude toward the cold war. Let us remember that we are not engaged in a debate, seeking to pile up debating points. We are not here distributing blame or pointing the finger of judgment. We must deal with the world as it is, and not as it might have been had the history of the last 18 years been different.

We must, therefore, persevere in the search for peace in the hope that constructive changes within the Communist bloc might bring within reach solutions which now seem beyond us. We must conduct our affairs in such a way that it becomes in the Communists' interest to agree on a genuine peace. Above all, while always defending our own vital interests, nuclear powers must avert those confrontations which present an adversary with a choice of either a humiliating retreat or a nuclear war. To adopt that kind of course in the nuclear age would be evidence only of the bankruptcy of our policy—or of a collective death-wish for the world.

To secure these ends, America's weapons are nonprovocative, carefully controlled, designed to deter and capable of selective use. Our military forces are committed to peace and disciplined in self-restraint. Our diplomats are instructed to avoid unnecessary irritants and purely rhetorical hostility.

For we can seek a relaxation of tension without relaxing our guard. And, for our part, we do not need to use threats to prove that we are resolute. We do not need to jam foreign broadcasts out of fear our faith will be eroded. We are unwilling to impose our system on any unwilling people—but we are willing and able to engage in peaceful competition with any people on earth.

Meanwhile, we seek to strengthen the United Nations, to help solve its financial problems, to make it a more effective instrument of peace, to develop it into a genuine world security system—a system capable of resolving disputes on the basis of law, of insuring the security of the large and the small, and of creating conditions under which arms can be finally abolished.

At the same time we seek to keep peace inside the non-Communist world, where many nations, all of them our friends, are divided over issues which weaken Western unity, which invite Communist intervention or which threaten to erupt into war. Our efforts in west New Guinea, in the Congo, in the Middle East and in the Indian subcontinent, have been persistent and patient despite criticism from both sides. We have also tried to set an example for others—by seeking to adjust small but significant differences with our own closest neighbors in Mexico and in Canada.

Speaking of other nations, I wish to make one point clear. We are bound to many nations by alliances. Those alliances exist because their concerns and ours substantially overlap. Our commitment to defend Western Europe and West Berlin, for example, stands undiminished because of the identity of our vital interests. The United States will make no deal with the Soviet Union at the expense of other nations and other peoples, not merely because they are our partners, but because their interests and ours converge.

Our interests converge, however, not only in defending the frontiers of freedom, but in pursuing the paths of peace. It is our hope—and the purpose of Allied policies—to convince the Soviet Union that she, too, should let each nation choose its own future, so long as that choice does not interfere with the choices of others. The Communist drive to impose their political and economic system on others is the primary cause of world tension today. For there can be no doubt that, if all nations, could refrain from interfering in the self-determination of others, the peace would be much more assured.

This will require a new effort to achieve world law—a new context for world discussions. It will require increased understanding between the Soviets and ourselves. And increased understanding will require increased contact and communication. One step in this direction is the proposed arrangement for a direct line between Moscow and Washington, to avoid on each side the dangerous delays, misunderstandings, and misreadings of the other's actions which might occur in a time of crisis.

We have also been talking in Geneva about other first-step measures of arms control, designed to limit the intensity of the arms race and to reduce the risks of accidental war. Our primary long-range interest in Geneva, however, is general and complete disarmament—designed to take place by stages, permitting parallel political developments to build the new institutions of peace which would take the place of arms. The pursuit of disarmament has been an effort of this Government since the 1920's. It has been urgently sought by the last three administrations. And however dim the prospects may be today, we intend to continue this effort—to continue it in order that all countries, including our own, can better grasp what the problems and possibilities of disarmament really are.

The one major area of these negotiations where the end is in sight—yet where a fresh start is badly needed—is a treaty to outlaw nuclear tests. The conclusion of such a treaty—so near and yet so far—would check the spiraling arms race in one of its most dangerous areas. It would place the nuclear powers in a position to deal more effectively with one of the greatest hazards which man faces—the further spread of nuclear arms. It would increase our security—it would decrease the prospects of war. Surely this goal is sufficiently important to require our steady pursuit, yielding neither to the temptation to give up the whole effort nor the temptation to give up our insistence on vital safeguards.

I am taking this opportunity, therefore, to announce two important decisions in this regard:

First, Chairman Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan and I have agreed that high-level discussions will shortly begin in Moscow looking toward early agreement on a comprehensive test ban treaty. Our hopes must be tempered with the caution of history—but with our hopes go the hopes of all mankind.

Second, to make clear our good faith and solemn convictions on this matter, I now declare that the United States does not propose to conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere so long as other States do not do so. We will not be the first to resume. Such a declaration is no substitute for a formal binding treaty—but I hope it will help us achieve one. Nor would such a treaty be a substitute for disarmament—but I hope it will help us achieve it.

Finally, my fellow Americans, let us reexamine our attitude toward peace and freedom here at home. The quality and spirit of our own society must justify and support our efforts abroad. We must show it in the dedication of our own lives—as many of you who are graduating today will have a unique opportunity to do, by serving without pay in the Peace Corps abroad or in the proposed National Service Corps here at home.

But wherever we are, we must all, in our daily lives, live up to the age-old faith that peace and freedom walk together. In too many of our cities today, the peace is not secure because freedom is incomplete.

It is the responsibility of the executive branch at all levels of government—local, State, and National—to provide and protect that freedom for all citizens by all means within their authority. It is the responsibility of the legislative branch at all levels, wherever that authority is not now adequate, to make it adequate. And it is the responsibility of all citizens in all sections to respect the rights of all others and to respect the law of the land.

All this is not unrelated to world peace. "When a man's ways please the Lord," the Scriptures tell us, "he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him." And is not peace, in the last analysis, basically a matter of human rights—the right to live out our lives without fear of devastation—the right to breathe air as nature provided it—the right of future generations to a healthy existence?

While we proceed to safeguard our national interests, let us also safeguard human interests. And the elimination of war and arms is clearly in the interest of both. No treaty, however much it may be to the advantage of all, however tightly it may be worded, can provide absolute security against the risks of deception and evasion. But it can—if it is sufficiently effective in its enforcement and if it is sufficiently in the interests of its signers—offer far more security and far fewer risks than an unabated, uncontrolled, unpredictable arms race.

The United States, as the world knows, will never start a war. We do not want a war. We do not now expect a war. This generation of Americans has already had enough—more than enough—of war and hate and oppression. We shall be prepared for

war, if others wish it. We shall be alert to try to stop it. But we shall also do our part to build a world of peace where the weak are safe and the strong are just. We are not helpless before that task or hopeless of its success. Confident and unafraid, we labor on—not toward a strategy of annihilation but toward a strategy of peace.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, what does one say about the address made this morning by the President of the United States which is already causing speculation that Mr. Kennedy may eventually go to Moscow.

In June 1960, when the President was still a Member of this body, he stated:

No President of the United States must ever again be put in the position of traveling across the seas, armed only with vague, speculative hopes in order to provide an occasion for public humiliation.

In October 1960, the President was quoted in Newsweek as saying:

Any meeting at the summit must be planned carefully with sufficient assurances of good faith at the secondary level to justify a belief that the meeting would contribute materially toward ending world tensions.

In June of 1960, when the President was a Member of this body, he said:

Our task is to devise a national strategy—based not on the 11th hour responses to Soviet-created crises—but a comprehensive set of carefully prepared, long-term policies designed to increase the strength of the non-Communist world.

There are some questions that very readily come to mind in view of these minimal conditions that were set down: Is there anything more than a speculative hope if a high-level conference is contemplated at Moscow? Where, if there be any, are the assurances of good faith, in view of the complete failure to achieve agreement after so many meetings at Geneva?

Will it be another case of concession after concession to Khrushchev to achieve some kind of a test ban treaty?

Then I must add that in view of an entrenched Soviet Communist state in Cuba only 90 miles from our shores, is this the time for a conference with the ever-present hazard of leaving the impression that we are retreating from weakness rather than leading from strength?

And do we now accept another self-imposed moratorium on atmospheric testing particularly after experiencing a Soviet doublecross only a short 2 years ago when a previous moratorium existed?

Are these not the questions which so very naturally arise in contemplating this new move?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, all of us recognize that any negotiation with any country involves certain hazards—or at least, certain unknowns. We recognize that meetings and negotiations with representatives of the Soviet Union have not been very fruitful in the past and are filled with the possibilities of hazard. The President of the United States knows this as well as any man in the world.

We are fully cognizant of the history of our negotiations with and our efforts for negotiation with the Soviets, but the President made it quite clear in his message this morning that the meeting to be held in Moscow is one which has been and is carefully planned and is one about which there is a great deal of information and a clear-cut proposal. I quote from the President's message, as follows:

Speaking of other nations, I wish to make one point clear. We are bound to many nations by alliances. Those alliances exist because their concerns and ours substantially overlap. Our commitment to defend Western Europe and West Berlin, for example, stands undiminished because of the identity of our vital interests.

The President went on to say:

The United States will make no deal with the Soviet Union at the expense of other nations and other peoples, not merely because they are our partners, but because their interests and ours converge.

Following that inclusive and clear-cut statement, the President announced certain decisions. He did this in light of what he considers to be the urgent necessity of slowing down the nuclear arms race. The President said:

The one major area of these negotiations—

Referring to the negotiations with the Soviet Union—

where the end is in sight—yet where a fresh start is badly needed—is a treaty to outlaw nuclear tests. The conclusion of such a treaty—so near and yet so far—would check the spiraling arms race in one of its most dangerous areas. It would place the nuclear powers in a position to deal more effectively with one of the greatest hazards which man faces—the further spread of nuclear arms. It would increase our security—it would decrease the prospects of war. Surely this goal is sufficiently important to require our steady pursuit, yielding neither to the temptation to give up the whole effort nor the temptation to give up our insistence on vital safeguards.

Again the President made clear that he knows whereof he speaks and that he recognizes the dangers and hazards involved in negotiations as well as recognizing his responsibility for leadership in these matters.

Then the President said:

Chairman Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan and I have agreed that high-level discussions will shortly begin in Moscow looking toward early agreement on a comprehensive test ban treaty. Our hopes must be tempered with the caution of history—but with our hopes go the hopes of all mankind.

The President and the Prime Minister have agreed to send their representatives to high-level discussions in Moscow. I do not consider this to be in conflict with the statements of Senator Kennedy in 1960 regarding the need for meticulous preparation and caution when dealing with the Soviet Union. I do not interpret it as a circumlocution for a summit conference or necessarily as an effort to lay the groundwork for a summit conference. Moscow is not now on the itinerary of the President's trip this summer. If it were, I can assure Senators that the prestige and security of the United States would be well provided for in advance.

I said earlier that sometimes it takes more courage to be a peacemaker than a warrior. In this instance the President of the United States has clearly told the American people of the hazards, the difficulties, and the dangers; but he has also told them that he is fully aware of history and that vital safeguards must be provided. There will be no yielding to temptation, to give up something which would injure our security; nor would we bargain away the rights of others.

The President of the United States, as the leader of freedom in this world, is demonstrating great personal and political courage by attempting, once again, to lift the terrible burden of the arms race from the backs of the overburdened people not only here in America but also throughout the world. He needs our support. He needs our help. He needs our prayers. He needs our confidence. And he is going to have mine.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Minnesota for what he has said. I hope that the climate in this body with respect to the President's announcement that he and Prime Minister Macmillan have agreed that there shall be very high level discussions in Moscow on a test ban treaty will be one of hope, of joy, of support for the President, who has had the courage to take this step which is so important to the survival of civilization.

I do not want to see what President Eisenhower has referred to as the military-industrial complex and its supporters within and without the Congress cast doubt on the President's action, indicating grave fears that our national security is about to be prejudiced. I hope the climate in this body will be one of strong support for the President in doing something which is badly needed.

I hazard the suggestion that if the President or his emissaries comes back from Moscow with a test ban agreement, that agreement will and should promptly be ratified by this body.

I have complete confidence in the integrity and ability of the President. I have confidence in his principal advisers in the area of a test ban treaty. I know that he, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, would never bring to this body for ratification a treaty which was not in the best interests of our national security.

I hope we shall not find during the remainder of the day or the remainder of this week that Senators will rise to criticize the President for taking this step. I hope there will be unanimity on a bipartisan basis among those who commend him, as the Senator from Minnesota said, for his courage and wisdom.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, with reference to the comment made by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, let me point out that I cited the record and raised some questions. I leave the record and the questions to speak for themselves.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not want my comments today to be indicative of criticism of what the minority leader has said. Surely he has a right to raise questions, as anyone has. I merely stated

what I considered to be a proper position in respect to the President—the feeling that the President took into consideration the statements which had been made in the past and that he recognizes the hazards of the future.

I think it should also be clear that the possibility of the President himself going to Moscow for high level discussions is, at best, a possibility. The Moscow conference to which the President referred is described in this morning's Associated Press dispatches as follows:

The Moscow conference could lead to a Foreign Ministers meeting and a summit session, depending on whether it achieves a breakthrough in the stalemate of the past 6 months.

What we see here is the transfer of negotiations to Moscow, possibly with new negotiators; hopefully, a Foreign Ministers meeting; and, if there is something to be achieved worthy of the presence of the President of the United States, he will be there.

At the present moment, it should be emphasized that all talk of a summit meeting is speculation only. The President is fully aware of the need for statesmanship rather than exuberance in matters of such grave import as a test ban treaty. He is well aware of the pitfalls of personal diplomacy. This is precisely why the men he is sending to Moscow will be trained diplomats able to distinguish between serious negotiation and mere gamesmanship. On the basis of their findings the President will decide whether further steps are desirable or necessary. The President, like all great statesmen, is accustomed to crossing bridges when he comes to them. He is also accustomed to testing them beforehand to see whether they will bear his weight.

NIPPON'S OBVIOUS AFFLUENCE HAS DECEPTIVE SIDE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I would like to draw the Senate's attention to the extraordinary example of national purpose that Japan is setting in the world today. Her own intense efforts to rebuild her war-shattered economy have made American aid more fruitful; no nation in the postwar era has made such a remarkable leap from economic devastation to modern technological achievement.

Many thousands of people visiting Tokyo next year for the Olympic Games will see the results of a whole nation's hard work all around them—in the new industrial plants, new highways, fast express trains, and in the air-conditioned buildings.

In the meantime, perhaps the most convincing picture of current Japanese progress is the 24-page special report entitled "Japan in Today's World," published on May 26 by the Washington Post. It is the second such section that this newspaper has devoted to the Japanese people, and carries personal greetings to American readers from Prime Minister Ikeda, Foreign Minister Ohira, and H. E. The, Japanese Ambassador.

The stories and illustrations of modern Japan and the display of its products and services are a vivid reflection of the country's growing capabilities. On my own last visit I was tremendously impressed by Japan's advance toward its goal of complete self-support, and toward the role that Western leaders hope it will assume—that of the economic leadership of free Asia.

In its lead story by Rafael Steinberg I think the Washington Post gives a particularly good comparison of Japan's obvious affluence and the less obvious areas of instability that she still must strengthen. Mr. Steinberg gives a clear account of the changes that revolutionary ideas and methods are bringing to what some guidebooks picture only as an exotic, backward land of cherry blossoms and geishas; therefore I ask unanimous consent that the story on Japan entitled "Nippon's Obvious Affluence Has Deceptive Side" be printed in the RECORD.

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

NIPPON'S OBVIOUS AFFLUENCE HAS DECEPTIVE SIDE—AUTOMATION DISTORTS PICTURE AS MUCH AS THE KIMONOS DO

(By Rafael Steinberg)

TOKYO.—Years ago, in a tiny bay on Japan's Inland Sea, a shipbuilding company used to celebrate a launching by passing out to all the workers ceremonial red and white rice cakes called tori-no-ko mochi, and by giving everyone a day off.

The rice cakes are a thing of the past, but last year the shipyard launched more tonnage than any other yard in the world. Instead of mochi, the company gave the workers a bigger yearend bonus than usual, and there are no extra days off for launchings because there are always new keels to be laid.

Anywhere in Japan, you can send out for home deliveries of sushi (raw fish and rice), and this delicacy has always arrived in graceful lacquered wooden trays which the delivery boy would come around to pick up the next morning.

But now the sushi shops can't find enough delivery boys to afford two trips for every order, so in many places sushi is packed in plain plastic boxes that look as if they belonged in an American supermarket, and the customer can keep them for refrigerator trays.

What's more, this labor shortage—the only one in Asia—has encouraged the development of automatic vending machines, supermarkets and instant soybean soup, while electronic computers are taking the place of abacus operators and a new train will be able to stop and start without an operator.

THE GUIDEBOOK VIEW

First-time visitors to Japan, who arrive with images of geisha girls, tea ceremony and cherry blossoms, are bowled over by these visible signs of modernity and economic progress. It seems to them impossible to believe that this highly industrialized, active nation, with its fast express trains, air-conditioned office buildings and automated factories, is the same exotic backward land the guidebooks still talk about.

From tori-no-ko mochi and exquisite tableware to oil tankers and microwave relays seems too big a jump.

Are Japanese supposed to be polite and old worldly. Watch the rush-hour stampedes in the subways.

Are they dedicated to beauty and symmetry? Look at Tokyo. Are they quaint? See the businessman with his golf clubs.

Do the Japaneses subsist on dried fish and a bowl of rice? Peek at the meat and bread in the housewife's shopping basket.

Are they short, stocky, and bowlegged? Feast your eyes on that long-limbed young beauty strolling down the Ginza in high heels, Paris dress, and Jacqueline Kennedy hairdo.

Are the farmers peasants? Examine the electric water pumps at the wells, the tiny tractors, the TV aerials on the thatch roofs.

Is the Japanese spirit spartan and frugal? Look around at the advertising signs, the purple shirts, the expense accounts, the rising prices that shoppers no longer haggle over.

Is the quiet contemplation of eternal verities a Japanese and Zen Buddhist trait? Listen to the rat-tat of the riveter, the thump of the piledriver, the roar of the dump trucks.

THE INSTABILITY PERSISTS

From these sights and sounds, the visitor could come away with an impression as distorted as the one he arrived with. He is apt to think that Japan has completed the transition from a feudal to a democratic society, from economic backwardness to modern technology, from Asian poverty to a society of affluence.

Such is not quite the case. Despite the 9 percent yearly average growth rate of the Japanese economy that has increased the per capita income from $258 in 1958 to $416 in 1961 (and an estimated $450 last year), so many points of instability and obsolescence remain that the country's politicians and businessmen still hesitate to take the economic leadership of free Asia—a role Western leaders want them to assume.

Commenting on American urging that Japan give more aid to the developing nations, and join more wholeheartedly with the United States in helping to lower world trade barriers, Foreign Minister Masayoshi Ohira recently explained that "we in Japan see our role as the establishment in our country of a free, stable, democratic order * * * a Japan that can stand on its own feet, that is self-supporting and does not need to ask for outside assistance. * * * We feel we still have some way to go.

"I wonder if the United States realizes what we consider to be our role," he muses. "We think that the United States believes Japan has already established this orderly and stable government, and therefore expects us to shoulder more responsibilities. * * * But we have to create a healthier and stronger domestic situation first."

To be sure, politics plays a part in this hesitation. Japan's Socialist Party, which can be noisy and disruptive when aroused, automatically opposes whatever it considers to be in the interests of "American imperialism," and Government leaders must go slow.

And much of the reluctance to shoulder responsibilities is merely the application of natural self-interest—an attitude that kept Japan free of foreign domination while other countries in Asia were becoming colonies, and that in large part is responsible for her fortunate position today.

But the Japanese point out several economic facts which they say are unique and which they claim make it impossible for them, despite their surface prosperity, to take what Western leaders consider to be their "rightful place in the economy of the free world."

Without attempting to make any final judgments, it is worth considering the economic problems that Ohira sums up as Japan's attempt "to catch up with the world."

It is not just a question of whether the economy is doing well or badly at the moment. (Actually, it seems to be pulling out of a temporary recession.) The more pertinent question is whether Japan will be able to carry out Prime Minister Hayato Ikeda's famous "income doubling" plan in the 1960's, and what will happen to the country in the process.

Specifically, it is a question of the future of that sushi shop delivery boy who no longer comes for the lacquered trays, and his employer, the shop owner. And it is a question of what will happen to the majority of the nation's industrial laborers who work in small shops and factories with inefficient machines, at relatively low wages.

Faced by competition from foreign goods, which Japan has pledged to admit more freely, will they be driven to the wall? And will the big firms, which pay better wages to their own employees but which depend on these small enterprises for component parts and for distribution, also go bankrupt?

To improve productivity, the Government is encouraging more and more workers to abandon the farms and small shops for the more efficient, better-paying, large modern plants, where they will live in company dormitories, eat company food, take vacations together at company resorts. Will this contribute to democracy and individualism, so difficult to take root in Japan anyway, or will it merely pave the way for another form of communal living?

If Japan is to expand her exports, compete in world markets, her industries have to modernize even further, her ports and roads must be expanded and improved. As the labor shortage worsens in the 1970's thanks to birth control and abortion in the 1950's, it will become more imperative than ever that all of Japan's workers attain a high rate of productivity.

But what will happen to the inefficient worker too old to learn a new trade? He is not a fringe minority. He represents a large proportion of the working force, and under the old system he would never be laid off no matter how useless he became. But will his employer be able to live up to this traditional obligation and still compete with the manufacturer in Germany or the United States who pays for work performed?

The Japanese have no confident answers for those questions. Their predictions have not been very accurate in the past, and already there is serious talk of revising Ikeda's 10-year income-doubling plan.

First advanced in 1959, the plan became official Government policy when Ikeda took over as Prime Minister in 1960. It calls for an average annual growth of 7.2 percent in the gross national product for 10 years with an eye to "catching up to Europe's standard of living" by 1980.

But in 1961, the first year, actual growth was 14 percent. This overheated growth also resulted, alarmingly, in such an increase in capital equipment investment that the 1970 figure for investments was attained in the very first year.

This was nearly disastrous. Since much of this investment was in the form of modern machinery imported from abroad—machinery which Japan, of course, sorely needed—Japan suddenly found herself with a balance-of-payments problem, a labor shortage (as people were needed to man the expanded plants) and, shortly thereafter, surplus production of heavy industrial products.

"Technical" measures, such as raising the bank rate, cooled the excessive growth, curbed investment and managed to get international payments back on an even keel.

Growth in 1962 was only about 4 percent.

But this amounted to a recession, from which the country is only now emerging. Because money was tight, businessmen used up stockpiles rather than buy, so the problem of surplus production worsened and there was a scramble for export expansion.

But while the surplus forced down domestic prices of such commodities as steel, consumer prices rose drastically—and are still going up—as farm production fell and urban workers, employed in constructing the new plants or running them, found themselves richer than ever.

The Government had forecast a consumer price rise of 2.8 percent last year, but the actual increase was 6.7 percent. The danger of inflation is the Government's most pressing single economic problem.

The problem is to keep the modern section of the economy from expanding so fast that prices run away, and at the same time to encourage the modernization of the backward sectors and the roads, harbors and utilities that are still far from sufficient to support the kind of technological society that the Japanese dream about.

The problem will be made more difficult by the fact that Japan's huge labor pool, which supplied the muscle for the expansion so far, will reach a peak in the next couple of years and then start to decline. And, ready or not, Japan will have to open her doors to more foreign products or risk losing the chance to expand her exports.

Yet no one doubts the capacity of the highly literate, skilled and ambitious Japanese to solve these problems, and others. For despite all the transformations that have taken place here since the war, most Japanese still retain the single-minded purposefulness, the willingness to submerge individual ambitions and interests for what they consider to be the good of the community and the nation, that enabled them to leap from crumbling feudalism to modern statehood in two generations, and from defeat and devastation to prosperity and prominence in less than one.

It's not rugged individualism, or Jeffersonian democracy, but it works in Japan, and it seems to be what the Japanese want.

Only by following her own path can Japan attain an influential position in the world. "We want to be a bridge between the industrialized nations of the West and the underdeveloped countries of Asia and Africa," Prime Minister Ikeda has said. "We understand them both."

THE MIGRATORY LABOR BILLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received expressions of concern from Oregon farmers relative to the migratory labor bills. In my judgment, I owe to these citizens of my State the right of having the Senate consider the points they have raised before the vote is taken on the legislation.

I regret that the materials were not received by me from the Oregon Farm Bureau and the Nyssa-Nampa Beet Growers Association at an earlier date so that the subcommittee could have considered them during the hearings. However, the distinguished junior Senators from New Jersey, with his accustomed fairness, has reviewed the Farm Bureau communication and has provided me with the position of the subcommittee on each of the points raised.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter, dated May 14, 1963, signed by Mr. Howard Fujii, director, commodities and farm labor, of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, together with Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS' letter to me dated June 4, 1963, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

OREGON FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Salem, Oreg., May 14, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A conference of representatives from our member county farm bureaus and other agricultural organizations met in Salem, Monday, May 13, to discuss S. 523 and how it would affect farmers and their community. This letter contains a number of their comments on Oregon conditions and recommendations for amendments to the bill.

S. 523, as we understand the bill, would:

1. Prohibit employment in agriculture of local children under 12.

2. Prohibit employment of children of migrant worker families under 14.

3. Prohibits employment of minors below the age of 18 in agriculture "in an occupation that the Secretary of Labor finds and declares to be particularly hazardous for the employment of children below age 18 * * *."

In our opinion, Oregon has taken the leadership among States in providing summertime employment opportunities for children and young people. Our farmers, in cooperation with the State employment service, school officials, chambers of commerce and the food processing industry, have developed work programs for young people that are unparalleled anywhere in the Nation.

First, the platoon system was developed as an Oregon program. Farmers employ and transport children for berry and vegetable harvest under the supervision of a platoon leader, who may be a teacher, youth leader, or some other responsible adult. Although farmers have reservations about employing younger children, many of the best workers over 12 are those that have previously worked with their parents or with older brothers and sisters in platoons.

Second, the drive-out program offers supplementary income to families with children. Mothers have a chance to teach children the responsibility of earning their own. The whole family can work together during the weekend to add to their income and make possible purchases of additional consumer goods.

Mothers and others that drive out may not do so if they could not bring their younger children. Work habits developed by young children have proved that they pay off as the youngsters graduate to other types of employment in succeeding years.

Third, migrant families have reported to us that one of the primary reasons they come to Oregon is that the family can work together and children can work and earn money. They say they do not have this opportunity back home.

Restrictions would result in the loss from our labor force of many families that make the annual trip to Oregon so the whole family can work together.

Fourth, the food-processing industry that cans, freezes, or otherwise converts raw farm commodities into consumer products, supplies jobs for a large number of high school and college students, housewives, and others for whom employment opportunities are limited. Reduction in the farm labor force would mean less crop delivered to the processing plants, further restricting job opportunities there.

Fifth, seasonal farm occupations such as irrigation, loading and stacking hay, hauling grain, loading fruit and vegetables on trucks, picking tree fruit, and many short duration jobs are filled by high school boys. In addition, high school youth fill in for regular employees of dairy, livestock, and poultry farmers on many occasions. This is true, particularly of vocational agriculture students that add to their income by helping neighboring farmers.

Almost any occupation has an element of risk involved, and there is concern that such broad authority granted the Secretary of Labor in paragraph (2) could tend to regulate minors out of a job.

Also mentioned in the discussion of S. 523, is the fact that the bill as written, discriminates against the migrant child. He cannot

work until he is 14, whereas, a local resident of 12 years of age may work if he "commutes daily from his permanent residence." The "permanent resident" feature also poses a problem at Corvallis and Eugene as families of summer school students could not commute from their "permanent residence." Farmers from Benton and Lane Counties indicate that a number of mothers and children who work in the strawberry harvest are from summer school families. There would also be a hardship on intrastate migrant families that are Oregon residents who move from job to job within our own State.

Following considerable discussion on the minimum age issue, our conference felt that younger children should not be denied the right of job opportunities, but felt that a limit on the time that they may be employed could solve the problem of possible abuses arising from employment of children.

They suggested that the language on page 2, lines 5 and 6, and the word "residents" in line 7, be deleted and this rewritten so there was not discrimination between migrant and local children by substituting the limit of time that a child may be employed in any one day as follows: 9 years of age or younger, not more than 4 hours; 10 and 11 years of age, not more than 5 hours; 12 and 13 years of age, not more than 6 hours.

In addition, they recommended that children below the age of 13 be required to be under supervision of the employer or an authorized supervisor, or under the direct supervision of his parent or person standing in the place of his parent.

The substitute language in line 5 after (C) should read "is under the supervision of the employer or his authorized supervisor, or the direct supervision of his parent or person standing in the place of his parent for not more than 4 hours a day if the child is 9 years of age or younger, not more than 5 hours a day if the child is 10 or 11 years of age, and not more than 6 hours a day if the child is 12 or 13 years of age (then continue with the language on line 7, starting with the word "and").

On page 2, line 11, change "18" to "16" and in line 12, starting with "in" delete the balance of the line through "18" on line 14, and substitute "to operate power driven machinery and handle poisonous materials under conditions found by the Secretary to be particularly hazardous for minors under age 16."

At the end of line 17, change the period to a comma and add the following: "or person standing in the place of his parent, provided that for purposes of this Act the term "standing in the place of his parent" shall be construed to include any person with whom a minor is residing."

Paragraph (2) would then read:

(c) (2) No employee below the age of 16 may be employed in agriculture to operate power driven machinery or handle poisonous materials under conditions found by the Secretary to be particularly hazardous for minors under age 16, except when such employee is employed by his parent or by a person standing in the place of his parent on a farm owned or operated by such parent or person, or person standing in the place of his parent, provided that for purposes of this Act the term "standing in the place of his parent" shall be construed to include any person with whom a minor is residing.

We would certainly appreciate any effort that you, as a senior and ranking member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, can make to gain an understanding of Oregon conditions mentioned in this letter to members of the Committee.

We would certainly appreciate an opportunity for a committee of farmers to meet with you to discuss the problems involved in the proposed legislation. Please advise, if possible, when you will be in Oregon and can reserve some time for such a conference.

Sincerely,

HOWARD FUJII,
Director, Commodities, Farm Labor.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON MIGRATORY LABOR,
June 4, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: I have reviewed the Oregon Farm Bureau position on the child labor bill (S. 523), as presented in their May 14 letter to you, and have these comments to offer:

1. Although the Oregon Farm Bureau views were submitted after hearings on the bill had been completed, and after the bill had been ordered favorably reported to the Senate, you may assure your constituents that their viewpoint was thoroughly considered during our work on the bill. The testimony of the representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation suggested similar amendments to S. 523. These views were considered and rejected during the committee deliberations on the bill.

2. Since initially introduced, efforts have been made to consult with farm employers regarding the effect of this bill on local employment patterns. As a result, the subcommittee has attempted to preserve the beneficial aspects of farm- and youth-work programs that exist in rural communities. Accordingly, S. 523 provides that (a) children of any age can work under any conditions for their parents on a home farm, and (b) a 12- or 13-year-old child can be employed on a farm to which he commutes daily from his home.

The commuting provision, in fact, was developed during the last Congress to accommodate Oregon farm interests in preserving existing employment opportunities in agriculture for children. And although the Oregon views were not expressed until after the child labor bill (S. 1123) had passed the Senate, you will recall that we became involved in the development of the commuter provision in the House. In view of this history of the commuter provision, it appears rather paradoxical for the originators of the commuter provision to assert now that the provision discriminates against migrant children.

3. The proposed Oregon Farm Bureau amendment that would allow a child of any age to work for limited periods under the supervision of an employer or his authorized supervisor, or the direct supervision of his parents—would, in view of the known hazards incident to farm employment, seriously endanger children working in agriculture. Aside from the known hazards of arduous child labor, there are other important considerations. Consider, for example, the recent bus accident in Pahokee, Fla., that took the lives of 27 migrants. About a dozen of the children under the age of 12 were drowned when the bus plunged into a canal alongside the road. One boy was only 4 years old. And while I realize that your State is one of the most progressive in regard to safe transportation, national policy considerations cannot be ignored.

4. To protect children from injuries resulting from hazardous farmwork, S. 523 provides that the Secretary of Labor can find and declare that certain farm occupations are particularly hazardous to children under 18 years of age. Although data is not available on a national scale, the following table from California, showing the high percentage of injuries among children between ages of 16 and 18, indicates that this provision is eminently realistic:

Year	Total under 18 years	Under 16 years	16 to 17 years
1950	485	128	357
1951	523	134	389
1952	525	145	380
1953	464	133	331
1954	440	95	345
1955	501	140	361
1956	499	132	367
1957	512	127	385
1958	434	92	342
1959	565	117	448
1960	539	117	422
1961	426	83	343

Moreover, since modern farming uses many diverse harvest methods, such as high ladders, field packing, and conveyor-belt harvest operations, pesticides, mechanical devices, and power-driven machinery, the bill does not attempt to delineate what constitutes "hazardous employment." Rather, it was considered far more practicable to provide the Secretary of Labor with flexibility in this regard. This flexibility is especially important in view of the great changes that occur almost daily in modern farming operations.

In view of the well-documented need to protect young children from harmful child labor in agriculture, and the fact that S. 523 has adopted some of the specific suggestions of farm employers, it is my judgment that further amendments would not receive support when the bill is considered by the Senate. Moreover, given the limited coverage of S. 523, I am reasonably certain that the farming community in Oregon will be able to adjust existing youth employment programs so that they will be able to operate within the framework of the child labor bill.

Sincerely yours,

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on June 3, I received a letter from the Nyssa-Nampa District Beet Growers Association commenting upon the migratory labor bills, S. 521 through S. 529. I ask unanimous consent that this communication be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

NYSSA-NAMPA DISTRICT
BEET GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
Nyssa, Oreg., May 13, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our association has reviewed S. 521 through S. 529 and submits the following as our viewpoint on this proposed legislation.

S. 521, educational grants for migrants: The intended goal of this bill is most desirable as the future welfare of the migrant population depends on an education program and the migrant's absorption in the general employment area. While we do not object to this bill we think at present the education program proposed is difficult of accomplishment as summer schools for migrant children, unless compulsory, would not be productive of students since from our experience the migrant family would not permit its children who can work in the field during the summer to attend school during the day. As to night education for children and adults, the migrants, after an exhausting day of work in the field, would not respond with enthusiasm to an evening session at school. On the subject of repayment of cost

to local districts for prorated cost of education of migrant children in free public grade and high schools, we believe the local areas should assume this obligation as the taxpayers in such areas are the direct beneficiaries of the efforts of the migrant laborers. In our areas of Oregon and Idaho the migrant children are accepted freely by the various school systems, as soon as they arrive, and they attend the schools until their departure, receiving the same educational opportunities as the local children.

S. 522, day child care: Our position is the same as previously mentioned. As long as the opportunity to work is available most migrant children will be working with their families and the very young are usually cared for by the mother or older daughter. From our experience with labor camps this arrangement seems to work very well.

S. 523, child labor provisions, is objectionable as it imposes restrictions which are unfair to the children for whom the protection is intended. First, children who are ambitious or willing enough to work in the fields should be given the opportunity to do so and migrant children should not be discriminated against with a 14-year restriction while local children are limited only to 12 years. Another reason migrant children should not be restricted is that they usually are part of a family unit where the family is endeavoring to earn sufficient income to sustain it through periods of unemployment and any assistance the children can render maintains the well-being and self-respect of the family. The provisions of this bill would eliminate many local women who go out with their children to pick vegetables and fruit. Several examples brought to mind are the need for this type of labor during pea, bean, and strawberry harvest in Oregon, Idaho, and Washington. We believe that minors under 18 years should be fully safeguarded from hazardous employment.

S. 524, farm labor contractor and crew leader registration, will work an unnecessary hardship on crew leaders with the financial burden of the insurance requirement. Most of these men come to work areas as a family unit which consists of their immediate family and close relations. Invariably members of a crew will travel in their own cars and in some instances the crew leader will come to the work area with his family and recruit the remainder of his crew from among migrants already arrived. These crew leaders do not usually earn substantial incomes and in many instances will work with their crews, receiving their supervisory income as the only additional income. Requiring insurance coverage will not serve as a control over crew leaders but will only result in an additional unnecessary expense to them.

S. 525, National Advisory Council, is pointed in the right direction.

S. 526, sanitary facilities, seems to call for an unnecessary expenditure of Federal funds while our Government faces a severe deficit. There appears to be no need for money to be granted to States to provide sanitary facilities for migratory workers. We have numerous camps in our areas which have provided adequate sanitary facilities for their migrant workers with improvements made annually. The cost of these facilities are borne by the farmer. Field facilities should not be provided by the State at the expense of the Federal Government or the taxpayer but should be provided by the individual farmer.

S. 527, Farm Employment Service Act, is a burdensome, unworkable bill, as migrant labor is free labor which comes and goes as it desires. In this area hundreds of migrants travel from place to place at their own expense, without being recruited, and stay so long as work is available or until other pastures look greener. If the restrictions of this bill are forced upon the farmers they will be obliged to resort to complete mechanization, wherever possible, at the expense of migrant labor which will thus be faced with unemployment.

S. 528, Minimum wages: The aim of this bill if attained would have the same results as S. 527, the elimination of employment of many migrants. In this area farm labor, whether local or migrant, is receiving not less than $1 per hour with the range to $1.25 per hour. On piecework in sugarbeet and potato crops some migrants earn $20 or more per day.

S. 529, NLRB coverage: We oppose this bill as farmwork is so different from industrial work that agricultural labor would not be benefited by unionization. In many instances farmers will hire their labor on a yearly basis even though the need for such labor is not entirely necessary during many of the months outside the crop season. This employment is maintained on a compensatory basis since the farmhand is called upon to work long and odd hours during the growing season and he works short hours and light work during the off season. If the farmer is forced to live with unionization he would have to hire his labor only when needed. Furthermore with farmers producing crops which require harvest within limited periods a strike could result in the complete loss of a crop and financial disaster to the nonfarming segment of the economy dependent on the farmers, as well as to the farmer.

We are offering these remarks so you will have the benefit of the local farmers' viewpoint.

We hope you will support the extension of Public Law 78 without amendments.

Thanks for the many courtesies you have extended to me in Washington and your interest in the dirt farmer.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM M. CARSON,
President.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, farm labor legislation—almost by definition—is controversial. Honest men of sincere conviction can be found on both sides of the issues. Conditions of work may differ in different areas of the country so that what is felt in area A to be a necessity, in area B may have far less importance attached to it. By and large, it is my judgment that Oregon farmers are good and conscientious employers. They are family farmers for the most part. Being fairly small operators, many of them actively engage in their field operations, working alongside their harvest-time help. I suspect that, even as you and I, they dread the thought of legislation which might involve them in more paperwork. But, they are affected in their operations by this legislation, and that being so, they have the right to have their views presented to the Senate, before the legislation is acted upon.

As one of their representatives in the Congress, I feel that I have this obligation to them. When the floor leader for the legislation presents it to the Senate, I am confident that he will do so forcefully and well. He has assured me that the subcommittee has weighed carefully the points, similar to those presented by my constituents, which were presented by other witnesses. It is my judgment that the Senate is ready to work its will in this area, to the end that the public good may be served.

Mr. President, in order that I may not leave an incorrect impression of the mail I have received on this subject, I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated May 24, 1963, which I have received from the Reverend Kent D. Lawrence, chairman, Department of Migrant Ministry, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

WESTMINSTER PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Portland, Oreg., May 24, 1963.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to reaffirm the position I support for legislation relative to migrant farm laborers which the Oregon Council of Churches Department of Migrant Ministry personnel has consistently taken in recent years.

S. 521–9 and S. 981 and H.R. 4516–23 and H.R. 4558 represent a comprehensive program which would greatly help the migrant population. Even in Oregon, where State laws have done much to improve the situation, we find growers saying that the State should not require what the Federal Government does not require.

I want to register disapproval of any outright extension of Public Law 78. The use of bracero labor should be gradually eliminated.

Very truly yours,

KENT D. LAWRENCE,
Chairman, Department of Migrant Ministry.

WHAT CAN WE DO ABOUT CUBA?

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I believe that all of us are agreed that something must be done about Cuba. The question that confronts us is, What can be done, short of military invasion, that will help to restore freedom to the Cuban people and eliminate the menace of Castroite subversion in the hemisphere?

This last April 25 to 27, Freedom House in collaboration with the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, brought together a group of experts at Ardsley-on-Hudson, N.Y., in an effort to find an answer to this question. This last Tuesday, Freedom House released to the press a 16-page summary of the discussion which took place at the conference. I consider this to be a document of such significance that I earnestly commend it to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this report printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The report found that, "the freeing of Cuba, not ultimately but soon, must be the aim of U.S. policy." The document takes on all the more significance, in my opinion, because of the extraordinary caliber and balance of the list of participants in the Ardsley-on-Hudson conference. There were conservatives and liberals, Democrats and Republicans in the group. There was not a single member of the group whose name carries an extremist connotation; and the discussion at the conference was gratifyingly free of partisan rhetoric. On certain issues, as was inevitable, there were marked differences between the distinguished participants. What was remarkable, was that despite these differences the debate revealed an extraordinary degree of agreement on fundamentals.

I should like to read the concluding paragraphs of the section of the report entitled, "A Consensus for Action":

Timing is, of course, a crucial factor in assessing risk. The Freedom House conferees tended to the view that the risks later will be more formidable than the risks now. Even on the assumption that time is inevitably on our side, which we do not accept, one cannot be sanguine about a Sovietized Cuba that brings a large portion of the United States and the Western Hemisphere within easy range of Communist missiles and nuclear warheads.

The conference was aware that the major premise of present policy is the assumption that action on Cuba must be delayed because of risks to our position elsewhere in the world. But the conferees were impressed by the fact that the U.S. position in October, far from provoking Communist adventures, forced the Soviet leaders to act with greater caution everywhere. In the context of the Sino-Soviet dispute, American toughness justifies Khrushchev's position of restraint, while any evidence that the United States is a "paper tiger" would strengthen Mao's call for aggression.

In any case, if choices must be made as to where we should take bold stands, Cuba is the most logical place. The Soviet Union has overextended itself geographically by reaching into the Caribbean. Of all the fronts on which we face each other, Cuba is militarily Russia's weakest, and our strongest. The only Russian chance for success in such a contest would be to convert the local conflict into a general war—clearly too fearful a price for so small a prize. Moreover, military opinion considers the risk of general war in the near future relatively small because the Kremlin knows that it could not win. The record already shows that the Soviets have almost always backed away from action that might lead to general war when the United States has taken a firm stand, as in Cuba last October and in Berlin since Khrushchev issued his original ultimatum in November 1958.

The risks of inaction, however, must be spelled out also in terms of the impact on the non-Communist world. There is the risk—indeed, almost a certainty—that inaction will encourage neutralism. If the United States can accommodate itself to the indefinite perpetuation of a Communist regime in Cuba, why should not the rest of Latin America? And the consequence will be a steady seepage of communism into the other islands of the Caribbean and the other Latin countries of the hemisphere. At the same time, in Europe and Asia, countries contiguous with the Iron Curtain will have every reason to ask: If the United States dare not uproot Communism from its own doorstep, how can we expect it to risk anything on our behalf?

The freeing of Cuba, not ultimately but soon, must be the aim of U.S. policy, implemented by a practical program of action.

Mr. President, I consider the report of the Ardsley-on-Hudson conference, sponsored by Freedom House and the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, to be an example of the workings of democracy at its best. Here were private citizens with a genuine concern over the course of hemispheric affairs, coming together for the purpose of exploring one of the most critical problems which confronts our Government and attempting to share with their Government the problem of exploring and assessing alternative solutions.

Again I want to say that I hope my colleagues will find the time to read this report in its entirety and to accord it the careful thought which it deserves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD.

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

WHAT CAN WE DO ABOUT CUBA?

FOREWORD

In October 1962 the world was shocked by the relevation that the Soviet Union had established a nuclear missile base in Cuba. The American people were virtually unanimous in supporting the President's decision to take prompt and effective action, regardless of the risk, to force the withdrawal of Russian missiles and troops.

The succession of events needs no recounting here. What is significant is that, as of this writing, more than a half year has gone by and the task has not been completed. In the meantime, relations between the U.S. Government and anti-Communist Cuban exiles have deteriorated rapidly, dimming hopes for an early overthrow of the Castro regime. It is urgent, therefore, for the American people to review what has happened and to consider what ought now to be done.

To help in this process, Freedom House invited a group of prominent individuals—seasoned observers and analysts—to meet at Gould House, New York University's conference center at Ardsley-on-Hudson, New York, April 25–27. The sessions were conducted in association with the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba.

This report on the sessions was prepared by Freedom House; nothing in it is binding on any participants. The aim is to present the exchange of opinions among people representing different points of view, the airing of their proposals and the consensus which emerged from the deliberations.

Freedom House expresses its gratitude to the busy men and women who put aside personal interests to attend the conference. The list of participants is as follows:

Mrs. Mariada Arensberg, executive director, Cuban Freedom Committee.

Mr. William E. Barlow, publisher, Vision magazine.

Mr. Murray Baron, labor relations.

Mr. Paul Bethel, editor, "Cuba Research Reports."

Mr. Leo Cherne, executive director, Research Institute of America.

Mr. James Daniel, roving editor, Reader's Digest.

Mr. Roscoe Drummond, columnist, New York Herald-Tribune.

Mr. Christopher Emmet, chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.

Mr. George Field, executive director, Freedom House.

Miss Frances R. Grant, secretary general, Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom.

Mr. Hal Hendrix, Latin America editor, Miami Daily News.

Mr. William vanden Heuvel, president, International Rescue Committee.

Mr. Daniel James, secretary, Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba.

Prof. Harry Kantor, Department of Political Science, University of Florida.

Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall (retired), military writer and syndicated columnist.

Mr. Edgar Ansel Mowrer, syndicated columnist.

Mr. William Patterson, business executive.

Miss Virginia Prewett, Latin American columnist, Washington News.

Mr. John Richardson, Jr., president, Free Europe Committee.

Mr. Leo Sauvage, New York correspondent, Le Figaro.

Mr. John Smithies, consultant on Latin American Affairs.

Mr. Gerald Steibel, Research Institute of America.

Dr. Sig Synnestveldt, Latin America specialist, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania.

Prof. Frank Tannenbaum, School of International Affairs, Columbia University.

Vice Admiral Charles Wellborn, Jr. (retired), Hudson Institute.

Prof. A. Curtis Wilgus, director, School of Inter-American Studies, University of Florida.

Mr. Chester S. Williams, associate director, Freedom House.

FOCUS ON A PROBLEM

Americans are agreed that a Soviet Cuba is intolerable to the Western Hemisphere. The reasons bear upon our security and freedom as well as the independence and integrity of the other nations in this hemisphere.

The facts about Castro and Communist Cuba are beyond debate: Six million people who won their freedom from Batista's dictatorship found themselves betrayed into the hands of a new dictatorship. They are denied the right to vote, to speak, to publish—to think. More than 100,000 Cubans have been jailed for refusing to accept communism. Another 250,000 have fled, preferring exile to tyranny at home; 180,000 more are awaiting transportation and countless others dream of escaping from the terror.

Cuba has become an overt Soviet satellite—the only one in the Americas. The Castro regime deliberately handed over the island to the Russian dictator and allowed it to be transformed into a launching pad for potential military aggression against the United States and the other countries of the hemisphere.

Present conditions do not suggest that the evil has been abated, much less eliminated. Even if we could be certain that every offensive military weapon has been removed from Cuba, we would still live in the presence of the 20th century's most efficient offensive weapon—aggressive communism itself. This time bomb is still to be defused.

Fundamental objectives

American policy must rest on three objectives:

1. The elimination of the Soviet political and military base in Cuba;

2. The halting of Castro-Communist subversion, sabotage, and guerrilla warfare against Latin-American peoples; and

3. The liberation of the Cuban nation from Castro's brutal police state.

Americans will unite behind any program that gives hope of achieving these goals. But what would such a program be?

Formulating it presents certain immediate difficulties. Public opinion, while it is clear on the basic objectives, does not have full access to the facts. The reasons are many. Some are founded in the requirements of security, some rest on theories of "strategy" that may or may not be sound. In the last analysis, however, whatever policy is adopted will require, for its success, the understanding of the American people and their wholehearted support. Indeed, it is a function of alert citizenship to participate actively in the formulation of policies, even if it must do so on the basis of incomplete information.

The conference agenda

The mechanics of the conference were designed to facilitate a full exchange of ideas, help clarify differences in approach and substance, and pave the way for the enunciation of areas of common agreement. The agenda was divided into three parts:

1. What we know: The basic facts about the situation inside Cuba and among Cuban exiles, and the views of U.S. Government officials and Congressmen as well as leaders of Latin American Republics.

2. What we do not know and need to know: The difficulties of incomplete information about United States and Latin American

policies and programs. (Where possible, conferees filled in the gaps, clarified ambiguities and defined the areas of uncertainty.)

3. Policy and actions: Judgments on objectives and tactics, consensus on what Government policy should be in the interests of the Nation, Latin America and the free world, alternative courses of action.

The Department of State had been invited to participate but found it necessary to decline because "pressure of problems relating to Cuba preclude attendance of officers of the stature which your seminar would merit." The Department, however, supplied the conference with a statement for its guidance.

In view of the consensus ultimately reached by the participants, the diversity of premises from which they started, is noteworthy. The diversities came out clearly in a formal opinion poll composed of 21 questions formulated in the light of the first day's discussion. At the time the poll was taken, 25 participants were seated at the conference table.

Some sense of the participants' initial attitudes emerges from the rather even division on such questions as these:

Does the administration believe that Russian troops will leave Cuba?

Has Washington reached a decision not to act except as it is presently acting?

Does the administration believe that continued economic pressure will topple Castro?

Does the U.S. Government have a policy for liberation of Cuba?

On the other hand, there was fairly close agreement on the following:

That Castro's regime can be toppled without U.S. military action and without an invasion.

That the hit-and-run raids of the exiles were contributing to Castro's difficulties.

That raids not based on U.S. soil did not endanger the peace.

To ascertain the political bias of the conferees, they were asked to express their attitudes toward the present administration on issues other than Cuba. Of the 25 participants, 14 declared themselves friendly, 7 said they were opposed, and 4 abstained. (For a full appreciation of both the temper and the substance of the conference, the poll is reproduced as Appendix II of this report.) In the judgment of Freedom House, it is worth study not only as a summary of the conferees' views but as a reflection of the way qualified observers see America's current Cuban posture.

IN SEARCH OF A POLICY

An American's confrontation with the Cuban problem must begin with the question: What is our Government's policy?

Since Castro took power in 1959, and especially since the Bay of Pigs disaster in 1961, there have been many conflicts and contrasts between official pronouncement and actual performance. While no one doubts the administration's desire to see Cuba liberated from the grip of communism, there is considerable concern that far less than an all-out effort is being made in the Caribbean to do anything about it.

Troubling questions

From their own specialized vantage points, the experts at the Freedom House conference raised these troubling questions:

1. Is American Cuban policy geared to a negotiated accord with Khrushchev on the kind of Cuba with which the United States could "coexist"? If this is not contemplated, why the reluctance to make public the exchange of messages and letters between the President and the Soviet Premier? The time seems overdue for a full disclosure of the agreements reached and the promises broken.

2. Under present circumstances, is the administration reluctant to increase pressure on the Cuban regime? The east coast longshoremen's union has been boycotting Polish and other satellite lines that use some of their ships in Cuban trade. Washington has been seeking to end the boycott. The question was asked: Why has there been no tough, ironclad ban on the shipment of American goods in any vessel of any line that trades with Cuba? At the present time, a watered-down regulation applies only to the individual ships that deliver goods to Cuban ports, and even violations of this weak measure are reportedly permitted.

3. At a meeting in England, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., is said to have described the U.S. position on Cuba in these terms: The first objective is to clean up our own backyard in Central and South America by vigorous implementation of the Alliance for Progress, meanwhile containing Communist Cuba. A second objective is to bring isolated Cuba back into the Organization of American States as a chastened, cooperating member. If this is an accurate reflection of U.S. policy and not just a personal view, how long does Washington think step No. 1 will take before action can begin on step No. 2?

4. Is it possible that the humanitarian mission of James Donovan, the lawyer who negotiated the release of the Bay of Pigs prisoners, has become something more? Is it also a cover for administration-approved negotiations with Castro, looking toward some kind of reconciliation, perhaps on the basis of a Tito-type arrangement for Cuba? Castro's conspicuous entertainment of Donovan and his son in early April 1963 suggests that the Cuban dictator may be reaching for some kind of "accommodation" with the United States, since the October events may have convinced him that the Soviets are unwilling to risk much to support him.

(Significantly, a television interview filmed on April 24 just before Castro's departure for Russia, released after the Freedom House Conference had adjourned, lent credence to this assessment of Castro's policy. Aware that he was addressing an American audience, Castro expressed appreciation that the United States has "taken some steps in the way of peace" such as "the stopping of piratical acts against Cuba." He indicated that these steps might be the basis for better relations. "I have looked at such steps with good eyes," he said, adding that the question of Soviet technicians in Cuba—"who would fight with us against any aggressor"—might be the subject of a three-way discussion between Cuba, the United States and the Soviet Union, and not just between the United States and the Soviet Union.)

These uncertainties about the direction of American policy, whether well founded or not, are profoundly disturbing in and of themselves. They suggest that actually there may be no master plan and that we are merely improvising on this crucial cold war front. Certainly, a coherent policy and plan of action would have to begin with an evaluation of a whole series of basic relationships, including the following:

1. The relation of the Cuban problem to the other cold war fronts.

2. Cuba's relation to the other Latin American countries.

3. The relation of the United States to the other Latin American countries.

4. Possible effects on the Sino-Russian conflict.

5. The fear that action on Cuba may escalate into global war.

Specifically, clear-cut U.S. policies are needed in these areas:

1. Exiles' activities.
2. Developments inside Cuba.
3. Post-Castro Cuba.
4. Current Russian presence in Cuba.

Virtually all the discussion on Cuba revolved around these issues. The following pages are an attempt to organize and integrate the observations.

Cuba and the other cold war fronts

Communism's conquest of Cuba must be viewed in the context of the worldwide expansionist drive conducted by the Kremlin, which has already led to totalitarian control over a third of the human race. At this point in history, simple solutions are no longer possible. The problem of resisting Communist expansionism is growing more complex and less manageable all the time. Any plan of action in the Caribbean has to take into account conditions and potential developments around the globe. Since we have committed ourselves to the defense of allies in all the continents, our Cuban policy must be consistent with those commitments, or at least must avoid jeopardizing them.

Participants in the Freedom House Conference saw this fact as a major preoccupation in the thinking of those responsible for American policy. In an effort to define Washington's current approach, several conferees used role-playing procedures to present what might be the views of high Government officials. In substance, they said:

"Our policy on Cuba must necessarily fit into the larger U.S. policy of defending the free world against communism while avoiding war. Where certain common interests are shared by the United States and the Soviet Union, we must press for an agreement with the Soviets. In this context, other problems may have priority—such as reconstituting the troika coalition in Laos to prevent a serious collapse that would have dire consequences for Vietnam, Indonesia, and others; the urgent need for concluding a nuclear test ban in Geneva; and preventing the military use of outer space. In such a framework Cuba is not the most pressing issue. We are concerned not only with restoring freedom to Cuba but also with maintaining and enlarging freedom in Berlin. A victory on any given front would hardly be worthwhile if the price turned out to be the loss of Berlin, Iran, Vietnam, or some other sector of the global struggle. What we do about Cuba may precipitate reactions elsewhere that could seriously injure our wider interests.

"Nor can we forget the implications of the rift between Moscow and Peiping. At this juncture it would hardly be wise to increase the pressure on Khrushchev and possibly make him look worse than he did when we forced him to pack up his missiles and go home. The prospect of another such defeat might force him, for example, to move into Iran in order to salvage his already shaky position as leader of the world Communist movement.

"As realists, we know there is no automatic virtue in just doing something; consider the Bay of Pigs and the trouble we're having in Vietnam. And we have to take cognizance of the handicaps imposed by our very strength—the restraints on our freedom of action that flow from our giant size in comparison with the Cuban pigmy. Rough action would alienate world opinion. In any case, even our friends in Latin America are opposed to what they call intervention. Certainly, the reaction during the Bay of Pigs misadventure demonstrates that a program of direct action by U.S. forces would be even less palatable than action by the Cuban freedom fighters—and that would be so despite a quick success and moderate casualties on both sides.

"We are committed to getting Soviet troops out of Cuba as fast as possible. Some Sovietologists tell us we can probably do it more quickly by reducing, rather than increasing, the pressure on Khrushchev. Meanwhile, we are isolating Cuba from the rest of the hemisphere and discrediting its revolutionary image among Latin Americans. We are slowly strengthening our OAS allies and reinforcing their ability to maintain internal security. Over the long haul,

we hope to achieve our goals through a successful Alliance for Progress.

"Those who demand a commitment to immediate Cuban liberation are simply ignoring the unacceptable risks that would be involved. After all, we have a commitment to the eventual liberation of Eastern Europe, but those who pledged in campaign speeches to make good on it soon found out that they couldn't fulfill this promise without risking a global war. In 1956, Radio Free Europe and even the official Voice of America were criticized for having encouraged the Hungarians to revolt under the misconception that outside help would be forthcoming.

"The risks of precipitant action cannot be dismissed. To go to the brink and then be forced to retreat rather than accept the dreaded next step, would be disastrous. Even the political opposition which condemns a policy of caution, does not advocate military action in Cuba. Its leaders have been quick to disavow the few who call for blockade and invasion."

Such is the point of view apparently prevailing in Washington, as the conferees reconstructed it. It represents the considerations that seem to trouble the administration as it picks its way across the heavily mined terrain of foreign policy.

Opinion at the conference was predominantly pessimistic that such consideration could get anywhere. As one participant put it: "The United States wants Cuba to be free, but does not want Cuba to become free. We are eager for the result that is sought; but we have no stomach for the actions needed to achieve it." Concededly, there was good reason during the first part of 1962 (before October) for U.S. officials to be apprehensive over the effect on Berlin, Laos, and Vietnam if this country challenged Soviet arms shipments to Cuba. The most significant aspects of the brilliantly executed confrontation in October–November, however, was that it did not trigger Soviet actions in Berlin or in other places where Soviet capability existed.

The lesson of October–November confirms the thesis that action in the Caribbean ripples out to distant shores and sensitive regions. But even more important, it emphasizes dramatically that indecisiveness in the Caribbean can have the most deleterious effects on our alliances, especially NATO and SEATO. Inaction on the Cuban front will only be taken to mean a U.S. unwillingness to run risks in defense of others. If the United States accepts Russian intrusion at its own doorstep, where the Soviet military posture is weakest, how can Europeans expect the United States to risk nuclear devastation to repel a Soviet attack in Europe where Soviet military power is greatest?

Indeed, American resistance to Soviet military penetration in the Caribbean is a prerequisite to restraining the the Soviets from an adventure in West Berlin. Defend our interests close to home, and we reinforce rather than endanger our outposts in more distant places. Blur our purpose and commitment in our own hemisphere, sow confusion between words and deeds about Cuba, and we can only damage American objectives around the world.

CUBA IN CONTEXT: LATIN AMERICA'S FUTURE

Thoughtful observers are by now aware that Cuba is the Western Hemisphere base from which the Communist knife is aimed at the soft underbelly of the hemisphere—Latin America. A long history of economic and political errors has filled Central and South America with internal discontent, thus making it vulnerable to conquest by external forces. How many more Cubas can we sustain?

Time is a vital factor. There are hopeful, prodemocratic forces at work, but they are in a deadly race with the destructive, totalitarian forces. Decisive to the outcome will be the length of time it takes to dislodge not only the Russian troops but communism itself from Cuba. The mere survival of the Castro regime is a factor of great importance. It strengthens the Communists in other Latin American countries and creates an image of Communist invincibility. It encourages the trend toward neutralism, already pronounced in some countries, with increasing numbers of Latin Americans saying, "If the United States is willing to tolerate or coexist with a Communist Cuba, why shouldn't we?" It also encourages an equally dangerous trend toward extreme rightist dictatorship.

The spawning of more neutralist or militarist governments in Latin America, in reaction to the continued existence of the Castro regime in Cuba, can threaten the U.S. objectives of preserving and enlarging freedom. Coexistence, on the one hand, may lead to coalitions which ultimately produce one-party rule, while rightist dictatorship gives the Communists a moral pretext for carrying out their tactics of conspiracy and helps polarize public support in their direction.

History does not operate in smooth unidirectional lines. Developments are the product of a given equilibrium between rival forces. The presence of Castroism, viewed as a temporary phenomenon, has generated some wholesome reactions in Latin America, which should not be dismissed. The delivery of Cuba to Khrushchev as a military base added considerably to the disenchantment of many Latin Americans who had originally considered Castro a genuine patriot fighting foreign economic exploitation. Even before October, Castro had paid some price for his betrayals—ranging from unfulfilled promises to hold elections to the public confession that he had been a Communist all along but had concealed the fact while seeking popular support. But now Soviet domination of Cuba has made it plain that Castroism is not a nationalist liberation movement. Political, labor, and business leaders, editors, intellectuals and students whose hostility to Batista's dictatorship made them sympathetic to Castro, have been disabused. Military officers who might have been tempted to seek a deal with "the wave of the future" have been sobered by the purges and executions that followed Castro's accession to power.

The volatility of the poverty-stricken Latin American masses is another matter. It is difficult to predict the direction in which their pent-up resentments are likely to explode in a period when old institutions are disintegrating and new claimants are demanding power. Army takeovers, like those in Peru and Guatemala, are in the historical Latin American pattern. They are the traditional response when power centers are threatened or when chaos seems imminent. To be sure, in some situations the military play a legitimate role in preventing a minority from seizing power. But U.S. policy must take into account the fact that the Communists often find oppressive rightist regimes more useful than liberal or anti-Communist leftist-governments.

The ultimate success of the Alliance for Progress may hinge on whether Latin America can be persuaded that Castro is not here to stay, and communism will not spread to other Latin republics. Unfortunately, the Communist challenge has not yet convinced a majority of the more conservative Latin Americans to accept the reforms essential to the success of the Alliance. The effect of that challenge has been, rather, to encourage a massive flight of capital from Latin America and to discourage new investment there, thus contributing to further economic deterioration and reducing the Alliance's chances of success.

American policy seems geared to the thesis that we can defeat communism by defeating hunger, poverty and disease in Latin America, and that all we need is time to accomplish the latter. The reality is that the attainment of a higher standard of living does not necessarily preclude communism, as demonstrated by the very case of Cuba, which before Castro was one of the two or three most advanced countries in Latin America. At bottom, we are engaged in a two-front struggle against both communism and poverty, at the same time. If communism remains in control of Cuba indefinitely, it will have proved its permanency in the Western Hemisphere before the reform battle can be won. On the other hand, the mere erasure of communism from Cuba would not, by itself, automatically insure orderly social and economic progress.

U.S. relations with Latin America

These considerations brought the conferees to an examination of American policy vis-a-vis the countries south of the border. Despite the fear of Communist expansion, Latin America still considers U.S. intervention an anathema. The question was whether this factor has not been given undue weight, distorting our relations with Latin America generally. Oversensitivity to the charge of interventionism, based on fear of offending our friends, may now have reached the point where we are alienating support or weakening the hemisphere because of our restraint.

The conference members therefore discussed these questions in the framework of concrete situations. For example:

1. In 1947, the United States and Latin America joined in the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, more popularly known as the Rio Treaty, which established a mutual security system, based on the formulation that an aggressive act against one is an aggressive act against all, to be met by economic, political and military sanctions. At Punta del Este in 1962—before the Russian military base in Cuba was revealed—the United States pressed for strong resolutions, which were adopted by the Organization of American States, specifically applying the Rio Treaty to the Sino-Soviet intrusion into the hemisphere. Why did not the United States rest a forthright policy of eliminating the missile bases in Cuba on those OAS resolutions? Can the United States entertain the idea of deals with Khrushchev and/or Castro, involving coexistence with a sovietized Cuba or even a Titoist Cuba, without repudiating the Rio and Punta del Este positions and in effect the whole inter-American system?

2. Since December 1962, according to reliable reports, President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela has wanted to go before the OAS to document the story of Castro-supported sabotage and terror against his country. The immediate objective would be to induce the five OAS members that still maintain relations with Cuba—Mexico, Brazil, Uruguay, Chile, and Bolivia—to end their ties. It is reported that the United States has been stalling off the Venezuelan action. If the reports are not true, the question remains whether the United States has been using its full influence to persuade the five to break relations. The issue is a practical one. If the five states permit Cuban embassies to operate in their countries, the subversion will spread throughout Latin America under the shelter of diplomatic immunity, and subversives trained in Cuba and the Soviet bloc will be free to undermine other nations.

The fear of escalation

Undoubtedly, much of American policy is based on genuine fears—not only the fear of consequences in other areas of the cold war,

or of the reactions in Latin American countries, but also the fear that decisive action might escalate into a global, nuclear war. This is not an irrational fear, and it cannot lightly be dismissed. But it is precisely because we are living in a world of risks that leadership is necessary. Whoever would give guidance to others must be capable of assessing the risks, and then of acting. In a riskless world there would be no need for leadership.

In his speech of October 22, 1962, President Kennedy said that the greater risk lay in not acting. He concluded that strong action involved the lesser risk.

Whatever happens, the same task will remain: To follow the line of the lesser, more manageable risk. In evaluating the hazards of weak versus strong action, the Freedom House conferees cited the following questions as most relevant:

1. To what extent will the risk of nuclear war increase with the passage of time, in view of the relative increase of Soviet nuclear capabilities?

2. What will be the effect of American vacillation in Cuba on other sensitive fronts of the cold war?

3. What will be the worldwide psychological impact of continued taunting propaganda by Castro and the Soviets?

4. What are the probabilities that the Cuban Communist base will be used against us in the future under unpredictably changed circumstances?

5. What will be the probable effectiveness of the Cuban Communist base in undermining other Latin American governments, with a consequent spread of communism in the hemisphere?

The net effect of examining such factors is to suggest that a simple policy of risk avoidance can lead only to the certainty of a worsening position for the United States. Indeed, it is more likely that an improvement of our position will occur only from a process of intelligent risk taking.

This was demonstrated in the October confrontation. The administration took manageable risks rather than accept the certainty that the nuclear balance would swing in Russia's direction and that Khrushchev's capabilities for blackmail and attack would be increased by the presence of Soviet missiles in Cuba. Unfortunately, while it was clearly willing to take risks in order to obtain a Soviet pledge of an inspected withdrawal of the missiles, there was no willingness to take the risk of a followthrough. Is there any practical value in running risks to gain a pledge, and running no risks to enforce it?

The fear of escalation, while it might logically deter certain types of all-out action, has distorted the judgment of our decisionmakers on more limited action and narrower sectors of strategy and tactics.

U.S. policy on exile activity

The conferees were especially troubled by the deterioration in the relations between the U.S. Government and the Cuban exiles, whose principal concern is to find ways and means of liberating their country. Does this development foreshadow an ultimate conflict between the freedom fighters' objective of liberation and an American policy of containment? This disturbing question underlays the discussion of American policy toward the Cuban exiles.

Arguing that there has been no consistency of purpose or action in our Government's relations with Cuban activists in exile, conferees cited these specific items:

We can understand the legal and technical reasons for withholding the use of U.S. territory as a base for launching raids against Cuba and against Soviet shipping bound for Havana. But why was it considered necessary to deprecate as "irresponsible, ineffective and dangerous" the raids and supplying missions that originated outside the United States? Is that not inconsistent with our official position that the Cubans themselves must get rid of the Castro dictatorship? Does it mean that the administration disapproves of the rebel action in the mountains and their use of sabotage against Castro? If we favor such action, can we expect the Cubans to proceed without our help and in the face of our public condemnation? In any case, what are anti-Castro Cubans in exile or inside Cuba to conclude?

Miro Cardona and his council had urged Cuban exiles to enlist in the U.S. Army for training. Thousands of young Cuban exiles, including many of the Bay of Pigs veterans, did so. Why? What official representations led them to believe that joining the U.S. Army would offer them the best way of fighting for a free Cuba?

Reports of Central Intelligence Agency collaboration with the exiles seem to suggest a conflict of policies and activities within the administration. Has CIA at times followed an independent line in conflict with that of the State Department?

Attorney General Robert Kennedy appealed to the Cuban exiles to unite in one organization with which the U.S. Government could consult. Does this mean that the administration disapproves of CIA's experiment in favoring certain Cuban factions which has merely increased the disunity? Does the Attorney General's statement look toward the recognition of a government in exile?

The answers to these questions are uncertain, but they sustain the impression that American policy toward the Cuban exiles has lacked consistency and has not contributed toward their unity essential for the fight against Castro.

POLICY ON POST-CASTRO CUBA

American policy should not limit itself to the overthrow of Castro. The attitude of the United States toward the long-range future of Cuba is itself a major strategic element in the right to end the Communist regime.

Discussion among the conferees revealed that little is known about the administration's orientation on this question. To be sure, it would be tactically unwise for the United States to appear to take any action imposing or supporting a specific type of regime. The very concept of democracy held by the United States prohibits such a course of action. Moreover, as a practical matter, any candidate selected by the United States to succeed Castro would be rejected by Cuban public opinion long before he reached Havana.

Nevertheless, intelligent policy, used as a guide for action, must have some orientation on the possible alternatives that will be available, or probable, when Castro is driven from the scene. These possibilities, which American policy must take into account, include:

1. A Titoist Communist state in Cuba: There are indications that this result might be acceptable in certain American quarters. There appear to be some who even believe that a modus vivendi could be worked out with a Communist Castro if, like the early Tito, he breaks all ties with the Soviet Union and ceases to be a tool of its foreign and military policy.

2. A democratic Socialist state: This would be a regime in the tradition of the Western Socialist parties which are anti-Communist but seek to resolve economic problems on the basis of government planning and controls. Pressure for such a form of government might grow inside Cuba after Castro is overthrown, the objective of the people being to retain certain welfare programs and socialized industries rather than restore a free enterprise economy.

3. A liberal democracy: Another choice might be a social, economic, and political system resembling that of Western democracies in its fundamentals, but adapted to Cuban conditions.

It is conceivable that Cuban exiles in the United States could reconcile their differences and join with the resistance forces inside Cuba to form a provisional government. Much would depend upon the composition of the forces which topple Castro.

American policy, of course, must not seek to impose any regime on Cuba as a substitute for the present one. The danger is that its actions in relation to the exiles in the United States will be interpreted as favoring or opposing one or more of the alternatives, when in fact no formal decision has been reached. The effect might then be to produce exactly the opposite of the one we might ultimately find preferable.

THE SOVIET PRESENCE IN CUBA

Despite the political retreat by Khrushchev during the October–November crisis, there is no reason to believe that the Russian dictator has abandoned his hopes of maintaining a Soviet base only 90 miles from U.S. shores, That "fortress Cuba" is a military threat in the Western Hemisphere is beyond question: It is operating as the training ground for guerilla warfare against Latin American Republics and as a center for the spread of subversion, terror, and sabotage.

The latest Soviet aim in Cuba is to use the island as a base for medium-range missiles which could completely circumvent U.S warning systems and keep a large part of the hemisphere and the United States under the constant threat of nuclear attack. (This subject has most recently been treated in the "Summary of Major Findings" on the Soviet buildup in Cuba by the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, May 9, 1963.) In the absence of verified and precise knowledge of the conditions inside Cuba, American policy must be predicated on the assumption that the danger is real and will persist.

Other Soviet aims in Cuba have been achieved:

1. Castro has been supplied with the latest weapons to fend off an invasion from without or an uprising of the people from within. What still remains is for the Russian experts to train Cuban Communists in handling these weapons. According to some military opinion, this will take 4 to 6 years. The Castro regime argues that it has the right, as a sovereign power, to invite military assistance from a foreign country.

2. Cuba has been converted into a Communist West Point for the training of officers intended to lead military attacks on existing regimes. The island will eventually be the arsenal of Latin American revolutions, from which swift military support can be given to the creation of "new Cubas."

3. With its 150 operational jet fighter-bombers, which have a substantial range, Cuba is in a position to control the air over a number of small, nearby countries. (It is reported that some policy makers in Washington find comfort in the fact that all this lethal equipment is under the control of Soviet officers rather than the hard-core Castro Communists who incline toward the more reckless views of the Chinese.)

American policy at the present time is focused, however, on the issue of the missile buildup in Cuba. There is little confidence that Khrushchev has actually carried out his pledge of last October–November. Russian credibility was completely destroyed by the fact that the prelude to the crisis was a direct face-to-face lie by Foreign Secretary Andrei Gromyko to President Kennedy on the very subject of missiles in Cuba. In the absence of on-site inspection, there can be no certainty that all the missiles and nuclear warheads have been removed. Some could have been installed in caves from which they can be fired with perhaps as great precision as missiles from an underwater Polaris. Moreover, the Soviet troops and technical advisers, even if we accept the lowest estimate

of their numbers, can accomplish significant secret preparations, partly protected by darkness, cloud formations, and other similar impediments to aerial surveillance. After the Kremlin took such large risks to execute the buildup, one does not have to be of a suspicious nature to wonder what 12,500 to 30,000 Russian military personnel would be doing in Cuba.

Continuance of the status quo—the uncertainty about the missiles and the absolute certainty of the Soviet Army presence—obviously has strong implications about our global position and could lead to even more serious consequences than we have already suffered. Both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have categorically declared that a Communist base in this hemisphere would never be tolerated. The fact that a Soviet base is now being tolerated can lead the enemy to the kind of miscalculation that might be disastrous. A misreading of our equivocation could induce probing adventures elsewhere. Also, our acceptance of the situation could be taken as some justification for the Chinese view that strong-arm methods do work in dealing with the "degenerate democracies."

But most serious of all, the continued presence of Soviet military forces in Cuba could provide the very spark that ignites a nuclear war. The United States has warned that it will not stand by and allow Soviet forces to quell an uprising in Cuba as they did in Hungary. Any incident—a barroom brawl with Soviet soldiers in Havana, a flareup of tempers over a child run down by a Soviet jeep—could lead to Russian shooting, even in self-defense. As long as Russian troops are in Cuba, peace is endangered by the possibility of an accident. Emotions in this country might well make it impossible for any administration to control the consequences, which could escalate into nuclear war.

Precisely because the situation endangers peace, and because it threatens Khrushchev's policy of coexistence, there is some leverage in persuading the Russians to withdraw. But this can be done only if the United States persists in applying pressure.

A CONSENSUS FOR ACTION

Readers of this report are aware of the diversity of views that were brought to the conference table at Gould House. Early in the proceedings, a formal opinion survey had made the conferees conscious of their differences, the significance of which was explored thoroughly in the ensuing sessions. Ultimately, however, the incisive, and often pointed debate revealed an extraordinary amount of agreement on fundamentals. (A listing of alternatives will be found in appendix I at the end of this report.)

It should be underscored that the following effort to state a consensus is not intended to suggest unanimity on all its components. The task of formulating crucial policy is never really completed, and those who contribute to it render their greatest service by expressing dissents, probing for weaknesses and asserting their own personal insights.

The lack of public information

It was recognized that the implementation of policy may sometimes call for a withholding of information when publication might automatically defeat the objective. But the conferees felt that the effect of current practice was to hinder the formation of American public opinion rather than obstruct the enemy. Many participants indicated their belief that some kind of negotiations were being conducted off-the-record in the effort to balance the interests of one sector of Western defense against the interests of another.

It was acknowledged that the President alone was in possession of the fullest body of information, while others who seek proposed courses of action must do so with less than complete knowledge. In a free society the concerned citizen has no other alternative but to proceed on the basis of the limited information available.

At the same time, it is a legitimate and essential demand on the part of the citizen that his Government clearly expound its policies and thus expose them to the wholesome influence of public debate. Such an exposition, to be constructive, must be conducted in an atmosphere of bipartisanship which has been missing from recent discussions in which both parties have been seeking political advantage. A bipartisan approach, of course, cannot be invoked merely for the convenience of the party in power, any more than the difficulties created by our adversaries abroad may be properly used as ammunition in political campaigns. Nor should national debate be suspended by bipartisanship, the function of which is to nourish discussion by providing conditions favorable to intelligent appraisal. Certainly no political party has a right to utilize a period of great national anxiety and difficulty to further narrow party purposes.

Every American who ventures to suggest a policy on Cuba must recognize that there is an enormous difference between presenting the most intelligent critique of policy and actually carrying the awesome responsibility for the consequences. The effect of such awareness should be to temper forms of expression but it should not reduce the personal responsibility of the citizen to seek and advocate solutions for our national problem.

Definition of the American commitment

Both political parties seem to be united on the objective—freedom for Cuba. To carry out appropriate measures will call for a national unity such as prevailed in the October crisis. But we must be prepared for the fact that future measures will have to be more numerous, more involved, perhaps more onerous and surely less dramatic, requiring a longer period of application than the quarantine during the fall of 1962. Bipartisan consultations are needed now to reach a broad, long-range understanding.

This is possible, however, only if the administration recognizes that it is responsible for providing leadership in a national discussion of the Cuban problem. It must supply the needed facts and it must clearly articulate the country's objectives.

No responsible American doubts the desire of the administration to see Cuba ultimately free and meanwhile to prevent Castro from spreading Communist dictatorship to other parts of the hemisphere. It can certainly be assumed that Washington is committed to eliminating the Soviet political and military base from Cuba eventually and to blocking Sino-Soviet ambitions in Latin America. What is needed is a commitment to urgent and immediate action, unambiguously expressed to the Nation and the world. It is imperative that our people, our allies, and especially our enemies, clearly understand that this Government intends to use all its power to achieve the objective.

All must know that we not only want to free Cuba but we are determined to help it become free—without undue delays. Any doubts on this score must be dispelled—for example, by publication of the correspondence between Khrushchev and the President during and following the October confrontation. So long as the record is withheld, there will be rumors and apprehensions, at home and abroad, about our Cuban commitment. There must be no gap between word and deed.

Providing leadership

Because the Cuban issue deserves high priority and as an evidence of the intention to act decisively, the administration must assign top national leadership to concentrate on this area of national concern. The appointment of an outstanding personality to a Federal post on Cuban or Latin American affairs will symbolize the importance we assign to the problem and should help to improve our performance. Arrangements should be made to call together Department of State personnel, both incumbent and retired, who know the problems and can communicate effectively with our OAS allies to win support for U.S. policies and actions.

The Alliance for Progress

Thoughtful Americans support the Alliance for Progress. Experience demonstrates that the Communists cannot be defeated in their drive for world domination by purely defensive action or negative opposition. The justification of the free world lies in its promise of a better life to the individual. For millions of hungry, illiterate people, living in mud huts and doomed to early death, freedom means, above all, a chance to work and live in dignity. Their yearning for escape from hardship makes them an easy prey for the demagog who holds out glittering prospects under communism.

Every effort must be made, through the Alliance for Progress, to raise the living standards of Central and South America. But the program will succeed only if the people can see and feel the advances. Unfortunately, so long as communism can use Cuba as a base for subversion, economic progress will be sabotaged by the Communists, on the one hand, or strangled by rightists who use the threat of communism to oppose essential reforms. Awareness of these obstacles should lead us to increase, not diminish, our zeal for strengthening the economies of our neighbors to the south. We must be prepared for an uphill struggle against reaction, corruption and communism—all foes of an effective Alliance for Progress.

But there may be an even more serious danger to the Alliance for Progress—our own illusion that it can succeed by itself. The Communists can destroy faster than others can build. The Alliance for Progress must therefore not be considered as a substitute for direct, militant opposition to communism. It is but one of the weapons that must be brought into action. The Marshall plan did not really take hold until NATO provided a shield against the military threat of communism. So too the Alliance for Progress needs an alliance for freedom as a shield against Communist violence and sabotage.

The achievement of progress in Latin America will require the development of local leaders, dedicated to freedom and capable of standing as "a wall of dedicated men" against the inroads of totalitarian tyranny. Theirs will be the task of combating the agents now being trained in Cuba and Russia. Even after the liberation of Cuba, Latin America will be confronted by a formidable disruptive force because of those who have already been taught Communist subversion and guerrilla warfare in Castro's and Khrushchev's schools of revolution. They will be defeated only if the free world is defended by trained men who possess the skills of democratic leadership.

The activities of the Alliance for Progress—such as the labor institutes now underway—must be enlarged. The OAS should be encouraged to set up additional training centers in democratic countries like Costa Rica and Venezuela, with U.S.-supported facilities and teachers. We must fight communism with trained minds as well as good hearts.

This need grows all the more urgent because Communist attacks on the weak spots in Latin America increase the danger of a resort to military dictatorships like the Peralta junta in Guatemala. Such a trend would multiply our difficulties and jeopardize the cause of freedom. We cannot afford to be caught in the crossfire of a battle

between the extremists. To escape such a dilemma, we must take timely action in buttressing a system of inter-American democracy. Our need is for knowledgeable leadership in all our embassies and agencies in the field as well as at the top. Only by putting our best men in strategic posts can we hope to handle the explosive situations if and when they occur.

Aid to the Cuban exiles

Cuba's proudest hope is the resistance of its patriots to Communist domination. No act of the American Government should downgrade their courage; every pronouncement should aim to uplift the morale of freedom-loving Cubans everywhere.

We have a considerable responsibility for helping the exiles to achieve unity in their own ranks. We injure such unity if we play favorites among factions. We must encourage all groups to select responsible leaders with whom the U.S. Government can cooperate for the common cause. Through every possible channel, we must assist the organized underground inside Cuba, bringing to bear our extensive resources and experience.

Exile and underground activity has many values. Not the least is the fact that it warns the Soviet interventionists that seizure of other men's countries will bring inevitable retaliatory action. If Communists can promote phony wars of liberation, we can and should support real ones.

The presence of Cuban refugees in the United States, now numbering about 250,000, presents us with a rare opportunity. These men and women are the only major groups of exiles since World War II who have any reasonable prospect of an early return to a liberated homeland.

Cuba's problems will not end with the overthrow of the Communists. If those problems are solved by a future democratic regime, a powerful blow will have been struck for liberation everywhere behind the Iron Curtain. Thus, we contribute to the oppressed people in Cuba and all the satellites when we provide special study opportunities to the refugees now within our shores. By training them in the fields of democratic government, public administration, industrial and agricultural management, defense, public safety and order, public education, we can lay the foundations for a wholesome future.

THE TAKING OF RISKS

Underlying the discussion of policy and action was the question: What risks are Americans willing to take in response to Communist expansionism and which policy is likely to minimize the risks?

We are most in danger of Communist attack, whether from Peking or Moscow, when our indecision suggests fear, weakness, or ineptness. We are safest when our adversary realizes that we are clear about our objectives and determined in pursuing them.

Timing is, of course, a crucial factor in assessing risk. The Freedom House conferees tended to the view that the risks later will be more formidable than the risks now. Even on the assumption that time is inevitably on our side, which we do not accept, one cannot be sanguine about a sovietized Cuba that brings a large portion of the United States and Western Hemisphere within easy range of Communist missiles and nuclear warheads.

The conference was aware that the major premise of present policy is the assumption that action on Cuba must be delayed because of risks to our position elsewhere in the world. But the conferees were impressed by the fact that the U.S. position in October, far from provoking Communist adventures, forced the Soviet leaders to act with greater caution everywhere. In the context of the Sino-Soviet dispute, American toughness justifies Khrushchev's position of restraint, while any evidence that the United States is a "paper tiger" would strengthen Mao's call for aggression.

In any case, if choices must be made as to where we should take bold stands, Cuba is the most logical place. The Soviet Union has overextended itself geographically by reaching into the Caribbean. Of all the fronts on which we face each other, Cuba is militarily Russia's weakest, and our strongest. The only Russian chance for success in such a contest would be to convert the local conflict into a general war—clearly too fearful a price for so small a prize. Moreover, military opinion considers the risk of general war in the near future relatively small because the Kremlin knows that it could not win. The record already shows that the Soviets have almost always backed away from action that might lead to general war when the United States has taken a firm stand, as in Cuba last October and in Berlin since Khrushchev issued his original ultimatum in November 1958.

The risks of inaction, however, must be spelled out also in terms of the impact on the non-Communist world. There is the risk—indeed, almost a certainty—that inaction will encourage neutralism. If the United States can accommodate itself to the indefinite perpetuation of a Communist regime in Cuba, why should not the rest of Latin America? And the consequence will be a steady seepage of communism into the other islands of the Caribbean and the other Latin countries of the hemisphere. At the same time, in Europe and Asia, countries contiguous with the Iron Curtain will have every reason to ask: If the United States dare not uproot communism from its own doorstep, how can we expect it to risk anything on our behalf?

The freeing of Cuba, not ultimately but soon, must be the aim of U.S. policy implemented by a practical program of action.

CONCLUSION: THE PEOPLE AND THE PRESIDENT

The men and women who assembled at the invitation of Freedom House were sympathetic to the heavy burden carried by the President of the United States and his advisers. Theirs is a fearsome responsibility in these days of civilization's great dilemma.

As we were meeting, Haiti became a close second in the Caribbean developments of deep concern to the United States. Southeast Asia is engaging our attention and costing American lives. Berlin is always in the wings. The complexity of these interrelated problems must not be minimized by those who seek to be helpful in the finding of solutions. Our chosen leaders should be able to count on the cooperation of all Americans in the effort to solve the gigantic problems confronting the Nation and the world. And they have a duty to do all in their power to create a spirit of national unity that will prepare us for the crises ahead.

Both the cooperation and the national unity can be achieved only if the people have access to relevant information, study every suggested solution, and develop a consensus for action. Our leaders must keep us informed of the facts and their plans for the future; we must keep our leaders informed of the people's judgment and willingness to sacrifice.

This is the discourse of democracy. Only through such an interchange between the people and their Government can America find the way toward freedom and peace in the difficult days ahead.

APPENDIX I: A PANORAMA OF ALTERNATIVES

From the vantage point of their own contact with the problems of Latin America and the cold war, the conferees attempted to formulate their personal conclusions within the framework of these parameters:

1. Questions of high policy: (a) What do we regard as indispensable? (b) What is intolerable?

2. What costs and risks are acceptable in achieving our objectives?

3. How much action, and what kind, is needed and feasible on the part of (a) the United States; (b) Cuban exiles; (c) the underground in Cuba; (d) the Organization of American States; (e) NATO?

4. What mix of measures would be most effective, including (a) refugee training for service in a liberated Cuba; (b) propaganda and psychological warfare; (c) economic isolation of Cuba; (d) support of sabotage and rebel forces; (e) aid to insurrection; (f) para-military and military actions?

Freedom House commends this formulation to other discussion groups as a helpful tool in studying one of our most urgent problems. Its use in the sessions of this conference proved profitable in laying out at least a partial list of alternative policies and action points. They are listed here, not as points advocated by the conference or even by the individuals who presented them but as evidences of the fact that a frank facing of our position reveals many directions—of varying merit, to be sure—in which we can go. Many of the proposals are contradictory in some respects or even mutually exclusive. They nevertheless help to illuminate the areas in which decisions must be made consciously rather than by default.

TOP-LEVEL DECISIONS

1. Insist as a basic premise that Castro-communism must go or be defeated.

2. Seek to coexist with a Communist Cuba headed by Castro or some other ruler.

HEMISPHERIC POLICY

1. Reassert the Monroe Doctrine, or a modernized version.

2. Announce U.S. support for all dedicated democrats who fight for freedom against dictatorship anywhere in the hemisphere.

3. Proclaim a hemispherewide right of self-determination, accepting any democratic decision on the form of government and social system so long as "human rights and fundamental freedoms" are observed.

4. Help to organize a Latin American Treaty Organization (LATO) outside the OAS, which would welcome all nondictatorial states willing to ally themselves for purposes of military defense after the pattern of NATO. (It is assumed that several of the larger Latin American States would be reluctant to join, and that dictatorships like Haiti, Paraguay, etc., would be barred.)

5. Rally nongovernmental organizations throughout the hemisphere, including business groups and labor unions, for freedom and social justice.

6. Declare that the United States oppose Communist penetration but not revolutionary social change in Latin America.

DIRECT PRESSURE ON CUBA

1. Assert a policy of collective measures against Cuba based on a rigorous implementation of the Rio Treaty, the Bogotá Pact, and the Punta del Este resolutions.

2. Repeal or amend the U.S. Neutrality Acts.

3. Organize a tight OAS embargo against trade, communications, and travel between member states and Cuba; any states rejecting participation to forfeit U.S. aid.

4. In cooperation with Venezuela, exert effective pressure on the five OAS members still maintaining diplomatic relations with Cuba to sever their ties.

5. Withdraw U.S. recognition of the Castro government.

6. Propose an OAS study of the steps deemed necessary to achieve the objective of a free Cuba.

7. Impose comprehensive sanctions on shipping to include all vessels of any line that uses as much as one of its ships in the Cuban trade.

8. Use preemptive buying to tighten the noose on Castro's economy.

9. Press OAS to impose the same quarantine on Communist Cuba as it did on Trujillo's Dominican Republic.

10. Citizen groups in this country should cooperate with free Cuba committees in our sister republics.

11. Press NATO countries to curtail the sale of any goods to the Iron Curtain countries of the type being supplied to Cuba by the Communists.

12. Quarantine Cuba against receiving any weapons, whether called offensive or defensive.

13. Quarantine all shipments of petroleum to Cuba.

14. Promote the organization of an OAS task force and prepare an OAS invasion force to be used as a last resort.

AID TO ANTI-CASTRO CUBANS

1. Arm and assist Cuban freedom fighters inside and outside of Cuba; encourage sabotage and raids.

2. Help establish bases for Cuban rebels outside U.S. territory.

3. Publicize the extent and character of current Cuban resistance.

4. Launch a major propaganda effort through all media, calling for public support of a Radio Free Cuba.

5. In cooperation with Cuban exiles, start OAS work on "winning the peace" in a free Cuba.

6. Help to organize a Cuban government-in-exile.

POST-CASTRO CUBA

1. Create OAS machinery for governing liberated countries and conducting elections under preplanned rules, to be available for action in Cuba, Haiti, and elsewhere.

2. Provide opportunities for qualified Cuban refugees to receive advanced training in their fields and to conduct studies on problems they will face in a liberated Cuba.

3. Prepare plans for the political, social, and economic future of a free Cuba.

4. Declare that Cubans must and will choose their own form of government.

REMOVING THE RUSSIANS

1. Announce that the removal of Soviet troops from Cuba has first priority in America's agenda.

2. Adopt a formal decision that Soviet troops and technicians must be repatriated within a stated time or face measures of expulsion.

3. Impose an OAS quarantine or blockade if necessary to expel Soviet forces or bring down the Cuban Communist regime—any states rejecting participation to forfeit U.S. aid.

4. Establish OAS teams to inspect all ships bound for Cuba.

APPENDIX II: OPINION SURVEY ON CUBAN POLICY

The following questions were formulated by a subcommittee in the light of the first day's discussion. Participants were requested to indicate their views by choosing among four possible replies: (1) Yes; (2) Qualified yes; (3) No; (4) Qualified no. The qualified replies were intended to indicate the respondent's degree of conviction about his views. During the poll, 25 participants were present.

Tabulation of responses

Questions	Yes	Qualified yes	No	Qualified no	Abstention
1. Has Washington reached an agreement with the U.S.S.R. on Cuba?	0	7	9	2	7
2. Is Washington interested in reaching an agreement with the U.S.S.R. on Cuba?	17	5	0	0	3
3. Is Washington fully committed on a policy to bring down Castro in practical terms?	3	5	11	3	3
4. Does the administration believe that Russian troops will leave Cuba?	5	7	8	1	4
5. Has Washington reached a decision not to act except as it is presently acting?	6	6	9	2	2
6. Does Washington wish an exile Cuban Government?	1	1	20	2	1
7. Does Washington hope to pry Castro loose from the U.S.S.R.?	9	8	3	3	2
8. Does Washington have a plan on Cuba?	1	5	13	4	2
9. Does the administration think it runs a serious risk of losing the 1964 election if Castro remains?	4	2	13	2	4
10. Can Castro's regime be toppled—					
(a) Without U.S. military action?	10	11	3	0	1
(b) Without an invasion by the United States?	21	1	0	0	3
11. Do President Betancourt of Venezuela, former President Figueres of Costa Rica, and others want sterner U.S. action than presently exists?	19	2	0	1	3
12. Would Brazil and Mexico be ready to support such action?	4	13	2	1	5
13. Can Castro-Communist subversion in Latin America be contained without action larger than presently exists?	2	2	19	1	1
14. Is it U.S. policy to oppose widespread and organized internal sabotage against Castro?	0	7	12	2	4
15. Is the United States opposing oil refinery sabotage because former and future U.S. properties are involved?	0	1	11	4	9
16. Were the hit-and-run raids contributing to creating difficulties for Castro?	20	2	1	0	2
17. Did raids not based on U.S. soil endanger the peace?	1	2	18	1	3
18. Does the administration count on or believe it can isolate Cuba?	10	9	0	2	4
19. Does the administration believe that continued economic pressure will topple Castro?	4	6	9	4	2
20. Is Washington's concern with nuclear raids—					
(a) A significant cause of inaction?	5	8	5	2	5
(b) Or is it a rationalization to support its present policy?	8	7	2	2	6
21. Does the U.S. Government have a policy of liberation of Cuba?	4	6	8	4	3

Apart from Cuba, how many in this room are friendly to the administration; or opposed to the administration?

Friendly	14
Opposed	7
Abstention	4

FOREIGN AID AND THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as the foreign aid program for next year is now being presented to the appropriate committees in the Senate and the House, the question of support for the foreign aid program by the American public once again is being raised. Once again a good deal of mythology is being spawned about the unpopularity of the foreign aid program with the American public. And it is being circulated without any prior examination of the facts, the facts about the American public's true views on the program.

In essence, unlike much of the conventional wisdom that has been peddled about the alleged unpopularity of the foreign aid program, there is clear evidence to indicate that foreign aid is now more popular than ever with the American people. In fact, a recent Gallup poll indicated that popular support of the foreign aid program is at a high point for the entire 9-year period. However, the poll also indicated that the American public is also gravely misinformed about the facts of foreign aid. These facts relate to such basic matters as percentage of gross national product devoted to foreign aid, percentage of the Federal budget, and actual amounts. It is most important that supporters of foreign aid do a far better job in bringing these facts to the American people.

In a recent speech before the National Conference on International Economic and Social Development, I have attempted to evaluate some of the salient factors about the American public's stand on foreign aid. I ask that the text of this speech be inserted into the RECORD.

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

FOREIGN AID AND THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

(Speech delivered by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY before the National Conference on International Economic and Social Development, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., May 29, 1963)

Discussion about the foreign aid program this past 2 months has invariably centered around the Clay report. Some of this discussion has been illuminating and helpful; much has been confused and harmful.

One of the most misguided arguments raised in the discussion of the Clay report is that which contends that since the foreign aid program is more unpopular today than ever before, a critical report will only tend to increase the unpopularity of foreign aid among the American public. This argument is based on a fundamentally unsound premise—that foreign aid is unpopular with the American people. On the question of the popularity of foreign aid, I should like to call attention to a recent Gallup poll released which indicated that, contrary to a widespread mythology, foreign aid is more popular with the American public today than ever before.

A study of a whole sequence of findings of the Gallup polls from 1955 to 1963 shows that:

Popular support of the foreign aid program is at a high point for the entire 9-year period.

Today 58 percent of the American people record themselves as approving foreign aid, 30 percent oppose, and 12 percent are neither for nor against it.

There is no great variation between the different sections of the country: in the South 55 percent approve; East, 60 percent; Midwest, 58 percent; Far West, 59 percent.

In recent years, despite the appropriation of about $4 billion annually, popular support has not, as widely believed, been declining; voter approval has been going up and voter opposition has been going down.

Despite this evidence of increasing public acceptance of and support for the foreign aid program, the myth is still widely circulated that foreign aid is more unpopular today than ever before.

Indeed, this line appears to have become the "conventional wisdom" for journalists

writing on the problem of foreign aid. If the evidence cited from these Gallup polls is reliable, the American public may well be ahead of the Congress in its acceptance of the value of the foreign aid program.

But if the American public is disposed to accept the foreign aid program, it is also clear that the public is very badly informed about it. The same Gallup poll revealed that most Americans believe that our foreign aid appropriation is much higher than $4 billion, is a much larger percentage of the American gross national product than the actual 1 percent. Forty percent of the people polled think that foreign aid appropriations represent over 10 percent of the national budget rather than the actual 5 percent. More than 80 percent of the people did not know the approximate amount appropriated for foreign aid.

What is more important than this ignorance about the statistics of the foreign aid program is a widespread unawareness of what actually has been accomplished by the program—of the thousands of people that have been fed by the Food for Peace program, of the people who have received decent housing and health facilities, of the people who have seen new schools built and teachers trained to educate their children. There is a lack of awareness or the accomplishments of the foreign aid program in creating more viable economies by building dams, roads, and industries; by modernizing agricultural systems and aiding in the training of the public administrators and technicians needed to run a modern government and a modern economy.

Samplings of American public opinion have indicated clearly that support for the foreign aid program increases in direct proportion to knowledge of the foreign aid program. Among those well informed on foreign aid, support for the program was 40 percent higher than among the uninformed. There is therefore a great opportunity and a great responsibility for a group like this to take the lead in informing the American public on the true record of the foreign aid program. A public that is not only receptive to foreign aid by well-informed on it will actively support those members of the Congress who take the lead in assuring adequate appropriations for foreign aid.

In telling the story about foreign aid to the American public, you can draw upon a record of proven success. We have had four foreign aid programs that have achieved unquestionable success. The first was the most successful of all—the Marshall plan. Americans know something about its success—and cannot resist the temptation to judge all later aid programs by the standard of success achieved by the Marshall plan. They fail to remember that this program aided the reconstruction of the war-ravaged economies of highly developed, highly skilled European nations which are radically different from underdeveloped countries of the southern half of the world.

The second success in the field of foreign aid was the point four program which sent trained American technicians to all parts of the world. On two trips to Latin America during the past 2 years most of the people I spoke to referred to American foreign aid as "point four." Point four was the program they remembered.

The third success in the field of foreign aid has been the food-for-peace program. Through this program, millions of persons, both children and adults, have been able to share in America's agricultural miracle. This success continues as the program expands. Today U.S. food is reaching an average of 92 million people a day in more than 100 countries throughout the world.

A fourth success in foreign aid should be mentioned—even though it is only slightly more than a year old. I refer, of course, to the Peace Corps—by any standard a smashing success.

There are at least three striking characteristics which should be noted about the last of these three successful programs (point four, food for peace and the Peace Corps). All three of these involve the outlay of comparatively small amounts of American dollars. All three have an immediate impact upon the recipient country. All three benefit the common people, rather than the elite group. Because they benefit the common people, they have been gratefully received.

Although the record is mixed when we come to the area of long-range economic aid, there have been some notable successes here also. In Greece, Israel, and Taiwan, United States assistance has helped build strong economies that will soon be able to stand on their own. In India and Pakistan, American aid has contributed much to building economies which, despite almost insuperable obstacles, are flourishing, which provide the economic basis for the preservation of democracy on the Asian mainland. Here too is a record of solid success which the American people should know about.

One final program, which is undoubtedly the most important American effort in the foreign aid field today, is also beginning to show signs of success. I refer to the Alliance for Progress program for Latin America. It is not only the most important program as far as American foreign policy is concerned but it is also the program of greatest interest to the American public, the program which has more latent or active support from the public than any other foreign aid program in which the United States is involved. I say that, despite tremendous obstacles and temporary failures, there are indications that some successes are being recorded in Latin America.

I learned something about the progress being made on a trip last fall to the Caribbean area. I visited Venezuela, Panama, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, and Mexico. I visited gleaming new health centers and was impressed by the simple drugs on hand. I saw hundreds of clean new houses, some of them priced to sell for less than $1,000 with monthly payments of less than $10. The Alianza has moved further in housing than in perhaps any other field; it is beginning to make a dent—but only a dent—in the appalling slums which fester in almost every Latin American city and in much of the countryside. I likewise saw dozens of new schools, many of them built with the donated labor of local residents using materials furnished by the national government and the Alianza. And I learned of an exciting new program which is making simple paperback textbooks available to all elementary schoolchildren at a cost of between 10 and 15 cents per book.

I visited land resettlement and rural housing projects, indicating that agrarian reform is becoming a reality. The cooperative movement both on the farm and in the cities is spreading. I saw foreign private companies flourishing in Venezuela and Mexico. The administrative competence of many governments has improved.

I was favorably impressed with improvements in the work of the U.S. Information Agency; its activities seem to have a better sense of proportion and of priority. Progress has been made in Latin American universities in combating Communist student activity; more effort is still needed in this field. The Voice of America is better, but not yet as good as it ought to be, especially as regards its signal strength. Service to local broadcasters has been effectively strengthened.

This is but a brief summary of some of the progress being made in Latin America today. I have spelled out my own views at length on the progress and problems of the Alliance in a report issued in March to the Senate Appropriations and Foreign Relations Committees, and therefore will not expand my views here.

I do not wish to ignore the difficulties we face in Latin America. The problems confronting the Alliance are staggering—and will not be solved in a few years. There will continue to be bad news from Latin America. But I would hope that the American public will hear the good news about Latin America as well as the bad. In the past, the headlines have regularly informed us of all the bad news. The good news, when it has been reported at all, is found on the bottom of page 28. This situation has improved some in the past year, but if the American public is to be fully informed on the successes of the Alliance program, it will require a great deal of hard work by people like yourselves.

I am convinced that the American public has a special interest in the welfare of neighbors in this hemisphere. If they are convinced that our support of the Alliance program is achieving good results, they will continue to make the sacrifices needed to support this program. Quite candidly, it is not easy for a Member of Congress to support the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars in southeast Asia. He may acquiesce on expenditures for programs in that area, but he knows full well that there is little active support back home for this program. But when it comes to Latin America, I believe the situation is different. On programs for this area, a Senator or Congressman can count on widespread interest in and active support of the public. I know of few Congressmen who believe there is great political risk in supporting appropriations for the Alliance for Progress. American officials administering the foreign aid program, and groups like this one with a special interest in foreign aid should keep this in mind in their efforts to educate the public. There is not much mileage in talking about Laos when the real interest of the public is—and should be—in Brazil. If this is kept in mind, I am convinced that the Congress and the public will continue to support a foreign aid program commensurate with America's responsibilities as the chief defender of freedom in the world today.

BEAUTIES AND ATTRACTIONS OF WEST VIRGINIA PRAISED AND STATE'S CENTENNIAL ACTIVITY FEATURED IN JUNE ISSUE OF "FORD TIMES"

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, 1963 marks the 100th anniversary of West Virginia's entry into the Union, the 35th to achieve statehood. During centennial 1963 citizens of the Mountain State are holding a wide variety of meaningful activities designed not only as a commemoration of the past, but as a reminder of the challenges of the future. Achievement in our rugged and beautiful home has been remarkable, but there yet remain testing problems which must be solved and difficult tasks which must be accomplished.

Blessed with majestic mountains which rise above secluded and scenic valleys, quartered by rushing rivers and chill highland streams, and abounding in wildlife and game of virtually every description, West Virginia has become noted as a tourist haven and vacationland. It is not surprising, therefore, that national magazines and newspaper travel editors have shown lively interest in the activities and attractions available to visitors in West Virginia. This

has been especially apparent during the centennial.

The June issue of Ford Times, published by the Ford Motor Co., features West Virginia in a series of three articles, accompanied by colorful illustrations.

The article entitled "100th Birthday Party for West Virginia" gives a brief account of the State's entry into the Union, along with pertinent information on centennial programs. "Wheeling's 1,000 Acres of Fun" is the story of the founding and development of Oglebay Park, the large and inviting municipally owned recreation area at Wheeling, W. Va. Travelers will wish to read "West Virginia's Vertical Vacationland"—extolling the breathtaking beauty of the Allegheny Mountains and the Monongahela National Forest.

Writers Charles Harper and Ned Moore are to be congratulated for the lucid and entertaining manner in which they have described the pleasures and educational experiences which await the visitor in West Virginia. Our citizens are gratified that such great numbers of Americans traveled to West Virginia each year, and we are especially hopeful that tourists will come in 1963 so that they may share our sense of joy and pride in our centennial celebration.

Mr. President, it is my hope that Members of the Congress, and citizens generally, will read the articles "100th Birthday Party for West Virginia," "Wheeling's 1,000 Acres of Fun," and "West Virginia's Vertical Vacationland," in the June 1963 issue of Ford Times.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS HOLDING RESERVE COMMISSIONS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently, the Scripps-Howard newspaper has evidenced an interest in the status of those Members of Congress who hold Reserve commissions in the various services, and having addressed myself to the legal aspect of this interest, I hold the thought that possibly my colleagues might be interested in a brief history and roster of the 9999th Air Reserve Squadron.

During September of 1960, considerable interest was expressed by reservists affiliated with the Congress in the establishment of a training activity on the Hill to facilitate their participation in the Air Force Reserve program. After the air staffing of a summary concerning the above subject, concurrence was reached that an Air Reserve squadron should be activated. In December 1960, Continental Air Command was directed to implement the necessary actions to provide the proposed squadron.

Channels of command were from Headquarters, USAF to CONAC with CONAC designating Headquarters Second Air Force Reserve Region, Andrews Air Force Base, as the monitoring agency for the administration, control and training of Hill Squadron. Within a week, the 9999th Air Reserve Squadron was established by CONAC General Order No. 127. Prior to the establishment of the 9999th, it had been determined that the congressional reservists were unique inasmuch as they had mobilization day assignments pretty much across the United States so that they were unable to actively train during the period that Congress was in session. The establishment of this squadron was predicated on the fact that these reservists could receive a highly standardized training tailored to the professional levels of the group. Within this standardization there would be opportunity for the Secretary, Chief of Staff, Deputy Chiefs of Staff, major air commanders and others in key positions to present current information on the matters of both Air Force and congressional interest. These presentations were not limited to the Air Force, but invitations were extended to other service chiefs and their deputies to visit and make presentations on the squadron training days. Further, other Government agencies were contacted and have appeared before the squadron.

The training gained by the reservists of the 9999th gives them a greater insight on the Air Force, its activities, concepts, and missions. Further, this insight enables the reservist to return to his mobilization assignment at the conclusion of the congressional session and carry to those organizations information and experience that will immediately enhance the training of the organization.

Actual participation in the weekly reserve meetings has never been limited to the 9999th members but has, additionally, been made available to others on congressional status that have an interest in a specific program, as well as visiting reservists. This, of course, is done only within the limits and bounds of security clearance.

The first meeting was held on Tuesday, January 17, 1961, in the New Senate Office Building and was attended by 23 persons. The squadron now boasts a membership of 85 persons—38 assigned to the 9999th ARS, and 47 attached to the 9999th for training with their mobilization assignment elsewhere.

Membership is confined to people working on the Hill for if it were thrown open we could easily have a membership of over 200. The interest shown in the squadron is attached to the following figures showing percentage of attendance for each of the years: In 1961, total percent attendance was approximately 70; 1962, total percent attendance was approximately 65; 1963, as of June 4, approximately 71 percent attendance.

The 38 members assigned to the 9999th ARS, 2 AFRR, CONAC are listed in accordance with their rank as follows:

Col. G. Ward Hobbs.
Lt. Col. Alphonzo E. Bell, Jr.
Lt. Col. James T. Breen.
Lt. Col. John N. Dinsmore.
Lt. Col. Peter H. Dominick.
Lt. Col. O. Clark Fisher.
Lt. Col. Gordon A. Nease.
Lt. Col. John D. Stringer.
Maj. James F. Battin.
Maj. Orren Beaty, Jr.
Maj. John P. Carlson.
Maj. Geo. L. Milstead, Jr.
Maj. Francis E. O'Gorman.
Maj. Neal E. Smith.
Maj. Stanley R. Tupper.
Maj. Basil L. Whitener.
Capt. Robert C. Cantrell.
Capt. Phillip J. Carlson.
Capt. Geo. F. Cashman.
Capt. Milton Eisenberg.
Capt. Jack Golodner.
Capt. Daniel A. Kavanaugh.
Capt. Jimmy S. Konduros.
Capt. Wiley S. Messick.
Capt. John A. Murphy.
Capt. Fernand J. St Germain.
Capt. John F. Stroud, Jr.
Capt. Paul A. Theis.
Capt. Robert E. Waldron.
Capt. Ira E. Whitlock.
1st. Lt. David L. Batt.
1st. Lt. Wm. O. Billiter, Jr.
1st. Lt. Donald H. Brennan.
1st Lt. Herbert M. Crane, Jr.
1st Lt. John A. Knebel, Jr.
1st Lt. Maurice C. Mackey, Jr.
1st Lt. John B. Simpson, Jr.
2d Lt. George M. Lusk.

The 47 members attached to the 9999th ARS for training purposes are listed in accordance with their rank and mobilization assignment are as follows:

SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE—LEGISLATIVE LIAISON OFFICE

Brig. Gen. Robert W. Smart.
Col. Walter W. Jenkins.
Col. Joe M. Kilgore.
Col. Frank E. Moss.
Col. Robert R. Poston.
Col. Lyle O. Snader.
Lt. Col. James T. Ashworth.
Lt. Col. K. R. Harding.
Lt. Col. Herbert M. Lineberger.
Lt. Col. James R. Queen.
Lt. Col. Vorley M. Rexroad.
Lt. Col. John H. Simms.
Maj. Cyril T. Bendorf.
Maj. Frank M. Clark.
Maj. Stuart P. French.
Maj. Lewis G. Odom, Jr.
Maj. Harry L. Wingate, Jr.
Maj. James C. Wright, Jr.
Capt. Joe E. Gonzales.
Capt. Harry E. McAdams.
Capt. Earl J. Morgan.
Capt. T. A. Thompson.

HEADQUARTERS USAF—JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S OFFICE

Lt. Col. William P. Cochrane.
Lt. Col. Rabert W. Hemphill.
Lt. Col. Lawrence C. Merthan.
Maj. Thomas L. Hughes.
Capt. Thomas P. Kerester.

HEADQUARTERS AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Brig. Gen. Howard W. Cannon.
Capt. William R. Seward.
Capt. William Siegrist.
First Lt. Robert H. Miller, Jr.

HEADQUARTERS USAF—DCS/PERSONNEL OFFICE

Maj. Gen. Barry Goldwater.
Maj. Clement J. Zablocki.

HEADQUARTERS USAF—AF CHIEF OF INTELLIGENCE OFFICE

Lt. Col. Eugene M. Emme.
Lt. Col. Robert R. Smyers.
Capt. Donald E. Lukens.

HEADQUARTERS USAF—DCS/PLANS AND PROGRAMS OFFICE

Col. Laurie C. Battle.
Col. Hiram L. Fong.
Lt. Col. Franklin J. Schupp.

HEADQUARTERS USAF—DCS/MATERIEL OFFICE

Col. Jack R. Miller.

HEADQUARTERS USAF—DCS/OPERATIONS OFFICE

Col. Fred L. McIntyre.

OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Brig. Gen. William C. Lewis, Jr.

AIR UNIVERSITY, MAXWELL AFB, ALA.

Brig. Gen. John A. Lang, Jr.

4500 AB WING, LANGLEY AFB, VA.

Maj. Robert A. Muldonian.

FOREIGN TECH. DIV., WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB, OHIO

Capt. Eugene L. Krizek.

1001ST AB WING, ANDREWS AFB, MD.

Capt. Douglas W. Metz.

1405 AB WING, HEADQUARTERS MATS, SCOTT AFB, ILL.

Capt. John R. MacKenzie.

At the weekly meetings an up-to-the-minute intelligence briefing is given by a representative of the Current Intelligence and Indications Center of the Defense Intelligence Agency. The balance of the weekly drills consists of a lecture by outstanding individuals in the services or connected with the services. A list of those people is as follows:

1961

Brig. Gen. Felix L. Vidal, organization of the squadron.

Maj. Gen. Robert Eaton, Maj. Gen. Chester McCarty, and Maj. Gen. Winston Wilson, plans and policies of the Reserves Forces.

Lt. Gen. William E. Hall, role of the Reserve program.

Maj. Gen. Richard M. Montgomery, decisionmaking processes in the Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Edward J. Timberlake, Air Force personnel.

Lt. Gen. Mark E. Bradley, Air Force logistics financial management improvement program.

Col. H. F. Cruver, integrated military personnel incentive program.

Brig. Gen. Robert C. Richardson spoke on three different occasions: Future concepts and commitments; concepts of general war and deterrence; and U.S. Air Force long-range plans and concepts.

Maj. J. E. Kayhill, airman officer retention.

Hon. Eugene M. Zuckert, Air Force program.

Maj. Gen. A. M. Minton, missile site construction.

Maj. Gen. C. K. Niess, space medicine.

Maj. Gen. V. R. Haugen, Dyna-Soar spacecraft.

Brig. Gen. Jerry Page, Air Force limited war capabilities.

Gen. Curtis E. LaMay, jobs that confront us in the Air Force.

Gen. Thomas D. White, state of the Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Bruce Holloway, space and national security.

Lt. Gen. T. H. Landon, Maj. Gen. E. S. Ligon, management of Air Force human resources.

Maj. Gen. James V. Edmundson, officer production through Air Force Academy and ROTC.

Maj. Gen. E. S. Ligon, officer grade limitation act II; and on another occasion he spoke on "Personnel programing and retention."

Col. John P. Lisack, changing requirements in the Air Force officer structure.

Maj. Gen. William S. Stone, Air Force Academy.

Maj. Gen. Frank M. Bogart and Col. D. L. Crow, Air Force budget.

Lt. Gen. Joe W. Kelly, Military Air Transport Service.

Mr. Herman Kahn (Rand Corp.), relationships between strategy weapons and choice of targets.

Col. David Miller, Air Force nuclear weapons program.

1962

Gen. Frederic H. Smith, Jr., future of the Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Frank A. Bogart and Col. Duward Crow, program package concept.

Brig. Gen. A. N. Williams, sublimited warfare.

Lt. Gen. James Ferguson, Air Force space program.

Col. David C. Jones, RS–70 employment concept.

Lt. Gen. E. J. Timberlake, Air Force personnel program.

Gen. B. A. Schriever, management trends.

Maj. Gen. A. M. Minton, ballistic missiles construction program.

Maj. Gen. M. C. Demler, advanced technology program.

Col. Jack L. Tueller, Polaris missile.

Brig. Gen. Jerry D. Page, results of Air Force war games, and again on Air Force intercontinental ballistic missiles program.

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Bergquist, Air Force Communications Service.

Maj. John C. Toomay, satellite detection and tracking.

Col. O. P. Thorne, Air Force nuclear testing program.

Maj. Gen. Daniel E. Hooks, basic research.

Col. G. Ward Hobbs, Washington International Airport program.

Brig. Gen. Irving L. Branch, mission of Air Force Flight Test Center.

Brig. Gen. Marion C. Smith, ranges and space.

Brig. Gen. Jamie Gough, Air Force counter-insurgency operations.

Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, Jr., Tactical Air Command.

Adm. Geo. W. Anderson, Jr., naval operations.

Dr. Knox Milsaps and Col. Robt. Fontana, aerospace research.

Maj. Gen. Osmond J. Ritland and Mr. D.D. Wyatt, manned space flights.

Brig. Gen. J. E. Thomas, Allied Command Europe.

Gen. Geo. H. Decker, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army.

Dr. Theodore Taylor, ORION project.

Lt. Gen. Wm. S. Stone, personnel programs.

1963

Gen. B. A. Schriever and Col. Raymond S. Sleeper, foreign technology.

Col. Walter P. Glover and Col. Theodore S. Coberly, aeronautical systems.

Col. Gene Romig, Air Force space program.

Col. Robert H. Service, command control and communications.

Maj. Gen. Ralph A. Palladino, overall Reserve program.

Lt. Gen. E. J. Timberlake, CONAC's role in overall defense.

Col. Leo E. Benade, proposals for military compensation.

Gen. Paul D. Adams, STRICOM.

Hon. Eugene M. Zuckert.

Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, current status of Air National Guard.

Gen. David M. Shoup, the Marine Corps.

Maj. Gen. H. G. Thorne, Jr., personnel planning.

Brig. Gen. Irving L. Branch and Col. Charles E. Yeager, aerospace research pilot training program.

Mr. Najeeb E. Halaby, Federal Aviation Agency.

Maj. Gen. Otto Glasser, electronic systems.

Brig. Gen. Gilbert Pritchard, COIN.

Lt. Gen. Harvey T. Alness, Maj. Gen. Nils O. Ohman, weapons systems.

Col. Thomas W. Wolfe, translation of Marshal Sokolovskii's book, "Soviet Military Strategy."

Maj. Sherman S. Reed, Air Force Reserve records.

In addition to the regularly scheduled weekly Tuesday meetings, interesting and varied field trips, both domestic and foreign, were conducted. In 1961, visits were made to Strategic Air Command Headquarters, Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr.; Tactical Air Command Headquarters, Langley Air Force Base, Va.; Cape Canaveral, Fla., and Fort Bragg, N.C., to observe Operation Swift Strike. Arrangements were made for members to complete their 2-week active duty training on one of four trips abroad: First, Hong Kong, Japan, Philippines, Thailand, and Alaska; second, Newfoundland, France, Germany, Italy, and Spain; third, Newfoundland, Germany, France, Italy, Greece, and Spain; fourth, Newfoundland, Germany, Italy, Turkey, Iran, Libya, Spain, and the Azores. All of these trips were made on a space- and aircraft-available basis.

In 1962, the squadron made one field trip where they visited Deputy Chief Air Systems, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and Nellis Air Force Base. Another tour was conducted at NORAD Headquarters and the Air Force Academy. In June, a trip was made to Jacksonville, Fla., where an inspection was made of the aircraft carrier *Franklin D. Roosevelt*. The 2-week active duty tour consisted of visits to the following locations: Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala.; Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.; Randolph Air Force Base, Tex.; Mexico City, Mexico; Albrook Air Force Base, Panama Canal Zone; Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico, and Guantánamo.

This year, there have been two field trips; one to view an airborne exercise at Fort Bragg, N.C.; and another to Luke Air Force Base, Ariz. Plans for the 2-week active duty training tour have not been finalized.

AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently I was appointed along with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], to serve on the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy.

The Board of Visitors met May 1, 2, 3, and 4 of this year. While this does not constitute the formal report which will be forthcoming from the president of the Board—the former Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General White—I should like to make my colleagues aware of some of the things that transpired during that meeting and make a short report on the Academy itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point a list of the members of the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy.

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

BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT

Three years effective 1961

Hon. James H. Douglas, former Secretary of the Air Force, Chicago, Ill.

Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, president, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.

Three years effective 1962

Dr. Fred H. Harrington, president, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Dr. Payson S. Wild, dean of faculties, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Three years effective 1963

Mr. John Lawrence, chairman of the board, Dresser Industries, Inc., Dallas, Tex.

Gen. Thomas D. White, former Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C.

APPOINTED BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Senator BARRY M. GOLDWATER, of Arizona; Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, of Florida; Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

APPOINTED BY THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

Representative J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Third District of Colorado.

Representative JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., Fourth District of Georgia.

Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, Seventh District of Wisconsin.

Representative BYRON G. ROGERS, First District of Colorado.

REPRESENTING THE CHAIRMAN, SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Senator HOWARD W. CANNON, of Nevada.

REPRESENTING THE CHAIRMAN, HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, First District of South Carolina.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a fact sheet giving the mission, the cadet strength, the permanent party strength, and other interesting factors.

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

GENERAL INFORMATION

Mission (AFR 23-23, Dec. 4, 1959): The Academy provides instruction, experience, and motivation to each cadet so that he will graduate with the knowledge, character, and qualities of leadership essential to his progressive development as a career officer in the U.S. Air Force.

Cadet strength: Full strength July 1, 1962, 2,519 (includes 4 foreign cadets). Current cadet strength, 2,336.

Permanent party strength:	
Officers	659
Airmen	839
Civilians	1795
Total (as of April 7)	3,293

Construction cost:	
Authorized	$140,986,000
USAFA	139,183,084
Interim Site	1,802,916

Facility occupied: August 29, 1958.

O. & M. Budget, fiscal year 1963: $15,586,000.

Area:	*Acres*
USAFA	17,762
Farish memorial	60
Farish memorial (to be acquired later)	40
Total	17,862

Family quarters:	
Indigenous	18
Appropriated	46
Capehart	1,200
Total	1,264

Roads:	
Miles paved	75
Miles unpaved	14
Total miles	89

Cadet facilities:	
2-Man dormitory rooms	1,320
Classrooms	168
Science labs	45
Lecture halls	5
Seats, Arnold Hall theater	3,000

Airman facilities:	
Dormitories	3
Rooms	120
Lounges	3

Prep school data:	
Students entered summer 1962	160
Students current strength	138
Graduates, 1962 class	138
Appointments to Academies	99
Dormitories	4

(Prep school students also have joint usage of the airmen dining hall and all community center facilities.)

Stock fund data:

	Fiscal year 1962
Commissary yearly sales	$3,185,522.20
Cadet sales store sales	74,810.64
Clothing sales store sales	1,306,775.00

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, all Members of Congress have the privilege of nominating cadets for the various military academies; and, of course, the Air Force Academy is one of these. How we do this varies from coast to coast. I was interested, during my visit to the Academy, in the results obtained by the various methods.

So that my colleagues may get a better insight into this matter, I asked Maj. Gen. Robert H. Warren, who is the Superintendent of the Air Force Academy, to address a letter to me giving an analysis of the success of cadets who had been named as principal candidates compared to cadets who had one appointment in a competitive nomination list.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter, giving that comparison, be made a part of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

HEADQUARTERS,
U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY,
Colorado, May 24, 1963.

Hon. BARRY M. GOLDWATER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: During the meeting of the Board of Visitors you asked for an analysis of the success of cadets who had been named as principal candidates compared to cadets who won appointment in a competitive nomination list. The attached table makes several such comparisons.

In the current freshmen, sophomore, and junior classes there were 1,002 cadets who won appointments by competitive congressional nominations, while 555 received appointments as a result of nomination as principals or numbered alternates. In every respect in which we have been able to make comparisons, the competitive appointees as a group have proven superior to the group of named principal and alternate appointees.

The differences in percentages in the attached table are, I believe, of greater practical significance than might appear at first glance. The 5-percent difference in attrition rates means that a cadet class of 800 selected entirely by the principal-alternate system would have 40 fewer graduates than one selected completely by the competitive system. Or, put another way, the attrition rate among competitive appointees has been one-fifth smaller than the attrition rate among principals and principal-alternates.

When it comes to proportions of cadets recognized by my office for excellence in both academics and military performance, difference between the two groups is again only 5 percent. The fact is that the proportion of top-level cadets in the competitive appointee group is nearly twice the proportion of top-level cadets in the principal and principal-alternate appointee group.

There is ample reason to believe that cadet attrition would be less and general cadet quality would increase if more nomination lists were competitive. In 106 principal-alternate lists this year, the candidate offered the appointment had lower score totals than others. That is, in each of 106 lists a different candidate, one who showed evidence of better abilities and preparation, would have been selected had the Member of Congress named his candidates without stating his preference.

Your interest in these comparisons is much appreciated. If there are additional data which would be of concern to you and which we may provide, please ask.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. WARREN,
Major General, USAF, Superintendent.

Comparison of principal and competitive congressional appointees (classes of 1964, 1965, and 1966)

	Cadets by competitive nomination	*Cadets by principal nomination*
Number admitted	1,002	555
Attrition (percent)	22	27
Dean's list—academic honors (percent)	34	27
Commandant's list—military honors (percent)	20	14
Superintendent's list—overall merit (percent)	11	6

Mr. GOLDWATER. The record will show that the cadets who entered the Academy by competitive nomination do better in this Academy than do those who entered by principal nomination.

This is information which my colleagues can obtain from the Superintendent of the Academy. I assure them that such information would be of great value to them in evaluating the educational opportunities in their own States. It is a comparison of the cadets from each State with the general corps. Of course, this information will not be given to a Senator who comes from another State. I suggest, however, after reading the record made by Arizona candidates, that my colleagues in the Senate might want to get this list from the Air Force Academy.

It is interesting to note that Arizona's cadets have done better than the average, and I am very proud of this fact. It points up to the fact that Arizona's educational opportunities are well above the average.

So that my colleagues may see this as a sample and be guided by it, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be placed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ARIZONA CANDIDATES FOR THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY CLASS OF 1966

During the selection cycle for the Air Force Academy's class of 1966, 33 candidates were nominated by Members of Congress from your State. Of these 33, 23 or 69 percent completed all selection tests; 16 of the 33 or 48 percent were fully qualified. Two of the qualified candidates declined appointments offered them.

In the following table, quartile scores on four selection measures for the 23 candidates from your State who completed all tests are

compared with quartile scores for all 4,210 congressional candidates completing all tests and with the scores of the 751 new cadets of the class of 1966.

Selection measures	Group	Bottom quartile	Middle quartile	Top quartile
CEEB	Arizona candidates	512	601	653
Verbal	Congressional candidates	474	535	594
Average	AFA cadets	547	600	648
CEEB	Arizona candidates	560	639	708
Mathematics	Congressional candidates	548	611	669
Average	AFA cadets	628	671	717
Academic	Arizona candidates	540	607	645
Selection	Congressional candidates	503	559	611
Average	AFA cadets	584	624	656
Selection	Arizona candidates	534	581	631
Examination	Congressional candidates	501	544	585
Average	AFA cadets	574	606	627

Additional information on all candidates is provided in attachment 2, which also gives a brief description of the nature and utility of these selection measures, and explains the quartile statistics. The middle quartile is usually very close to the mean or average score.

CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES FOR THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY CLASS OF 1966

The Air Force Academy has entered its class of 1966, a class which gives promise of of being the best thus far admitted. That the class is a most promising one is not surprising since it was selected from a very capable group of candidates, probably the best group of candidates to apply for admission to the Academy since it began operation in 1955. Of 751 new cadets, 719, or over 95 percent, had received congressional nominations. The credit for the quality of the candidates as well as the selected cadets must go to the Members of Congress who nominated them.

This year, Members of Congress nominated a total of 5,359 candidates, 24 fewer than were nominated last year. However, of these 5,359 individuals, 2,314, or 43 percent, completed all tests and were fully qualified; this was a definite improvement over the 2,103 (39 percent) who were fully qualified last year. This year, 1,896 other candidates, or 35 percent, took all selection tests but failed to qualify on one or more measures; last year 2,049 congressional candidates (38 percent) completed all tests but were disqualified on one or more. This year 21 percent failed to complete all the required selection tests; last year 23 percent failed to complete these tests.

In discussing the quality of candidates we would like to be able to present information on all candidates. However, the absence of some test scores for many candidates causes us to limit the presentation of selection data to the 4,210 congressional candidates who completed all tests. For comparison purposes, similar score data are presented on the 751 new cadets of the class of 1966. Although many different tests and measures are used in cadet selection, the data are limited to four average scores which include most of the aptitude and achievement information the various tests provide.

The following paragraphs give quartile scores of cadets and candidates on each of the four average scores. Each of these averages has a possible range from 200 to 800. These quartiles are scores which divide the groups into quarters, three-fourths have scores above the bottom quartile and one-fourth fall below it, while half are above and half below the middle quartile. Similarly, one-fourth are above the top quartile and three-fourths are below it.

CEEB verbal average

This score is the average of the nominee's scores on two tests, the college entrance examination board's verbal aptitude and English composition tests. The average thus combines measures of aptitude and achievement, and predicts fairly well achievement at the Air Force Academy in humanities and social sciences.

	Bottom quartile	Middle quartile	Top quartile
Candidates	474	535	594
Cadets	547	600	648

CEEB mathematics average

This score is also the average of the nominee's scores on two college entrance examination board tests, quantitative aptitude and mathematics achievement. It combines both aptitude and achievement measures and predicts achievement at the Air Force Academy in basic and applied sciences.

	Bottom quartile	Middle quartile	Top quartile
Candidates	548	611	669
Cadets	628	671	717

Academic selection average

This score is an average of all four college entrance examination board tests, plus score based on the nominee's prior academic achievement—that is, his academic standing in his high school graduating class. The average thus includes not only aptitude and achievement but also gives us some idea as to the nominee's motivation to do well in previous academic situations. It predicts most course grades fairly well and is a good predictor of overall grade point average.

	Bottom quartile	Middle quartile	Top quartile
Candidates	503	559	611
Cadet	584	624	656

Selection examination average

This is a weighted average of academic aptitude, physical proficiency, and high school leadership activity. It is an overall evaluation of cadet potential, and has a possible range from 200 to 800.

	Bottom quartile	Middle quartile	Top quartile
Candidates	501	544	585
Cadets	574	606	62.

Looking at all four averages, one can see that over three-fourths of our new class came from the upper half of the candidate population.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Another interesting table I obtained is that showing the attrition of congressional nominees by States. I have a list of all 50 States, giving the percentage lost by attrition from the classes of 1959 through 1966, as of May 1, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that this list be placed in the RECORD. I urge my colleagues to study it. I believe there is a direct relationship between motivation and the education obtained in the cadet's own State and the rate of attrition at the Academy.

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

Attrition of congressional nominees by State (classes of 1959 through 1966, as of May 1, 1963)

State	Percent lost
Utah	7
Iowa	13
New Mexico	13
Delaware	14
Arizona	15
Washington	19
Ohio	20
Massachusetts	21
Indiana	22
New Hampshire	22
Oklahoma	22
California	23
North Dakota	23
Pennsylvania	23
New York	24
Virginia	24
Minnesota	25
Florida	26
Kansas	26
Michigan	26
Wyoming	26
Colorado	27
Texas	27
Wisconsin	27
Arkansas	28
Illinois	28
Louisiana	28
Nebraska	28
New Jersey	28
North Carolina	28
Hawaii	29
Kentucky	29
Missouri	29
Rhode Island	30
West Virginia	31
Georgia	32
South Carolina	32
Alaska	33
Connecticut	33
South Dakota	33
Tennessee	33
Oregon	34
Montana	35
Vermont	35
Maryland	36
Nevada	38
Mississippi	39
Alabama	40
Maine	42
Idaho	43

Mr GOLDWATER. Mr. President, character and motivation play a large part in the success of a cadet at any of the academies. This is a factor that is being studied more and more by each of the Academies in the selection of cadets. For example, in the current cadet classes in the Academy, we find that 18 percent of them had been class presidents of their high schools. Eleven percent had been class vice presidents. Twenty-one percent had been Boys State delegates. Thirty-six percent had received outstanding student awards.

There is a list that continues with this type of accomplishment.

Eighty-five percent had been in the top quarter of their high school graduating class. Zero percent had been in the fourth quarter of the class.

These figures show that we are selecting better and better cadets for the academies.

I ask unanimous consent that this table of the class of 1966 character and accomplishments be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

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

CLASS OF 1966

CHARACTER AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Participation in high school extracurricular activities

	Percent
Class president	18
Class vice president	11
Boys state delegate	21
Outstanding student award	36
Citizenship award	18
Student government president	16
Yearbook or newspaper, editor or business manager	16
Yearbook or newspaper assistant editor	24
Band or orchestra	17
Debate team	12
Dramatic productions	37
Chorus or glee club	20
Athletic Letter Awards:	
Football	39
Basketball	28
Baseball	17
Track	27

Rank in high school graduating class

Top quarter, 85.3 percent; second quarter, 13.2 percent; third quarter, 1.5 percent; fourth quarter, 0 percent.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I also ask unanimous consent to have a table showing the comparisons, mean score service, academy classes of 1959–62, on college entrance examination board tests and graduate record examination area tests, made a part of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Comparisons, mean score service academy classes of 1959–62, on college entrance examination board tests and graduate record examination—Area tests

CLASSES OF 1959

	USAFA	USMA	USNA
CEEB tests:			
Verb. Apt	550		
English Comp	542		
Quant. Apt	619		
Inter. Math	621		
Composite	2,332		
GRE area tests:			
Natural sciences	619	574	
Social sciences	595	549	
Humanities	524	465	
Composite	1,738	1,588	

CLASSES OF 1960

CEEB tests:			
Verb. Apt	564	552	
English Comp	553	551	
Quant. Apt	645	626	
Inter. Math	645	642	
Composite	2,407	2,371	
GRE area tests:			
Natural sciences	603	594	565
Social sciences	584	550	498
Humanities	503	495	460
Composite	1,690	1,639	1,523

Comparisons, etc.—Continued

CLASSES OF 1961

CEEB tests:			
Verb. Apt	559	543	
English Comp	543	559	
Quant. Apt	631	627	
Inter. Math	619	640	
Composite	2,352	2,369	
GRE area tests:			
Natural sciences	635	609	604
Social sciences	562	540	503
Humanities	553	510	491
Composite	1,750	1,659	1,598

CLASSES OF 1962

CEEB tests:			
Verb. Apt	563	552	586
English Comp	552	560	580
Quant. Apt	633	632	647
Inter. Math	616	632	652
Composite	2,364	2,376	2,465
GRE area tests:			
Natural sciences	592	575	561
Social sciences	589	553	542
Humanities	515	488	485
Composite	1,696	1,616	1,588

Mr. GOLDWATER. I ask unanimous consent to have made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD a table showing cadet appointment, attrition, and graduation data.

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

Cadet appointment, attrition and graduation data

GRADUATES

	Class of 1959	Class of 1960	Class of 1961	Class of 1962
Appointed initially	306	300	306	453
Admitted as turnbacks	0	17	8	12
Class total	306	317	314	465
Graduated	207	227	217	298
Percent	68	72	69	64
Assignments of graduates:				
Pilot training	186	188	181	253
Navigation training	3	1	16	1
Technical school training	5	0	7	14
Graduate training (AFIT)	6	4	9	17
Medical school training	0	0	0	1
Directed duty	4	25	0	2
Rhodes scholars	1	0	(1)	2
Other services	1	8	4	7
Not commissioned	1	1	0	1
Total graduates	207	227	217	298

CURRENT CLASSES

	Class of 1963		Class of 1964		Class of 1965		Class of 1966	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Appointed initially	748		772		802		755	
Admitted as turnbacks	7		28		21		14	
Class total	755	100.0	800	100.0	823	100.0	769	100.0
Resignations:								
Motivation	87	11.5	113	14.1	55	6.7	30	3.9
Honor	33	4.4	32	4.0	21	2.5	22	2.9
Other	23	3.0	12	1.5	8	1.0	7	.9
Total resignations	143	18.9	157	19.6	84	10.2	59	7.7
Dismissals:								
Physicals	22	2.9	10	1.2	13	1.6	12	1.6
Conduct and aptitude	3	.4	3	.4	3	.4	15	1.9
Academics	56	7.4	85	10.6	52	6.3	29	3.8
Total dismissals	81	10.7	98	12.2	68	8.3	56	7.3
Turnbacks	27	3.6	19	2.4	14	1.7	5	.6
Total attrition	251	33.2	274	34.2	166	20.2	120	15.6
Present strength	504	66.8	526	65.8	657	79.8	649	84.4
Total				2,336				

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a table of great interest is that of academic curricula of the service academies in semester hours. The Air Force Academy is proud of what are called master's programs. In the master's programs the boy is allowed to take, if he so desires 164 units of classroom work in 4 years. This entitles him to a master's degree. But, unfortunately, one academy has not agreed to this enrichment course. So we in the Congress will not be able to enact legislation which will enable the academies to give master's degrees. Purdue and Georgetown Universities are schools to which cadets can go after graduation and, after 7 months, get their master's degrees. The experiment is very interesting. I feel that it will upgrade colleges all over the United States, because if a boy as busy as a cadet in the Air Force Academy can take this many units in 4 years, I do not think it is expecting too much for others to follow suit. This is something we are all interested in.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of the academic curricula of the three service Academies, together with an explanation of the U.S. Air Force Academy's masters' programs be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Academic curricula of the service academies

[In semester hours]

	USMA	USNA	USAFA
Basic sciences	46	39½	35
Applied sciences	54	44¼	33
Humanities	36	27¼	36½
Social sciences	23	12¾	31½
Electives	5	0	7½
Total	164	123¾	143½

Total curriculums of the service academies

[In semester hours]

	USMA	USNA	USAFA
Academic program	164	123¾	143½
Military training program	16	31½	28½
Athletic program	7	4¾	14½
Total	187	160	186½

Prescribed academic curriculum in semester hours

4th class:	
Mathematics	13½
Chemistry	5½
Human physiology	2½
English	5½
History	5½
Geography	4
Total	36½
3d class:	
Mathematics	5½
Physics	5½
History	5½
Foreign language	9
Behavioral sciences	2½
Political science	5½
Economics	3
Mechanical drawing	2
Total	38½
2d class:	
Behavioral sciences	3
Mechanics	6
Electrical engineering	5½
Thermodynamics	5½
Economics	2½
English	2½ or 3
Philosophy	3 or 2½
Law	5½
Lab. option	2
Total	35½
1st class:	
Astronautics	5½
Aeronautics	5½
Electronics	3
Mod. physics	2½
Political science	5½
English	5½
Optional courses	5½
Total	33
Grand total	143½

USAFA MASTER'S PROGRAMS

Two master's-level programs are in operation—in astronautics, and in international affairs. Both are extensions of the Academy's enrichment program and were developed to meet the educational needs of unusually able cadets and those who have prior college. Cadets pursuing the master's program must have completed the 143½ semester-hours prescribed for graduation with a bachelor of science degree, and an undergraduate major. Engineering sciences is the required undergraduate major for the master's program in astronautics; for the program in international affairs it is the undergraduate major with the same name.

The purpose of the international affairs master's is to develop cadet understanding of international relations and foreign policies in the modern world. It is a background for military command and staff responsibilities in operations, intelligence, planning, and programing, foreign representation, politico-military affairs, and joint and combined activities. The master's program in astronautics will contribute to the preparation of future astronauts (for whom the time saved by being able to get a master's degree during their 4 years at the Academy will be an important factor) and will help prepare officers qualified in the sciences to administer the Air Force's vast research program. Both of the Academy's master's programs have been endorsed by the Academic Advisory Committee of eminent professors from a number of the Nation's leading universities.

Although these programs are in operation, master's degrees cannot be granted until there is a change in the legislation governing the Academy. The Air Force has sought the necessary change but has not achieved it to date. Inhibiting factors are the opposition of the other service academies (although only permissive legislation is being requested) and the attitude of the American Council on Education, which opposes degree granting by Federal agencies. There is some reason to believe that the opposition of the ACE was based on a belief that the academies were not fully accredited and on the misapplication to the service academies, which are recognized academic institutions, of a policy designed to prevent Government agencies from entering the academic field at the graduate level only. The academies are fully accredited and have the desired undergraduate base; it is therefore hoped that the council may modify its position. Similarly it is hoped that the other service academies, which at first opposed the enrichment program but later adopted many of its features, may undergo a like change in their attitude toward USAFA's request for master's degree authority. These developments, it is believed, might induce the Department of Defense to approve the Academy's effort to broaden the educational opportunity it offers.

In the meantime, under cooperative arrangements between the Academy and two civilian universities—Purdue and Georgetown—selected cadets may earn master's degrees from these universities within 7 months after their graduation from the Academy. Under these arrangements, 14 cadets will pursue graduate work in astronautics at Purdue, and 15 cadets will complete graduate programs in international relations at Georgetown University. Cadets selected to participate in the cooperative programs will have completed, on their graduation from the Academy, the requirements of the prescribed curriculum, a prerequisite undergraduate major, and the equivalent of one-half year of graduate-level course work. For these cadets, Purdue and Georgetown are waiving their normal 1-year residence requirement for a master's degree. Since these cadets will be able to earn accredited master of science degrees within 7 months after their graduation, headquarters, USAF, has permitted their entry into flying training to be delayed until their graduate work is completed (approximately February 1964). The cooperative programs will result in a great saving of time and money for the Air Force; a similar program in management is being studied.

Mr. GOLDWATER. An important part of the Military Academy's curricula is military training. While one might not think of the Air Force as being interested in basic military training, I watched them "get the works" out there. They come out well trained soldiers as well as airmen.

So that my colleagues may have some understanding of the subject, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the military training program be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Military training program

4th class year:	Semester-hours
Basic cadet training (summer)	7½
Command training	½
National security and the Armed Forces	1¾
Total	9¾
3d class year:	
Field study of the Armed Forces (summer)	4
Command training	½
Contemporary world forces	¾
Total	5¼

Military training program—Continued

2d class year:	Semester-hours
Field study of oversea areas (summer)	2½
Duty with A.F. unit—3d Lt. (summer)	1½
Instructor training	1
Command training	½
Employment of aerospace power	1½
Total	7
1st class year:	
Duty with underclass (summer)	3
Command training	1
Aerospace systems	½
Navigational indoctrination (optional)	½
Total	5

Mr. GOLDWATER. Contributing to the phenomenal record being made by the Air Force Academy in education is the rather interesting fact that 21 percent of the faculty have Ph. D. degrees.

When we look at the list, we find that 2 in that Academy have bachelor degrees; 86 in the Military Academy have; while there are 180 in the Naval Academy.

As for master's degrees, 276 in the U.S. Air Force Academy have them; 243 in the Military Academy; and 149 in the Naval Academy.

When we come to Ph. D's, there are 72 in the Air Force Academy; 15 in the Military Academy; and 53 in the Naval Academy.

These facts speak very well for the motivation of those who have devoted themselves to teaching the young men who comprise the cadet detachment at the Academy.

Many things have been done at the Academy which are a little different from the historic experience of the other academies. We have known of the hazing and the plight of the fourth-classmen, who go through a rather strenuous period of hazing at the other academies. The Air Force Academy started it, but it was felt that hazing detracted from the Academy, rather than helped it. So an effort has been made to modify the fourth-class system over the past several years. The Board of Visitors thinks so highly of it that we want the effort to be continued. For example, cadets had to sit at the edge of their chairs at mealtime. If an upper classman wanted a glass of water, he threw the glass, and the fourth-classman would have to catch it. They would have to give detailed explanations of the meaning of leather or time. Work was substituted for the beat. The beat was carried on while the lower classman marched around a quadrangle. Now he has to go to work and work off his demerits. This system recognizes the dignity of the cadets, and it has paid off. They go home for Christmas and are given privileges. They are given privileges in the fourth class that are above the privileges given to cadets in the other academies. The dropout in the fourth class is 17 percent, which speaks very highly for the morale of the cadets there.

This morale and motivation, I believe, is best reflected in the activity of the cadets and religious exercises.

I ask unanimous consent that my notes on the Catholic religious activities at the Academy be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CATHOLIC RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES

Despite the fact that Sunday chapel attendance is mandatory for members of the fourth, third, and second classes, it is in the area of voluntary participation in religious activities that the Catholic chapel program shows its strength.

All the following religious activities are on a strictly voluntary basis:

1. Daily mass: Of the 640 Catholic cadets attending the Air Force Academy, about 150 cadets attend daily mass; and during the Advent and Lent this number increases to well over 200 cadets. Attendance at daily mass involves an extra effort on the part of the cadets because they must be physically present at mass before the early morning breakfast assembly.

2. Holy communion: During the academic year, holy communion is distributed to 1,200 cadets weekly, which by ratio compares most favorably with any college or university in America.

3. Novena service: The weekly novena service which is conducted after supper on Monday evenings on voluntary time is well attended throughout the entire year, between 50 and 100 cadets in attendance.

4. Religious retreats: By cadet regulation each cadet may attend a weekend retreat, from after class on Friday until supper on Sunday evening. The Catholic cadets attend retreats conducted at the Sacred Heart Retreat House, 1 hour's drive from the Academy. At their own expense, and giving their own time, about one-third of the Catholic cadets attend these retreats every year.

5. Catholic choir: Under the able direction of Mr. Edward Ladouceur, the Catholic choir of a hundred voices, has made frequent appearances on TV and radio. They have been requested frequently to sing at local churches and cathedrals, and have twice most successfully appeared at St. Patricks Cathedral in New York. Catholic and Protestant choirs are permitted one away-from-the-area trip per year.

6. Guest speakers and lectures: So as not to cut into academic time, cadets are permitted to sign up for early supper on specified days, to attend lectures after supper by guest speakers. These have been enthusiastically attended in numbers ranging from 75 to 200 cadets each lecture. During the past year the following have addressed the Catholic cadets: Rev. John A. O'Brien, author and lecturer, Notre Dame University; Chaplain, Brig. Gen. Edwin R. Chess, Deputy Chief of Chaplains, U.S. Air Force; Rev. Charles Forsyth, O.S.B., Newman chaplain, Colorado University; Rev. Charles F. Taylor, Newman chaplain, Wyoming University; Rev. Henry G. Guyot, professor of scripture, St. Thomas Seminary, Denver; Rev. Paul O'Connor, S.J., Alaskan missionary; Rev. Vincent S. Delavy, C.S.C., Pakistan missionary; and others.

7. Cana conferences: Each year a series of talks are given to the Catholic cadets contemplating marriage after graduation. These talks emphasize the problems and responsibilities of marriage, with special emphasis on the permanency of marriage. The cadets eagerly attend these conferences where open discussion is encouraged, and are most receptive to the suggestions and advice from the expert marriage counselors invited to speak.

In an overall evaluation of the response of the cadets to the entire religious program, I would say it is most encouraging. The cadets are inquisitive about religious matters and want the answers. They ask intelligent questions, and expect intelligent explanations. It is an inspiration and a challenge to work with and for the cadets, and a most rewarding experience.

Chaplain, Col. STEPHEN J. O'CONNOR,
Catholic Cadet Chaplain, Command Chaplain, U.S. Air Force Academy.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Protestant record is excellent. Their discussion groups, for example, are limited to 60 cadets per week. Three hundred and eighty-five from the class of 1966 have signed up. Sunday school teachers: They needed 29. One hundred and twenty-seven have signed up from the class of 1966.

Ushers and acolytes: 20 were needed. One hundred and fifteen signed up from the class of 1966.

Choir: They needed 40, and 277 have signed up from the class of 1966.

I ask unanimous consent that this list of Protestant religious activities be made a part of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

CADET PARTICIPATION IN THE RELIGIOUS PROGRAM AT THE U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

PROTESTANT

Discussion groups: Limited to 60 cadets per week; 385 from class of 1966 have signed up.

Retreats: 3 chapel sponsored, 6 church sponsored last year; over 400 cadets signed up.

Sunday school teachers: 29 needed; 127 signed up from class of 1966.

Ushers and acolytes: 20 needed; 115 signed up from class of 1966.

Choir: 40 needed; 277 signed up from class of 1966.

Protestant flight includes 50 different denominational groups.

Mr. GOLDWATER. As I said at the outset, this is not a formal report on the Air Force Academy. It is merely the report of one member of the group of observers from the Senate while attending with the Board of Visitors. The two other Members from the Senate were prevented from visiting the Academy because of the activities of the Senate at that particular time. I wished to make this report so that my colleagues in the Senate might have a better idea of what is going on in Colorado Springs. In due course of time, the formal report will be made available.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for the report he is giving to the Senate today, and, more significantly, for the attention he has given to the Air Force Academy. I consider it a privilege to be one of the members of the Board of Visitors of the Academy with the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Florida. The Senator from Arizona has given a moving and important report to us, with regard to the achievements of the Academy—those who teach at the Academy, and those who are members of the student body, the cadets. I look forward to visiting that fine institution, which I consider to be one of the truly outstanding educational institutions of our country, as well as being exceedingly vital to our national security. I commend the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank my friend, the Senator from Minnesota. I know that he was extremely busy at the time of the visit, and I know from discussions that the Senator from Minnesota had planned to be in Colorado Springs. However, in the capacity in which he serves the Senate so well, it is not always possible for him to leave when he desires. I suggest that the Senator visit the Academy at the first opportunity. It is a wonderful institution, and I am sure he will be richly rewarded by a visit to it.

CARE FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which 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.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR GRANTED TO CERTAIN STAFF ASSISTANTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the consideration of the migratory labor bills I ask unanimous consent that an unlimited number of the staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted the privilege of the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the request for unanimous consent is for an unlimited number, I have no objection.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William H. Orrick, Jr., to be an Assistant Attorney General.

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

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

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

CARE FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the 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.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from New Jersey has introduced a bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act. In commenting on the measure, he notes that it is coauthored by Senators HUMPHREY, MORSE, MCNAMARA, ENGLE, and CLARK. The Senator has made several presentations in support of this repeal measure. In some of the material which he has inserted in the RECORD there are statements that must be challenged and factual inaccuracies that must be brought to the attention of the Senate.

First, however, I should like to comment on my colleague's attack upon right-to-work laws, which now are in force in 20 States. He questions the wisdom of the people of these 20 States for having adopted these laws safeguarding the freedom of American citizens at the places where they work.

The right-to-work law gives the worker freedom to join the union or not join the union at his place of work—without affecting his job and livelihood, without affecting his right to work at his job. In other words, it outlaws compulsory unionism. It does not, of course, restrict voluntary unionism. It preserves the right of collective bargaining for those who wish to have a union do this for them.

Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey says the general public in the 20 States which have had the right-to-work laws in force for years, some of them for nearly 20 years—that the people of these States have not made a careful enough analysis of these laws. So he proposes that the privilege of such analysis be withdrawn from the population of these 20 States by the Federal Government and that they no longer be permitted to make their own laws safeguarding a vital exercise of individual freedom. The repeal measure would accomplish this withdrawal of permission to legislate.

This would be an affront to the citizens of 20 States, and a political shackling of the citizenry of the other 30 States. As the Senator well knows, my State of Arizona is one of the 20 so-called right-to-work States. Our people enacted a right-to-work amendment to the State constitution safeguarding individual liberty back in 1946, actually prior to the Taft-Hartley Act. We have had a chance to see how the law works for the benefit of all. Two years after its enactment, the very same forces who are today trying to establish the rule of compulsory unionism, sought to repeal our Arizona right-to-work law. Arizona people gave it a much bigger vote, both in numbers and percentage, than it had gotten 2 years previously. Then again in 1952, the compulsory unionism forces sought once more to repeal the law. This time, the people of Arizona gave it still a bigger vote of confidence. The point is that in nearly 20 years of experience with the law, the support for it among the people of Arizona has become stronger and more widespread. It is overwhelmingly favored by our people—after nearly 20 years of service safeguarding individual freedom—Arizona vote: 1946, yes, 61,875—55 percent, no, 49,557; 1948, yes, 86,866—59 percent, no, 60,295; 1952, yes, 115,389—63.2 percent, no, 67,036.

Gov. Paul Fannin, in a radio interview recently, was asked to state the importance of Arizona's right-to-work law. He replied, and I quote from the radio program transcript:

> The right-to-work law protects everybody involved in the free enterprise system—the worker, management, responsible unionism, and the public. This is what makes it a critical factor. By removing the monopoly power which compulsory unionism puts into the hands of union officials, the law protects both management and the public from irresponsible abuses of union power. The right-to-work law states a very simple principle of freedom (Governor Fannin continued). It guarantees that workers can have the free choice of joining the union or not joining. Thus the worker is able to guide his personal destiny in the finest tradition of individual liberty.

Mr. President, I might add that during the years Arizona has had the right-to-work law, our State has progressed economically. In fact, by all but two of the yardsticks of economic progress, Arizona is the Nation's leader in economic growth.

I wish at this point to make note of the fact that I have statements from 24 past and present Governors of right-to-work States endorsing the law that their States have had from 20 years to a few weeks—Wyoming's new right-to-work law became effective on May 18. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, this list of 24 quotations of 24 right-to-work State Governors.

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

GOVERNORS FOR RIGHT TO WORK: ENDORSEMENTS BY THE CHIEF EXECUTIVES OF STATES

J. Lindsay Almond, Governor of Virginia 1958–62: "The right-to-work law has served a very wholesome purpose in Virginia. Relations between management and labor are on a very high plane."

Ross R. Barnett, Governor of Mississippi, 1960–64: "The people of Mississippi are strongly in favor of the right-to-work law, as evidenced by their vote in 1960 to put the right-to-work law in our State constitution."

Henry Bellmon, Governor-elect of Oklahoma 1963–67: "I believe a right-to-work law is important in stimulating industry and new jobs in Oklahoma. Adjoining States have such legislation and this gives them a competitive advantage over Oklahoma in attracting new industries."

Farris Bryant, Governor of Florida 1961–65: "I am pleased to note * * * that Florida's population growth, its industrial development, its personal income, and its job opportunities have been expanding faster than those of any other State in the Nation, and this has occurred while the State right-to-work law was in effect."

Frank Clement, Governor-elect of Tennessee 1953–55, 1955–59, and 1963–67: "The Tennessee open shop, right-to-work law has been productive of harmony and its repeal is not in the best interest of the people of Tennessee."

George D. Clyde, Governor of Utah 1957–61 and 1961–65: "I feel Utah's right-to-work law has been advantageous to all workers. We have had only a limited number of labor disputes since the law was enacted in 1955."

John A. Connally, Governor of Texas 1963–65: "The right-to-work plank should be in the platform because a majority of the Democrats of Texas want it. To have omitted it from the platform would have been dishonorable."

Price Daniel, Governor of Texas 1957–59, 1959–61, and 1961–63: "The Texas right-to-work law has been important to the industrial development of this State and I feel it is fair to both management and labor. The State Democratic platform calls for preservation of our law."

John E. Davis, Governor of North Dakota 1957–59, 1959–61: "Our right-to-work law is guaranteeing the constitutional rights of all employees in North Dakota. This law does not prevent labor from organizing when they desire voluntarily to do so. It does prevent labor unions from forcing employees to join a union against their will. The State has developed industrially and expanded its job opportunities and wage rates since the right-to-work law has been in effect."

Buford Ellington, Governor of Tennessee 1959–63: "As I see it, we have had pretty good labor-management relations in this State. We have gained new industries because of our right-to-work law. Industry knows that both management and labor will get fair play."

Norman A. Erbe, Governor of Iowa 1961–63: "The Iowa right-to-work law has been the topic of discussion for many years, during which the interest has varied. I have expressed publicly that to date the people of Iowa have shown no indication that they think the right-to-work law should be changed."

Paul Fannin, Governor of Arizona 1959–61, 1961–63, and 1963–65: "The official figures show that in 1958 the AFL–CIO unions had 40,000 members in our State, and in 1960 they had 80,000 members. That's doubling the membership in 3 years—under our right-to-work law."

Archie Gubbrud, Governor of South Dakota 1961–63 and 1963–67: "Union propagandists frequently raise the deceptive cry that right-to-work laws have as their purpose the destruction of unions. Nothing could be more misleading. Statistics establish that in the right-to-work States, since the enactment of their laws, union membership has increased, wages have increased, and the general economy of the State has improved at a higher rate of acceleration than in some of the surrounding non-right-to-work sister States."

Harold W. Handley, Governor of Indiana 1957–1961: "The right-to-work law has the approval of thousands of union members who maintain that it makes the union leaders more responsive to the wishes of the membership and is a weapon by which corruption and racketeering can be curbed by the members themselves * * * It simply reaffirms and strengthens the traditional position of that pioneer in unionism, Samuel

Gompers, that to be effective, union membership must be voluntary."

A. S. Harrison, Jr., Governor of Virginia 1962–1966: "The principle underlying right-to-work laws is now recognized in Virginia as fundamental. The preservation of the right-to-work law was an important part of my program in the campaign for Governor in 1961. The election results were indicative of the overwhelming sentiment of Virginians for this legislation."

Ernest F. Hollings, Governor of South Carolina 1959–1963: "We have proven the worth and value of this law. The record shows it has been successful. South Carolina intends to maintain this legislation with confidence. It is a fundamental portion of our progress. We recognize anad respect it as such."

Luther Hodges, Governor of North Carolina, 1957–61: "I am convinced that North Carolina's right-to-work law has attracted business and stabilized employment. I favor the right-to-work laws."

Frank Morrison, Governor of Nebraska, 1961–63, 1963–65: "Right to work is in our State constitution, and as far as I'm concerned, it's there to stay. This provision is basic to our Nebraska philosophy."

Gordon Persons, Governor of Alabama, 1951–55: "In my opinion, all of our labor unions will be far stronger and the members in them will have a far greater interest and respect in the organizations if membership can be shown to be desirable and they are not forced to join."

Terry Sanford, Governor of North Carolina, 1961–65: "The Republicans charge * * * that I have pledged to repeal the right-to-work law. This is absolutely false. I have pledged once a week, and sometimes 40 times a week, throughout the campaign to keep this law on the books."

Grant Sawyer, Governor of Nevada, 1959–63 and 1963–67: "Nevada has a right-to-work law that works very well."

S. Ernest Vandiver, Governor of Georgia, 1959–63: "We like the right-to-work law in Georgia because it insures freedom to both labor and management, and this freedom of choice is a basic principle upon which our country was founded."

Edward F. Arn, Governor of Kansas, 1951–53, 1953–55: "I would talk long and loud about the right of labor to organize, but I think, too, that the right to work is equally fundamental, and is based upon the concept of the Constitution, just the same as is the right to worship in a church of one's choice—and just the same as the many other rights guaranteed by our Constitution."

Ben T. Laney, Governor of Arkansas, 1945–47 and 1947–49: "Personal freedom and liberty is the priceless pearl sought by all men everywhere. During the 4 years I served as Governor of Arkansas, our State development agencies working with statewide and local groups of civic-minded citizens, secured new industries creating 40,000 new jobs and advancing the economic welfare of all citizens. A major factor in the preservation of freedom, and in the development of our new industrial program in Arkansas, was our Arkansas right-to-work law. Under it, both industry and labor, as well as the citizenry as a whole, have benefited."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the area of compulsory unionism, the Allen case. The Court found that the freedom of American citizens is being violated in so-called union shop contracts. These are the contracts for compulsory union membership which the distinguished Senators who are sponsoring the bill to repeal 14(b) wish, in effect, to force upon the people of the 20 States which have outlawed them. These are the contracts that are now permitted in the other 30 States that do not yet have right-to-work laws. These are the contracts which, every day for millions of Americans, violate the vital political freedom upon which the American Republic was built. Backing me up in this statement is the judgment of the U.S. Supreme Court. Union shop contracts permit unions to force American citizens to contribute their money to political activities which they oppose—or be fired from their jobs.

In spotlighting the injustice and the illegality of such political bondage, the Supreme Court has gone halfway toward abolishing compulsory unionism which, in one of its less perceptive moments, Congress permitted in those States which have not erected barriers against such coercion. The Supreme Court's recognition of this chink in the armor of freedom can become a truly historic milestone if we, in Congress today, will but go the other half mile.

My bill (S. 87) would make amends for our myopia of a few years ago. It would, as a national policy and in harmony with the whole constitutional structure, establish freedom of choice at the places where people work for their livelihood, but at the same time would recognize the right of the States to retain their legislative prerogative.

The Senator from New Jersey defines the right-to-work issue in two parts. Part 1 is the question, he says, of whether government should be permitted to interfere with agreements between employer and employees.

Mr. President, it is the primary function of government to protect individual liberty. Many years ago government found that the "yellow dog" contract was interfering with the individual liberty of American working people. Congress outlawed the "yellow dog" contract.

What was the "yellow dog" contract?

It was a contract between the employer and employee. It prohibited an employee from joining a union—under penalty of being fired. Let me repeat that under the "yellow dog" contract a worker would be fired if he joined a union. Therefore he was forced not to join a union—if he wanted to keep his job. I am sure the Senator from New Jersey is as unalterably opposed to such an arrangement as I am. Congress was opposed to it. The Congress of the United States outlawed it. Thus a worker's liberty to join a union was safeguarded. This was government interference in the area of contracts between employer and employee.

Let us make it clear once and for all: Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which the Senator and his five colleagues wish to repeal, merely permits State governments to further safeguard the very liberty that Congress safeguarded in part when it outlawed the "yellow dog" contract. The other half of the liberty I am talking about is the liberty not to join a union. If Government protects a worker's right to join—which is a fundamental function of government—then it must also protect a worker's right not to join.

This is the essence of the debate on the issue of voluntary versus compulsory union membership. It is the essence of any debate that may arise in Congress on this issue. This is government interference on the side of individual liberty; it is government's primary function; and no other agency in our society can fulfill this function.

Another way to approach this aspect of the issue is to pose the question whether State governments should have the right to interfere when an individual's political freedom, and freedom of association, and freedom to work are endangered, or violated. This, I submit again, is at once the primary and the paramount purpose of government—to protect individual freedom, and to interfere with anything that seeks to violate it.

The agreements which the Senator proposes to move beyond the power of intervention by Government are compulsory unionism agreements, the so-called union shop and other forms of such coercion. What do these agreements do? One thing they do, as the Supreme Court noted, is to violate the political freedom of individual Americans. The Supreme Court says that no union should have the right to exact money from an individual by coercion and spend it on political activities objectionable to the individual. The union shop confers this license upon unions, and unfortunately, the Supreme Court, while condemning it, has failed to provide a readily accessible escape for the millions of workers held captive in this bondage. The union shop also forces upon citizens actual membership in an organization to which they may not wish to belong, the alternative is to be fired from the job.

The escape from such bondage is provided in right-to-work laws.

In part 2 of the Senator's discussion of the issue, he seems to imply an uncertain personal support for the premise set forth in part 1. He propounds the idea that unions are different from other nongovernmental organizations. He says the proposition that a person should be free to withdraw from any voluntary association is generally true. But not so with union membership. He holds up the free rider argument as his straw man. He says those who are not members benefit from the union activities and should be forced to pay.

There is only one answer to this: Any man who considers that he benefits from the union's activities certainly ought to pay. Those who do not think so should not be forced to pay. They are not free riders. They are captive passengers. They are captives of a device called exclusive representation. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor in 1935, when the present labor law was being formulated in Congress, threw all of the power of big unionism into the fight for the license of so-called exclusive representation. This provision makes it mandatory that union bargaining units represent nonunion workers as well as union members in the work unit. This created the misnamed free rider who is, in fact, the captive passenger.

Some of the top people in the New Deal fought to preserve the right of

bargaining for the minority and the individual, but they were overwhelmed by the power of Mr. Green and other union officials. On February 1, 1934, an Executive order on collective bargaining was issued by the White House and on February 4, the bargaining section was interpreted officially in a press release—No. 3125. The release said:

2. This selection of majority representatives (in an election conducted by the National Labor Board) does not restrict or qualify in any way the right of minority groups of employees or of individual employees to deal with their employer.

3. Section 7(a) affirms the right of the employees to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing; and such concerted activities can be lawfully carried on by either majority or minority groups organizing and selecting such representatives in such manner as they see fit. Also, in affirming this right of collective action, the law lays no limitation upon individual action—Committee on Education and Labor on Senate bill 1958, 74th Congress, 1st session, part I, pages 117–121.

Mr. William Green took note of this interpretation in his testimony at hearings on the proposed Wagner Labor Relations Act. On March 14, 1935, Mr. Green testified:

We have protested against this interpretation * * * and we hold it is contradictory of the Executive order.

He went on to throw the full weight of his organization against the granting of individual and minority freedom—for reserving to the majority all bargaining prerogatives—exclusive representation.

The sponsors of the repeal measure talk about freedom to contract and majority rule. On these points I should like to read a short editorial which appeared in the Richmond News Leader and then was picked up and published in other newspapers around the Nation. The editorial says:

Senator CLAIR ENGLE, of California, issued a statement last week, calling for repeal of the section of the Taft-Hartley Act that permits States to adopt right-to-work laws.

The editorial then quotes the Senator as follows:

"If, through a voluntary and free choice," said the Senator, "the workers in a shop vote to set up a union shop, they have every right to do so. To deny them this choice is to deny them their fundamental right to organize."

That is the end of the quotation attributed to Senator ENGLE. The editorial continues:

What a lovely thought. Let us extend it it a little.

Senator ENGLE's shop consists of 100 workers. Fifty-one of them vote for a union shop, the other 49 don't want to belong to a union. The Senator says the 49 must go. They may have worked at the shop 20 years. Never mind. Out.

Suppose the 51 voted voluntarily and by free choice that no Negroes could work at the place. Obviously, to deny them this choice would be to deny them their fundamental right to organize. Does the Senator not agree?

This is a question, understand, posed by the newspaper. The editorial continues:

Or suppose that the 51 militant unioneers voted that as a condition of employment, every worker would have to contribute to the National Democratic Party. Do they not have "every right to do so"? And if not, why not? Does the Senator not believe in pure majority rule?

The editorial continues:

In the Senator's book, all "fundamental rights" belong to the 51 percent; the other 49 have none. He calls this democracy. We offer him another word for it: tyranny.

Mr. President, that is the end of the editorial. I feel that it makes the point on majority rule very well. One of the keystones of our American system is the protection it gives to minority and individual rights, while at the same time operating through the democratic process. 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:

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, Apr. 29, 1963]

THE PURE DEMOCRAT

Senator CLAIR ENGLE, of California, issued a statement last week calling for repeal of the section of the Taft-Hartley Act that permits States to adopt right-to-work laws.

The statement was nothing new—Mr. ENGLE is one of labor's little darlings—but we were fetched by the way he put it.

"If, through a voluntary and free choice," said the Senator, "the workers in a shop vote to set up a union shop, they have every right to do so. To deny them this choice is to deny them their fundamental right to organize."

What a lovely thought. Let us extend it a little.

Senator ENGLE's shop consists of 100 workers. Fifty-one of them vote for a union shop; the other 49 don't want to belong to a union. The Senator says the 49 must go. They may have worked at the shop 20 years. Never mind. Out.

Suppose the 51 voted voluntarily and by free choice that no Negroes could work at the place. Obviously, to deny them this choice would be to deny them their fundamental right to organize. Does the Senator not agree?

Or suppose the 51 militant unioneers voted that as a condition of employment every worker would have to contribute to the National Democratic Party. Do they not have every right to do so? And if not, why not? Does the Senator not believe in pure majority rule?

In the Senator's book, all the fundamental rights belong to the 51 percent; the other 49 have none. He calls this democracy. We offer him another word for it: tyranny.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in California a year ago, Mr. Reuther and Mr. Hayes of the auto and machinists unions attempted to impose compulsory unionism upon all aerospace workers. Tens of thousands of workers had not joined the union, although the UAW and IAM had been the collective bargaining agents for 20 years. They sincerely believed that the union activities did not benefit them. They resisted an agency shop fee because they did not wish to contribute to the union's political and other activities. The union prevailed at Douglas Aircraft Co., and several thousand workers were forced to contribute in order to hold their jobs. Some of the workers refused to contribute. They were fired. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a newspaper article, published in the January 14, 1963, edition of the Santa Monica Evening Outlook, on the firing of one of these workers, a Mr. George Seeley.

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

[From the Evening Outlook, Jan. 14, 1963]

TWENTY-SEVEN-YEAR MAN AT DOUGLAS FIRED IN AGENCY DISPUTE—IAM ORDER DEFIED BY WORKER

(By Walter L. Scratch)

Friday afternoon, tool and diemaker John Seeley walked across Ocean Park Boulevard and looked back at the plant where he has worked for the past 27 years.

Seeley is one of the Douglas Aircraft Co. employees who have been fired because they won't agree to pay service fees to the International Association of Machinists (IAM) in order to hold their jobs.

He is one of hundreds of Douglas employees who argued that the agency shop contract between Douglas and the IAM is wrong because it forces a worker to join or pay fees to a union against his wishes. They believe in voluntary unionism, but only 25 or 50 of them stood by their guns and accepted final pay checks Friday afternoon. The rest agreed to pay "under protest" to the union.

MOST CAN'T AFFORD INTEGRITY

"Most people," commented Seeley, "can't afford the luxury of integrity."

As we sat on a parking lot guard rail and talked, a claxon horn sounded in the Douglas plant across the street.

"That's the coffee break," chuckled Seeley. "Now we can relax for 10 minutes."

Two days ago, when Seeley was notified he either had to pay $5 a month to the IAM or be fired, he went to call on Donald W. Douglas Jr., president of the company.

"He wasn't in," said Seeley, "so I gave my 25-year pin to his secretary. Mr. Douglas called me later and asked to see me. He wanted to make sure I understood the company's position and my rights under the agency shop contract. I assured him I did. He asked me about turning back my 25-year service pin. I told him I didn't want the pin any longer because I couldn't wear it with pride. Then he asked me to see Mr. Counts before I made my final decision."

J. Curtis Counts is director of employee relations for Douglas.

"Mr. Counts tried to convince me that Douglas had made a good contract for me because I can work there without joining the union. I told him a good many of the employees think the company sold us down the river to the union," said Seeley.

He said Counts got out a copy of the agency shop contract and pointed out that IAM members now are free to withdraw from the union at any time. They can elect to pay the agency fee instead of belonging to the union and paying union dues of the same amount, Counts pointed out. Previously IAM members had to maintain their memberships.

"I was not impressed," said Seeley. "The union can also fire you any time you disagree with the union bosses. They will get their money anyway, because you have to pay service fees in order to keep working."

EXPERT TOOL, DIEMAKER

During his 27 years at the Douglas plant in Santa Monica, Seeley has done every phase of a tool and diemaker's work. He finished his career in department 635, where highly skilled tool and die men build special machinery.

"My superior gave me the highest rating in the plant," said Seeley, pulling his final paycheck and dismissal notice out of his coat pocket. Across the notice was typed

"Failure To Pay Agency Fee," under "Reason for Dismissal."

"Everyone was fair to me," said Seeley. "I feel no resentment against anybody—not even the union. Everybody wanted to make sure I understood my rights. My foreman, George Dobbs, looked real sad when he told me I had to go out at 1 o'clock Friday. I explained to everybody it was just a matter of principle with me."

OLD UNION MAN HIMSELF

Seeley went on to explain that he is an old union man himself. Years ago he helped to organize a union at the Douglas plant. It was called the Aircraft Workers Union. During World War II, he was a member of a CIO union at Douglas, serving it as an assistant shop steward for a time.

These were voluntary unions. Employees were free to join or not join. Seeley believes in that type of unionism. He contends union officials serve the members well when the members don't have to belong to the union in order to hold their jobs.

"I went to union meetings for years," said Seeley, "at which less than 10 percent of the membership showed up. At Douglas a handful of union members had been dictating the affairs of 1,000 workers."

WOMEN IN TEARS

Seeley and George Seay, president of Douglas Employes Right-to-Work Committee, which fought the agency shop contract and still is challenging its legality in a court action, said they saw several women employes in tears in the Douglas plant when they took their final paychecks.

They said they had failed in an effort to learn how many took their dismissals instead of sacrificing their principles. They said, however, the total was between 25 and 50. Hundreds of others who bitterly resent the contract could not afford to quit, they said. One of these is Seay himself, who on Friday paid up his agency shop fees under protest and continued his battle against the contract.

He constantly seeks new members for the right-to-work committee.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD a part of the article, which was written by the newspaper's labor reporter, Walter L. Scratch. It reads in part as follows:

Friday afternoon, tool and diemaker John Seeley walked across Ocean Park Boulevard and looked back at the plant where he has worked for the past 27 years.

Seeley is one of the Douglas Aircraft Co. employees who have been fired because they won't agree to pay service fees to the International Association of Machinists (IAM) in order to hold their jobs. He is one of hundreds of Douglas employees who argue that the agency shop contract between Douglas and the IAM is wrong because it forces a worker to join or pay fees to a union against his wishes. They believe in voluntary unionism, but only 25 or 50 of them stood by their guns and accepted final paychecks Friday afternoon. The rest agreed to pay under protest to the union.

Seeley and George Seay, president of Douglas employees right-to-work committee, which fought the agency shop contract said they saw several women employees in tears in the Douglas plant when they took their final paychecks.

Mr. President, this is the story of the loss of a man's livelihood, along with that of 49 others. Some union officials might say, "Well, let them get a job elsewhere." But in standing up for what they believed to be their rights, these men and women have become controversial. I am told that this makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for them to secure work elsewhere in the trade in which they have spent their working lifetime.

This is a story of the loss of freedom. I submit to the Senate that this is the only real issue involved in the debate over voluntary versus compulsory unionism.

There is close at hand an even more dramatic illustration of the value of right-to-work laws. I refer to the story of Casey Delatte, a porter on the Reading Railway. He lives in Philadelphia. I have the story here, as it appeared in the May 12 issue of the Philadelphia Bulletin. I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Sunday Bulletin, May 12, 1963]

BROTHERHOOD ENFORCES RULE—CASEY DELATTE: A RAILROADER FACING LOSS OF JOB OVER $8 BILL FOR DUES

(By Douglas H. Bedell)

Casey Delatte, 62, is a man in the grip of a rule.

Delatte is a porter for the Reading Railroad and a former freight tallyman. He looks after the East Falls, Wissahickon and Spring Mill stations.

He's been working on the Reading for 38 years. His record is unblemished.

On February 1 he owed $8 in dues to his union, the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, AFL–CIO. Because of his failure to pay the dues on time, the brotherhood says, he must be fired from his job.

Unless an arbitrator waives the rule in Delatte's case—and the case has some complications—he will be dropped from the Reading's payroll sometime this summer.

Three years short of retirement age, he would lose about $30 of the $150 a month, pension he and his wife, Martha, expect to receive. His current takehome pay of $128.17 every 2 weeks would be stopped.

The rule in question is article 6, section 1 of the statutes of the clerks' brotherhood.

It reads, "A member who fails to pay his dues within the time limits specified in this article is automatically suspended at 12 o'clock midnight of the last day of the second month for which he owes dues and no notice of suspension is required."

The rule was adopted by the brotherhood's convention in 1959. It is intended to encourage members to pay their dues on time.

Before it was adopted, brotherhood officials explain, some members let their dues lapse and confused their lodges' books.

In 1960, Delatte's lodge notified its members that it had been directed to comply with article 6 and that:

"In the event of such suspension, we are informed, the provisions of the union-shop agreement will be followed and fully complied with and after an adverse decision the suspended member's seniority and employment * * * shall be terminated.

"Although it seems some leniency has been shown in the past, after January 1, 1961, these rules will be strictly enforced."

Last February 1, the books of lodge 1771 showed that Casey Delatte owed $8, his $4 a month dues for December and January. The rule took hold.

HE WAS SUSPENDED

He was suspended by the lodge's secretary-treasurer, Willie G. Council, and reported to Judson Swan, the brotherhood's general chairman for the Reading Co.

"I got no pleasure out of it," Council said last week. "Before if a man was suspended, he had a chance of being reinstated. Now there is no reinstatement and I don't agree with it.

"I had to do what I saw fit according to the rules and regulations on the books."

Swan asked that Delatte be cited for violating the brotherhood's union-shop agreement with the Reading.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act, the only offense for which a union can ask that a member be fired is nonpayment of dues.

On March 12, following a hearing the preceding day, Earl T. Hunter, superintendent of the Reading's Philadelphia division, ruled that Delate had failed to pay his dues on time.

The ruling was upheld by Harrison F. Wyatt, the railroad's director of personnel. Delatte's keys and annual pass were to be taken from him on April 24.

STILL ON ACTIVE STATUS

His decision to fight the ruling, however, has kept him on active status until an arbitrator decides the case this summer.

At his hearing, Delatte testified he thought his dues had been paid.

He said he had given them early in December to a friend who had been regularly turning them in for him. The practice, brotherhood officials acknowledge, is a common one, although article 6 says it is a member's responsibility to give his dues to an authorized collector.

Delatte, who lives in Tioga at 2215 Estaugh Street, told a reporter he had been giving his duesbook and money to his friend, James W. Lawrence, while the two of them worked at the freight station in Reading during 1960 and 1961.

He continued the practice when they returned to jobs in Philadelphia. In Reading, Delatte said, Lawrence was an authorized collector.

The two would meet, Delatte said, at the North Broad Street Station. Lawrence, he explained, lived at 2052 Fitzwater Street, near the lodge meeting place at the Citizens Republican Club, 422 South 15th Street.

It was easier for him to pick up Delatte's dues than for Delatte to make the trip downtown.

NINE DAYS LATE

Delatte said he assumed his dues were paid for December and January as they had been for the preceding months.

At Delatte's hearing, however, Swan brought out that Lawrence hadn't offered the money to Council until February 9, 9 days late.

"I trusted Lawrence and he trusted me," Delatte said. "When he told me he paid my dues late, I said, 'Oh, my goodness, why didn't you tell me, why didn't you call?'

"I didn't see why I should lose my job on account of that."

Lawrence, who in December 1961, transferred from the Reading to Acme Fast Freight, Inc., when the trucking company took over operation of Lawrence's station at Willow and Noble Streets, testified at the hearing to the effect that he was sick and couldn't get out to pay Delatte's dues on time.

ASSUMES RESPONSIBILITY

"Because of the circumstances," he testified, "I assume responsibility for this very serious affair."

Swan told Delatte that the brotherhood has used "every means possible" to impress on its members the necessity of paying dues on time.

Swan, who is attending a brotherhood convention in Los Angeles this week, said in a telephone conversation that possible mitigating circumstances have "nothing at all to do with the matter."

CAN'T MAKE EXCEPTIONS

"It's a matter of carrying out the requirements of the union-shop agreement. We can't make exceptions in any case."

He noted that Delatte has taken the case to arbitration. "If Mr. Delatte has not been properly treated," Swan said, "it will be handled in the proper procedure."

Speaking for the Reading, Wyatt said he had no alternative but to uphold the ruling against Delatte.

"The railroads don't like the union shop," he said, "but we have agreements with these organizations and we're required to live up to them."

HAS TO GO ALONG

"Morally, I think it is wrong (for Delatte to lose his job)," he added, "but as long as the clerks are applying this rule uniformly, the only alternative I have is to say they're right."

Wyatt said the clerks have the strictest policy on dues of all but one other of the railway brotherhoods.

Delatte himself is a former union steward. He said that at one time he held 100 duesbooks for other men and kept their records straight.

Delatte said that when his friends on the Reading heard of his case, their reaction was:

"Not you, Casey. It was always your preaching, 'If you're working, pay your dues.'"

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, at this time I should like to present to the Senate the facts in this case.

Casey Delatte is 62 years old. He has been working for 38 years on the Reading Railroad. His record is unblemished. He has been a union member for more than 20 years. For several years he served as the union shop steward in his union, the AFL–CIO Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks.

The brotherhood has a compulsory membership contract with the railroad. Only union members can work. In recent years, Mr. Delatte has handed his monthly union dues to a fellow worker who lived close by the union office. The friend would pay both of their dues once a month, on his way home.

Last February 1, Casey Delatte received a terrible shock: The union secretary-treasurer notified him that he was expelled from the union. This meant loss of his job. His dues for December and January had not been paid.

Mr. Delatte explained to everyone concerned that he had, as usual, turned his dues over to his friend James Lawrence, a fellow railroader. Lawrence had in fact paid the dues. He said he had been delayed in paying Casey Delatte's dues for the 2 months in question because he was sick in bed. He had actually been 9 days later than the union rules permit. The records showed this to be the fact.

On March 12, nevertheless, the railroad company, acting upon the provisions of its compulsory unionism contract with the brotherhood, set into action the machinery for Casey Delatte's dismissal. His keys and annual pass were taken from him on April 24.

Mr. Delatte has field a court action. This and the wide publicity in newspapers may move the union to make an exception. However, if the union shop action is upheld by a court-appointed arbitrator, Casey Delatte will be fired officially. He has only 3 years to go before retirement. By being fired he will have lost a substantial portion of his pension.

Judson Swant, the union brotherhood's general chairman for the Reading Railroad employees, said:

It's a matter of carrying out the requirements of the union shop agreement. We can't make exceptions in any case.

Harrison Wyatt, the railroad's director of personnel, said:

The railroads do not like the union shop. But we have agreements with these organizations and we're required to live up to them.

Mr. President, this is compulsory unionism in action. This heartless exercise of monopoly control of jobs by a union and its violation of human rights—yes, civil rights—are the heart of the issue of voluntarism versus compulsion in union membership.

However, those who wish to perpetuate the tyranny of the majority over the minority, by prohibiting States from legislating against it, make an argument on economic grounds, too. The staffs of the international unions have long cried out in their propaganda releases that right-to-work laws depress wages and stifle economic progress in the States which have them. To meet the challenge of this attack, the National Right-to-Work Committee recently prepared a brochure based entirely on statistics published in reports of the U.S. Department of Labor and the U.S. Department of Commerce. The Right-to-Work Committee, I am told, did not initiate the debate on the economic effect of right-to-work laws. Their brochure was published as a means of replying to the union's charge that right-to-work laws hold back the economic progress of States which enact them. Since this brochure is the basis for renewed debate on the economics of right-to-work, I ask unanimous consent to have the brochure printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FREEDOM AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS: NEW JOBS, NEW WEALTH, NEW PROGRESS IN THE RIGHT-TO-WORK STATES DOCUMENTING, WITH U.S. GOVERNMENT STATISTICS, THE RECORD OF POCKETBOOK PROGRESS IN RIGHT-TO-WORK STATES

The overriding benefit of right-to-work laws is the specific protection they spell out for individual freedom: declaring that union membership shall be voluntary, that no American shall be forced to join a union in order to hold the job of his choice.

This is but an enunciation of one of the fundamental civil rights guaranteed under the U.S. Constitution.

Why then is it necessary to have such State laws?

Answer: Because, under another form of compulsory unionism—the closed shop (now outlawed)—some unions became so politically and financially powerful[1] that they forced into the Taft-Hartley Act a permission for "contracts" between union and the employer compelling all workers to join and support the union (sec. 7 and 8). The Taft-Hartley Act recognizes, however (sec. 14–b), the right of States to prohibit such contracts and to enforce the principle of voluntary unionism with right-to-work laws.

These right-to-work laws, spreading across the Nation, are destroying the monopoly economic powers of the Big Union hierarchy and, in time, will cut down their political powers and governmental influence to a proper level. For this reason the hierarchy is using its vast resources to prevent new right-to-work laws and repeal all present laws. Knowing the keen interest of all people in bettering their economic welfare—in a greater choice of jobs, more money in the pay envelope, higher per capita incomes, a brighter future—the propagandists for compulsory unionism distort, twist and falsify the economic record of progress under right-to-work laws in 19 States that have had the law in force.

This brochure is an accurate presentation of the true facts of economic progress in the right-to-work States. Its facts came officially from the U.S. Department of Labor and the U.S. Department of Commerce, on January 1, 1963. Confirmation of them can be easily secured by an inquiry to the departments.

These facts hold out a great promise to the people of the States that have not yet enacted a right-to-work law * * * the promise of right-to-work freedom guaranteed by State law, and the promise of a sound, wholesome and continuing betterment of their economic welfare.

Right-to-work States lead the rest of the Nation in the creation of new jobs in business and industry.

Among the 50 States, the leaders in the creation of new jobs: (1) Arizona; (2) Florida; (3) Nevada. All three are right-to-work States.

For the period 1953–61, rate of increase: Other States, 3.8 percent; right-to-work States, 14.6 percent.

Right-to-work States lead the nonright-to-work States in wage rate improvement in industrial jobs.

Among the 10 States in America having the highest percentage increase in hourly wages were 7 right-to-work States: (1) Florida; (2) Iowa; (4) Utah; (6) South Dakota; (7) Alabama; (9) North Dakota; (10) Nevada.[2]

Wage rate improvement, 1953–61: right-to-work States, 37.5 percent; States without right-to-work law, 33.3 percent.

The personal income of the people in right-to-work States is increasing more rapidly than in the other 31 States.

The low income States are showing the greatest strides forward, catching up with the higher income States, with wage rates for skilled workers only pennies apart. For instance, Arkansas has tripled its per capita income during the years it has had a right-to-work law and in the last 8 years has scored the greatest per capita gain in America.

Per capita income improvement, 1953–61: States without right-to-work law, 25.3 percent; right-to-work States, 30.2 percent.

Right-to-work States show a greater gain in capital expenditures for producing new wealth than the other States.

New wealth can come only from production of goods—the processing of raw material into something useful. Such new wealth is dynamic: it creates new manufacturing jobs, new industrial payrolls, new purchasing power, a rising degree of prosperity for all.

The two basic factors necessary to expanding a State's wealth are (1) an increasing capital expenditure, building new factories and new industrial expansions; and (2) expanding production of goods and services through such factories and processing plants. In both of these vital areas of progress, right-to-work States lead the Nation.

---

[1] Income of all unions today is reported by the U.S. Department of Labor to total approximately $1,500,000,000 a year.

[2] Nevada was shown to have the highest industrial wage paid anywhere in America.

Gain in capital expenditures,[3] 1954–59: right-to-work States, 29.7 percent; States without right-to-work law, 8.2 percent.

Value (wealth) added in manufacturing,[3] 1954–59: right-to-work States, 57.6 percent; States without right-to-work law, 34.3 percent.

The bank accounts of people in the right-to-work States are increasing more rapidly than in the nonright-to-work States.

Increase in total bank deposits, 1953–61: right-to-work States, 47.3 percent; [4] other States, 40.6 percent.

The rate of increase in retail sales in right-to-work States is outstripping the nonright-to-work States.

Increase in retail sales, 1954–58: right-to-work States, 20.8 percent; [5] other States, 16.5 percent.

New retail businesses are being established in right-to-work States at nearly three times the rate of the other States.

Increase in number of retail establishments, 1954–58: right-to-work States, 7.4 percent; [6] others, 2.7 percent.

Retail payrolls are growing faster in the 19 right-to-work States than in the 31 nonright-to-work States.

Growth in annual retail payrolls, 1954–58: Right-to-work States, 24.1 percent; [7] other States, 17.3 percent.

Roll call of right-to-work States: Arkansas, 1944; Florida, 1944; Arizona, 1946; Nebraska, 1946; Georgia, 1947; Iowa, 1947; North Carolina, 1947; South Dakota, 1947; Tennessee, 1947; Texas, 1947; Virginia, 1947; North Dakota, 1948; Nevada, 1952; Alabama, 1953; South Carolina, 1954; Mississippi, 1954; Utah, 1955; Indiana, 1957; Kansas, 1958.

Automobile population an indication of progress—is rising more rapidly in right-to-work States than in the other States.

Gain in motor vehicle registration, 1953–60: other States, 29 percent; right-to-work States, 34.8 percent.

The people population goes up in all the right-to-work States.

The U.S. Bureau of the Census reported on January 1, 1963, that populations of all 19 right-to-work States increased, July 1, 1961 to July 1, 1962.

ENRICHING THE WELFARE OF ALL CITIZENS—SAY THE GOVERNORS [8] OF RIGHT-TO-WORK STATES

Texas: "The Texas right-to-work law has been important to the industrial development of this State."—Gov. Price Daniel, 1958–62.

"The right-to-work plank should be in the platform because a majority of the Democrats of Texas want it." (NOTE.—It was in the Republican platform, too.)—Gov. John A. Connally, 1962–64.

Indiana: "In the past 4 years Indiana has enjoyed the greatest industrial expansion in the history of the State. Many industrial firms have openly stated that one of their reasons for moving to Indiana or expanding their existing operations was on account of the right-to-work law."—Lt. Gov. Crawford F. Parker, 1957–61.

"The right-to-work law has the approval of thousands of union members who maintain that it makes the union leaders more responsive to the wishes of the membership and is a weapon by which corruption and racketeering can be curbed by the members themselves."—Gov. Harold W. Handley, 1957–61.

Arizona: "We are convinced that the right-to-work law has been an aid to us in our industrial development activities. In this regard, a great many companies, seeking plant locations in Arizona, have indicated the fact that we have a right-to-work law was materially helpful in allowing them to make a favorable decision."—Gov. Paul Fannin, 1959–65.

Florida: "I am pleased to note * * * that Florida's population growth, its industrial development, its personal income, and its job opportunities have been expanding faster than those of any other State in the Nation, and this has occurred while the State right-to-work law was in effect."—Gov. Farris Bryant, 1961–65.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the honesty of the statistical basis of the brochure can readily be confirmed by publications of the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce. The brochure shows that on a percentage basis, the rate of improvement in the right-to-work States, using the accepted yardsticks of economic progress, is outstripping the rate of improvement in the States which have not yet enacted right-to-work laws.

The Senator from New Jersey, in his presentation to the Senate on May 15, gave currency to the charge of the union people that right-to-work laws have a deressing effect on the economy of the States that have them. In fact, the Senator himself made the charge. He stated:

Georgia is by no means the only victim of the depressing effect of the so-called right-to-work law.

In his remarks on Georgia, the Senator cited an article published last April 30 in the Atlanta Constitution, the lead paragraph of which stated:

Georgia's so-called right-to-work law may be crippling the State's economic progress.

The writer of the article is Jim Montgomery, of the newspaper's staff. The Senator from New Jersey suggested that in implying that the right-to-work law is hindering economic progress in Georgia, Mr. Montgomery was speaking for the newspaper itself. That may or may not be the case. The Constitution editorially has not, to my knowledge, advocated repeal of the Georgia law.

It is rather ironic, Mr. President, that on the very day when Mr. Montgomery published on page 32 of the Atlanta Constitution, his article bemoaning the depression into which the right-to-work law has projected the State of Georgia, there was published on the front page of the Constitution a news dispatch which the editors considered of high importance. I have the front-page item here. The headline reads as follows:

Revenue up 5 percent in Georgia.

The lead paragraph of his front page article reads as follows:

Georgia's economy has grown more than 5 percent during the first 9 months of the current fiscal year, the State revenue department believes.

It would seem, Mr. President, that Mr. Montgomery might well have checked with Mr. John Bearden, of the State Revenue Department of Georgia, who reports that Georgia's economy has progressed more rapidly than the national average—in the last 9-month period of record. The article on the front page of the Atlanta Constitution is a clear refutation of the whole substance of Mr. Montgomery's article printed on page 32. I ask unanimous consent that this front-page article be printed at this point in the RECORD, inasmuch as the Senator from New Jersey had Mr. Montgomery's page 32 article printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Apr. 30, 1963]

REVENUE UP 5 PERCENT IN GEORGIA

Georgia's economy has grown more than 5 percent during the first 9 months of the current fiscal year, the State Revenue Department believes.

Its calculations are based primarily on the collection of motor fuel taxes—which it regards as more of an economic barometer than sales taxes, which fluctuate more.

The tax collections have increased 5.38 percent during the first three quarters of the fiscal year ending June 30.

Motor Fuel Tax Unit Director John Bearden said the increase also is attributable to more driving by the 1.7 million autos and trucks as expressways open up.

The gas tax collections are the steadiest barometer because they do not "fluctuate as rapidly as a result of seasonal buying and economic crises," Bearden said.

The gas taxes have doubled since 1950 as the State experienced its greatest growth. However, there also was an increase in the tax rate during that period.

Total collections for the first 9 months have climbed to $72,434,000, the Revenue Department said.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Montgomery's article makes note of the fact that he drew his conclusions in large part from a magazine article, which the Senator from New Jersey also inserted in the RECORD. The magazine article was written by Prof. Milton J. Nadworny. He is given a highly useful academic aura by being identified as the Professor of Commerce and Economics at the University of Vermont. Another of Professor Nadworny's connections should be noted, and in my opinion, this connection may to some extent dissipate the academic aura which lends prestige to his article. Dr. Nadworny is the Vermont State chairman for the National Council for Industrial Peace. This is the organization, with a two-man staff, that was set up years ago by the American Federation of Labor to propagandize against right-to-work laws and the right-to-work movement. Mr. John Redding, former publicity director of the Democratic National Committee, has been its operating chief from its beginning. The Associated Press categorically established the fact that the so-called peace council is in fact a front for the AFL–CIO.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD several items dealing with this organization.

[3] Indiana and Kansas not included; their right-to-work laws enacted 1957 and 1958 respectively.

[4] All right-to-work States included.

[5] Does not include Indiana and Kansas.

[6] Indiana and Kansas not included.

[7] Indiana and Kansas not included.

[8] These are typical of statements available from 24 Governors.

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

[From the Kansas City (Kans.) Star, July 30, 1958]

RIGHT-TO-WORK LINES SHAPE UP—SMALL BUSINESS AND THE UNIONS CONTRIBUTE TO RESPECTIVE COMMITTEES—CENTER ON SIX STATES—ELEANOR ROOSEVELT IS ACTIVE IN THE GROUP FIGHTING ON LABOR'S SIDE

WASHINGTON, July 30.—Business and labor are putting up the bulk of the money to finance the expensive campaigns for and against State right-to-work laws.

The laws, already in effect in 18 States, will be an issue on the ballot in at least five and probably six States in the November elections.

INTENT OF LAW

Such a law bars employers and labor unions from negotiating any labor contract arrangement requiring compulsory union membership of workers. Voters will ballot on the issue in November in California, Colorado, Idaho, Washington, and Kansas, and probably Ohio.

Heading the opposition to spreading right-to-work laws is the newly formed National Council for Industrial Peace, with Herbert Lehman, former Senator of New York, and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt as cochairmen. Jack Redding, former publicity director of the Democratic National Committee, is its operating chief.

The main proponent organization is the National Right-to-Work Committee, with W. H. Harrison as executive secretary. Fred Hartley, former Representative, coauthor of the Taft-Hartley law, served for several years as chairman, but Harrison now says, "We've dropped him off our stationery."

Redding was reluctant to talk about financing of the opposition group.

"We've had contributions from individuals, from some management organizations and, in some instances, from international labor unions," he said. "We're not rich. We have a small staff and a small budget."

Redding operates from the office of Andrew Biemiller, legislative director of the AFL–CIO, which is fighting the right-to-work proposals tooth and nail.

FROM LABOR UNIONS

It is reliably reported that at least half the funds of Redding's organization comes direct from labor unions. The ban in the Taft-Hartley law against use of union dues, money for political purposes applies only to Federal issues and this exempts the State right-to-work fight.

Redding's group reportedly has a budget of $250,000.

Harrison says his right-to-work organization has no budget, but "just spends all the money we get; printing and distributing material.

Harrison says his group gets no money from the two big employer organizations, the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Nor does it get money, he said, from such big businesses as United States Steel, General Motors, or Ford.

"We don't have many takers from big business," Harrison said. "We get most of our money from small, family owned firms."

State organizations for and against right-to-work laws are associated with the two national groups, but operate largely on their own funds.

[From the Burlington (Vt.) Free Press, Nov. 10, 1959]

NEW VERMONT COUNCIL OPPOSES LAWS ON RIGHT TO WORK

Several Vermont political, educational, and church leaders linked to opposition to right to-work legislation Monday with formation of a Vermont Council for Industrial Peace.

Announcement of the council and its opposition to right-to-work laws was made by Dr. Milton J. Nadworny, University of Vermont economist.

Heading the list of signatures on a formal statement were the Most Reverend Robert F. Joyce, bishop of the Burlington Catholic diocese; Bishop Vedder Van Dyck of the Vermont Episcopal Diocese, and Rabbi Max B. Wall of Burlington.

Lt. Gov. Robert S. Babcock, Royce Pitkin, president of Goddard College, Plainfield, and State Senators Mildred Brault and Robert C. Spencer of Jericho also endorsed the statement.

Others associated with the statement included Howard Foster of Salisbury, Edward Peet of Cornwall and Frank Salhman of East Montpelier.

"While the Governor and the house of representatives clearly and emphatically rejected right-to-work legislation, it appears that its proponents intend to continue agitation for it," the group's statement said.

"The Vermont Council for Industrial Peace has been organized to provide a voice for those who would speak out against such legislation."

Formation of the council came less than a week after the Vermont Farm Bureau called for a referendum on the issue at the earliest possible general election.

A referendum proposal to put a "freedom of association" plan before Vermonters at town meeting was killed in the house last spring.

Nadworny said the newly formed committee is composed of citizens who do not purport to represent organizations.

The statement said:

"The major purpose of this committee is to oppose laws which would make the union shop illegal.

"We believe the union shop is beneficial to the process of collective bargaining, to employers and employees.

"However, we do not take the liberty even to recommend that employers and unions negotiate union shop agreements.

"We simply maintain that employers and employees be left free to negotiate on this matter under a free system of collective bargaining in a free society.

"The union shop is a matter for negotiation and comes into being when both the employer and the union agree to establish it.

"Just as we do not believe the union shop should be made mandatory for all employers and unions, so we do not believe it should be prohibited."

Right-to-work legislation is now in effect in 19 States.

It generally makes union shop contracts illegal. These provide that if management and labor agree, a worker is required to join the union within a specified time as a condition of employment.

NEWS RELEASE OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR INDUSTRIAL PEACE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Use of the Kansas right-to-work amendment against the National Farmers Organization was condemned today by the National Council for Industrial Peace.

John M. Redding, executive director of the NCIP, which opposes so-called right-to-work legislation, said:

"We have opposed this type legislation for this very reason. We have repeatedly warned that right to workers would use the law against farmers and that right to work committee members also opposed farmers' cooperatives, REA electric cooperatives, and credit unions through interlocking memberships in other ultraright organizations.

Yesterday, the National Farmer's Organization was threatened with action under the Kansas right-to-work amendment passed in 1958. L. E. Weiss, president of Kansans for the Right to Work, declared in Wichita that the NFO was in violation of the Kansas State constitution by virtue of a maintenance of membership provision in NFO recruiting blanks.

Mr. Weiss said farmers belonging to the NFO were acting like union goons in their efforts to get other farmers to join the farmer's market boycott.

Farm organizations in several States already alarmed by attacks by conservative groups on farm cooperatives were studying the Weiss statement. In Indiana, George Feldman, executive director of the Indiana Council for Industrial Peace in Indianapolis, Ind., said:

"We take a grave view of this development. We are studying the statement by Mr. Weiss and are asking our attorneys to advise us whether the Indiana right-to-work statute also would penalize farmers in this State. We have recognized that the same people who support so-called right-to-work laws also attack farmers' groups, but this is the first time the right-to-work law has been invoked against farmers, as far as we know."

In Vermont, Dr. Milton Nadworny, of the University of Vermont, chairman of the Vermont Council for Industrial Peace, said, "This is a development we have long expected. U.S. Senator George D. Aiken of Vermont, warned the Vermont State Labor Council a year or so ago that:

"It (so-called right-to-work laws) would definitely pave the way for abolition of marketing orders for farmers. If labor is denied the right to organize effectively so can farmers be denied the right to organize themselves into farm cooperatives for bargaining purposes."

Leadership of the National Farmers' Union, which opposes the NFO on many issues, including the present boycott, said they were studying Mr. Weiss' statement. They have asked for legal opinion as to whether the Kansas RTW law could, in fact, be used against farmers.

"We are not for the NFO," said a spokesman, "but we certainly are against this type of shotgun utilization of what at best is a bad law."

Several months ago when the John Birch Society was under scrutiny in the Nation's press, leaders of Kansans for Right to Work were identified as members of that ultra-right secret society.

Mr. GOLDWATER [reading]:

Heading the opposition to spreading right-to-work laws is the newly formed National Council for Industrial Peace—

Says the Associated Press—

with Herbert Lehman, former Senator of New York, and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt as cochairmen. Jack Redding, former publicity director of the Democratic National Committee, is its operating chief.

The AP continues:

Redding operates from the office of Andrew Biemiller, legislative director of the AFL–CIO, which is fighting the right-to-work proposals tooth and nail.

I might say that this Associated Press dispatch is several years old. In the meantime, Mr. Redding has moved the office of the anti-right-to-work organization out of the AFL–CIO headquarters building and into the National Press Building. However, its ancestry established and the source of its operating funds has not changed, of course.

In citing these facts I am not challenging the integrity of Professor Nadworny, but it is important that the American public know the source of the magazine article which the Atlanta Constitution and other newspapers have accepted as an objective appraisal of the economics of right-to-work. The implication of

the article and the conclusions being drawn from it place right-to-work in a distorted light. In fact, Mr. Montgomery calls Dr. Nadworny's article "The carefully documented indictment of right-to-work laws."

Let us take a careful look at this documented indictment.

In his effort to conceal the true facts about economic progress in right-to-work States, Professor Nadworny has resorted to statistical manipulations which do violence to his position as a university professor of economics. He purports to compare wage differentials between right-to-work States and the U.S. average, for the period from 1950 to 1962. In so doing, he is guilty of:

First. Incorrectly representing the Department of Labor's officially reported average of wage rates in right-to-work States for 1962.

Second. Including in the 1962 national average but not in the 1950 national average the unusually high wage rates of Alaska, thus artificially increasing his particular version of the 1962 wage differential on the side of nonright-to-work States.

Third. Totally ignoring the effect of 12 years of inflation, and erroneously implying that the value of 1962 dollars could be compared directly with the value of 1950 dollars.

Using Professor Nadworny's own selected indicators of 1962, but correcting the errors, the accurate figures would read, according to the U.S. Department of Labor:

Hourly wages of production workers in manufacturing

	U.S. Department of Labor figures, 1962	Professor Nadworny figures, 1962
U.S. average for 48 States (excluding Alaska and Hawaii)	2.32	2.39
Average for 19 right-to-work States	2.16	2.10

This means that the 1962 "differential" between right-to-work States and the U.S. average would actually be 16 cents rather than the 29 cents which is shown by Professor Nadworny's figures. Furthermore, if the 1962 differential is converted to the real value of 1950 dollars, it becomes 12.7 cents, which compares very favorably with the 21 cents differential that Professor Nadworny says was the difference between right-to-work States and the U.S. average in 1950.

Even Professor Nadworny admits, however, that Labor Department reports on State wage rate averages were incomplete prior to 1952. Therefore, rejecting all the contrived comparisons offered by the professor, I believe that the only fair and strictly comparable data are those compiled by the U.S. Department of Labor beginning in 1953 and published annually in what is now called "Employment and Earnings, Annual Supplement Issue."

These reports show that in 1953 wage rates in the 19 right-to-work States averaged $1.52 compared with an average of $1.77 for 29 nonright-to-work States.

Labor Department figures for 1962—not yet published but available to the public—reveal that wage rates in the same 19 right-to-work States had risen to $2.16, compared to $2.42 in the 29 nonright-to-work States excluding Alaska and Hawaii. This means that wage rates in right-to-work States in 1953 were 85.9 percent of wage rates in nonright-to-work States. Figures for 1962 show that right-to-work States had risen to a level of 89.3 percent of the wage rates in nonright-to-work States. The 1962 wage differential, measured in real—noninflated—dollars, was actually far less than the 1953 differential.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD documenting U.S. Department of Labor tables.

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

Gross earnings of production workers in manufacturing, percent increase, 1953–62

State	1953 rate	1958 rate (old base)	1958 rate (new base)	1962 rate	Total gain (hourly)	Percent gain (hourly)	State	1953 rate	1958 rate (old base)	1958 rate (new base)	1962 rate	Total gain (hourly)	Percent gain (hourly)
Alabama [1]	$1.39	$1.81	$1.82	$2.06	$0.66	47.5	Nebraska [1]	$1.57	$1.94	$1.93	$2.20	$0.64	40.8
Arizona [1]	1.88	2.31	2.30	2.57	.70	37.2	Nevada [1]	2.08	2.62	2.60	3.02	.96	46.2
Arkansas [1]	1.21	1.48	1.49	1.66	.44	36.4	New Hampshire	1.42	1.64	1.65	1.88	.45	31.7
California	1.97	2.43	2.44	2.79	.81	41.1	New Jersey	1.82	2.21	2.20	2.51	.70	38.5
Colorado	1.74	2.25	2.24	2.61	.88	50.6	New Mexico	1.80	2.19	2.01	2.20	.58	32.2
Connecticut	1.77	2.16	2.16	2.46	.69	39.0	New York	1.79	2.16	2.16	2.44	.65	36.3
Delaware	1.73	2.15	2.14	2.41	.69	39.9	North Carolina [1]	1.23	1.45	1.45	1.64	.41	33.3
Florida [1]	1.31	1.70	1.70	1.99	.68	51.9	North Dakota [1]	1.48	1.89	1.90	2.14	.65	43.9
Georgia [1]	1.26	1.54	1.55	1.77	.50	39.7	Ohio	1.95	2.40	2.40	2.76	.81	41.5
Idaho	1.87	2.12	2.09	2.34	.50	26.7	Oklahoma	1.69	2.04	2.03	2.19	.51	30.2
Illinois	1.86	2.28	2.28	2.60	.74	39.8	Oregon	2.12	2.40	2.41	2.64	.51	24.1
Indiana [1]	1.89	2.34	2.34	2.65	.76	40.2	Pennsylvania	1.77	2.15	2.15	2.41	.64	36.2
Iowa	1.69	2.17	2.16	2.53	.85	50.3	Rhode Island	1.52	1.76	1.75	2.02	.51	33.6
Kansas [1]	1.79	2.21	2.21	2.52	.73	40.8	South Carolina [1]	1.24	1.45	1.45	1.68	.44	35.5
Kentucky	1.62	1.99	1.98	2.27	.66	40.7	South Dakota [1]	1.47	1.89	1.86	2.17	.73	49.7
Louisiana	1.53	2.02	2.02	2.29	.76	49.7	Tennessee [1]	1.40	1.71	1.71	1.93	.53	37.9
Maine	1.40	1.65	1.65	1.89	.49	35.0	Texas [1]	1.68	2.08	2.09	2.32	.63	37.5
Maryland	1.66	2.13	2.13	2.40	.74	44.6	Utah [1]	1.79	2.30	2.29	2.66	.88	49.2
Massachusetts	1.65	1.95	1.95	2.24	.59	35.8	Vermont	1.46	1.70	1.71	1.96	.49	35.6
Michigan	2.09	2.52	2.52	2.91	.82	39.2	Virginia [1]	1.40	1.65	1.65	1.91	.51	36.4
Minnesota	1.76	2.18	2.19	2.52	.75	42.6	Washington	2.04	2.43	2.43	2.81	.77	37.7
Mississippi [1]	1.14	1.51	1.51	1.64	.50	43.9	West Virginia	1.78	2.24	2.25	2.55	.76	42.7
Missouri	1.69	2.07	2.08	2.38	.68	40.2	Wisconsin	1.78	2.17	2.17	2.51	.73	41.0
Montana	1.93	2.29	2.30	2.58	.64	33.2	Wyoming	1.99	2.39	2.37	2.61	.64	32.2

[1] Right-to-work States.

Average hourly earnings of production workers in manufacturing, 1953–62

	1953	1958	1958	1962	Total gain	Percent gain
Average, right-to-work States	$1.52	$1.90	$1.90	$2.16	$0.64	42.0
Average, non-right-to-work States	1.77	2.14	2.13	2.42	.66	37.6
National average	1.67	2.05	2.03	2.32	.65	39.4

Source: 1953–58 figures (old base): Employment and Earnings Annual Supplement, May 1959. 1958 figures (new base): Employment and Earnings Annual Supplement, November 1962 figures: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, for those who, at this point, may have become totally confused in a sea of statistics, I think the air can best be cleared and the situation summarized by placing in the RECORD the latest report from the Department of Commerce, which gives the average rate of economic progress for persons in each of the 50 States, for the 5-year period ending in 1962. This table shows that income of persons in nonfarm employment has increased at a national average rate of 20 percent. Fifteen of the 19 right-to-work States are shown to have exceeded the national average rate of improvement. The average percentage rate of improvement in right-to-work States was 32 percent, compared with the national average of 20 percent.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two items—the reproduction of the U.S. Department of Commerce report to which I have just referred, and a sheet recapitulating the percentage improvement in each of the right-to-work States.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE 3.—*Percent changes in industrial sources of personal income, by States and regions, 1957–62* [1]

[From the Survey of Current Business, April 1963, vol. 43, No. 4, U.S. Department of Commerce, Luther H. Hodges, Secretary]

State and region	Broad industrial sources of income						Income received by persons for participation in current production								
	Total personal income	Farm income	Nonfarm income	Government income disbursements			Private nonfarm income	All private nonfarm industries	Mining	Construction	Manufacturing	Wholesale and retail trade	Finance, insurance and real estate	Transportation, communication and public utilities	Services
				Total	Federal	State and local									
United States	25	10	26	46	43	52	21	20	−13	13	16	20	35	12	37
New England	25	−18	26	46	47	45	22	21	4	6	17	21	31	15	43
Maine	20	−13	21	43	36	59	16	15	5	3	15	10	28	10	35
New Hampshire	32	−29	33	51	52	50	29	28	0	26	25	24	29	16	54
Vermont	25	−13	29	45	34	62	25	23	19	27	18	23	28	9	46
Massachusetts	26	−18	26	48	54	39	22	23	−3	9	17	22	31	14	47
Rhode Island	22	−11	22	31	24	46	19	19	17	21	13	18	28	18	38
Connecticut	24	−23	25	49	46	53	22	20	7	−4	18	22	32	18	36
Mideast	22	−8	23	45	43	48	19	17	−31	14	10	18	31	11	35
New York	24	−16	24	43	43	44	21	19	−5	23	11	18	34	10	32
New Jersey	26	−11	27	49	45	55	23	23	−10	16	17	25	26	22	43
Pennsylvania	15	−5	15	43	40	47	10	8	−37	−5	6	10	24	4	30
Delaware	20	29	19	46	40	55	16	16	0	2	13	21	31	13	37
Maryland	33	18	33	58	53	74	27	26	23	18	10	32	42	20	57
District of Columbia	27	0	27	39	38	40	18	15	0	37	3	1	14	−5	30
Great Lakes	18	7	18	48	45	50	14	11	−6	−8	9	13	28	9	27
Michigan	13	−1	14	45	43	46	9	6	−15	−16	5	6	22	6	21
Ohio	15	6	16	46	43	50	11	9	−1	−19	6	12	29	9	28
Indiana	20	18	21	45	44	47	17	15	2	−11	16	12	34	9	31
Illinois	20	8	20	51	49	54	16	14	−7	2	10	16	29	9	27
Wisconsin	24	3	26	51	47	55	22	20	−3	13	19	16	26	17	35
Plains	25	7	28	45	43	47	24	22	−11	25	21	19	34	11	36
Minnesota	26	2	28	50	43	58	23	21	−18	11	25	17	33	9	39
Iowa	20	−17	29	45	43	48	26	22	22	10	24	18	33	11	37
Missouri	24	9	25	43	47	37	22	19	−8	20	18	16	32	12	30
North Dakota	52	104	36	67	76	57	25	23	−9	29	14	16	57	5	53
South Dakota	35	12	45	36	33	41	48	48	6	117	49	29	43	47	45
Nebraska	27	−9	35	43	44	43	33	32	20	67	35	26	35	12	42
Kansas	25	50	23	39	35	47	19	17	−17	28	10	19	33	4	37
Southeast	29	21	29	45	40	54	25	24	−20	12	29	22	43	13	36
Virginia	31	21	31	36	31	56	30	30	−11	31	34	28	39	9	46
West Virginia	5	−29	6	49	52	44	−2	−5	−38	−35	13	1	17	1	18
Kentucky	25	30	25	52	45	66	17	16	−22	36	20	13	29	1	29
Tennessee	25	4	27	41	36	51	23	23	−11	27	27	13	42	11	33
North Carolina	35	29	36	52	44	67	32	33	26	30	34	26	51	27	42
South Carolina	31	9	33	34	32	40	32	33	24	32	36	21	47	17	47
Georgia	29	−1	31	42	39	49	28	27	26	23	26	24	45	24	30
Florida	40	25	41	59	50	77	37	36	13	1	71	34	56	20	39
Alabama	23	4	24	43	44	40	18	16	−24	−10	15	19	31	11	36
Mississippi	36	38	36	50	48	54	31	31	25	41	40	21	54	16	31
Louisiana	17	23	17	39	40	37	11	8	−3	−19	8	12	32	5	26
Arkansas	36	49	34	39	36	46	31	33	−24	52	46	24	47	17	41
Southwest	27	21	28	42	35	53	24	22	−3	20	19	23	42	16	40
Oklahoma	25	30	25	38	39	35	21	18	−4	25	14	18	41	14	33
Texas	24	22	24	41	33	54	20	19	−6	11	16	21	36	15	33
New Mexico	33	11	34	40	31	56	32	30	9	13	39	30	53	18	49
Arizona	55	16	59	62	48	86	59	59	15	80	55	48	85	30	91
Rocky Mountain	30	2	33	46	42	52	29	28	−15	30	44	26	44	11	46
Montana	23	27	22	52	57	45	14	8	−42	44	21	3	29	0	24
Idaho	25	3	30	48	50	47	24	25	−20	37	31	21	37	9	42
Wyoming	22	−6	26	33	20	54	24	22	12	39	−5	32	42	10	31
Colorado	33	−19	36	44	39	53	34	35	−13	21	50	31	51	17	57
Utah	35	−12	38	48	44	58	35	34	−8	33	65	32	44	11	43
Far West	35	5	37	54	47	64	32	33	−1	30	30	31	42	17	51
Washington	27	−3	29	35	31	41	27	27	4	14	32	24	39	12	36
Oregon	27	−1	29	47	44	50	25	23	10	27	22	21	37	10	32
Nevada	65	−18	68	49	37	71	73	77	−8	98	19	56	106	40	117
California	37	7	38	59	51	70	33	34	−1	31	31	33	42	18	52
Alaska	20	0	20	9	−3	110	31	31	14	−39	44	34	81	98	88
Hawaii	45	1	49	34	31	46	60	62	−40	93	58	54	116	29	71

[1] For analytical purposes Alaska and Hawaii included in 1957 totals. Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics.

FACTS OF ECONOMIC PROGRESS IN THE RIGHT-TO-WORK STATES AND IN THE NATION AS A WHOLE

(Documentation: Survey of Current Business, vol. 43, No. 4, Apr. 1963, U.S. Department of Commerce)

PERTINENT FACTS

Workers in business and industry in 15 of the 19 right-to-work States are enjoying greater gains in income than the average for the Nation as a whole.

In the 5-year period, 1957–62 the average improvement in personal income (wages) for the 50 States: 20 percent.

Improvement in the right-to-work States individually:

	Percent
Nevada	77
Arizona	59
South Dakota	48
Florida	36
Utah	34
South Carolina	33
North Carolina	33
Arkansas	33
Nebraska	32

Improvement in the right-to-work States individually—Continued

	Percent
Mississippi	31
Virginia	30
Georgia	27
Tennessee	23
North Dakota	23
Iowa	22
Texas	19
Kansas	17
Alabama	16
Indiana	15
Average of 19 right-to-work States	32

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in closing, may I emphasize again that economic progress is not the primary yardstick with which right-to-work supporters all over America wish to measure the issue of voluntary versus compulsory union membership.

Whenever anyone tries to sell the idea of right-to-work or voluntary unionism and attempts to do it on an economic basis, he is invariably defeated. The issue to me is strictly one of individual freedom. It is one based upon constitutional and moral grounds. Therefore I think the most important yardstick is the measurement of individual freedom.

Today under congressional-made law, the individual American citizen has half his freedom at the place where he earns his livelihood. He is free to join a union if he so desires. The other half of his freedom at the place where he works has been denied him in a moment of default by the U.S. Congress. He can be forced to join a union against his will—or be fired from his job. This violates the very essence of human freedom and civil rights. This is where the right-to-work principle is brought to bear—in section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations

Act. Under this section, States may safeguard the individual liberty that Congress in 1947 shortsightedly placed in jeopardy. They can do it with right-to-work legislation. Twenty of them have done it; the most recent, Wyoming, just this year. As Gov. Clifford P. Hansen, of Wyoming, said when he signed the right-to-work bill last February:

> The crux of the issue is that the measure is designed to restore full freedom of choice to the working men and women of Wyoming. It guarantees anew one of the most important hallmarks of American liberty and citizenship—the right of individual decisionmaking.

Mr. President, let us here in the Senate of the United States not confuse the issue in the right-to-work debate. Governor Hansen has spoken the issue. It is the simple issue that brought the creation of this legislative body: the right of individual decisionmaking. We are constituted to protect it. Let us count this our primary duty.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before yielding the floor?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I regret that I had to be in and out of the Chamber during the Senator's analysis of my proposed legislation designed to repeal 14(b), the source of the so-called right-to-work laws that now exist in some States. On the question of individual freedom, I should like to point out that I come from a State which has not elected to enact so-called right-to-work legislation. In my State the government has not injected itself into the freedom of employees to vote for a union and the freedom of employers and employees to agree to a union shop.

I assume that in a State such as Arizona, if there is a union and if the employer and the employees freely elect to adopt a union shop—probably after negotiation and bargaining—they are prohibited from having a union shop by the government; is that not true?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is true. In the nearly 20 years this has existed as a constitutional amendment our whole union picture has improved. There are very few strikes. Labor leaders have become much more responsible, because they recognize that with the right to exercise the power of individual freedom a man can be more outspoken than if he were bound by a union shop contract.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am certain that the Senator dealt with the question of the employee—when there is a union and the union is the bargaining agent—getting the benefits of the union's work in negotiation and collective bargaining but not paying any of the expenses of the union.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. We call this the "free rider." It was the Senator's suggestion, I think, that every man should have the right to decide whether he would get a benefit from or be disadvantaged by the union.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator raised the question of "free riders." This has been a shibboleth used by organized labor ever since the beginning of right-to-work laws. This to me is one of the great sources of union power that is sometimes abused. This is exclusive representation, when 49 percent of the workers may not wish to join the union for various personal reasons. They may not like the politics of the union. They may not like the leaders of the union. They may not like the place where the union meets.

Under the right of association, in my opinion, these men have a right not to join the union, even though they might be, as the Senator calls them, "free riders."

This is true all through our society. I believe the Senator is a lawyer. Probably he belongs to the American Bar Association, but he does not have to belong to the association. I happen to have been a merchant in my earlier days. I belonged to the National Retail Merchants' Association. Many of my competitors did not. It used to "burn me up" to have to pay my dues and to see them receive the benefits. But I think this is their right.

It is the right of a workingman not to join a union if he does not wish to join. This is the real "guts" of the debate. It is a matter of individual freedom whether a man has to do something or does not.

I point out that churches, the Red Cross, the YMCA, the YWCA, and other such organizations benefit the whole country, yet many Americans refuse to support these institutions.

I cannot agree with the "free-rider" argument, because it is a freedom of choice that a man is, as called, "a free rider."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The analogy, of course, is not precise when one does not join a voluntary association, one does not receive the benefits of that association, but the nonunion worker does receive the precise benefits of the union. We all have freedom to elect our governing officials in the executive branch. Slightly more than 50 percent of the voters made the decision that we should have as our President for 4 years Mr. Kennedy. Because of the sanctity of the ballot box, I do not know how the Senator from Arizona voted at that election.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator has a good idea.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I would speculate that the Senator from Arizona did not join the popular choice, but I am sure the Senator is paying taxes along with the winners. The losers, too, pay the cost of this Government, which benefits all citizens.

In our democratic process we accept defeat and pull our oar with the others, even though we do not like the direction given the boat by the coxswain.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The comparison the Senator is using is a rather foolish one, because the only compulsory thing in our lives is service to our country under its laws. Unless we have religious objections we must serve in times of war, and we must pay our taxes. These are compulsory acts which all Americans recognize.

What I am talking about is the extension of compulsion into the field of labor, so that a man may be forced against his will to join a union when a union shop exists after proper bargaining. This is the basis of the whole debate.

I point out to my friend from New Jersey that the United States is one of only four countries in the whole world which have compulsory features in labor laws. We specifically have it. Three others, including England, have the compulsory feature by reason of lack of reference.

It is interesting to note that the countries in which the labor movement has reached its greatest peak—namely, the Scandinavian countries, where 94 percent of the workers belong to unions—prohibit any form of compulsory unionism.

In this country only 31 or 32 percent of the working force belong to unions. The percentage has remained at this figure for many years. I personally do not think it is high enough, but the percentage remains the same in the industrial States without right-to-work laws. It has actually improved somewhat in the States with right-to-work laws.

If I were a workingman, the first thing I would wish to do would be to join a union. On the other hand, if I did not wish to do so I would like to have the right to say "No."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I have only one further observation. We enjoy the liberty of disagreeing on this issue, and we shall continue to disagree. This is not a matter of Democrats believing one thing and Republicans believing another.

I was very much impressed by a news clipping—I do not have the speech—dealing with a speech by a former distinguished Governor of a State which has right-to-work legislation. It was reported in yesterday's Washington Post under the headline "Right-to-Work Laws Are Attacked by Landon."

The article relates to expressions by former Governor of Kansas Alf M. Landon. The news clipping says that he—

> lashed out at so-called right-to-work laws and asked for a better American understanding of the workingman.

He also called the right-to-work laws bad, punitive, and a burden on labor in 20 States.

In addressing himself to the argument as to whether the right-to-work laws would improve labor-management relations and industrial development in a given State, he said:

> Gov. John Anderson in a report to the legislature recently revealed that Kansas has lost nearly 15,000 jobs of production workers in manufacturing in the years since the so-called right-to-work law went into effect.

He also observed that these laws—

> actually bar progress in good labor relations and industrial development.

I wanted to have this in the RECORD, because Governor Landon knows about right-to-work laws in operation. He was the Governor of a State which has such a law. I have never been a Governor of,

nor lived in a State with a so-called right-to-work law.

I think that is competent evidence to put in the RECORD and the debate at this point.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I read the article to which the Senator has referred. The 15,000 people who lost their jobs in Kansas lost them because of the shutdown of the B–52 line in Wichita. That involved a union shop, and not a right-to-work law. The 15,000 men—or at least a great number of them—were already organized, and they lost their jobs chiefly because the U.S. Air Force, through the Secretary of Defense, stopped buying this particular airplane.

I would not be surprised in the next year or two to see an increase in right-to-work laws. I have found from my study of this problem that it helps labor-management relations.

My observation has been that it has helped the relations between management and the workers.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Again, I hesitate to discuss it with authority, but if there is a *disagreement*, the Senator's fundamental disagreement is with Governor Landon. Perhaps the Senator should pursue the argument with that gentleman.

Mr. GOLDWATER. He was a Governor a good many years before the right-to-work law was enacted. I do not like the words "right to work." "Voluntary unionism" is a much better term. If we think of the right to work as a civil right, nobody has a right to a job. He has the civil liberty to seek a job. "Right to work" is a misnomer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I agree with that point. Perhaps a more appropriate name for the State laws would be "compulsory open shop."

Mr. GOLDWATER. No, merely "voluntary unionism." Put it on that basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. We cannot agree on much.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I would never vote for a so-called national right-to-work law. I think the States have the fundamental right to pass such laws. We recognize it in 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I find myself in the unusually good company of a former Republican candidate for the Presidency and, of course, the very respected, beloved former Senator Robert Taft, the author of the major bill, who later called the men who were enjoying the benefits of the union, while not joining, "free riders."

Mr. GOLDWATER. I suppose they could be called that. It must be recognized that there are free riders in every branch of our society. We have them in the Senate—for example, those who do not attend committees and let others do the work.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There are so many committees that it is impossible to attend all of them.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am not being critical; I am merely saying that we cannot find a segment of our society where someone is not taking a free ride. We do not like it, but we should not force the situation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to make a comment about the discussion which has just taken place about free riders. It is contended that a worker who believes the course followed by the union is not in his general interest or in the general interest of the Nation still must belong to the union if a majority of workers so decide.

The argument is made that, since he gets the benefit of what the union does, he ought to pay a share of the cost of operating the union. But I pose this question: Why should we ascribe to union leaders infallible judgment with respect to what they demand for the benefit of the workers in general or for the benefit of the country? When labor leaders continue to pump up prices, removing the United States from a position of competitive advantage in selling goods throughout the world, is that course helpful to the worker? Is it helpful to the security of the Nation?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I might say——

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator will permit me to continue, I should like to do so. I thought he had yielded the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I had. I thought the Senator asked me a question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me finish my thought. The Senator from Arizona made the statement that there may be various reasons why the worker does not want to belong to a union. I agree with that statement. But before we argue the benefits that are derived from compulsory membership, we ought to have a clearly outlined definition of what the benefits are. It may be that what the union is doing will kill the industry, kill the job, place the country in an embarrassing fiscal position, endanger our balance of credits in international trade, and many other things. So when it is argued, prima facie and ipso facto, that what the union does is for the benefit of the worker and the benefit of the country, I cannot agree. I venture to say that there are thousands of clear-minded workers who realize that what is happening will destroy the jobs they hold.

A group of workers belonging to a union in Cincinnati came to me. They had learned that their employer was moving out of the city. The employer said to the union leaders, "We cannot meet your demands and survive." The union said, "We want these demands met with respect to working conditions and wages." The employer said, "I cannot meet them." The union leaders insisted that their proposals be accepted. The employer decided to move out of Cincinnati.

The question comes back: Did the union act for the benefit of the workers?

The workers told me they were never informed by the union leaders that the company said it would move out of the city. The workers did not learn of it until after the decision was made to move from the State. I repeat, it cannot be said that everything the union leader achieves is beneficial to the worker.

Now I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I must agree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio. We have had much evidence that some of the decisions of the labor leaders have not benefited the workers. I am thinking of the plight of the coal miners, for example, in West Virginia, who have been put out of work by automation brought on by cheaper fuel in the form of gas and oil which were introduced into the eastern portion of the country as a result of the high hourly wages in the coal-mining industry brought on by bargaining.

This is what bothers me with respect to the word "right." If a group of persons organize and form a union and then select a president, I do not think the Government should intrude itself constantly into every decision made by them officially. I have been preparing legislation to provide that in the matter of contracts or settlement offers, the decision should be by vote of the union membership. I think it would be the better part of judgment for any union leader who was contemplating bargaining to sit down and say, "We are thinking of proposing this kind of increase," and letting the men decide for themselves what it should be and advise the leader. This is done in many unions. Well conducted unions do it. I am thinking of the man in West Virginia who said, "I would rather be working for a dollar and a half an hour than be out of work at $3.50 an hour," when a union drove a steel company out of the State.

The Senator has brought a very important point to the attention of the Senate. Not all decisions made by the heads of unions, or, for that matter, those made by the heads of government or the heads of banks or other organizations, are infallible. That is why we, as elected officials, go back to the people, to find out what they are thinking of. We do not want to propose things that will cause them to be unhappy.

I believe that union leaders should be sensitive to anything in the area of wage increases. I agree that some of the wage increases which have been granted since the war have put us in a disadvantageous position with respect to world trade and competition. It has brought in automation. I have used the argument all the way through, that whenever an unearned wage increase is paid, the price is forced up. Any businessman who has any sense knows that if his workers are earning more money, they should be paid more, without any argument.

I suggest that the Senator from Ohio study the bill I have introduced, which includes a provision that there be a strike vote, and a settlement vote, once a strike has been started.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I believe we are faced with the ugly specter of the Federal Government attempting to procure compulsory union membership. About 3 months ago the administration, by its own statement, said that unless some aircraft companies on the west coast adopted compulsory union membership, they would likely suffer the loss of governmental assignments in the way of business. To me that was frightening. The proposal to enact a Federal law that would prevent the States from adopting provisions against closed shops is another evidence that there are those

who believe that Senators and Members of the House of Representatives have all the brains and possess perfect judgments; that we ascribe to ourselves the idea that we know all and that State legislators know nothing; and that out of Washington comes all wisdom and all ability to achieve social reforms, and especially government for the people.

I cannot subscribe to that theory. I cannot do so because I know that in Congress we are motivated by the same political objectives that motivate the trustee, the city councilman, and the State legislator.

Each year, before election, programs are sponsored for the protection of voters; and the conspicuous aspects of such proposals is the quest for votes, rather than the objective of trying to serve the country.

This afternoon and tomorrow Senators will be voting on what are known as migratory labor laws. To me this is another effort of the Federal Government, through Congress, to impose its judgment on the States and local communities. The proposals contained in the several bills upon which action will be taken, from the standpoint of dollars expended, are inconsequential and seemingly innocuous. However, they are merely the beginning of a program that will expand each year. We entered this field in a limited way either last year or the year before. I have read the reports dealing with the several migrant labor bills which will be before the Senate for consideration today and tomorrow. Throughout them there appears the foreboding that this is merely the beginning. One of the bills provides for grants to subsidize educational programs in the States for migrant workers.

Another bill provides for grants for day care services for the children of migrant workers.

Still another bill provides for grants for sanitation facilities on the farm for migrant workers. Another bill provides for the establishment of a National Advisory Council to give to Congress and, I suppose, to the President, advice on what course of conduct the Federal Government should follow to help solve the migrant workers' problems.

Primarily, the object is to spend Federal money. My inquiry is this: If these things are to be done, why should we assume that the Federal Government ought to do them, and not the States? Why have not the States done such things? We get back to the argument that the Federal Government knows what ought to be done. If it is argued that the States do not have the money, and the Federal Government does have the money, I point out that this year our deficit will be $8 billion; next year it will be $10 billion; the following year it will be another $10 billion; in 1966 it will be another $10 billion.

Our gold reserves are being withdrawn. The word was current that our position was improving. Figures now show that the dwindling of gold reserves in fiscal year 1963 will be worse than it was in 1962.

I will vote against these bills, except one, and that is the bill that would require agents in the assignment of migrant workers to register in Washington. I will cast my vote against the other bills, because I believe these problems can be handled by the States and should not be handled by the Federal Government. The problems confront the States, and they are best able to handle them.

In the northwestern corner of my State of Ohio, migrant workers are employed. They can handle this problem without Federal aid. We get back to the proposition that the Federal Government wants to put its fingers into everything it can.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I need not tell the Senator from Ohio that I am always very much impressed with the position he takes on any issue before the Senate. I do not always join him in his conclusion; but I find myself concerned about the present status of our economy. The Senator from Ohio just finished with what I thought was a very provocative discussion of our gold balance, and has announced his position with respect to the bills which will be under consideration. I wonder if the Senator would join with me in my opposition to a Federal expenditure that far exceeds by many times any of our domestic expenditures; namely, the expenditure for our giveaway foreign aid program, particularly with relation to NATO; and if I could count on the Senator from Ohio joining with me in refusing to vote for any more funds for NATO until our NATO allies decide to assume their reasonable share of the cost of protecting freedom around the world.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I welcome the question asked by the Senator from Oregon. I am glad to state that I have adopted clearly defined principles with respect to how I shall approach the foreign aid program. First, I shall oppose the granting of aid to any country having a Communist form of government.

Mr. MORSE. I share that view.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Second, I shall oppose the granting of aid to any country that tells the United States that unless we give it aid, it will move into the Soviet camp.

Mr. MORSE. I share that view, too.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Third, I shall insist that there be developed a more efficient program in the administration of foreign aid.

Mr. MORSE. I share that view, also.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Those are the three basic principles that will guide me. I have voted for reductions in foreign aid. I agree with the Clay report that was recently made. However, I am somewhat doubtful now because I fear that the attitude of General Clay has become a little softened and that he may abandon his proposal.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Ohio share my view that the Clay report did not go far enough?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall further oppose the granting of aid by way of grants to countries that want to establish government-operated steel plants, aluminum plants, and other manufacturers. I wish the Clay report had gone further.

I cannot say that I will join fully with the Senator from Oregon in the views which he has expressed. I have heard his arguments in the Committee on Foreign Relations. No graver problem confronts us than that of getting our international credits and debits in balance. That is one way to do it.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Ohio. At least he has not yet slammed the door in my face. He still gives me some hope that he will support me in voting against the expenditure of a single dollar for the benefit of a single NATO country unless that country starts to cooperate with us.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall be glad to hear what the Senator from Oregon will have to say on that subject.

In conclusion, it must be 8 years, perhaps 10 years, since, as Governor of Ohio, I gave recognition to the migrant labor problem. We proceeded to achieve the things that are sought to be done by Congress now. I regret to say that some of the principal proponents of Federal solutions have failed to take action in their own States to try to solve the problem.

My views have been expressed. I shall vote in accordance with the declaration which I have made.

SPECIAL CITATION PRESENTED BY BROADCAST PIONEERS TO REPRESENTATIVE OREN HARRIS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on Wednesday, June 6, 1963, at the International Inn, Washington, D.C., a special citation was presented by the Broadcast Pioneers in an elaborate ceremony to Representative OREN HARRIS, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives.

The Broadcast Pioneers is an organization founded by veteran news commentator, H. V. Kalternborn. Gen. David Sarnoff is honorary president, Mr. Ward L. Quaal, WGN, Inc., of Chicago, Ill., is president. It is a national organization including a membership of those who have been active in radio broadcasting for 20 years and television for 10 years or longer.

Mr. Frank U. Fletcher, a Washington attorney, is chairman of the District of Columbia chapter of Broadcast Pioneers and presided at the luncheon on the occasion of the award to Mr. HARRIS. Over 300 attended the luncheon, including several Members of Congress and of Mr. HARRIS's committee.

I was privileged to attend the luncheon. I rejoice in the conferral of this honor upon my Representative. It is a recognition which he richly deserves. I applaud Broadcast Pioneers for having made this presentation to him.

The award to Mr. HARRIS in tribute to his contribution to the broadcasting industry was made by Mr. Quaal. The special citation was made by Mr. Paul W. Morency, chairman of the awards committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the remarks made by Mr. Quaal and Mr. Morency, together with the

citation presented to Representative HARRIS and his response thereto.

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

REMARKS BY MR. WARD L. QUAAL, PRESIDENT, BROADCAST PIONEERS

Stanza I of "The Elephant's Child," by Rudyard Kipling, states: "I keep six honest serving men (they taught me all I knew); Their names are What and Why and When and How and Where and Who."

Mr. Kipling could have been writing about the gentleman to whom we pay tribute today, the Honorable OREN HARRIS, Member of the Congress from the Fourth District of Arkansas and chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This is the committee, as all of us here know (some with poignancy, some with remorse and some with delight) which is responsible for the origination of legislation governing the American system of broadcasting. And this man is the Governor of those Governors.

In the hearing room in the New House Office Building where much of the testimony in this committee's inquiries is taken, there hangs at the back of the room an oil portrait of the Congressman. It was dedicated February 9, 1960. It is so located that if a witness looks over his shoulder to avoid the stern visage of Chairman HARRIS who is before him, he will be staring at a benign and smiling copy of the original.

When that portrait was dedicated, the principal speaker was Mr. HARRIS' colleague, Congressman JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, of Mississippi. I would like to quote two paragraphs from his speech on that occasion:

"Very few people here, I am sure, have ever heard of Bingen, Ark. If so, it doesn't matter anyway, because Mr. HARRIS was not born in Bingen; he was born in Belton, a few miles out in the country from Bingen. Bingen, in turn, is about 10 miles out in the country from a place called McCaskill, and McCaskill is out in the country from a town named Nashville, where the nearest railroad station is located.

"Belton, Ark., consists mainly of a general store. Its chief industry is a blacksmith shop and gristmill. It is a thriving little community, with a population of some 15 people, 4 or 5 coon hounds, a couple of milk cows, and innumerable chickens and hogs. Well, OREN wasn't exactly born right in Belton, he was born about 4 miles out in the country from Belton. He was raised so far back in the country he can look at the size of a coon track and tell how much its hide would bring on the market in St. Louis, Mo."

As you can deduce from this, Mr. HARRIS is indeed an uncommon man. One of his uncommon virtues in these days of intrigue is a fervent devotion to the truth. He is accustomed to the slings and arrows that beset one so engaged. We of the Pioneers feel that he merits the applause and praise of some of those he oversees by reason of the fact that in that search for truth he has always and constantly demonstrated fairness.

He has always besought both sides of the story, and in this process, also, he has been a constant defender of free broadcasting, despite the fact that at times he may have seemed puzzled and querulous about the manner in which some broadcasters belabor this free opportunity.

It is a pleasure today to pay special tribute to the Honorable OREN HARRIS through some small recognition which we trust he will keep before him as an evidence of our good will and affection, even though he may not have it framed and displayed in the aforementioned hearing room.

REMARKS BY PAUL MORENCY, CHAIRMAN, AWARDS COMMITTEE

Special citation to Hon. OREN HARRIS, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives.

For his firm and fair leadership as chairman of the committee of the House of Representatives which develops legislation governing America's system of free broadcasting; for his devotion, often expressed and demonstrated, to the idea that broadcasting in this Nation should be free; and for his constant and unwavering loyalty to the citizens of this Nation who are the arbiters of that freedom and whose interests he upholds and defends.

This special recognition is inscribed, respectfully and with gratitude, by the Broadcast Pioneers on this 24th day of April 1963, on the occasion of the annual Peabody awards.

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE HARRIS

Mr. Quaal, my colleagues and friends, it is with genuine feeling of appreciation and a deep sense of humility that I accept the honor you so generously extend to me today.

I hasten to say, however, that in accepting your expression of kindness and recognition, I do so with full realization that it is a tribute to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which I think is the greatest committee in the House of Representatives. I would also give a large measure of credit to my family and a wonderfully fine, loyal, and efficient staff in both my office and committee.

Personally, I am exceedingly grateful for your friendship manifested by your presence here today. I am fully aware of the fact that it has not been so at all times in the past.

I can recall some experiences in looking down into the glowering expressions of broadcasters.

One of these experiences had something to do with quiz shows; another was in connection with a well-recognized term "payola," a subject of hearings a few years back; then there was, as I remember, the matter of "ex-parte influence" hearings; and more recently the problem of ratings.

Maybe I should not mention these unsavory questions except to say that I like to think that our final judgment thus far has been in the public interest, as well as in the best interest of the broadcasting industry. I am hopeful that most of you share this view.

Even so, I think the industry overall is doing a fine job in performing a public service under our system and concept for the American people. There is always room for improvement, and I encourage you toward this objective.

I want to say to you in all sincerity that the pleasantness and joy of this occasion touches me very deeply. I am indeed grateful, Mr. Quaal, for the honor which the broadcast pioneers has bestowed upon me today and you have my sincere thanks.

I have tried to be firm in my responsibility, but if I have not at all times been tolerant and fair, it is not because I have not tried.

Thank you so much.

CARE FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the 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.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGOVERN in the chair). The pending business is S. 522, a bill 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.

CHILDREN EMPLOYED IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after a discussion with the author of Senate bill 523, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], the acting minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that beginning at the hour of 2:30 p.m. tomorrow one half hour be allocated to Amendment No. 104, in accordance with the usual procedures.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that at the conclusion of that time there will be a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. If I might ask for a revision, the debate could commence at 2 o'clock and a yea-and-nay vote could take place at 2:30. That would be acceptable.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I change my request accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana wish to suspend the rule that requires a quorum call before a vote?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that the usual procedure be followed.

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

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday, June 11, 1963, at 2 p.m., during the further consideration of S. 523, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes, with the amendment by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], numbered 104, as the pending question, and that all debate on that amendment and amendments thereto shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. TOWER and the majority leader or someone designated by him, following which the Senate will proceed to vote thereon: *Provided,* That no amendment that is not germane to that amendment shall be received.

SURPLUS FOOD FOR NEEDY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Washington Daily News for today, June 10, contains an interesting article entitled "Surplus Food Is Still Hard for Needy To Get." This timely article, written by Sam Stafford, of the Daily News staff, points out that redtape in the District of Columbia Welfare Department is causing many old and disabled people to fail to receive their proper quotas of surplus food, and that the recently disclosed scandal about hustlers making a profit from the delivery of surplus food for the needy is continuing. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SURPLUS FOOD IS STILL HARD FOR NEEDY TO GET

(By Sam Stafford)

The District Welfare Department is callously ignoring the very people it promised to help following revelations of surplus food irregularities in this newspaper 4 months ago.

Throughout the city, there are still thousands of needy old, sick, crippled, or blind people who have no way of getting the surplus food that is available and that other poor people use to beef up their meager diets. Or they get it only with incredible difficulty.

Commissioner John Duncan has prodded the Welfare Department to come up with a workable food distribution plan using some volunteer help.

PAPER AND TALK

But the welfare bureaucracy, which moves slowly when it moves, has produced a lot of talk and mountains of paper but little action.

"It is hard to see why it should take so long," Mr. Duncan said. "I intend to keep right on pressing for a good plan."

Meanwhile, as a result of the surplus food policies of Acting Welfare Director Donald Brewer and Welfare Controller Alvin Rosin:

Senile old people who should not be on the streets alone board buses for the surplus distribution center on Virginia Avenue SW., get confused, and wind up in the wrong section of town.

Old men and women so crippled they can scarcely move are forced to make the tiring trip to the food center.

Sick or paralyzed old ladies—many without friends or relatives—sit alone in small rooms, fingering surplus food certificates they cannot redeem for food.

A volunteer group that 2 months ago, with Mr. Duncan's backing, offered to carry food to blind and seriously ailing persons at no charge has so far been cold-shouldered by welfare officials.

Some "hustlers" whose profitable food delivery arrangements with some welfare employees were detailed in the News' series, are still running an unlicensed cab service from the distribution center, with aid recipients as a captive clientele.

Under welfare rules, no person may pick up more than two surplus orders a month. So most recipients—presumably including bedridden with no helpful neighbors or relatives—must appear personally at the distribution center to get food.

A private car crammed with recipients—including the ailing who are able to walk—may bring a hustler $8 or $10 at $1 or more a head.

Some sick or disabled persons manage to endure the bus or taxi ride to the center, then return by hustler service since taxis are seldom available at the center. Total cost is sometimes $1.75 or $2.

The system still seems designed to discourage people from getting surplus food.

Under the two-orders-a-month restriction, a man can pick up food for his own family and his sister's family, but not for himself, his sister, and the ailing woman next door.

MOVED

Complicating recipients' problems is the fact the surplus operation early this year moved from Northwest, where many of the needy live, to Southwest, where relatively few live.

The other day, this reporter watched a badly crippled old man approach the food platform at the distribution center.

Face drawn with pain, he inched along in the rain, taking a full minute to walk several feet.

How had he gotten there—by taxi, hustler, or two or three bus transfers? Had he walked far?

He paused for breath, then started up steps leading to the platform. He inched upward, moving each limb with grotesque deliberateness. He seemed the most pathetically crippled man on earth.

The old man struggled upward, reached the platform, presented his food card, then began his painful descent.

It took him 11 minutes by my watch to walk up and down a few steps.

Mr. Edna Frazier, a dignified lady of 70, lives at 732 Morton Street NW. Paralyzed on the left side, she is under doctor's orders not to leave the house.

No one was available to redeem her last month's food card, due May 6, so she and a 76-year-old "forgetful" woman she has taken under her wing had a lean month.

"I mostly could have used the floor," said Mrs. Frazier. "I make a little bread and it lasts a while."

She has lived here 44 years, 26 of them in the same house. When younger, she worked. Her husband, a plumber, died 12 years ago.

When I visited her, she was worried about whether her 76-year-old friend would get lost riding a bus to the surplus center.

"She's lost her way before," Mrs. Frazier said. But the friend eventually returned.

Across the street, Mrs. Fred Mosley, 67, told how she and six other recipients recently had been forced to pay a hustler $1 apiece for a ride home after getting the impression the fee would be lower.

MRS. MOSLEY

Mrs. Mosley, who is partly disabled by arthritis and a bad back, has difficulty boarding and riding a bus. But she recently traveled to the center by bus, walking at transfer points even though this was painful, on the day the hustler took her home.

Mr. Mosley, 69, paralyzed and seldom out of bed, said he wished he could get the food himself, but his wife said she didn't mind.

Elsewhere on the street, I spoke to Mrs. Bessie Gaines, 62, who has glaucoma, and can see only blurred shapes.

She worked in a private home for many years and would be working now "except that I can't get a job because of my eyes. I tried. Even Goodwill turned me down."

Mrs. Gaines cannot see well enough to take a bus to the food center. The other day, she took a cab to the center for 50 cents and gave 75 cents to a hustler to bring her back, although he wanted $1.

Commenting on former harsh treatment of recipients by some welfare employees, brought to light by the News, she said, "They treat us better now, but getting the food is still hard."

ALL ALONE

Others throughout the city also have problems. A crippled woman in Southeast was unable to get to the center or have someone go for her and so lost her month's food. Holed up in musty rooms visited only by landlords and social workers are many other hungry shut-ins.

While some ailing persons have relatives here, the relatives may be unavailable to help on certain days because of work or family duties.

Although Alvin Rosin has taken charge of the surplus reorganization, John Olsavsky, surplus division chief who denied responsibility for the hustlers' profiteering and said he rarely visited the distribution center, still handles the day-to-day operation.

John West, whose Volunteer Transportation Service, a low-cost food delivery service for the needy, was whittled down by surplus officialdom and finally put out of operation when restricted to two orders a month, has offered free food delivery service to shut-ins.

Since nobody has taken him up on the offer made many weeks ago, he figures it must have been buried under Welfare Department redtape—of which there seems to be plenty.

REFORM OF CONGRESS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Washington Post for June 9 contains an article entitled "Congress Must Seize the Initiative," written by the distinguished columnist Roscoe Drummond. Mr. Drummond makes the point that Congress has not been measuring up to its potential for rendering public service as a viable, progressive, independent branch of the Government.

The article reminds me that it was not very long ago that the Senate passed a resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Budget.

I hope that all Members of the House will read Mr. Drummond's article, and that it will inspire them to take prompt action on the resolution, a resolution which, as I understand, has passed the Senate several times previously.

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

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

TIME FOR REFORM—CONGRESS MUST SEIZE THE INITIATIVE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

A veteran of the House of Representatives who is retiring undefeated from one of the largest States remarked in private conversation the other day: "In all my 15 years in Congress I have never been able to devote more than one-tenth of my time to doing what I was primarily elected to do—help shape the laws of the land."

The able and respected chairman of one of the Senate's many investigating committees raised his arms in despair the other evening and exclaimed: "The Executive has become so big that we (the Congress) have simply lost control. We can't review it adequately; we can't check it adequately; we just don't know what it is doing."

And this: Congress never gives one look at the massive and mounting Federal budget as a whole. It looks at it piecemeal but never in toto. It appropriates piecemeal without ever putting the parts together to know what it is doing, then it abandons responsibility for continuous, overall review—despite the fact that its own rules call for such review.

What do these facts (and others like them) really mean? They mean that the congressional minutiae so gobble up the time of individual Members of Congress that they can't do their primary work; that even the best congressional investigating committees are no longer able to oversee how the Executive is carrying out the congressional will; that as the Federal budget grows, Congress is steadily losing control, even losing sight, of what is going on.

The need for congressional reorganization to modernize its creaking, Model-T machinery is no longer seriously questioned. The need is to enable the Congress to lay hold of the means and procedures to transact the public business efficiently and responsibly and to capture its eroded authority.

Fortunately, the prospects for such reorganization are looking up. One step is the bipartisan resolution introduced by Senator CLIFFORD CASE (Republican of New Jersey) and Senator JOSEPH CLARK (Democrat of Pennsylvania) to create a Commission on Congressional Reorganization to study and propose needed reforms.

Public hearings will be held shortly by a Senate Rules Subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator CARL HAYDEN (Democrat of Arizona), aided by a specially appointed staff counsel, former Representative Hugh Alexander, of North Carolina.

Reflecting the almost unanimous endorsement of those in private life who know most about the Congress, the volume of correspondence which Senator CASE has had from political scientists is particularly revealing.

Senator CASE has received 195 letters from specialists in government. Of these, 160 strongly approve the move for congressional reform, none is opposed, 35 are noncommittal. Eighty-two percent of the letters consider the proposed study very timely and necessary, and hope it will succeed. Some of the specific comments and suggestions are these:

The Commission should focus on this central question: How can Congress remain an independent, productive, efficient, and creative branch of Government?

Many contend that Congress is not measuring up to its potential and to public expectations.

The statement that "congressional reform is long overdue" repeatedly occurs in the letters.

"Congress is in for rough sledding in the coming months and years," one of the political scientists writes. "Unless Congress moves to reform itself, that criticism will grow. Now is the time to begin study of reform so as to bring Congress up to date before even more power passes to the executive branch and before the image of Congress drops further in the minds of our people."

Wouldn't it be well if Congress paused in trying to reform everybody else and took a clear look at its own shortcomings—and did something about them?

FALLOUT SHELTERS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there was published in the Washington Star of June 5 a lead editorial entitled "Shelters—a Cruel Deception?" The editorial presents an interesting and timely analysis of the problem relating to fallout shelters. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

SHELTERS—A CRUEL DECEPTION?

An index to the kind of world we live in today can be found in the Hamburg firestorm of July 24, 1943.

On that date the British dropped a mere 2,400 tons of conventional explosives on the German port city. But the consequences for Hamburg were catastrophic.

These first bombs knocked out the water mains. On succeeding days tens of thousands of small firebombs were dropped and these were followed by more blockbusters—8,000 tons in all. The chief intelligence officer in our London Embassy, James R. Newman, reported as follows:

"We got a phenomenon that man had never seen before, except perhaps in prehistory. Fires joined together in a radius of three miles. Hot gases rose, while surrounding cool air was pulled in and acted as a bellows. Seventy thousand of Hamburg's 100,000 trees splintered to earth. Two hundred and fifty thousand dwelling units out of 556,000 were completely destroyed. The fire lasted for 7 days. Temperatures flared to 1,400 and 1,800 degrees so that the bricks themselves actually burned. Thousands and thousands of people were in shelters at the time; all but a negligible fraction died anyway. Bodies were still being dug up 6 months later, most of them completely unmarked by fire. They had died of suffocation and carbon monoxide—70,000 in all."

Remember, this disaster was visited upon Hamburg 20 years ago by a trifling 8,000 tons of "conventional" bombs. Has it a meaning for us today when, in an all-out thermonuclear attack, any major American city could expect to be hit, not with 8,000 tons, but with up to the equivalent of 100 million tons of explosives?

Surely it has. But very few people seem to care. We think the reason is not hard to discover.

A House Armed Services Subcommittee headed by Representative HÉBERT has been holding hearings on a Federal civil defense program, with particular reference to fallout shelters. And an Associated Press man reported the other day that the hearing was droning along before an average audience of 35 persons, some of whom were dozing. Obviously, nobody cares very much. And this view is reinforced by the recent decision in Portland, Oreg., to abolish its civil defense program and forget about it—fallout shelters and all.

Why is it that there is so little interest, so little concern? An excellent report to the Hébert subcommittee by its counsel, Philip W. Kelleher, furnishes at least some of the answers—especially with respect to fallout shelters. He quotes Dr. Alexander Langsdorf, Jr., a physicist at the Argonne Laboratories, as saying in a Chicago newspaper interview that the Russians, if they knew we had adequate fallout protection, would explode the bomb in the air rather than on the surface. Dr. Langsdorf added:

"From an airburst you get a massive firestorm which might set all Chicago on fire, Concrete fallout shelters would turn into ovens, cooking the people inside. If they don't burn they would probably suffocate, because all the oxygen would be consumed."

But let's suppose that some people hidden away in fallout shelters in some areas should survive. What of them? Mr. Kelleher quotes Dr. John N. Wolfe, chief, Environmental Sciences Branch of the Biology and Medicine Divisions of the Atomic Energy Commission, as follows: "Fallout shelters in many areas seem only a means of delaying death and represent only part of a survival plan. With an environment so completely modified, the question is, where does a man go after his sojourn in shelters? What does he do upon emergence?"

Mr. Kelleher elaborated on Dr. Wolfe's meaning in these words: "The survivor emerges from his shelter only to find that communications and distribution systems are damaged or destroyed. If there is food still undestroyed it may be contaminated, as will be the water supply. It is at least possible that the land which he must stand on is dangerously radioactive. Under these circumstances he may survive, but if so it will be through pure luck."

There is, of course, another side to this debate, and Mr. Kelleher presents it. But as we read his paper, he comes down squarely on the side of the argument which holds that "the currently planned fallout shelter program, or any extension of it, would work a cruel and dangerous deception on the American people."

For our part, we do not think the American people will want to spend up to $7 billion for fallout shelters, much less $100 billion to $200 billion for blast shelters. There is nothing in the American nature that is compatible with the prospect of burrowing into the ground to hide for days and weeks, not knowing what has happened to wives, children, or parents. George Kennan, speaking in a somewhat different context some time ago, just about said it all when he asked:

"Are we to flee like haunted creatures from one defensive device to another, each more costly and humiliating than the one before, cowering underground one day, breaking up our cities the next, attempting to surround ourselves with elaborate electric shields on the third, concerned only to prolong the length of our lives while sacrificing all the values for which it might be worth while to live?"

We think not. The only remedy, the only hope, is to prevent nuclear war. Meanwhile, again borrowing from a quotation used by Mr. Kennan: "Let us at least walk like men, with our heads up, so long as we are permitted to walk at all."

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there was published in the Christian Science Monitor of June 7 a lead article entitled "Cloture Seen as Key—Battle Lines Form on Rights Bills." The article points out that the program, which we understand the White House will soon present to Congress, includes several points in the civil rights area. Some of these points will, I am sure, be recognized as being long overdue subjects of legislation. Others perhaps will be highly controversial. The article points out that it is probable that some of these points will be modified or withdrawn.

Mr. President, I hope that when the time comes for presentation of a civil rights bill before the Senate, the proponents will have checked out very carefully the matter with various Members of the Senate, because it appears that the key vote will eventually be on the question of invoking cloture.

I recognize that some Senators are opposed as a matter of principle to invoking cloture; but I suggest that the great majority of Senators are not opposed as a matter of principle to invoking cloture—as was revealed by the cloture vote on the telstar communications satellite bill in the last session of Congress.

I also suggest that the cloture issue will be premised on the nature of the underlying bill on which a filibuster will be waged, and that the degree to which the bill will appeal to two-thirds of the Members of the Senate as being appropriate, needful, and timely legislation will determine the outcome of the cloture vote.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Christian Science article to which I have referred, and also an article entitled "On D-Day All GI's Were Brothers." The latter article was written by William S. White, and was published in the Washington Star on June 5.

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 7, 1963]

CLOTURE SEEN AS KEY—BATTLE LINES FORM ON RIGHTS BILLS

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy's political advisers in the Senate tell him that to enact his proposed two-part civil rights bill will require cloture.

They feel that they must get between 23 and 25 Republican Senate votes to enact the measure.

Civil rights legislation, they argue, like foreign affairs, now requires bipartisan treatment.

Applying cloture means that an expected southern filibuster must be worn down to a point where a vote is possible.

What seems to be shaping up is one of the big legislative battles of the year; in fact it could blow into a decisive struggle over the will of the majority to prevail.

Delay in presenting the Kennedy civil rights legislative package from this week to next is to allow the administration spokesmen to try to negotiate an agreement with Republicans on a bill that will command bipartisan support.

Republican Senators have promised to support additional civil rights legislation. But they remained mute on whether they would try to crush a southern filibuster. The Republican position was hammered out Wednesday at the second of two conferences promoted by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, an ardent supporter of civil rights legislation.

FACTORS INVOLVED

To apply cloture requires a two-thirds majority of the Senate, or 67 affirmative votes.

In presenting civil rights legislation at this time President Kennedy may well be precipitating a decisive battle over the filibuster, which has been going on intermittently for a century or longer.

Three things will help determine the issue:

Whether President Kennedy makes an all-out fight for legislation;

Whether Republicans will cooperate;

Whether Negroes keep up pressure tactics in the South.

Present Senate membership is 67 Democrats and 33 Republicans. Southern Senators number only around 2 dozen, but their strength is increased by conservatives from both parties and by members from smaller States whose bargaining power rests on delaying tactics.

PLAN PREVIEWED

The Kennedy civil rights proposals, according to Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, assistant Senate majority leader, are as follows:

1. A "public accommodations" law, to outlaw segregation in private establishments above a certain size, dealing in commodities moving in interstate commerce.

2. A program of aid to school systems that desegregate.

3. Powers by the Attorney General to initiate court actions desegregating private establishments and initiating school desegregating plans on behalf of persons denied constitutional rights.

4. Voting rights legislation including a new literacy test provision establishing a presumption of literacy as a qualification for voting for those with sixth grade education.

5. Extension of the Civil Rights Commission.

SUPPORT SOUGHT

The foregoing proposals will be adjusted to meet Republican support.

For a full scale, frontal assault on the filibuster the Kennedy package almost certainly must be reduced to get the necessary 67 votes.

"As we put foreign policy on a bipartisan basis, we better put racial matters on a bipartisan basis," Senator HUMPHREY told a reporter. He added cheerfully:

"It looks as if we'll spend Thanksgiving in Washington."

[From the Washington Star, June 5, 1963]

ON D-DAY ALL GI's WERE BROTHERS—COMMON COURAGE AND COMPASSION OF THE 6TH OF JUNE IS RECALLED

(By William S. White)

It is good now to think back to another June day of long ago and so to let memory of the honor and gallantry of the past wash us clean, for a moment, of the little and the sweaty and the ugly contentions of the present.

Now, though directly and mortally we face no enemy shell and flame, we spend our national energy in bitterness and bickering among ourselves about this man's rights and that man's privileges.

Then, 19 years ago, facing unexampled perils while death walked heedlessly among our troops along the coast of France, we knew a timeless and an unforgotten hour of true national union and true national brotherhood. We thought then of man's duty.

Union was based then upon common courage and common compassion and not upon pompous exhortations from self-serving reformers—of whom few were present on D-day. Brotherhood was based then upon a common sacrifice and a common generosity in which no man spoke much of his rights but every man thought long upon his obligations. Brotherhood was not formed by "biracial" committees or white or black citizens councils, however these may be officially named—of which none were present on D-day.

Now, all we have to lose is our national dignity and our national self-control. Then, on the 6th of June, 1944, all we had at stake was the greatest battle in history—and perhaps even the greatest war—and the lives of many who would never see another day in June as the sun rose, for the last time for them, over the already reddening beaches of Normandy.

I remember seeing many men of many races and many religions (and some of no religion at all except the bleak religion of duty) on D-day. There was the redheaded corporal from the Bronx, passing alongside in an LCI (landing craft, infantry), who was fingering his rosary in the leaping light of the small predawn fire forward in the boat. This the platoon commander had lit, obedient to previous instructions, to burn his not-so-secret orders before we reached the touchdown on the other side of the English Channel.

The sergeant just next was a prematurely bald, once black-haired youngster from Philadelphia. He was "a kind of a Jew, I guess," he had mentioned at one point; meaning, I think, that while for whatever reason he had strayed from the ancient faith, the hour had come to seek reassurance from the long yesterdays.

The battalion major, in a larger LCI there, was, as I happened to know, a Presbyterian from a place in the South so small as to be only a mark on a rural free delivery mail route. There were some fellows in other craft thereabouts who were, notwithstanding a stateside saying that there would be none such, undeniably about to become atheists in foxholes, if they survived the first dash through the shallow tides at the beachside.

Now, none of these men had been ordered by higher military authority to love one another, to be fair to one another. Racial "tolerance" had not been legislated, by-the-numbers, by military command, as racial "tolerance" will not now be legislated by administrative, by congressional, or by court, decree.

But, at the risk of seeming sticky, simple truth compels the report that these men did love one another, did respect one another. But they loved and respected not merely the things that were the same in them but also the things that were different, were diverse—were "pluralistic," to use the egghead term—among them.

Here was that union in human diversity, that mutual respect in human divergence, which the great imperatives of adversity and danger can bring to a people in war. Is it too much to hope that—if only the professional minority-group agitators and the professional white-supremacy agitators can somehow be cut down to size by the patient people of all races—we can somehow reach amid peace and plenty what came so readily to us in war and suffering?

TAX-SUPPORTED PROPAGANDA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on May 26, my able colleague the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] delivered a very important speech at Portland, Oreg. Her speech was entitled "Tax-Supported Propaganda."

In the course of the speech she stated:

Our tax laws make tax-exempt income contributed to any organization "organized and operated exclusively for religious * * * or educational purposes" as long as "no substantial part of its activities * * * is carrying on propaganda." Propaganda, incidentally, is defined by Webster as "Any organized or concerted group, effort, or movement to spread particular doctrines."

Despite this express exclusion of propaganda organs from tax exemption, there is increasing evidence that dozens of right-wing groups are today masquerading as "educational or religious" organizations, and are flooding the country with the partisan, political propaganda of the far-right, financed by tax-free contributions from businessmen. And, whenever a businessman has tax-exempt income, somebody else is forced to pay more taxes—and that somebody else is you and I.

Who are these organizations and how do they get away with it? One thing is certain: you can't spot them by their titles. Our rightwing extremists may be deficient in their respect for democracy but they certainly are imaginative when it comes to selecting democratic-sounding titles. Let me cite an example. Are you interested in America's future? So am I. Then you may be interested to learn, as I was, what a "nonprofit, educational" tax-exempt institution called "America's Future, Inc.," has to say.

Then my colleague proceeded in her very able speech to point out what really amounts to a tax-exempt racket that is being operated by certain rightwing organizations. By means of this racket, the taxpayers as a whole are, in fact and in effect, paying for such propaganda.

I ask unanimous consent that the very able speech delivered by my colleague be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

TAX SUPPORTED PROPAGANDA

(Speech of Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER at COPE northwest regional conference, Portland, Oreg., on May 26, 1963)

Pollyanna was determined to find some good in everything and everybody—so much so that the term Pollyanna has come to characterize those perpetually cheery souls, we all know them, who profess to find a good side to even the blackest day—like the good people who always insist that though Mussolini was a villain, he did make the railroad trains run on time.

I don't meet many Pollyannas in my daily deliberations. I usually have to listen to the prophets of gloom and despair. But the other day I was discussing the activities of the John Birch Society with a colleague who argued, tongue-in-check, that even the John Birch Society had its good points.

First, he argued, by now, most Americans who spend at least part of the day awake, know the John Birch Society for what it really is: a maniacal sect dedicated to a return to a 19th century economy and repeal of the Bill of Rights. Not that the Society was eager to publicize its malicious wares, but because its founder and patron oracle, Robert Welch, stumbled into the glare of

public exposure 2 years ago with his accusation that Eisenhower was a Communist. And that was too much for any rational American, left, right, or center, to stomach. Consequently, the Society's name has become a warning flag to thinking Americans that any message associated with it is tainted by a distorted and perverted view of man, economics, and society. That was one good thing about the John Birch Society.

The second good thing he had to say about the John Birch Society was that at least the Federal Government didn't subsidize it.

I find it hard to dismiss that lightly an insidious cancer that has infected many otherwise well-intentioned Americans. But he did have a point: although the government doesn't contribute to the John Birch Society, you and I unwittingly, and certainly involuntarily, as taxpayers, are indirectly financing millions of dollars of Birch-type propaganda put out by less well-known but equally vicious organizations.

Our tax laws make tax-exempt, income contributed to any organization "organized and operated exclusively for religious * * * or educational purposes" as long as "no substantial part of its activities * * * is carrying on propaganda." Propaganda, incidentally, is defined by Webster's as "Any organized or concerted group, effort, or movement to spread particular doctrines."

Despite this express exclusion of propaganda organs from tax exemption, there is increasing evidence that dozens of right-wing groups are today masquerading as educational or religious organizations, and are flooding the country with the partisan, political propaganda of the far right, financed by tax-free contributions from businessmen. And, whenever a businessman has tax-exempt income, somebody else is forced to pay more taxes—and that somebody else is you and I.

Who are these organizations and how do they get away with it? One thing is certain: you can't spot them by their titles. Our right-wing extremists may be deficient in their respect for democracy but they certainly are imaginative when it comes to selecting democratic-sounding titles. Let me cite an example. Are you interested in America's future? So am I. Then you may be interested to learn, as I was, what a nonprofit, educational tax-exempt institution called "America's Future Inc.," has to say.

"America's Future, Inc.," puts out an eight-page newsletter which it describes as a weekly antidote for the flood of socialistic slanted news and views that assails us and broadcasts a weekly radio program with R. K. Scott as the principal commentator. Recently, Scott's brand of tax-supported education included:

1. Criticism of the Supreme Court decision on school prayers (July 13, September 14.)

2. Repudiation of the Supreme Court decision on school segregation. ("From that decision has flowed most of the racial dissensions and hatred with which we have been plagued ever since. In that decision the Supreme Court did something that it had no right to do under our Constitution") (August 10).

3. Opposition to government control of industry and power to levy taxes on industries (August 24).

4. Attacks on the State Department and the U.S.I.A. (the latter is riddled with hordes of boondoggiers, many of whom are soft on communism) (July 27).

5. Criticism of U.S. support of the U.N. actions in Katanga (September 7).

6. Criticism of our participation in the U.N. (the awful mess resulting from our involvement in the United Nations) (August 3).

7. Objections to admitting Russian tourists into the United States where they can spy (July 20).

8. Opposition to the dangerous Labor Union Monopoly which makes a political and economic slave of the union worker and should be equated with labor boss monopoly (July 6, August 31).

America's Future also conducts a thriving business in book-burning called operation textbook. Its textbook evaluation committee, which incidentally contains four men active in the John Birch Society, is now one-third of the way toward its expressed goal of evaluating all 400 social science textbooks currently in use in America's high schools—handing out failing grades to books which give too much attention to freedom of religion, speech, and the press, and which fail to stress the right to acquire and hold property, the right to work, the right to engage in free enterprise, and the right of a free society to protect itself against subversion. And woe betide any text that would "attempt to instill in the student the idea of world mindness or world citizenship, and world government."

We soon discover that "America's Future Inc.," is in reality dedicated to reviving the worst of America's past while burying the very freedoms that have made America great.

Who is it that pumps tax-exempt funds into "America's Future, Inc."? Many old friends of democratic education, led by Gulf Oil, Armco Steel, Cities Service, Consolidated Edison of New York, Dupont, and Socony-Vacuum. Your taxes and my taxes will be higher so that these companies can make tax-exempt donations to "America's Future Inc."

Let's turn to another fine-sounding tax-exempt organization, "The American Good Government Society." Each year the society makes George Washington Day awards at a George Washington Day dinner to Americans who have contributed to good government during the past year. That seems like a worthwhile function—except for the strange fact that between 1953 and 1963, of the awards given to Senators and Representatives, 10 went to Southern Democrats and the rest to conservative Republicans. I was surprised to learn, as I am sure you are, that for the last 10 years no one but Southern Democrats and conservative Republicans has made any contribution to good government.

Let me make myself perfectly clear. I don't really object—and I consider that I have no right to object—to any group of American citizens getting together and making George Washington Day awards to anyone they choose (though I sometimes wonder at the woeful miscarriages of justice that are committed in the names of American heroes). What I most certainly do object to is the use of tax-exempt income to promote these essentially political activities. The Constitution guarantees freedom of speech, thankfully, but it does not guarantee that political propaganda shall be subsidized by tax concessions. There is probably no one who gets more radical rightwing propaganda value for his tax-exempt dollar than Haroldson Lafayette Hunt, whom Time magazine labeled "the big daddy to many a far-right crusade." H. L. Hunt has been rated the second richest man in the United States with a total wealth as high as $3 billion and annual income hovering around $50 million. From his headquarters in Dallas, Tex., Hunt indulges his urge to convince his fellow citizens that the U.S. Government is so thickly infiltrated with Communists that it is practically Communist now, and that any man or woman who favors medicare, foreign aid, and virtually any other social welfare measure which you might care to name, is an enemy of freedom. Hunt also dabbles in anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic and even anti-Protestant propaganda (the National Council of Churches) (which doesn't leave him very much room), and damns the Supreme Court as the violator of the Constitution.

You would think that a man with $3 billion at his disposal and an active spleen would be willing to finance his own propaganda warfare. But Hunt prefers to let the Federal Government assume a substantial portion of his political crusades.

Hunt has simply packaged his propaganda network under the head of "The Lifeline Foundation, Inc.," and then had his business corporations—The Hunt Oil Co., and its food processing and canning division, the HLH Parade Co., commercially sponsor Lifeline propaganda throughout the country. Of course, commercial advertising expenditures are treated as a business expense and deducted from the company's income before taxes. Hunt's expressed goal is to see the $11 billion which American business spends on advertising annually, devoted to the sponsoring of right-wing propaganda.

Lifeline's boiling cauldron of trouble includes a five-day-a-week radio program, TV program, a four-page twice-weekly political polemic, a book club: "Lifeline Links," and Lifeline seminars: to "meet the public demand for accelerated enlightenment" on freedom, Communist subversion, and "shelter protection against fallout."

What kind of commercial entertainment does Lifeline put out? Here's a sample: "Support gained from church circles in the U.S. helps them (the Communists) to break down the moral antipathy of a community and gives the infiltrator this respectability which they desperately need."

And again "Everyone in the United States * * * except, apparently, the Supreme Court, knows that communism advocates the overthrow of this Government." To ward off libel suits Hunt's propagandists call the victims of their attacks "mistaken" but it is quite clear to anyone who listens that "mistaken" is a synonym for "enemies of freedom," which is in turn a synonym for Communist.

"As anti-Communist sentiment grows stronger in the United States, the 'mistaken' forces seeking to end freedom feel the damage to their cause. Word has gone out that anticommunism must be stopped. Definite orders for the liquidation of anticommunism have been given in a party manifesto. Since that manifesto, the drive against anticommunism has been growing steadily more intense. If you were the head man of the 'mistaken' forces that are working to end freedom, what orders could you have given that would have produced greater strategic victory than the communization of Cuba?

"The Second World War was but another step in the program of the 'mistaken' to conquer the entire world.

"The entire propaganda line of the 'mistaken,' including doubletalk about disarmament, is designed to make it easier for them to carry out their plot for ending freedom."

To label a group or individual as "mistaken," then, is Hunt's not-so-subtle way of accusing anyone who disagrees with him of being a Communist, without risking a libel suit. But the vicious innuendo is no less vicious because it is put into this kind of transparent code.

Another blatant example of the abuse of tax deductible advertising is the arrangement worked out by General Electric with erstwhile former Movie Star Ronald Reagan. While he was host and occasional star of the television show General Electric Theater, Reagan's contract called for 8 weeks of speaking tours for GE each year. On these tours Reagan had little, if anything, to say about GE toasters or television sets or even anything about his own television program, but at each stop he made the same rigidly conservative speech against social security, the income tax, Federal aid to education, and medicare. It has been suggested that

Reagan is even opposed to a national post office.

I think I have given you enough to convey the flavor of these organizations—and the aroma as well—but I assure you that this is by no means an exhaustive sampling. Just listen to this rollcall of high-sounding titles for low-hitting activities: The American Council of Christian Laymen (How Red is the National Council of Churches?); The American Economic Foundation; the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade; Christian's Echoes Ministry; Christian Freedom Foundation; Church League of America; the Circuit Riders; the Economists National Committee on Monetary Policy; Foundation for Economic Education; the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists; the National Education Program.

In 1961, these organizations—plus the ones I have already discussed—took in better than $5½ million in tax-free contributions.

What's in a name? Well, for each of these high-sounding organizations: tax-free income and the shield of respectability that cloaks their rightwing extremist propaganda.

How has this been permitted to happen? It is painfully clear that the tax Service has simply not done the job Congress gave it: to rout out the propagandists from the bona fide educators. It may be that the Service has simply lacked the manpower to investigate exemption applications. It is no doubt true that in a given instance the line between education and political propaganda is a difficult one to draw. Whatever the reasons I think it is incumbent upon the tax Service to terminate, and with more than deliberate speed, the fraudulent use of the "educational" exemption as a tax haven for partisan political propaganda. And I intend to use every resource at my command to see that this is done. Not, let me repeat, for the purpose of silencing political activity, but merely for the purpose of eliminating the tax-exemption subsidy.

If I make a contribution to the Oregon Dunes Committee, my gift is clearly not tax deductible because the Dunes Committee has a political, though non-profit goal: the creation of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore. But if I were a member of the DAR and contributed to that crusty old institution, my gift would be tax deductible.

Yet, at its 72d Continental Congress held in Washington last month, the DAR adopted resolutions opposing disarmament and the test ban treaty, deficit spending, foreign aid, liberalization of the Immigration Act of 1952, the United Nations, public housing, urban renewal, Federal aid to mental health care, the domestic Peace Corps and the Youth Conservation Corps (on the grounds that it would "result in endangering the future of private youth organizations and delay the entrance of the youth of this nation into the field of free enterprise"). Here is the dissenting testimony of Mrs. E. King, herself a member of the DAR and a representative of the Chappaqua, N.Y., chapter.

"While the DAR professes no political purpose and claims tax exemption on the strength of it," she reported to the members of her local chapter, "its policy year after dreary year monotonously issued from its rubber-stamped congresses support uniformly the position of a certain segment of American political thought. No resolution contrary to the positions of the far rightwing is adopted."

Would any fair-minded observer say with justice that the Oregon Dunes Committee is more political in its activities than the DAR? I think not.

Let me close by citing to you the strange case of the Inter-Collegiate Society of Individualists, which incidentally draws wide support from private power companies—though not, let me hasten to add, from the State of Oregon. The society is militantly opposed to both the income tax and Federal aid to education. Yet isn't it ironic that its own activities are income tax free and this exemption represents Federal aid—not to "education" in any meaningful sense, but to political propaganda masquerading as education.

THE OAS AND THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The OAS and the Alliance for Progress," which was delivered by William Sanders, Assistant Secretary General of the Organization of American States. As chairman of the Latin American Affairs Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, I wish to state that this is an excellent speech, and should be of interest to all who are interested in the Alliance for Progress program.

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

THE OAS AND THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(By William Sanders, Assistant Secretary General, Organization of American States)

It was with pleasure that I accepted the invitation to address this conference on the Alliance for Progress. In saying this I have more in mind than beginning my remarks with the usual words of courtesy that are routine on an occasion of this kind. Let me explain.

The Punta del Este meeting that brought the Alliance into being a year and a half ago declared that: "In order to attain its goals this vast program demands understanding and active cooperation from all the peoples of America." It called upon public opinion of the hemisphere—and in so doing made specific reference to student associations—to acquire an awareness of the social implications of the Alliance and "to take an active part in the dissemination of information on its objectives and in the discussion and execution of its programs." This student conference in Eugene is a fine and timely response to this call for action.

It has seemed to me that I might do well today to present the Alliance from the viewpoint of our regional association, the Organization of American States.

BACKGROUND OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

In order that we may have the same frame of reference as I proceed, I should like you to know at the outset that I am making the following assumptions:

Assumption No. 1: That you know what is meant by the term Latin America—that its implications of a homogeneous unity veils a heterogeneous reality of a people of 200 million divided into 20 separate, independent and sovereign states. I am sure that none of you here will ask me, as was the case of an individual with an inquiring turn of mind, who recently asked: What is the capital of Latin America?

Assumption No. 2: That you know that Latin America is classified as an underdeveloped area and that you know what that means—a region characterized economically by a predominantly agricultural economy; by reliance on one or a few agricultural and mineral export commodities for earning foreign exchange; by lack of capital, skilled manpower, and scientific and technological know-how; and socially by inadequate housing, health, and educational facilities; by a small middle class; an inequitably distributed tax burden; and inadequate socio-economic institutions such as trade unions, farm cooperatives, and small business associations; in short, by low productivity, low income, low life expectancy, unequal opportunity, and weak institutions through which the common man can participate more fully in his society. In such a region, the economic and social structures are predominantly those of the prescientific and pretechnological age.

Assumption No. 3: That you know that there is a "population explosion" in Latin America, and that you know that this means that during the next decade there must be an increase of almost 30 percent in food production, transportation, health, housing, and educational facilities, and national income merely to preserve the low standards of living now prevailing in the area; that, by way of comparison, during a period of unparalleled prosperity it took the United States, with all its technical know-how and financial resources, 15 years to raise national income 40 percent.

Assumption No. 4: That you know that extreme poverty, such as that existing in large areas of Latin America, is no longer accepted as a normal order of life, and that this factor exerts social and political pressures that reach the point of explosion; that this situation endangers political and social stability, creating conditions favorable to extreme ideologies of the right and the left, and to organized penetration by international communism.

Assumption No. 5: That you know the structure, the institutions, and the purposes of the OAS; that the OAS is the oldest international organization of its kind, being 72 years of age; that it recently was in the spotlight of public opinion because of the action it took to exclude the Castro regime from participation in the Organization and because of its decision by unanimous vote to establish a quarantine of that regime, designed to force the immediate dismantling and withdrawal from Cuba of nuclear missiles stationed there by the Soviet Union; and that the Alliance for Progress began as a collective program under the OAS and is being developed within the framework of this regional community of nations.

Concern with the economic and social conditions in the hemisphere has been pressing with a constantly increasing sense of urgency upon the deliberations of the institutions of the inter-American system since its beginnings. One of the objectives of the first International Conference of American States, held in Washington in 1889–90, was to preserve and promote the prosperity [and] the welfare of the hemisphere. The original name of our OAS secretariat, as established by that Conference, was the Commercial Bureau of the American Republics; its primary purpose was the development of trade. The Bureau was to be the central office of an association entitled the International Union of American Republics. It was within the broad concept of union that the inter-American movement developed, in the interval of 72 years since 1890, into the comprehensive regional community of nations of today.

At the time of the general reorganization of the inter-American system in 1948, the charter then adopted created the OAS and incorporated past experiences in cooperative undertakings and a vision of a still stronger unity of purpose and effort. In the field of your interest at this meeting—the economic and social—principles and objectives were agreed upon and institutions established for a greatly expanded community effort. The premise of this effort is that social justice and social security are bases of lasting peace and that economic cooperation is essential to the common welfare and prosperity of the peoples of the Continent.

After the historic 1948 date, 8 years followed characterized by hesitation, vacillation and failure to recognize the magnitude

of the problem of poverty and the urgency of its demand for a courageous and creative attack on its solution.

A first important forward step was taken in the years 1956 and 1957, when an Inter-American Committee of Presidential Representatives met to suggest ways of making the OAS a more effective instrument for cooperation in the economic, financial, social, and technical fields. Some of the measures proposed have proved highly fruitful, such as that instituting direct technical assistance services by the Organization to the Member States, and—perhaps of particular interest to this audience—the one establishing the fellowship program of the OAS. This last-mentioned represents an annual yearly investment of over $1 million, and under its auspices some 2,000 fellows have undertaken advanced training abroad.

In 1958, President Kubitschek of Brazil made a call for prompt, dynamic action of an overall nature under a program termed "Operation Pan America." A special group—the so-called Committee of 21—was appointed by the Council of the Organization to act on this proposal. Meeting over a period of 3 years, the Committee presented, as the result of its final sessions, a series of recommendations known as the Act of Bogotá of 1960, in which social development was recognized as a necessary part of balanced economic development.

During this same period, the long-cherished desire of the Latin Americans for a regional financing agency became a reality, with the establishment of the Inter-American Development Bank in 1960. The Bank in its 3 years of operations has had a major impact on Latin America, with one aspect, its Social Progress Trust Fund, playing a particularly important role in socio-economic development such as health and housing.

THE SCOPE OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Culminating previous efforts, and embracing them in an approach that is truly revolutionary, is the now well-known Alliance for Progress, proposed by President Kennedy, and developed at the OAS meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council at the ministerial level held at Punta del Este in August 1961.

It should be noted that the Alliance is more complex and far-reaching than that other great international undertaking with which it is frequently compared, the Marshall plan. The latter was primarily concerned with the physical rebuilding of a war-damaged economy in Europe. The Alliance is not a rebuilding; it is a creation of what did not exist: A modern economy, a modern society. The construction of roads, dams, and factories must be accompanied with major social and institutional reforms.

A special feature of the programs of the Alliance is that they are to be undertaken within the framework of overall national plans of economic and social development. An industry will not be set up without considering the manpower that must be trained to run it, the need for transportation facilities to distribute the product, or the social effects of industrialization on a predominantly rural community. National institutions to carry out the planning function on a continuing basis are being established. With national planning proceeding in all of the member states, six countries have presented detailed national plans to the OAS for review and counsel: Colombia, Chile, Bolivia, Peru, Venezuela, and Mexico. Colombia's plan, the first submitted to the OAS, has been the basis of consideration for extensive external financial assistance by a large-scale international consultative group.

Emphasis upon international cooperation has perhaps obscured the fact that the Alliance has three basic aspects, unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral, and that the first mentioned, represented by self-help, is in many respects the most important of all. The social and institutional reforms called for can be brought about only by decisions of each individual country, and, even in financing, while due attention was given to possibilities of external assistance, it was recognized at Punta del Este that 80 percent of the annual $10 billion in funds required would have to be raised locally. The credo of the Alliance for Latin America was to be—if I may be permitted a paraphrase of some of the more celebrated words of our day—"Let us ask, not so much what others can do for us, as what we can do for ourselves."

The bilateral aspects of the Alliance lie largely in the areas of financing and technical assistance. Many of the agencies involved here are official. Prominent among them are those of the U.S. Government, in particular the Agency for International Development (AID). It administers a considerable part of the U.S. funds earmarked for the Alliance; it also carries out bilateral technical assistance programs under arrangements with individual Latin American countries. The Export-Import Bank provides credits to make it possible for Latin American businesses to purchase equipment from U.S. private enterprises. The U.S. food-for-peace program has contributed more than a hundred million dollars in food for Latin America, and the Peace Corps now has more than 1,300 volunteers at work in the area, more than on any other continent. Now that their own national economies have been reestablished on a firm basis, European governments are also beginning to participate more fully in Latin American economic development.

An important role is likewise assigned to the private sector—individual banks and industrial concerns. It is expected that funds from these sources will be channeled toward enterprises from which a relatively early return can be expected, whereas the public sector will provide the resources required for the so-called infrastructure undertakings. These are ones for overall social and long-range economic benefit—schools, roads, hospitals, and the like—which are unlikely to attract investments for profit.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS AS A COLLECTIVE PROGRAM

I have put in third and last place, for more detailed consideration, the multilateral aspects—the third of the trinity of unilateral, bilateral, and collective components of the Alliance.

I shall start on this topic by indicating the two principal categories of multilateral organizations involved. First and foremost is the OAS, including in particular the Council of the Organization, the Economic and Social Council, the Pan American Union, and such specialized organizations as the Pan American Health Organization, which is also the regional arm of the World Health Organization, and the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences. Available as needed is the Inter-American Conference, the supreme organ of the OAS. An extremely important member of this regional complex is the Inter-American Development Bank, which, while not technically an OAS agency, is an integral part of the regional system. In addition there are subregional arrangements, specifically the Latin American Free Trade Association and the Central American Common Market. These, while not part of the OAS galaxy, are inextricably linked to it in objectives.

In the second category are found the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA), the U.N. Specialized Agencies—UNESCO, FAO, and the U.N. Special Fund, and the two vast fiscal institutions, the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank.) Their aid to Latin America is vital. For example, the World Bank last year lent $412 million to Latin America out of its total world loans of $882 million.

At the center of this complex of multilateral institutions participating in the Alliance are the Council of the OAS, the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, and the Pan American Union—the General Secretariat of the Organization of American States. I shall concentrate on these. These three bodies provide the Alliance's institutional framework for policy formulation; for the technical assistance and other services needed in the preparation and evaluation of the plans, projects, and programs of the Alliance; and for appropriate assistance in their execution. I shall attempt to describe the flow of multilateral Alliance activity from policy to execution in terms of the responsibilities and work of these OAS institutions.

THE COUNCIL OF THE ORGANIZATION

The responsibility of the Council of the Organization, which is the permanent deliberative body of the system, derives from the charter of the OAS. The principal provisions that have to do with the Alliance are those which determine that the Council shall fix the quotas to be paid by each member state for the maintenance of the Pan American Union (and therefore decide the programs it is to undertake); those which assign to it the responsibility for the proper discharge by the Union of its duties; those which give it the direction of the Union's efforts to promote economic, social, juridical, and cultural relations among the member states; those which provide for juridical, economic and social, and cultural councils as dependent organs of the Council of the OAS, enjoying, however, technical autonomy; and those which assign to the Council responsibility for overseeing the functioning of the OAS as a whole. The Council's explicit and direct responsibility for the functioning and for the program and budget of the Pan American Union, the principal operating arm of the OAS, gives the Council a decisive role in determining the pace and the magnitude of the OAS services to be rendered to the member states with respect to the Alliance. Moreover, in a system such as that of the OAS, in which there is technical autonomy in specialized fields, with separate forums for those fields at which special representatives of the governments speak, the Council offers a central locus at which final and unified policy positions can be taken by the individual governments.

THE INTER-AMERICAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

The basic decisions to give the social and economic transformation of Latin America urgent priority in the American community were taken at the meeting in Bogotá in 1960 of the Committee of 21 of the Council of the Organization, set up under Operation Pan America, and at the 1961 meeting in Punta del Este of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, an organ of the Council of the OAS.

At the latter meeting commitments were undertaken establishing the magnitude of the efforts to be made in internal and external assistance. These decisions have the hallmark of their origin in these cooperative and collective deliberations; they possess an essential unity and interrelationship. The tendency to isolate particular aspects of this vast plan from the whole has led to distortions that make the Alliance the target of charges that it is a "giveaway"—of public funds in the United States, and of national sovereignty in Latin America.

There can be little question that the existence of the multilateral institutions of which I have been speaking made possible the acceptance in an international forum of the all-important commitments to undertake reforms in areas intimately related to

the reserved domain of the state. As the countries participating in the Punta del Este meeting said, these agreements were made "in the exercise of their sovereignty," that is, by free consent and choice.

As if in anticipation of the Alliance for Progress, provision for high-level policy formulation and decision on matters of economic and social development were made by a thoroughgoing reorganization of the Economic and Social Council. This task was accomplished by the Council of the Organization in the winter of 1960–61.

The Inter-American Economic and Social Council now meets annually, at the ministerial or cabinet level. That is, the participants are the highest officials of the executive branch in the economic area. The same men that arrive at the Council's conclusions are directly responsible in their own countries for putting them into action.

The change in the composition and pattern of meetings was accompanied by equally significant changes in work methods. While the Council, at its annual meeting, can and does take decisions having immediate operational implications, it is apparent that it has assumed as a leading function that of serving as a forum for evaluation and comparison—for confrontation—at the highest level, of advances made in economic and social development under the Alliance for Progress. The first such annual confrontation of the Alliance achievements realized by the various countries took place at Mexico City last October, and was generally considered of great significance for determining future courses of action. The Council operates primarily on the basis of policy determinations already made at Punta del Este. To a large extent emphasis at the ministerial meetings is on execution of policy rather than on its formulation.

This fact is reflected in preparations for the ministerial evaluation. Immediately before this takes place, the Council meets at a technical level to lay the groundwork for the ministers. At this preliminary meeting the governments are represented by "experts of the highest possible level." While such experts could ill have been spared in many cases for permanent assignment to Washington, the countries can afford to release them briefly for exchanges of views and experiences from which much national benefit may be derived. The experts review at their meeting, from the technical standpoint, the documents and proposals to be submitted to the ministers for consideration in their political aspects. Prominent among the documentation are reports from each country on problems confronted and progress made in their solution, and a survey by the General Secretariat of the situation in Latin America as a whole. These, and other documents prepared by the Secretariat, give the Council a detailed view of action to be taken individually and collectively by the membership and by agencies of the OAS and other international organizations.

The Mexico City meeting created special committees in six areas: planning and project formulation; agricultural development and agrarian reform; fiscal policy and administration; industrial development and financing for the private sector; education and training; and health, housing, and community development. At their meetings, starting early this year, the members of the committees will exchange information regarding the progress of their own programs in the fields involved, on the problems they have encountered, and on solutions that have been found. The evaluation and confrontation process which culminates at the ministerial meeting will thus proceed during the intervals when the Economic and Social Council is not in session.

It will be interesting to see how the special committees perform. Unless properly used, they could represent a costly return to the committee structure of the old Economic and Social Council, calling for attendance at meetings that absorb limited financial resources and the time and energies of a small elite of trained personnel in short supply both in the Secretariat and in the Latin American member states.

With a view to permitting an objective, outside review of national development plans previous to their presentation for financing, the Punta del Este meeting established a new group, known officially as the Panel of Nine, and unofficially as the Nine Wise Men. Appointed by the Inter-American Economic and Social Council upon the nomination of the Secretary General of the OAS, the Executive Secretary of ECLA, and the President of the Inter-American Development Bank, these are experts of the highest level in varying aspects of national development. If it so desires, a nation may submit its overall plan for examination by an ad hoc group drawn from the Panel and from outside sources. While no limitations are placed upon the government's freedom of action, the Charter of Punta del Este declares: "The recommendations of the ad hoc committee will be of great importance in determining the distribution of public funds under the Alliance for Progress."

National plans will normally be of such a magnitude as to preclude obtaining all the required external funds from a single source. A possible channel is indicated by the Punta del Este Charter, which provides that: "A government whose development program has been the object of recommendations by the ad hoc committee with respect to external financing requirements may submit the program to the Inter-American Development Bank so that the Bank may undertake the negotiations required to obtain such financing, including the organization of a consortium of credit institutions and governments disposed to contribute to the continuing and systematic financing, on appropriate terms, of the development program. However, the government will have full freedom to resort through any other channels to all sources of financing, for the purpose of obtaining, in full or in part, the required resources."

THE GENERAL SECRETARIAT OF THE ORGANIZATION

I come now to the transformations that have taken place in the principal "operating arm" of the OAS, the General Secretariat. Whereas traditionally the Pan American Union was concerned almost exclusively with informational activities, and with the furnishing of organizational, administrative, legal, and technical services at headquarters to deliberative bodies and conferences, today only about 15 percent of its budget goes into such services. The other 85 percent is devoted to operations directed toward promoting the progress of the member states in economic, social, scientific, and training fields.

An important part of this activity takes place in the territories of the individual member states as field services to the governments, such as the OAS regional training centers in a number of countries.

A certain number of functions concerned with the forward march of the Alliance devolve primarily upon the Pan American Union. Important among these functions are those of assistance in planning. Experts in this sector are in short supply everywhere. The OAS, drawing upon its own staff and upon contract personnel, has been able to help several countries in working out their plans and programs. I foresee, moreover, increasing demand for assistance in developing specific projects for financing. Large sums have been earmarked by international agencies for general programs of investment, but detailed plans for individual undertakings must be presented before actual disbursement can take place.

The organization and administration of technical assistance missions, in areas ranging from electoral reform to rural electrification, represent another important feature of Pan American Union participation in the Alliance.

So too do the training programs operated under Pan American Union auspices, in such varied fields as statistics, housing, applied social sciences, rural education, urban planning, and business administration. In addition to its own projects, the Union maintains the fellowship program I mentioned earlier, which permits qualified personnel to pursue advanced study at institutions of recognized standing, in any area that the fellow's government considers of importance to national development.

The Secretariat also has the responsibility of carrying out special studies of importance for understanding the problems impeding development and the means of overcoming them. As in the case of the training and technical assistance programs, the Secretariat had been engaged in activities of this sort prior to the Alliance, but, though not innovations, they are still important for its success. In this connection, the Punta del Este meeting called for the establishment of large-scale task forces to undertake investigations and studies, and drawing on the experience of the member states, to prepare reports and adopt conclusions of a general nature for Latin America in the fields of education, land reform and agricultural development, and public health that may serve as a basis for the member states in preparing their national development programs. The education task force recently completed its work, having produced a series of studies and proposals that should be of great use to the countries of Latin America, the OAS, and other international organizations.

A highly significant function that has been assigned to the chief of the Secretariat, the Secretary General, is that of making representations, on behalf of the member states, to the Commission of the European Economic Community—the so-called Common Market—concerning measures that have had an unfavorable effect upon Latin American basic exports to the countries composing the Community. The Secretary General undertook a mission to this end in Europe last summer, thereby inaugurating a new, and I hope fruitful, era of collective action in international relations.

The geographic frame of reference within which the Pan American Union operates has expanded in other ways. Close collaboration has been established with other international agencies working in the inter-American area and arrangements are being worked out with the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and other European-based agencies in addition to the European Economic Community. With the aim of facilitating such relations, offices of the Pan American Union recently were established in Paris and Brussels.

The Old World is stretching out a helping hand to the New. Several European countries, the State of Israel and others, have offered a substantial number of fellowships for training in special fields. In many cases these have been processed and courses are now underway. Moreover, since in various areas the hemisphere does not have sufficient trained manpower to staff our technical assistance and training operations, we have been glad to be able to recruit personnel from other parts of the globe. However, while we welcome this help, and the possibility of financial assistance in the form of extraregional private investments and public funds, these positive factors could be canceled if members of the European community adopt restrictive policies and practices with respect to Latin American export products, the lifeblood of the region's economy.

THE COLLECTIVE PROCESS IN SYNTHESIS

The extent to which the Alliance for Progress depends on collective institutions may be put in perspective by the following summary of what I have said. The OAS furnished the forum within which the nations of America formulated the policies and objectives of the Alliance, and the means by which they can be assisted in carrying those policies and objectives into effect. Included in these means are those through which the nations may supplement their own technical skills through the advice and assistance of foreign technical experts in the formulation of national and sectorial development plans; through which the plans may be reviewed and adjusted so that they can be acceptable for international financing, and through the setting of standards by which projects can be judged as acceptable. International entities and procedures were agreed upon which permit the exchange of experiences and the development of concepts, of both a political and technical nature, which facilitate the resolution of major problems impeding development and the defense of the economies of the members against adverse developments in world markets.

The evaluation and confrontation process to which I have referred previously is of central importance. It marks the various stage of Alliance progression. It is here that we see the close relationship of the unilateral, bilateral and multilateral components of the program and of its planning, technical assistance and financial aspects.

As regards services made available by the OAS Secretariat and other international agencies, the work of the task forces and other special studies provide a basis for economic and social planning by the individual member States. In the course of the planning itself—overall or sectorial, long-term or short—technical assistance may be given, upon request from the governments. Some of this help may be in preparing specific projects for financing, within the general development programs.

The six special committees created by the Mexico City meeting of the Economic and Social Council gather between sessions of that body to exchange experiences in their respective fields, using in particular the information and materials that result from the activities just described.

The findings of the six committees are transmitted to the Economic and Social Council meeting at the expert level, where they are considered together with national reports on economic and social progress, the secretariat survey of the situation in Latin America as a whole, and other information. All this material, revised and coordinated in its technical aspects, is then transferred to the ministerial meeting for review from the policy viewpoint and decision as to possible changes in orientation of the Alliance programs.

The findings of the ministers are, finally, transmitted to the Council of the Organization for consideration in the light of overall policies and responsibilities of the OAS, and, insofar as programs are to be executed by the secretariat, for decision as to the scale on which they are to be carried out as determined by the financial resources made available.

The evaluation and confrontation process that I have outlined is similar to the functions performed under the Marshall plan by the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC). The confrontation provides the means for a collective examination at different technical and policy levels of the problems encountered, for a review of the progress being made and offers an opportunity to determine the degree of compliance with the commitments undertaken in the charter of Punta del Este.

BASIC PROBLEMS BEFORE THE ALLIANCE

Several times I have referred to problems impeding the progress of the Alliance. They are both many in number and serious in nature. No attempt should be made to minimize them. They must be brought into the open in order that we may cope with them effectively.

It must be recognized, for instance, that the economic and social goals of the Alliance are both competitive and complementary. Resources being limited, shall they be used to build schools or factories? Should profits from industry be paid out in more wages or reinvested to permit plant expansion? The economic and social are interdependent in their sequence. The modern economy requires a modern society, a society in which men possess education, health, and home so that they have the skill, stamina, and stake in society to work well and willingly at the complex tasks of a technological economy. In turn only a modern economy can produce sufficient resources to provide for the social development of a citizenry.

Another factor making for slow advance lies in the fact that the institutional reforms agreed upon in principle at Punta del Este, the general aim of which is greater social justice, often require in practice changes not only in the law but also in entrenched attitudes and habits of work that have their roots in traditions of the past. Changes in the tax structure will touch important sectors of the population in that peculiarly sensitive area of the pocketbook, and it can hardly be expected that they will give up long-held privileges of exemption without struggle.

Moreover, and to single out but one phase, converting systems of the pretechnological and prescientific age into modern institutions and practices is often not merely a matter of importing machinery and know-how, as if it were food and clothing to be distributed wholesale. Technological and scientific experience must be adapted to conditions prevailing in the underdeveloped countries—often adjusted to widely differing situations in different regions of the same country.

Agrarian reform, for example, is not merely a matter of taking land from a few large holders and dividing it among the many, or even of opening up public lands for distribution. It means also conveying modern methods of utilizing the soil to people living and working in what is to us the remote past. Even in so relatively advanced an area as the state of São Paulo in Brazil one can find farms on which the rice crop is cut with sickles, the sheaves beaten by hand against wooden rails, and the grain winnowed from the chaff by tossing it in the air with a shovel. This is a process that might have come out of the Biblical Book of Ruth. Not only must new types of seed, principles of crop rotation, and instruments of cultivation be introduced; but also markets and credit facilities must be developed, roads for the transport of produce built, schools, and training centers provided, and a whole complex program initiated of integrating previously abandoned or new rural communities into the economic and social life of the nation. The urgency of the effort required in this regard will be readily perceived when I remind you that, though Latin America does not today grow all the food its people need, there will be half as many mouths again to feed by the middle of the coming decade.

We see, therefore, that the achieving of agrarian reform means in fact the development of an entire supporting system of changes: political, economic, and social. The achievement of the other great objectives of the Alliance, whether they be housing or economic integration or education, requires this same long-term creation of a web of underlying political, economic and social changes. The implication is that the most meaningful criterion for measuring the progress of the Alliance is not merely the number of acres already redistributed or new homes already built, nor the exact number of dollars expended, but even more importantly the degree to which these essential prerequisite processes have been carried forward.

Another obstacle to a more rapid Alliance pace lies in the fact that, in large areas of Latin America, the climate has not been an inviting one of late for private investment. Social unrest and a strong wave of nationalism have led to threats of expropriation of foreign property, limitations on the conditions under which investments may be made by foreign concerns, and restrictions on the amount of profits that may be remitted abroad. These factors are of course greatly compounded in their adverse effects by the experience of foreign investments in Cuba.

The devising of ways and means to change this unfavorable climate is high on the agenda of the Alliance. And American business is not passively waiting for governmental action. More and more, American and European business sees that it, too, has a responsibility to improve the climate through policies identified with the economic development and social justice objectives of the Alliance.

The Charter of Punta del Este recognized that an important role must be played by private investment if the objectives of the Alliance are to be achieved as scheduled. The charter declared that: "The economic and social development of Latin America will require a large amount of additional public and private financial assistance on the part of capital-exporting countries. It recommended "promotion through appropriate measures * * * of conditions that will encourage the flow of foreign investments and help to increase the capital resources of participating countries in need of capital."

A factor which at times countervails external investment is represented by drops in prices on the world market for a given commodity. It has been estimated that the amount of dollars Latin American countries have lost in recent years as a result of declining prices is comparable, and in some cases superior, to the amount received under the form of loans and grants from the United States. The value of Latin American exports to the United States in 1961 would have been higher by $1.4 billion if prices had remained at the 1953 level. This sum is greater than the combined flow of funds from all sources into Latin America in the same year of 1961.

And this is still not the entire story. It is difficult to estimate the flight of domestic capital, since it often takes place under conditions of well-guarded secrecy. One estimate is that Latin Americans have sent more funds out of the area than external investors have put in—perhaps as much as $600 million more. This phenomenon is unquestionably a problem before the Alliance, but its magnitude and its relationship to the Alliance, in particular the contention that it represents a fear reaction to institutional reforms, needs objective analysis.

Guesses concerning the magnitude of this outflow of "hot money" have been as high as $10 to $25 billion during the past year or 18 months. No doubt, there has been a substantial outflow of short-term funds from Latin America, but not all of it can be classified properly as flight capital. The rise in the value of Latin American trade, particularly imports, means that traders must maintain larger working balances in foreign banks; moreover, medium- and long-term credits extended to Latin American borrowers are usually reflected in an increase in short-term deposits in foreign banks, since the loans are

being drawn down and utilized only gradually. A good slice of Latin American funds in the United States, moreover, constitutes balances with security brokers, reflecting the lack of similar investment opportunities at home, rather than a frantic flight of funds for safety. Finally, one must not forget, that capital flight from Latin America, as well as from many other areas, is nothing new. And while there may have occurred some increases in recent years, accounted for principally by two or three countries, there is no reason to believe that the magnitudes are anywhere near the figures commonly cited. I frankly doubt whether Latin American capital flight over the past year has exceeded $500 million. This does not mean that we should take comfort, for even this figure is large and represents a considerable waste of resources. In addition to these outflows, moreover, there are also others which fall into the category of speculative capital, or funds seeking a hedge against currency devaluation and depreciation. While these capital exports have an economic, rather than a political rationale, they are just as undesirable and underline the importance of monetary stability as a prerequisite for the effective harnessing of domestic resources in order to realize the objectives of the Alliance.

The decline of prices for Latin America's commodity exports, and the outflow of funds, both for political and speculative reasons, together threaten to cripple the member states capacity for securing the foreign exchange so essential to industrializing of their economies and improving the productivity of their agriculture. The needed diversification to escape the hazards of the one-crop economy cannot proceed without foreign exchange for new installations and equipment in both factory and field.

These are deep-rooted problems and movements, all simultaneously creating strains on the economies of Latin America: the cost of social development, class privilege, traditional work patterns; the cost of industrialization and agricultural diversification; the decline in export prices, the flight of capital, monetary inflation. To forget these problems is unrealistic; to let them obscure the new socioeconomic foundations being built would be equally unrealistic.

Other sources of difficulty, particularly in organizational and political aspects, are often summed up in facile slogans of glib catchwords which obscure their complexity.

It has been said, for instance, that the Alliance needs to be "Latinized." But just how is this to be done? And, just what does the proposal actually mean?

When the Marshall plan was set in motion, a special institution, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, was set up to coordinate the interests of the countries receiving aid. Some have suggested that a similar agency should be established for the Alliance for Progress. This proposal overlooks the fact that the Americas already have a going regional organization, whereas Europe had none, and that much time and effort had to be expended in preparing the OEEC for operations. A Latin American OEEC-type agency could well introduce a wedge into the inter-American community that would split the unity so laboriously created over the years.

Similar forces of cohesion and division are joined in a historic encounter on the other side of our Atlantic community. There we see a European Economic Community without Britain, at the same time that the Organization for European Economic Cooperation has become the larger Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, via the inclusion of the United States and Canada. If what is intended by proposals for a Latin American OEEC-type commission is to encourage self-help, or to develop a sense of Latin American identification with the Alliance, or to promote Latin American economic integration, all these can be accomplished, I am convinced, without resorting to devices that can do violence to our traditions and practices of inter-American cooperation.

We should take care to maintain the Alliance effort within the unique kind of internation relationship that we have evolved, a relationship in which the demands of independence and interdependence have been reconciled to produce a viable partnership between great and small powers.

There are those who say that the Alliance is a U.S. program, in some way imposed on Latin America. Now to be sure the suggestion which set the Alliance in motion came from President Kennedy, but he was in a very real sense taking up the ideal earlier advanced by President Kubitschek of Brazil for an Operation Pan America, within whose framework the Alliance has specifically been established. President Kubitschek's suggestion, in turn, summed up aspirations that had been voiced in Latin America for at least a decade.

Nevertheless, and despite the fact that the Alliance is multilateral rather than bilateral, champions of the Alliance in Latin America are classed by certain sectors as agents of Yankee imperialism, lackeys of the U.S. State Department, and the like. This is demagoguery and is increasingly recognized as such.

The recent meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council in Mexico City noted that the problem is primarily one of public education. It called upon "molders of public opinion * * * to collaborate * * * by taking a continuous and active part in * * * a movement directed toward publicizing widely this new concept of modern social democracy." It further recommended that "the member states instill in their peoples the conviction that their own national efforts, both public and private, in the field of economic and social development constitute an essential aspect of the Alliance for Progress." A sense of identification with the aims and programs of the Alliance on the part of the peoples of Latin America would contribute greatly to the success of the efforts being made, but this feeling must be developed within the countries themselves. It cannot be "sold" to them (in the words of another slogan) in a gigantic advertising campaign, sponsored from without.

We also have very much with us the contraposition of the concepts of status quo and change. The magnitude and comprehensiveness of the Alliance, its revolutionary approach, have put partisans of the different sides of this age-old conflict at odds in the inter-American setting. At times the struggle assumes the form of sterile exchange of stereotypes: "You are for the status quo," which means that the accused is against change and progress; and the other side replies: "You are for change for the sake of change," which means that the accused is a radical and perhaps an unthinking "fresh starter." We must avoid the stultifying effects on positive and creative thinking of the slogan approach to this crucial problem of the Alliance in an epoch of great transformations, in which sound judgment calls for a reconciliation of the requirements of change and stability.

Often novelty consists less in an idea, an instrument, or an object in itself than in the context in which it is employed and the use made of it. Because Homer spoke of a wine-dark sea, is that image to be forbidden to all later poets? Was Shakespeare not to write "Hamlet" because the plot was old? Who is to say that his work was not new in the use he made of his material? As August Heckscher, the consultant to the White House on the arts, recently observed: "In a balance between permanence and flux, between what is kept and discarded, what is loved and what is merely used, lies the key to a meaningful civilization." The same applies to a truly living and significant international organization.

A final comment on a problem affecting the OAS as the central agency of the Alliance. Admirable as all the expanded operations of the General Secretariat to which I have referred may be in themselves, and promising as they may be of productive results, they nevertheless pose a serious problem of financing. Quota payments must be made in dollars, and this represents an appreciable drain upon slim stocks of foreign exchange in the case of many countries.

The means must be found to permit the OAS to meet the demands made upon it for aid in the planning and the executing of national programs and for their coordination, and for the development of manpower resources through education and training, so that in economic and social questions, as in ones of a political nature, the OAS may be the instrument of concerted action by the American community.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE SUCCESS OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

A last word on the role of international organization. To focus on international institutions as the primary vehicle for action, whether political or economic and social, is dangerously misleading. Dr. Alberto Lleras, a former President of Colombia and Secretary General of the OAS, now engaged with ex-President Kubitschek of Brazil in reviewing the activities and procedures of the OAS with a view to making the operation of the Alliance more efficient and dynamic, observed upon a memorable occasion that an international organization can be only what the member goverments want it to be, since in essence the organization is the governments.

In the case of the Alliance for Progress, the governments have willed that the OAS be a far more active agency than ever before, but even so its role is primarily that of catalyst. The prime elements for achieving the goals of the Alliance are the governments, upon whose action or inaction success depends. Some will doubtless proceed with greater enthusiasm and dispatch than others, but I have every confidence that those who embarked upon the Alliance at Punta del Este will see that that noble resolve is carried to full fruition, so that a better life is brought to all the peoples of our hemisphere.

PERSPECTIVE ON PROGRESS WITH THE ALLIANCE

In recognizing the array of problems I have touched upon, we would do well to recall that most of them are not new to Latin America or other underdeveloped areas. The new element, the significant element of change, is the existence of this new Alliance with its action programs, which, after only 18 months of existence, are penetrating slowly but steadily into the communities of Latin America.

To grasp the scope of concrete Alliance achievements, you must bear in mind their cumulative and interrelated nature. The Alliance was not conceived in terms of a few spectacular achievements. Aswan dams alone will not do. The action programs are being woven into the entire social and economic fabric of the continent.

I suggest that the most meaningful approach to appraising the progress is to recognize that the Alliance is a process, a movement, not an assemblage of quickly manufactured finished goods.

With these points in mind, what can be said about actual results beyond the vast work of organization to which this study has been primarily devoted?

One can resort to statistics and lists, such as the fact that a large number of member states have increased their budgets for education from 20 to 60 percent since Punta del Este; that the manufacturing output increased by 8 percent in 1961; that the United States has channeled a quarter billion dollars in aid toward better housing, while, for example, Chile's national plan allocates a fourth of its total public expenditures for housing. Tax reform legislation has been passed, and a considerable degree of implementation begun, in most countries. Uruguay enacted its first income tax in 1961; new income tax systems were established in 1962 in the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Nicaragua; major structural changes were made in the tax laws of Colombia, El Salvador, Haiti, Mexico, and Panama; Guatemala, the only member state without a personal income tax, prepared such a law in late 1962 for presentation to its Congress; and so on for most countries.

Again, as an outstanding but not isolated example of agrarian reform, let me quote President Rómulo Betancourt: "The fact has not been sufficiently publicized that in Venezuela an agrarian revolution is being carried out in the countryside by peaceful and legal means, and that in 4 years more than 3½ million acres of land have been distributed among landless farmers; that more than 57,000 families have been settled on their own land; and more than $100 million have been invested in agrarian reform. This reform was begun before the Alliance for Progress was proclaimed, and in its recent phases it has received aid and cooperation from that progress."

Yet neither the criteria of percentages nor dollar signs nor number of factories or schools built and acres redistributed can provide a full insight into the dynamics of the process of progress in the Alliance.

One can more meaningfully study the dynamics by considering one of the approximately broad areas of activity, such as education, and reflecting on the new social and economic patterns being established by actions such as the following few examples from the complex process encompassed by the word "education":

At this moment, in hundreds of specific communities throughout Latin America, primary grade schools have recently been completed or are under construction. In Pernambuco, one regional state of the northeast area of Brazil, there were 144 schools under construction at one time under the Alliance. Thousands of new teachers are being trained. In, for example, Costa Rica, teacher training ranges from inauguration of newly expanded normal schools to science teaching texts prepared from materials of the National Aeronautic and Space Agency by the Inter-American University in Puerto Rico. New textbooks range from 2¼ million free readers being printed for more than 800,000 first and second grade children in five Central American Republics to advanced scientific texts under preparation for many universities. New techniques are spreading. Guatemala has launched television courses for adult literacy, secondary education, and university level, in broadcasts throughout the republic; Colombia has embarked on mass educational television for schools in five regional departments. University systems are being strengthened. For example, the Inter-American Development Bank has lent Chile $2.3 million to strengthen technological training in five regional universities.

When the balance sheet of the Alliance at its present stage is cast, a surprisingly impressive total, a far ranging panorama of action, becomes evident.

I have talked, I think with considerable frankness, about problems and issues we face in working at the Alliance's objectives. I have referred only to some of the principal difficulties and obstacles. The decade set for the Alliance can only get this great program underway. We face a long, hard road. Your generation will be traveling it, and you will travel it in the good company of your contemporaries of Latin America. This is a task you cannot avoid and cannot escape. The achievement of the Alliance's purposes, whether you call them the Alliance for Progress or by some other name, is a vital part of our world effort to maintain the freedom of man.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, today I have joined my distinguished colleague and friend across the aisle, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], in providing bipartisan sponsorship for a bill he introduced a few weeks ago, S. 1343. It would authorize moderate Federal financial assistance for public elementary and secondary education throughout the country, meeting undeniable educational needs in appropriate ways.

Both the bill and its bipartisan sponsorship are squarely in the tradition of our late and great Senator Robert A. Taft, a tradition with which I am glad to be associated.

Mr. President, there are honest fears about Federal control of education. To allay these fears the proposed legislation provides that:

First. Federal funds shall be invested in the State aid education system, authorized by the State legislature.

Second. Federal funds shall become State funds upon receipt by the State.

Third. The commingled Federal and State funds would be distributed to local school authorities for public education, in accordance with State law.

Fourth. State and local authorities would determine their most critical educational needs and how they can best be met.

The 4-year bill authorizes State surveys of educational needs and priorities in every local school district during its first year. The total Federal outlay for this year would be $6 million. The survey results would set the general pattern for distribution of commingled State and Federal funds by each State to the local school districts within its borders. Each State would thus pinpoint the various needs of its local districts and direct the merged Federal and State matched funds to these needs. The Federal Government would distribute funds only to the States.

After the survey year, Federal funds would be allocated to the States on a variable matching formula for each of the remaining 3 years. Complete and strict accounting by the States to the Federal Government would be required, but the fiscal procedures prescribed by the law would make Federal interference with local programs of teaching both illegal and administratively impossible.

Allocations to the States would be based on the latest annual total amount of State and local expenditures for public schools in each State. This bill would authorize increases in State and local funds now available for education, ranging from 2 percent of these expenditures in the richest State to more than 8 percent in the poorest State.

We are convinced that these Federal-State and State-local procedures would direct the Federal funds effectivly to the points of genuine priority needs in the thousands of school districts to be served. This bill would strengthen, rather than weaken, State and local autonomy in education.

Mr. President, local property tax resources in thousands of communities are strained. The States have, through great efforts, increased their direct appropriations for elementary and secondary schools to more than $6 billion a year. Enactment of the sort of proposal we make is to insure modest Federal financial cooperation in this most important area of American life. We commend this bipartisan legislation to all Senators, for their thoughtful consideration.

CANCER STAMP URGED

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am pleased and encouraged by the widespread support received by my bill, S. 1517, which directs the Postmaster General to issue a special postage stamp to commemorate the crusade against cancer. Fifteen distinguished Members of the Senate have joined with me in sponsoring the bill.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has gone on record in support of my bill and Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze has told me in his letter of June 6 that his Department will be pleased to lend its support to my proposal. The Surgeon General of the United States and the Director of the National Institutes of Health are also supporters.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD letters which I have received from the Secretary, the Surgeon General, and the Director, National Institutes of Health, in support of S. 1517.

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

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 6, 1963.*

Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. NEUBERGER: Thank you for your letter of May 14 informing me that you have introduced legislation authorizing and directing the Post Office Department to issue a special U.S. stamp commemorating the crusade against cancer.

This Department will be pleased to lend its support to your proposal.

The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Dr. Luther L. Terry, informs me that the Service, and particularly the National Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health, are aware of your efforts and are writing you in support of your proposal.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EUCATION, AND WELFARE,
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
May 24, 1963.

Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. NEUBERGER: I appreciate very much your letter of May 14 informing me that you have introduced in the Senate legislation authorizing and directing the Post Office Department to issue a commemorative stamp honoring the crusade against cancer.

As you know, the Public Health Service, through the National Cancer Institute, has long been active in this field and any effort to create public awareness of this disease and the need to take early precautions against it is always welcomed by the Service.

We take pleasure in lending our support to your effort. If there is any further action we can take please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. PRICE,
Acting Surgeon General.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCTION, AND WELFARE,
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Bethesda, Md., May 31, 1963.

Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: It was very thoughtful of you to bring to my attention, in your letter of May 14, the bill you have introduced to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to issue a special postage stamp commemorating the crusade against cancer. I am indeed happy to express my support of this proposal.

Allow me to express my appreciation, and that of my colleagues in the National Cancer Institute and the National Institutes of Health as a whole, of your unfailing interest in the problem of cancer as the second leading cause of death in this country.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. SHANNON,
Director.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION PROPOSALS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on June 4, 1963, the Securities and Exchange Commission submitted to Congress its legislative program for this session. S. 1642, which embodies the SEC proposals, was introduced by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and following the introduction of the bill, I announced that hearings on S. 1642 would begin June 18.

On June 5 the New York Times commented in an editorial on the legislative proposals of the SEC. The editorial noted in part that—

> Congress should not delay consideration of the SEC's demands, aimed at establishing a universal code of conduct for the marketplace.

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:

STANDARDS IN THE MARKET

The rapidly growing financial community and the army of shareholders across the Nation should welcome the Securities and Exchange Commission's proposals for increased regulation of the securities markets.

Its requests for legislation are not of a nature that would stifle the flow of capital or weaken public confidence in Wall Street. While they fail to touch on many problem areas, which may be covered in another message, they would set up standards to strengthen the free market process and pave the way for even greater public participation.

Most of the SEC's recommendations represent an extension of the tested regulatory principles that have governed operations on Wall Street. Its major demand, for example, is that full disclosure be applied to corporations whose shares are traded in the vast over-the-counter market. Full disclosure, which now covers only securities listed on the exchanges, has proved its usefulness both as a deterrent to unethical practice and a prerequisite for intelligent investing. The double standard that exists on Wall Street, with the activities of one group open to public scrutiny while the other operates in the dark, can be ended by casting the searchlight of disclosure on all publicly held companies.

The SEC breaks new ground in calling for qualifying standards for those entering or practicing in the securities industry. When it was first established as the watchdog over the markets, the SEC deliberately refused to set up any standards, largely because the financial community was then run along the lines of a private club. Now that Wall Street is becoming a mass market, the SEC's wide-open door has been a boon to shoestring promoters and uninformed or unscrupulous salesmen seeking to exploit public ignorance and greed.

Wall Street itself has recognized the need to raise its standards. Despite its original fears that regulation would prove either unworkable or lead to the withering away of the free market, the financial community has grown and prospered under the SEC's surveillance. The responsible members of Wall Street have not been able to enforce on all sectors of the industry a uniform code of ethical practices. This task has become the responsibility of the SEC.

With the markets once again showing signs of a revival of speculative activity, Congress should not delay consideration of the SEC's demands, aimed at establishing a universal code of conduct for the marketplace. Dealing in a free market will always entail risks. But the imposition of standards that foster integrity and more intelligent investing will provide a desirable safeguard that is long overdue.

CARE FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the 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 (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, there is a critical need to provide adequate day-care services for children of migratory workers. This legislation (S. 522) establishes a 3-year program to assist States in providing day-care services for children of migratory workers. The bill authorizes an annual appropriation of $750,000 for 3 years beginning with fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, to pay part of the costs of establishing and operating badly needed day-care services for migrant children. This measure is similar to the migrant day-care bill (S. 1130) approved by the Senate in the 87th Congress as a floor amendment to another bill.

NEED FOR DAY-CARE FACILITIES FOR MIGRANT CHILDREN

There were approximately 415,000 children of migratory farmworkers under age 14 in the United States in 1962. Yet, in the entire Nation today, there are only about 24 licensed day-care centers to serve these children. Thirteen of these 24 day-care centers are located in New York and Pennsylvania. Existing day-care centers would probably accommodate less than 1,000 migratory children.

Of the many children who must accompany their parents on their annual search for agricultural work, the most neglected are the very young children. Too young to work in the fields, they are left at the home camp, and are usually tended by a woman too old or sick to work, or by an older child—perhaps only 9 or 10 years old himself. Even if an older woman is in charge, the care and supervision provided are generally unsuitable and perfunctory. Sometimes infants are taken to the fields with their parents and left for the whole day with little shelter, care, or attention. In short, these children are generally uncared for, and when care is provided it is usually inadequate.

In his statement before the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony J. Celebrezze mentioned some of the unfortunate consequences of this lack of day care for migrant children:

> Such inadequate care has resulted in tragedies to many children through fires, drownings, and other accidents. They have been run over while playing in roadways or injured by farm machines. We are concerned not only about some of these dramatic fatalities but also about the day-to-day neglect of these children, the lack of adequate daily food, and their lack of training and supervision for normal growth and development.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Providing these children with proper care throughout the long working day would give them an experience in their early years which would have a lasting effect on their development into useful adult members of society.

Of the many accidents among young children of migratory farmworkers, a recent bus accident in Florida shows in tragic terms the great need for and value of day-care services. The bus carrying 42 migratory workers plunged into a canal drowning 27 men, women, and children. Among the drowned were about a dozen children under 12 years of age. One young boy was only 4 years of age. The availability of suitable day-care services for children of migratory workers would make it unnecessary for them to take their young children with them in overcrowded vehicles or to leave such children unattended in the fields or along adjacent roadways.

Day-care centers for migratory children would not only safeguard children against serious accidents or fatalities, but would also provide an environment offering adequate supervision and beneficial community activities.

Migrant children, being one of the most educationally deprived groups in the Nation, would benefit from educational programs that could be carried out in day-care centers. The educational programs might consist of health and hygiene training, language training and development, or other skills essential to the growth and development of the migrant child.

In this way, day-care centers could assist existing local efforts to provide continuity in the educational development of the migrant child. This, in turn, will make more effective the subsequent educational experience the child will receive in the regular school system.

Additionally, the day-care measure, S. 522, has important supplementary value to programs provided under another bill reported by the Labor Committee—namely, the bill S. 521, which would provide Federal assistance to States and local communities to help educate the children of migrant farmworkers. Day care, provided under the pending bill, S. 522, would give migrant children the foundation needed for a good start in their regular educational program. The day-care bill would therefore make a major contribution in the overall goal of providing migrant children a more equal opportunity for educational growth and development.

Another value of the day-care measure is highlighted by the child labor bill, S. 523, also reported by the Labor Committee. The child labor bill will increase the present need for day care, in that it will curtail the number of young children who currently accompany their parents to the fields. Moreover, since Public Law 78 may soon terminate—the House just recently voted down a 2-year extension of the law—there may be an additional need factor very shortly. Once Public Law 78 terminates, there will be more domestic migrant families moving about seeking farmwork. This means there will be more migrant children, perhaps in very substantial numbers, in need of day care and in areas where, because of the long use of the bachelor bracero, the very presence of children will constitute a new problem which only a day-care facility can meet.

Day care will also serve as a worthwhile adjunct to the migrant health program—Public Law 87-692—enacted by the previous Congress. To conduct the health program in areas not having day-care facilities, State and county health officials will be burdened with arduous physical and logistical problems in their efforts to provide migrant children with immunizations, examinations, or hospital referrals in cases requiring more extensive medical treatment. Conceivably, to reach as few as 50 migrant children, the health officials would have to travel to a dozen or more different locations, transporting with them necessary medical equipment and supplies. The availability of migrant children in fairly large groups in a day-care center would greatly facilitate this work and lessen the time demands upon State and county officials whose continued acceptance of and participation in the program is essential to the success of the Migrant Health Act.

In short, the day-care measure (S. 522) will perform an exceedingly useful function in the overall attempt to provide migrant children with the educational and health benefits which are available to most children and which are so necessary if the migrant child is to become a contributing member of our society.

Mr. TOWER. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare if it is not correct that under the provisions of S. 521, S. 522, and S. 526 all formulas are based on the number of domestic migratory workers and are not intended to count workers not citizens of the United States?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is correct. These programs are designed basically for the migrant farm families. These are American citizens who travel south to north in streams to harvest from Florida to Maine, from the great State of Texas—unfortunately, they must leave Texas from time to time to make meager earnings farther north.

Mr. TOWER. But they would prefer to stay in Texas.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am sure they would. I am sure the Senator would be happy to have them remain in Texas, and particularly happy to have them there in November. Most of them are away in November.

The formulas generally are geared to domestic migrant families.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator.

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 and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 522) was 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 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 purposes 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. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. TOWER. 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.

ADEQUATE SANITATION FACILITIES FOR MIGRATORY WORKERS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 185, S. 526.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 526) to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to establish a program to assist farmers in providing adequate sanitation facilities for migratory farm laborers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Jersey.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments, on page 3, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out $2,000,000" and insert "$2,500,000"; in line 9, after the word "laborers", to strike out "and"; in line 11, after the word "such", to strike out "facilities." and insert "facilities, and (c) to assist States to develop demonstration projects for field sanitation."; on page 6, line 10, after the word "the", to strike out "Secretary" and insert "Surgeon General"; in line 11, after the word "the", to strike out "Secretary" and insert "Surgeon General"; on page 7, after line 15, to insert a new section, as follows:

DEMONSTRATION GRANTS

SEC. 806. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to make grants to States (or political subdivisions thereof) to pay part of the costs of providing demonstration projects for the purpose of developing improved methods of field sanitation which could be utilized by migratory farm laborers, there is

hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, a sum not to exceed $500,000 which shall remain available until expended.

(b) Demonstration projects for which grants are made under subsection (a) shall be maintained and operated in conformity with health standards prescribed by the State in which such project is to be carried on.

And, on page 8, at the beginning of line 6, to change the section number from "806" to "807"; 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 the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE VIII—PROGRAM TO ASSIST FARMERS IN PROVIDING ADEQUATE SANITARY FACILITIES FOR MIGRATORY FARM LABORERS

"Findings of fact and declaration of purpose

"SEC. 801. The Congress hereby finds and declares that (1) the serious and extensive health problems among our Nation's migratory farm laborers and their families who annually reap our Nation's health-giving harvests are of national importance and concern; (2) inadequate sanitation facilities are directly related to the disease and death rates among such laborers and their families; (3) the interstate movement of such laborers and their families, moreover, poses a serious health hazard for the farming communities which they serve; (4) farmers utilizing the services of such laborers are adversely affected economically because such laborers and their families, when afflicted with disease or sickness, cannot efficiently perform the services for which they are employed; and (5) farmers utilizing the services of such laborers often are unable to defray the construction or renovation costs required to provide adequate sanitation facilities for the use of such laborers. It is therefore the purpose of this title to assist, through a program of grants, in the construction of adequate sanitation facilities to serve the needs of our Nation's migratory farm laborers and their families.

"Authorization of appropriation

"SEC. 802. In order to carry out the purposes of this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, such sums, not to exceed $2,500,000 for any such year, as may be necessary to enable the Surgeon General to make grants to States (a) to assist in the construction of adequate sanitation facilities for the use of migratory farm laborers, (b) to assist States in conducting surveys to determine the need, within the State, for the construction of such facilities, and (c) to assist States to develop demonstration projects for field sanitation. From the amounts so appropriated for any fiscal year, the Surgeon General shall determine the portion to be made available to carry out the purposes of clause (a) of the preceding sentence and the portion to be made available to carry out the purposes of clause (b) of such sentence.

"State plans for construction grants

"SEC. 803. (a) From the funds determined to be available for carrying out the purposes of section 802(a), the Surgeon General shall make grants to States which have submitted and had approved State plans for grants to assist in the construction of sanitation facilities for migratory farm laborers. To be approved, such a plan must—

"(1) designate a single State agency as the sole agency for carrying out such purposes;

"(2) contain information satisfactory to the Surgeon General regarding the extent of the need for adequate sanitation facilities for migratory farm laborers, and the plans, policies, and methods to be followed in meeting such need;

"(3) provide that such funds shall be used solely to assist persons in constructing adequate sanitation facilities for the use of migratory farm laborers;

"(4) provide assurances that any sanitation facility, the construction of which is assisted with funds under this title, shall be maintained and operated in conformity with health standards prescribed by the State and will be available for use by migratory farm laborers for a reasonable time after the facility is constructed;

"(5)(A) provide a schedule of priorities for determining the eligibility of persons to be assisted under this title based on (i) the number of migratory farm laborers who would be served by a proposed sanitation facility, (ii) the degree of inadequacy of the sanitation facilities presently available to serve such laborers, and (iii) the financial need of the person seeking assistance under this title with respect to the construction of such facility;

"(B) provide reasonable standards, consistent with the purposes of this title, for determining the amount of funds any person shall be eligible to receive with respect to the construction of any such facility. Such standards shall be designed to afford the greatest assistance to persons with the greatest financial need, except that no person shall be eligible to receive more than 90 per centum of the cost of the construction of any such facility. In determining the financial need of any person for assistance with respect to the construction of a sanitation facility for purposes of this paragraph, due consideration shall be given to the amount of funds available to such person for the construction of such facility from other sources, and the terms and conditions under which such funds are so available.

"(b) The amount granted to any State under subsection (a) shall not exceed the amount allotted to such State pursuant to subsection (c).

"(c) From the amounts determined by the Surgeon General to be available to carry out the purposes of section 802(a) during any fiscal year, the Surgeon General shall (pursuant to regulations issued by him) from time to time make allotments to each State which has submitted and had approved by him a State plan for grants under subsection (a). Such regulations shall provide that the amount to be allotted to any State shall be determined on the basis of (1) the number of migratory farm laborers involved and the length of time they spend in the State, and (2) the extent of the need for the construction of sanitation facilities for such laborers in the State. The amount of any allotment to a State under this subsection for any fiscal year which will not be required for carrying out the provisions of its State plan shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates as the Surgeon General may fix, to other States which the Surgeon General determines (1) have need in carrying out the provisions of their State plan for sums in excess of those previously allotted to them under such subsection and (2) will be able to use such excess amounts during such fiscal year in carrying out such plan. Any amount so reallotted to a State shall be deemed part of its allotment under this subsection.

"Regulations prescribing standards

"SEC. 804. (a) The Surgeon General shall prescribe by regulations standards as to the type of construction projects which will be eligible for assistance from funds available for carrying out the purposes of section 801.

"(b) Such standards shall provide that a project must (1) be needed for the use of migratory farm laborers, (2) not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials, and (3) be adequate in size, construction, and design to fulfill the purpose for which constructed.

"Surveys

"SEC. 805. (a) From the funds determined by the Surgeon General to be available for carrying out the purposes of section 802(b), the Surgeon General may make grants for surveys to States that do not have adequate data regarding the need in the State for the construction of adequate sanitation facilities for the use of migratory farm laborers.

"(b) The amount of such survey grant to any State shall be determined by the Surgeon General on the basis of the cost of the survey, giving due consideration to the number of migratory farm laborers involved, and the length of time they spend in the State.

"Demonstration grants

"SEC. 806. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to make grants to States (or political subdivisions thereof) to pay part of the costs of providing demonstration projects for the purpose of developing improved methods of field sanitation which could be utilized by migratory farm laborers, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, a sum not to exceed $500,000 which shall remain available until expended.

"(b) Demonstration projects for which grants are made under subsection (a) shall be maintained and operated in conformity with health standards prescribed by the State in which such project is to be carried on.

"Definitions

"SEC. 807. For the purposes of this title—

"(a) The term 'sanitation facilities' means drainage, water, sewage- and waste-disposal facilities, and includes field-sanitation facilities.

"(b) The term 'construction', when used in reference to sanitation facilities, includes expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing sanitation facilities.

"(c) The term 'person' includes any State (or political subdivision thereof), corporation, company, association, firm, partnership, society, or joint stock company, as well as any individual.

"(d) The term 'migratory farm laborer' means any individual who receives a substantial portion (as determined by the Surgeon General) of his income as a laborer on farms situated in the United States. Such term includes any member of such individual's family who accompanies him from place to place pursuant to the conduct of his occupation as a migratory farm laborer."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Public Health Service Act is amended to read as follows:

"Short title

"SECTION 1. Titles I to VIII, inclusive, of this Act may be cited as the 'Public Health Service Act'."

(b) Such Act is further amended by redesignating title VIII thereof (as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act) as title IX, and by redesignating sections 801 through 814 (as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act), and any references thereto, as sections 901 through 914, respectively.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, grossly inadequate sanitation facilities cause high disease and death rates among migratory farm families whose interstate movement poses a serious health hazard for the entire Nation. This legislation would establish a 5-year program designed to alleviate many serious, extensive health problems among migratory farm families. The bill authorizes an appropriation of $2,500,000

annually for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each of 4 succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Surgeon General to make grants to States: first, that have submitted, and had approved, a State plan to provide adequate sanitation facilities for migratory farm families; second, for surveys by States that need to determine the extent of the need for such sanitation facilities, and third, for field-sanitation projects.

The funds would be allocated, under the State plans, to individual growers and other eligible entities to improve or build sanitation facilities used by migrant farmworkers and their families.

HEALTH PROBLEMS CAUSED BY INADEQUATE SANITATION FACILITIES

This legislation has evolved from public hearings, research and field trips conducted by the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

Information developed by the subcommittee, the U.S. Public Health Service, and various State health departments demonstrates the need to improve the sanitation facilities used by migratory farmworkers. This need for proper sanitation facilities extends to sewage disposal, water supply, toilet and washing facilities in or near living quarters, and field toilets and handwashing facilities.

Unhealthy, unsafe sanitation conditions prevail not only where migrants live but also in the fields where they work. Agriculture is a notable exception to the usual practice of providing sanitation facilities at work locations. In other areas of commerce, especially in the food-packaging industries, we insist upon adequate toilets, clean drinking water, and handwashing facilities.

Numerous studies have proved that poor sanitation facilities are a direct cause of diarrheal diseases and seriously undermine the health of migrant farm families. Moreover, a high mortality rate among infants and young children results from diarrheal diseases.

Acute diarrheal disease is a condition that can be easily controlled by the maintenance of a sanitary environment, by adequate sanitation facilities, and by good personal health practices. A single simple precaution, such as making safe water available for family use, is an important factor in reducing the incidence of diarrhea. Yet reports of such diseases among migrant families recur year after year. A 1959 Florida Board of Health report, for example, referred to diarrhea as the most common cause of death and severe illness among migrant children after the first month of life.

In testifying before the subcommittee on April 10, 1963, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony Celebrezze discussed the deplorable environmental conditions in which migrant farm families live and work:

> The inadequacy of sanitation facilities for migratory farmworkers is common knowledge. Dilapidated privies are the most usual means of human waste disposal. Often located close to unprotected water supplies, they provide a source of contamination that leads to frequent outbreaks of diarrhea among young children in migratory farm families.
>
> In the fields where migrants work for long hours, often accompanied by young children, the lack of sanitation facilities is striking. Water for drinking or hand washing is seldom supplied. Men, women, and children alike have no toilets except the end of a long row, or space between rows.
>
> In view of the increase in the field packing of produce such as lettuce and celery, which reaches our dining tables without cooking, the lack of suitable field sanitation facilities is a health concern of consumers of fresh fruits and vegetables as well as the fieldworkers who harvest the crops.

Mr. President, the evidence resulting from research, testimony, and firsthand observations leads to only one conclusion: National assistance is necessary if migratory farmworkers and their children are to be provided adequate sanitation facilities that are so necessary to secure their good health and to protect the communities in which they work and through which they pass.

FINANCIAL PROBLEMS OF FARMERS

The farmer is keenly aware of the sanitation needs of the migrant. In some cases workers might come down with a sickness or disease that temporarily halts the harvest. In farming operations this can be disastrous.

Despite their concern with this problem, farmers are often unable to obtain the money needed to construct a new sanitation facility or to renovate an existing inadequate system. This financial squeeze imposes a particular hardship on small or marginal farmers, usually the farmers with the least adequate sanitation facilities.

This bill meets this problem by allowing States, under their State plans, to allocate funds to individual growers and other eligible groups and persons to improve or build sanitation facilities used by migratory farmworkers and their families. Although a State can provide an eligible person or group up to 90 percent of the cost of constructing a particular sanitation project, it is intended that this maximum percentage be available only in those situations where the economic and health factors clearly indicate that such percentage is both necessary and appropriate.

BILL WILL SUPPLEMENT OTHER EFFORTS TO IMPROVE ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

By easing the financial burdens that prohibit the farmer from providing improved sanitation facilities for migratory farmworkers, this bill will make three major contributions toward improving the health of migrant farm families.

First, this bill will be a valuable adjunct to the Migrant Health Act passed in the last Congress. This act provides family health clinics for migrants. But without improving the environmental health conditions of the migrant, the medical services provided under the Migrant Health Act will be of limited benefit. By eliminating the environmental causes of poor health, the Federal funds now provided for corrective medical services would be more effectively and economically used.

Second, once financial assistance is available to farmers, State legislatures will be less hesitant to pass adequate sanitation or health codes.

Third, the bill will encourage State health officials to strengthen or amplify their enforcement efforts of existing health codes. Sanitation codes have been enacted by a number of States; too often they have not been adequately enforced. A major reason militating against adequate enforcement of health codes is that State authorities recognize that many farmers do not have the capital necessary to provide adequate sanitation facilities.

The approach of this legislation then is eminently realistic. The assistance to States recommended in this bill is essential and will encourage public and private agencies to improve environmental health conditions of migrant agricultural families.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

Based upon a recommendation by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the bill was amended by the committee to include a provision authorizing an appropriation of up to $500,000 to enable the Surgeon General to make grants to pay part of the costs of establishing and operating demonstration projects for developing improved methods of field sanitation. Projects developed under this provision would be maintained and operated in conformity with health standards prescribed by the State in which the project is located.

Mr. President, this bill has not, prior to this time, been considered by the Senate. The other bills being considered today have in substance been before the Senate previously and have been passed. This is a new bill which has been reported from the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, after consideration by the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

The efficacy of this program has been amply demonstrated and is of particular interest to Senators who know of the problem and the serious lack of sanitation facilities in their States. There is broad representation and support of the bill. I am personally very grateful to the many cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments may be considered and agreed to en bloc; and that the bill, as so amended, may be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 526) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. TOWER. 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.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYEES AND THEIR CHILDREN

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 180, S. 521.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 521) to provide financial assistance to the States to improve educational opportunities for migrant agricultural employees and their children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from New Jersey.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments, on page 5, line 10, to strike out "sources." and insert "sources; and"; after line 10, to insert:

(10) The term "State" includes Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

On page 6, line 17, after the word "and", to strike out "1964 and 50 per centum with respect to the school years beginning in 1965, 1966, and 1967," and insert "1964, 75 per centum with respect to the school years beginning in 1965 and 1966, and 50 per centum with respect to the school year beginning in 1967,"; on page 8, line 13, after the word "employees", to insert "during the normal summer school period"; at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965, and each fiscal year thereafter" and insert "fiscal years beginning in 1965 and 1966 shall be available for paying not more than 75 per centum of any such costs and allotments for the fiscal year beginning in 1967"; and on page 11, line 25, after the word "the", to strike out "fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965, and each fiscal year thereafter shall be available for paying not more than 50 per centum of the costs of any activities for which payments are made under the provisions of this title" and insert "fiscal years beginning in 1965 and 1966 shall be available for paying not more than 75 per centum of the costs of any activities for which payments are made under the provisions of this title and allotments for the fiscal year beginning in 1967 shall be available for paying not more than 50 per centum of any such costs."; 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,

Short title

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Migrant Agricultural Employees and Children Educational Assistance Act of 1963".

Finding and purpose of Act

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over any primarily responsibility for public education. The Congress recognizes, however, that the interstate and large seasonal movement of migrant agricultural employees imposes severe burdens on local educational agencies in discharging their responsibilities with respect to the education of the children of, and in providing adult education for, such employees who temporarily live within their school districts. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide financial assistance for the education of children of migrant agricultural employees, and to provide for certain planning grants to the States to improve such education, and to provide financial assistance for pilot projects for adult education for such employees.

Federal control of education prohibited

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel, of any educational institution or school system.

Definitions

SEC. 4. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary, secondary, and adult education, or if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law;

(2) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of free public education in a county, township, independent, or other school district located within a State, and includes any State agency which directly operates and maintains facilities for providing free public education;

(3) The term "child" means any child who is within the age limits for which the applicable local educational agency provides free public education;

(4) The term "parent" includes a legal guardian or other person in loco parentis;

(5) The term "migrant agricultural employee" means an individual (a) whose primary employment is in 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 with his family for the purpose of such employment a temporary residence;

(6) The term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education;

(7) The term "average daily current expenditures per public school child" means the total current expenditures for a State's public elementary and secondary schools during a particular year divided by the product of the average daily attendance in such schools during such year times the number of schooldays in such year; the term "current expenditures" means expenditures for free public education in such schools to the extent that such expenditures are made from current revenues, except that such term does not include any such expenditure for the acquisition of land, the erection of facilities, interest, or debt service; and for the purposes of payments under title I for attendance during any academic year the Commissioner shall determine and use the average daily current expenditures per public school child for the year preceding such academic year;

(8) The term "institution of higher education" means any such institution which is accredited as such by a nationally recognized accrediting agency; and

(9) The term "migrant agricultural employee State" means any State which has five hundred or more such employees in any five or less counties each of which has at least one hundred such employees, and determinations for the purpose of this definition shall be made for the most recent year that satisfactory population figures are available from reliable sources; and

(10) The term "State" includes Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

Administration

SEC. 5. (a) The Commissioner shall administer this Act and he may make such regulations and perform such other functions as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) The Commissioner shall include in his annual report to the Congress a full report of the administration of his functions under this Act, including a detailed statement of disbursements.

TITLE I—PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR ASSISTANCE IN EDUCATING CHILDREN OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYEE PARENTS

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 101. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, and for the four succeeding fiscal years, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

Payments

SEC. 102. (a) Upon application in accordance with the provisions of this section for the school year beginning in 1963, or for any of the four succeeding school years, by the State educational agency of any migrant agricultural employee State, the Commissioner shall pay to such agency an amount equal to 100 per centum with respect to the school years beginning in 1963 and 1964, 75 per centum with respect to the school years beginning in 1965 and 1966, and 50 per centum with respect to the school year beginning in 1967, of the average daily current expenditures per public school child, for such State, for each day's attendance during such school year in a free public elementary or secondary school of a local educational agency in such State, by a child who attends any such schools in such State for at least five days during such year and whose parent is a migrant agricultural employee. The amount paid under this section to a State educational agency for each day's attendance in a school of a local educational agency shall be paid by such State agency, in accordance with regulations established by the Commissioner, to such local educational agency.

(b) Payments by the Commissioner under this section shall be made for attendance during the regular school year beginning in 1963, and the four succeeding school years, and may be made at such intervals as the Commissioner deems appropriate. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

(c) An application under the provisions of this section shall be in such form and contain such information as may be required by the Commissioner to carry out the provisions of this section, and the Commissioner may require such additional information and reports at such intervals during the school year as he deems necessary.

TITLE II—GRANTS FOR SUMMER SCHOOLS FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYEE PARENTS

Appropriations

SEC. 201. There is authorized to be appropriated $300,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, for grants under the provisions of this title.

Allotments and grants

SEC. 202. (a) Amounts appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year shall be allotted among the migrant agricultural employee States on the basis of their relative

populations of migrant agricultural employees during the normal summer school period for the most recent year that such populations are available from reliable sources. A State's allotment under the section shall be available during the year for which made and the succeeding fiscal year for payments in accordance with the provisions of this title for the operating costs of conducting necessary summer school sessions for children who have a parent who is a migrant agricultural employee, except that allotments for the fiscal years beginning in 1965 and 1966 shall be available for paying not more than 75 per centum of any such costs and allotments for the fiscal year beginning in 1967 shall be available for paying not more than 50 per centum of any such costs. As used in this section the term "operating costs" includes all ordinary costs of operation other than any costs for the acquisition of facilities or costs related to any such acquisition.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year, which the Commissioner determines will not be required for carrying out the provisions of this title in such State during the period for which such allotment is available, shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such period as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under this section, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent reallotment to any State of any sum in excess of the amount which the Commissioner estimates it needs and will be able to use during such period for carrying out the provisions of this title. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection from funds appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

Application and payments

SEC. 203. (a) The Commissioner shall approve any application for funds provided under this title if such application—

(1) is from a State educational agency;

(2) sets out the State program for summer schools to be conducted in such State by local educational agencies or institutions of higher education, or both, the necessity therefor, the operating costs of such summer schools, and the amount needed under the provisions of this title to defray such costs; and

(3) provides that such State agency will make such reports, in such form, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require, and, to assure verification of such reports, give the Commissioner upon request, access to the records upon which the information is based.

(b) Upon approval of any such application the Commissioner shall pay, in such installments as he may deem appropriate, to such State agency out of the allotment to such State, the amount requested. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

TITLE III—PLANNING GRANTS

SEC. 301. There is authorized to be appropriated $250,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years for grants under the provisions of this title.

Allotments and grants

SEC. 302. (a) Amounts appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year shall be allotted among the migrant agricultural employee States on the basis of their relative populations of migrant agricultural employees for the most recent year that such populations are available from reliable sources. A State's allotment under this section shall be available during the year for which made for payments in accordance with the provisions of this title (1) to survey the need for summer school sessions for children who have a parent who is a migrant agricultural employee; (2) to develop plans for such sessions where needed; (3) to develop and carry out programs to encourage such children to attend school during the regular academic year and such summer sessions, and to improve the quality of education offered such children; and (4) to coordinate programs provided for in this Act with similar programs in other States, including the transmittal of pertinent information with respect to school records of such children, except that allotments for the fiscal years beginning in 1965 and 1966 shall be available for paying not more than 75 per centum of the costs of any activities for which payments are made under the provisions of this title and allotments for the fiscal year beginning in 1967 shall be available for paying not more than 50 per centum of any such costs. Grants under the provisions of this title shall not be available for the cost of acquisition of any facilities.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year, which the Commissioner determines will not be required for carrying out the provisions of this title in such State during such year, shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under this section, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent reallotment to any State of any sum in excess of the amount which the Commissioner estimates it needs and will be able to use during such year for carrying out the provisions of this title. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection from funds appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

Application and payments

SEC. 303. (a) The Commissioner shall approve any application for funds provided under this title if such application—

(1) is from a State educational agency;

(2) sets out such program in sufficient detail to satisfy the Commissioner that it carries out the purposes of this title; and

(3) provides that such agency will make such reports, in such form, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require, and to assure verification of such reports, give the Commissioner, upon request, access to the records upon which the information is based.

(b) Upon approval of any such application the Commissioner shall pay, in such installments as he may deem appropriate, to such agency out of its State allotment the amount requested. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

TITLE IV—ADULT EDUCATION

Appropriations

SEC. 401. There is authorized to be appropriated $200,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, for grants under the provisions of this title.

Pilot project grants

SEC. 402. Amounts appropriated pursuant to section 401 for any fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner for paying the operating costs of pilot projects for adult education for migrant agricultural employees and their spouses in such migrant agricultural employee States as he deems appropriate. As used in this section the term "operating costs" includes all ordinary costs of operation other than any costs for the acquisition of facilities or costs related to any such acquisition.

Application and payments

SEC. 403. (a) The Commissioner may approve an application for funds provided under this title if such application—

(1) is from a State educational agency;

(2) sets out a program of adult education classes for migrant agricultural employees and their spouses which is to be conducted in such State on a pilot project basis by a local educational agency or an institution of higher education, or both, to provide fundamental education and training for healthful modern living, including the operating costs of such classes, and the amount needed under the provisions of this title to defray such costs; and

(3) provides that such State agency will make such reports, in such form, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time resasonably require, and, to assure verification of such reports, give the Commissioner upon request access to the records upon which the information is based.

(b) Upon approval of any such application the Commissioner shall pay, in such installments as he may deem appropriate, to such State agency the amount requested. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

Cooperation with Department of Agriculture

SEC. 404. In carrying out the provisions of this title, the Commissioner shall consult and cooperate with officials of the Federal Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that debate on S. 521 be limited to 30 minutes, to be divided 15 minutes to each side; the time for the proponents to be controlled by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the time for the opponents to be controlled by the junior Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc; and that the bill, as so amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the bill is designed to provide financial assistance to the States for improving the educational opportunities of migratory farmworkers and their children. The bill provides a 5-year program, under which Federal financial assistance will be available for the following purposes: first, education of migratory children during the regular school term, the assistance to be based on the State's average daily educational cost per child; second, summer school grants for migratory children, $300,000 annually; third, coordinating and planning grants respecting educational programs for migrant children, on a State

and interstate basis, $250,000 annually; and fourth, establishing pilot projects for adult education for migratory workers, $200,000 annually.

For the first three of these purposes, all relating to child education, the States will provide matching funds beginning in the third year of the program. During the third and fourth years, the States' contribution will be 25 percent. During the fifth and last year of the act, the States and the Federal Government will share the costs on a 50 to 50 basis.

Respecting the fourth purpose, adult education for migratory workers, Federal assistance would be provided on a pilot project basis, and State contributions for operating costs would not be required.

The bill expressly prohibits any Federal control of education and guarantees that State and local agencies shall have sole responsibility for their educatonal programs.

The bill follows very closely the proven principles of educational assistance to federally impacted areas. By granting aid on the basis of the number of migratory workers in the affected locality, the program provides help where it is most needed.

NEED FOR MIGRANT CHILD EDUCATION

Mr. President, the need for this legislation is serious and widespread. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in his favorable report on the bill, estimated that there are about 200,000 to 250,000 children who accompany their parents each year in the search for agricultural employment. Summarizing the educational problems of these children, the Secretary said:

> Migrant agricultural workers are often described as America's forgotten people and their children are referred to as "the most educationally deprived group of children in our Nation." They enter school late, their attendance is poor, their progress is slow, they drop out early; consequently their illiteracy is high. Studies indicate that most migrant children are far below grade level and that their school achievement is usually under fourth grade.

A primary reason why migrant children fall behind in school and drop out early is that they are on the move for a substantial part of each year and therefore, at best, must enroll in several different schools during a single term. Frequently the migrants are present in a community for such a short period of time that the parents may not consider it worthwhile to enroll the children in school; or they may delay enrolling their children until they have been in the new community for several days or weeks.

Many of the local school districts affected by migrants attempt to provide education to these children, but their efforts are often severely limited by lack of funds. The seasonal influx of large numbers of migrant children creates a need for additional classrooms, additional teachers, transportation, equipment, and supplies. Yet the migrant children come from transient, low-income families who do not contribute to the local tax system or otherwise help to defray the cost of educating their children. The rural school districts on which these educational demands are made, moreover, already have the most serious financial handicaps in our entire educational system.

If funds were available to affected local school districts, migratory children could be offered adequate educational opportunities. The few States that presently operate summer school for migrant children have clearly demonstrated the feasibility of educating the migrant child. In these summer sessions, many pupils have been able to do enough work to complete their school year or to make up one or even two grades of schooling. According to the most recent available figures, however, only 3,855 migrant children were enrolled in these remedial summer schools during 1961—a small fraction of the estimated total of 200,000 migratory farm children.

The Federal assistance provided by S. 521 would make it possible to implement these summer programs on a national basis, as well as enabling local school districts to provide more adequate education during the regular school year. The program of grants for summer schools, by allowing communities to use otherwise idle facilities to offer more education to the children, would markedly reduce the disruptive effects of their frequent travel. Finally, the program of planning and coordinating grants would enable local school districts and State educational agencies to work together, on a State and interstate basis. In this way, continuity in educational programs for migratory children could be developed.

NEED FOR ADULT EDUCATION

Like their children, adult migratory farmworkers are in serious need of educational programs. The Department of Agriculture has found that, of all migrants over the age of 25, one-third are functionally illiterate. An additional 43 percent have no more than an eighth-grade education.

The migratory workers' job opportunities have become increasingly limited because of mechanization on our farms. Most migrants lack the skills to operate complex farm machines, and, still more seriously, they are not now trainable in substantial numbers under the Area Redevelopment Act or the Manpower Development and Training Act because they lack the basic reading and writing skills needed to qualify them for job training.

Additionally, migratory workers in many instances lack practical knowledge of the simplest rules of hygiene and nutrition, or knowledge of the use of ordinary living facilities such as toilets, showers, and garbage cans. The result has often been unnecessary damage to employers' property, as well as needless expense for repairs. Educational efforts are also needed to enable migrants even to take advantage of the limited legal protections and community services which are presently available to them.

Federal assistance would enable the States, through local communities or institutions of higher education, to take the initiative in providing fundamental, practical training for migratory workers. These pilot projects would, in my judgment, reinforce the conclusion that feasible techniques for educating the adult migratory worker can be developed, and, once developed, would benefit the worker, his employer, and the community.

Mr. President, this legislation is supported by both governmental and private groups. The administration has recommended the enactment of this bill; and interested organizations across the Nation have urged that it be adopted.

I urge that the Senate now approve these most needed measures, dealing with one of the fundamentals of the good life; namely, education.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I rise in opposition to this measure. I do not believe it is necessary. In the estimation of many, it is merely an expansion of Federal aid to education when we do not need such aid.

The total number of migrant children in this country is declining, both absolutely and in relation to the total school population.

This is essentially and primarily a State problem, but is not an unbearable burden on any State. The States in which most migrants are employed are the States of California, Oregon, Washing, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Florida, and Texas. These are among our wealthy States. They are the States that have the resources to take care of their educational needs. In my considered opinion, the impetus for taking care of these educational needs should come from the States.

It is in the wealthiest States that most of the migrant workers are located. This legislation would be an instance of the poor States being taxed to meet the problems of the wealthier States.

Indeed, these migrants are used for the benefit of the economy of the States in which they work. This problem should be regarded primarily as the responsibility of those States. I think they should meet that responsibility.

It is not a question of need, but a question of where the responsibility lies. In this instance, the responsibility clearly lies with the States; and the Congress should not legislate in this field.

The number of migratory workers in the United States is declining. It will decline more and more as the technology of science is applied to the tilling of the soil and the reaping of the harvests. The more machinery and implements that are developed to do the job which previously was done by human hands the fewer the number of migratory workers will be. I view it as a declining problem.

It is my fervent hope that the Senate will not act favorably in the matter of legislation for migrant workers' children at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, first of all, this might be a good time to express my gratitude to the Senator from Texas for his exceptional diligence in the consideration of the bills before the Senate today. He is a most valued member of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor. While I have as chairman expressed my gratitude to him frequently, I would like to do so publicly now. It is a pleasure to work with the distinguished Senator from Texas. This is true even though

on occasion we find ourselves on opposite sides of a given issue, as we do now in connection with the education bill.

It is probably true that the per capita income is high in many of the States in which great numbers of migratory workers are employed. These are the so-called wealthy States; yet life is not quite that simple. Michigan was listed as one of the wealthy States. Three years ago our subcommittee was in Michigan observing various parts of what we call the migratory farmworker problem. In one community specifically we talked with local leaders in government and farmers about education. It was tragically remarkable that a $15,000 program of summer education, which had proved successful on a pilot project basis was snuffed out because of the budgetary situation in Michigan, which was rather difficult that year. It was only a $15,000 program, and yet it meant much to the community and to the youngsters who, in this one place, were getting the kind of start in life that we all hope for in the case of our own youngsters. But the opportunity for better education was snuffed out for the lack of $15,000.

We have received a communication from Mr. Leland J. Yost, a responsible citizen, a California farmer. His statement, which is quoted in the committee report, gives us an example of the financial burden that migrant children place on local school districts. Mr. Yost said:

> In spite of all we have done, I do not feel that we have been successful in educating even a significant portion of the migrant children who attend our schools for a portion of each year. Our efforts must be redoubled.
>
> Yet school taxes on farmland have reached a point where they cannot be increased. Total taxes for school purposes on the 80-acre farm upon which I live were $1,152 last year.

We have received similar information from another wealthy State, Florida. The wealthy State of New Jersey feels the pinch. We operate basically on a property tax, and the pinch is severe. We do not know when we are going to "unpinch ourselves" in terms of resources. In the meantime these youngsters, who are, in a sense, the victims of interstate commerce, should have the benefits of this national program which meets the needs for regular education and summer education. The program also will include education for adults who were left out when they were young and as a result are poorly equipped to deal with the complexities of life.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I had not expected to be present at this time, but I would like to express my satisfaction at the way in which the Senator from New Jersey and I have cooperated from the very inception on the subcommittee dealing with the problem of migratory labor and to pay my tribute to the quality of reasonableness and to the desire to accommodate views to the actualities of the situation which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] has shown.

I am glad that S. 522, providing for day-care services, and S. 526, providing for sanitation facilities, have already been passed; that S. 521 is now being considered by the Senate; and the rest of the bills in this field will also be considered.

I should like to state for the record my support of these measures and my hope that they will be signed into law.

In my State of New York a great effort is made to meet the standards which these bills prescribe. Yet I have found in few other places a greater desire that these bills pass. Aside from very human reasons, one reason is competition—putting it on hard economic grounds.

When migratory labor comes into our State, we wish to feel that a national standard obtains in respect to the treatment of our fellow workers, who in many cases have a sense of competition with our own.

We pride ourselves on the conditions which obtain in New York; yet we feel that national standards are extremely desirable. We do not believe that it will be necessary for us to change our State's practices under the bills if enacted into law. However, if it is necessary to do anything, we will cheerfully do it. That seems to be the general attitude in the State.

I appreciate the problems which some of my colleagues in the Senate have. I join the Senator from New Jersey in understanding the position of the Senator from Texas in respect of farm labor in his own State; secondly, I express my appreciation to the Senator from New Jersey for his fine cooperation, and the contribution he has made in his desire to advance the legislation as quickly as possible, consistent with the principles stated by the Senator from Texas. I am glad to be of assistance in this endeavor.

When these bills become a part of the body of the law, I believe they will reflect great credit upon the Nation, the Senate, the Senator from New Jersey, and all those who have participated with him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am grateful to the Senator from New York, my good friend, who is a most valuable member of the subcommittee. I recognize that the work we are doing today is the result of the work of the architects in the subcommittee. We have a subcommittee in which there is no acrimony, but the maximum of cooperation. Having the responsibility of the chairmanship, I can appreciate more than anyone else what a fine little institution our subcommittee is. It does not spend much money on national problems such as this, but it means a great deal to people who have been wholly left out, so to speak, with reference to care and attention and opportunity. I hope no one is surprised to find that the Senator from New York, from one of the most populous States in the Union, and I, from the most densely populated State of the Union, New Jersey, should work on problems of poverty in rural America. I hope it will be recognized that my attitude toward life—and this is true of the Senator from New York—is that the place where action should be taken is where the human need exists. The need does not have to be in the city where the Senator from New York perhaps gets his largest vote, or where I get my largest vote. Where there is a human need, I like to feel that we are together, and that our help is enlisted in behalf of people who need help.

Mr. JAVITS. I know of few subjects on the domestic front, certainly in the agricultural field, which appeal as much to the hearts and minds of our constituents as does this subject, in connection with which so little has been done, considering the deep sympathy which the city dweller has with the migratory workers. Certainly that is true in the case of my State, and I know, also, that it is true of the Senator's State, New Jersey, because I know his State pretty well.

The problem has been chronicled in great books, by Steinbeck, and others, and in motion pictures, based upon this recurrent theme in American life.

The Senator from New Jersey says that we are members of a very small subcommittee. That is true, but it is one that deals with prodigious programs.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article in the April 1963 issue of Health News, a publication of the New York State Department of Health, entitled "Health Services for Migrant Farm Workers."

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

HEALTH SERVICES FOR MIGRANT FARM WORKERS—NEW YORK STATE

(By Walter C. Levy, M.D., assistant director, Community Health Services, New York State Department of Health)

Each year 20,000 to 25,000 migrant workers enter New York State to help harvest the abundant crops of fruits and vegetables upon which the agricultural economy of this State so firmly rests. Most of these harvesters are residents of Southern States. They begin a trek, after the crop harvest has been completed in Florida, to New York State with one or more work stops in Georgia, North and South Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Many of these workers have been sharecroppers, displaced from their permanent homes, and they seek livelihood by following the crops as the ripening season advances northward through these States. They begin to arrive in New York State in May or June for the berry and early vegetable harvest. In late June, July, and August the number of arrivals increases rapidly as the snap beans, tomatoes, and sweet corn ripen. Their number reaches a peak in early September. Thereafter, the total declines rapidly. Substantial numbers of migrants are required for the harvest of the potato and apple crops. Relatively few stay on into November for work in processing plants and fewer still remain for the winter.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR SERVICES

The responsibility for providing and coordinating health services for migrant workers belongs to the State health department. The health department is represented on the State Interdepartmental Committee on Farm and Food Processing Labor. This committee acts as a clearinghouse exchang-

ing information among State agencies with responsibilities in this area. Other State agencies represented on the interdepartmental committee are: State department of agriculture and markets; State department of education; division of State police; State department of labor and its division of employment; State department of motor vehicles; and the State department of social welfare.

Additional State agencies concerned with migrant farmworkers are the Joint Legislative Committee on Migrant Labor and the Governor's Advisory Council on Farm and Food Processing Labor.

REGULATIONS AND INSPECTION

With few exceptions, migrant laborers are recruited for work in New York State by crew leaders. A crew leader recruits workers both in family groups and as individuals. While in New York, most migratory workers live in group quarters commonly referred to as farm labor camps. Since 1956, the public health law has required that properties occupied by five or more migratory farmworkers be operated under a permit in accordance with the State sanitary code regulations.

Significant steps have been taken to insure healthful conditions in the 1,000 migrant camps in the State through regulations and inspections. In 1961, more than 8,000 inspections were made of camp health and housing facilities.

HOUSING AND SANITATION

The State sanitary code establishes requirements on housing, construction and maintenance, fire hazards, bathing and toilet facilities, food handling and food storage facilities, water supply and sewage disposal in camps. To determine compliance with these code requirements, farm labor camps are inspected before permits are issued. Following occupancy, repeated inspections are made to insure that the camp continues to meet sanitary code regulations.

IMPROVEMENTS IN HOUSING

The sanitary code has recently been upgraded to require added improvements in housing facilities at farm labor camps. These requirements call for the provision of hot and cold running water for bathing facilities; heating facilities; fire resistant construction; a fulltime caretaker at the larger camps; increased sleeping quarter space; prohibition of portable kerosene heaters and screening of living quarters.

These requirements are enforced by city, county and district health officers. As a result of efforts to date, housing and sanitation at farm labor camps in New York State are generally recognized as being superior to those of most other States. The Empire State is considered among the leaders in improving living conditions at farm labor camps.

Most camps are brought into compliance through normal administrative procedures. A few hard-core cases require hearing and other legal actions each year. The State police have been helpful in gaining compliance through legal actions in local justice courts. The major problem at farm-labor camps continues to be that of continuing maintenance of the property and damage to facilities by the occupants.

NURSING SERVICES

Since 1945, public health nursing service has been provided by the State and by local health departments for migrants. Many local units feel that more nursing time should be spent among migrants than among the resident population. Nurses who visit camps are usually school nurse-teachers. Recruitment is fairly satisfactory in areas where migrants leave the State by early September. The school nurse-teacher group, of course, is not available for camps occupied during the potato and apple harvest after September.

In many county health departments, the public health nurse working regularly in the geographical area where camps are situated, is responsible for the camp nursing. In such counties, the migrant can be served more often in regularly scheduled local clinics such as tuberculosis, orthopedic and child health conferences. This reduces the need to set up special clinics for them.

In many areas the same nurse has been employed to visit migrants for several years. This gives her the advantage of knowing the owners or growers and many crewleaders. Many migrants return with the same crewleader to the same area each year. Thus the nurse has had previous personal contact with the migrant families. This has two advantages: the migrants are more at ease asking for guidance from someone they know and the nurse gains satisfaction since she can often see progress over the years.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH

Much emphasis is put on maternal and child health, although visits cover the same disease categories of other staff nurses, including bedside care. Nurses working with migrants must spend a great deal of time with public welfare agencies, the clergy and other community social agencies to obtain desired medical and hospital care.

Crewleaders and farmers may differ in responsibility they assume for injuries and illnesses among migrants. The nurse arranges for first aid equipment and for a responsible adult in each camp to treat minor abrasions or call the nurse. One public health nurse taught a first aid course to migrant ministers; this service is worth repeating.

When surplus foods are available, the nurse helps mothers prepare them. Other activities she teaches include simple sewing, first aid and health habits. Group activities must be conducted at night since most mothers work in the fields. The nurse's activities are not an 8:30-to-5 assignment. To see the owner, crewleaders, or the workers, she must be at camp by 7 a.m. or in the late afternoon and evening.

The public health nurse works closely with day-care centers, usually staffed by teachers from the South. At the beginning of the season, a 1-day institute is given to staff members on formula preparation, simple isolation techniques and review of indications of illnesses in children. The nurse visits the day-care centers regularly, and arranges for physical examinations and immunization of children admitted. The workers call her if an emergency arises.

CLINIC SERVICES

During 1961 and 1962, Dr. William H. Bergstrom, Department of Pediatrics, Upstate Medical Center, conducted a pediatric clinic for migratory farmworkers in two counties with large seasonal agricultural migrant populations. Clinics were held twice weekly during the summer. Well-baby care, immunization and routine physical examinations with tuberculin tests were given, and children with ambulatory illnesses received diagnosis and treatment. The clinics were part of the Upstate Medical Center's clinical teaching program. Nursing services were provided by local health departments. Supplies and drugs were furnished by the State health department, and department reports were used.

The venereal disease section of the department's bureau of adult health and geriatrics has conducted blood serology surveys in farm labor camps. Migrants found to have positive serology are treated promptly unless there is evidence they have been adequately treated before.

Special maternal and child health clinic services are provided by local health departments with State financial support. Prenatal consultation services may also be furnished as well as individual pediatric consultations.

Migrant farmworkers are eligible for any health department supported clinic services, including tuberculosis, orthopedic, venereal disease, and maternity and child health.

PUBLIC HEALTH EDUCATION

For several years, the State health department has employed two senior public health educators to conduct a health education program among the migratory farmworkers in farm labor camps in the Geneva and Utica districts. The educators visit the farm labor camps to acquaint themselves with camp conditions and meet crew leaders. They also meet with local citizen groups, church and civic workers, and others concerned with migrants.

Health education activities are carried out through individual counseling and group activities. The public health educators stimulate and advise local migrant committees and help them with special educational materials. They also report to other health department staff members on sanitation and medical problems at the camps.

Congress enacted the Migrant Health Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–692) to stimulate State and local health agencies to extend health and medical services for migrant farm workers. Under this law, $3 million will be appropriated each year for the next 3 years to pay for family health services clinics and other projects to improve health conditions and services for domestic migratory farmworkers and their families.

The Public Health Service will administer this law. Money will be authorized only as grants for specific projects. All State and local health departments or other public or nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations are eligible to apply for a grant. The State health department will review applications before the expert advisory committee makes its recommendation to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. Federal funds have not yet been appropriated, but appropriation is expected early in the 1963 congressional session. Health officials have been urged to develop projects and submit applications.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, how much time remains on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has 1 minute remaining; the Senator from Texas has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, first I should like to express my thanks to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey for his very kind remarks and to say, in reciprocation, that I wish to express my appreciation to him for the great fairness he has displayed in dealing with the opposition. He has given us every opportunity to advance our cause, and has never tried to put anything over on us, so to speak. He has been very fair and has always kept his word, and in every way has been a very fair and fine person to work with on the subcommittee. Therefore I am happy to express my gratitude to him.

In connection with the education problem among the children of migrant workers, we too often assume that if we establish a Federal program we will get rid of some of the vexing problems that confront us.

I do not believe that a Federal program is necessarily the answer to the problem. This problem, as I have pointed out, has two aspects. One is that these are children of people who move about

the country a great deal. We cannot expect to give a child a high quality of education when he moves about all the time, even under the most favorable circumstances, as can be given to the child when he is able to remain in one place and obtain his schooling in one place.

I am the son of a Methodist preacher. I grew up in Methodist parsonages throughout the State of Texas. We moved from town to town. Therefore, I am the educational product of that type of growing up; and the result is quite obvious. I am certainly no match in wits for the distinguished Senator from New Jersey who, I believe, received his education all in one place.

That is one aspect of the problem that should not be overlooked. Let us not deceive ourselves and believe that we can resolve this problem by establishing a Federal program, by additional Federal expenditures, and by additional Federal intervention.

There is a second aspect, namely, that a great number of families of migrant workers do not want their children to go to school in the areas where they are employed.

These factors must be taken into consideration. There are many aspects of this problem that make it difficult of solution, regardless of what the program is. I do not believe this is the answer.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield back the remainder of my time.

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 and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 521) was passed.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 525.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 525) to provide for the establishment of a council to be known as the National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Jersey.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments on page 1, line 9, after the word "the," to strike out "farmer;" and insert "farmer, who shall be individuals actively engaged in, and whose livelihoods are dependent upon, agriculture, and who employ migratory labor in connection therewith;"; and at the top of page 3, to strike out:

(d) Service of an individual as a member of the Council or employment of an individual by the Council as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(d) While rendering service as a member of the Council, or as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field employed by the Council on a part-time basis or without compensation, an individual shall be regarded as a special Government employee within the meaning of chapter 11 of title 18 of the United States Code.

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 (a) there is hereby established a Council to be known as the "National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor" (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of fifteen members, appointed by the President without regard to political affiliations as follows:

(1) Four individuals, appointed from private life, to represent the farmer, who shall be individuals actively engaged in, and whose livelihoods are dependent upon, agriculture, and who employ migratory labor in connection therewith;

(2) Four individuals, appointed from private life, to represent the migratory agricultural workers;

(3) Two individuals, appointed from private life, who shall have a demonstrated interest in and knowledge of the problems relating to migratory agricultural labor, including the problems of the migratory agricultural workers, his employer, and the community;

(4) Two individuals, appointed from private life, who are or have been actively engaged in activities aimed at determining and solving the health, education, and welfare problems of the migratory agricultural worker and his family; and

(5) Three individuals who have had experience as State officials and who are knowledgeable of the problems relating to migratory agricultural labor.

(b) Members of the Council shall be appointed for the life of the Council. A vacancy in the Council shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) The President shall designate one of the members of the Council as Chairman, and one as Vice Chairman. Eight members of the Council shall constitute a quorum.

(d) While rendering service as a member of the Council, or as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field employed by the Council on a part-time basis or without compensation, an individual shall be regarded as a special Government employee within the meaning of chapter 11 of title 18 of the United States Code.

(e) Members of the Council shall each be entitled to receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Council, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(f) The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman or at the call of a majority of the members thereof, but not less often than once each calendar year.

SEC. 2. (a) The Council shall have a staff director who shall be appointed by the Chairman without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The staff director shall have such duties as may be imposed by the Council, and shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed $18,000 per annum.

(b) The Council shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel, as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) The Council may procure, in accordance with the provisions of section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants; individuals so employed shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Council, but not in excess of $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the Council to advise the President and the Congress, with respect to (1) the operation of Federal laws, regulations, programs, and policies relating to any and all aspects of migratory agricultural labor: and (2) any other matters relating to migratory agricultural labor.

(b) It shall also be the duty of the Council to consider, analyze, and evaluate the problems relating to migratory agricultural labor with a view to devising plans and making recommendations for the establishment of policies and programs designed to meet such problems effectively. In carrying out such duty, the Council shall consider, among others, the following matters:

(1) The effect of existing laws, regulations, programs, and policies on the various problems relating to migratory agricultural labor, including the problems of the migratory agricultural worker, his employer, and the local area in which he is employed; and

(2) The means for improved coordination of Federal, State, county, and local policies and programs relating to migratory agricultural labor.

(c) The Council shall, on or before March 31 of each calendar year, submit an annual comprehensive report of its findings and recommendations to the Secretary of Labor for transmission by him to the President and to the Congress.

SEC. 4. The Council shall cease to exist upon the expiration of five years from the date of the initial appointments to the Council made by the President under this Act.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, not to exceed $50,000 in any fiscal year, to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on S. 525 be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to a side, and that the time for the proponents of the bill be controlled by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the time for the opposition be controlled by the junior Senator from Texas.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as amended be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the bill, S. 525, would establish a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor. The Council would exist for a period of 5 years and would be composed of 15 members appointed by the President without regard to political affiliations. Appropriations would be limited to $50,000 a year.

The membership of the Council would be as follows:

First. Four individuals, appointed from private life, to represent the farmer, with an express requirement that such individuals shall themselves be active farmers, dependent upon agriculture for their livelihood and employers of migratory farm labor;

Second. Four individuals appointed from private life to represent the migratory agricultural worker;

Third. Two individuals appointed from private life with interest in and knowledge of migratory labor problems generally;

Fourth. Two individuals appointed from private life with experience in health, education, and welfare problems of migratory labor; and

Fifth. Three individuals with experience as State officials and knowledge of migratory labor problems.

It shall be the duty of the Council to study and advise the President and Congress on matters relating to migratory farm labor. In studying migratory labor problems and formulating its recommendations, the Council is specifically charged to take into account not only the problems of the worker but also the problems of the farm employer and the local area on which the migrant worker is employed. The Council is also to give particular consideration to the means for improved coordination of Federal, State, county, and local policies and programs relating to migratory agricultural labor.

Mr. President, this is an extremely necessary measure. There are at present a sizable number of organizations and agencies, public and private, concerned with migratory labor problems. Nearly all of these agencies, though, are handicapped by limited jurisdiction either in terms of geography or in terms of subject matter. The numerous State committees on migratory labor, for example, are obviously not in a position to become familiar with or act effectively on these problems, which are truly national and interstate in all major respects. In some cases, it is true, there have been efforts at cooperation among the States, such as that made by the Council of State Governments through its Committee of Officials on Migratory Farm Labor of the Atlantic Seaboard States. Such cooperative efforts have not been wholly satisfactory, however, for, at the hearings on this legislation, this very committee submitted testimony that "it has long been the hope of the committee that a national council with advisory and recommendatory functions would be established."

A National Advisory Council cannot be validly criticized on the ground that it would simply duplicate the functions of the existing President's Committee on Migratory Labor. The fact is that the President's Committee has not fulfilled the functions it was designed to perform, for good and sufficient reasons inherent in its very nature. First of all, it is composed exclusively of Cabinet members, together with the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. In the best of circumstances, these men who compose the President's Committee, being required to deal with a wide variety of pressing problems, cannot be expected to devote a great deal of time and attention to questions involving migratory labor.

Mr. President, the last meeting of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor was held in January of 1962, nearly a year and a half ago. Moreover, it has been reported to the subcommittee that the administration intends to abolish the President's Committee altogether as soon as the National Advisory Council is established.

That private citizens—not Government officials—will predominate in membership on the advisory council should be kept uppermost in mind. There are 12 members drawn from private life; 3 would be present or former State officials. All members would be drawn from fields in which the problems of the migratory worker, the grower, and the local area involved are of daily and vital concern.

Since none of the council members would be Federal officials, they would be in a position to make a critical, objective evaluation of existing programs. In the words of the Reverend Shirley E. Greene, a widely respected and longstanding authority on migratory labor, at the time of the hearings:

> Although it is not apt to arouse the same degree of humanitarian interest as the other bills, S. 522 may turn out in the long run to be the most important measure before us in these hearings. By providing a national sounding board for the migrant worker and those concerned for his welfare, the proposed National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor, if properly manned and staffed, can become the instrument for genuine and lasting solutions to many of the serious problems surrounding the seasonal employment of labor in agriculture.

Mr. President, the administration has recommended enactment of the proposed legislation. Its favorable views have been presented in reports from the Department of Labor and the Bureau of the Budget. The bill is also supported by numerous organizations knowledgeable on migratory labor problems. I urge that the Senate approve the bill.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

A sprawling bureaucracy has been developed in Washington. A Frankenstein monster has been created that threatens to destroy us. The tendency is increasing for Congress to delegate to others responsibilities that legitimately, logically, and rightfully should be ours. We are constantly delegating authority to boards, commissions, councils, advisory groups, agencies, administrators, and others.

I believe we would be creating a redundant agency if we created the National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor. Let me name the instrumentalities which now exist: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor; a Senate subcommittee; two farm-labor committees in the House; a farm labor advisory committee in the Department of Labor; at least 28 Governors' committees on migratory labor; and numerous religious and private groups operating in the interests of migratory labor.

To establish a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor would be to create a redundant agency, one more Federal instrumentality added to the sprawling bureaucracy which now exists.

Someday, if we continue to create such agencies, more people will be working for the Federal Government than are working in private enterprise. If additional agencies are created for service in the field of migratory labor, more people will be working for the Federal Government in farm labor affairs than there are farm laborers.

I hope that Congress will not add another Federal agency to an already sprawling bureaucracy. The National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor, which is proposed to be established by the bill, would be a redundant agency. It is my hope that the bill will be defeated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

We know that there is a response to the needs of migrant farmworkers. We know that people individually and as members of organizations are working for the solution of the problems of such workers. But as it develops—and as our committee has seen, because we have traveled in many parts of the country—the assistance rendered by such groups is a kind of patchwork quilt of private and public effort.

Some national attention has been focused on the problem. The President has appointed a committee composed of the Secretaries of the respective departments. Their work is merely an appendage activity added to their already immense volume of work and responsibility. As a result, they have been unable to meet often. I am informed that the last meeting was held well over a year ago, on January 17, 1962. That was the date of the last meeting of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor. This is not intended as a critical statement; it is merely an acknowledgment of the facts of life.

True, there is a Senate subcommittee. It has been a kind of national committee, and has existed for 3 years. We are doing a part of the work that would be done by a national advisory committee, because we receive requests for information and analyses from church groups and local governments all over the country. I do not believe it is an overstatement to say that we have had to respond, in a national sense, more for the supplying of information, advice, and counsel than to consider legislative business. I am certainly not suggesting that the committee and its staff are not qualified to be helpful; but it seems to me that if there were people from the farming industry, people who were representative of the worker and the farmer and people from State governments, the representation would be from the grassroots, and could more readily be developed in a national council. They would have a more intimate knowledge of the facts of farm life. In

my judgment, there would be, an organization which would have an opportunity to weave all the operations into a more national, responsive program—a program which would get away from the patchwork quilt that now exists.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEARSON in the chair). The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I shall resist the temptation to get in the last word; and I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time is yielded back.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 525) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 182, Senate bill 523, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is my understanding that this is the measure on which the unanimous-consent agreement has been reached, and that, pursuant to the agreement, the bill will be considered at 2 o'clock tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the debate on my amendment will commence at 2 o'clock, and there will be 30 minutes of controlled time. The vote will come at 2:30.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I understand that then the leadership will call up the final bill of this series, Senate bill 524, which deals with the registration of labor contractors. I believe that can be stated as the program.

Mr. TOWER. I believe there is no agreement on that, but that is understood to be the procedure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. President, the child labor bill, S. 523, has come a long way since we first introduced it in the Senate over 2 years ago. The viewpoint and the attitude of the farm community have changed during this period from one of almost total rejection and opposition to one of almost total acceptance of the bill as reported by the Labor Committee.

Thoughtful farmers throughout the Nation, as they learned more about this proposed legislation and about the serious extent of harmful child labor, have reappraised their views, and have actively worked with us on this problem.

I am pleased, Mr. President, to cite as a leading example of this informed farmer viewpoint, the statement of the Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, of Orlando, Fla. This organization's view of the child labor bill, as presented in its statement to the subcommittee, is as follows:

> We support S. 523 as it is written.

I may say that no amendments were added to the bill.

I read further from the association's statement:

> The Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association has continually urged its members to comply with the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, as well as the applicable State laws. We do not like to see children in the migrant agricultural labor stream, and we do not like to see children employed on farms in occupations to which they are not suited. We also dislike seeing children employed when school is in session.
>
> We definitely feel that rural youth, 12 years of age and over, should be permitted to work in agriculture under conditions which would be acceptable under S. 523. That is, we believe that rural youth, 12 years of age and over, should be permitted to work on farms within commuting distance of their home with permission of their parents, in those occupations to which they are suited.

Mr. Richard T. O'Connell, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, in testifying, had this to say about the legislation:

> The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives has no objection to the apparent intent of S. 523. We believe this legislation is in keeping with the preventing of the exploitation of youth in any industry or occupation where there is danger of the health or physical well-being of the individual. We have no specific amendments to offer, but we do seek assurances that children may continue to work in certain activities in agriculture, particularly where it is both socially and economically desirable.

In like vein, Mr. Fred Burrows, although expressing reservations about the hazardous employment provisions, testified that:

> On the child labor bill, S. 523, in general we are in favor of the proposed legislation.

Mr. Burrows was speaking for the International Apple Association.

Mr. President, this bill amends the existing agricultural child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, which presently provides a total exemption for agricultural work when school is not in session. The effect of the current exemption is that a child of any age may be employed in agriculture before and after classes, during vacation periods, or during so-called crop vacations.

This bill (S. 523) narrows the gap in the Fair Labor Standards Act which today permits unlimited child labor in agriculture outside school hours. This bill (S. 523) does not affect existing law in regard to the 16-year-age minimum already applicable to agricultural work during regular school hours.

Specifically, the bill provides that a child may be employed in agricultural work outside of school hours: first, if he is employed by his parents on the home farm, or, second, if he is 14 years of age or over, or third, if he is between 12 and 14 years of age and commutes daily from his permanent residence and has the written consent of his parents or his parents are employed on the same farm.

The bill also contains a provision authorizing the Secretary of Labor to protect children below the age of 18 from working on particularly hazardous farm operations.

A child labor measure (S. 1123) similar to the present bill (S. 523), was the subject of hearing on April 12, 13, 1961, and passed the Senate in the 87th Congress.

UNLIMITED CHILD LABOR ENDANGERS THE SAFETY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE OF LARGE NUMBERS OF CHILDREN

The harmful employment of children in agriculture is one of the most unfortunate aspects of today's migratory farm labor situation. Although this condition has all but disappeared from industry, it is still very much in evidence in some parts of our agricultural economy. The Fair Labor Standards Act, enacted long before farming became a large-scale mechanized operation, desperately needs to be adjusted to the facts of modern agriculture. Today, modern farming operations constitute this Nation's third most dangerous commercial enterprise; only mining and construction are more hazardous. Yet, when school is not in session children of any age can be employed under any conditions and for any duration.

State child labor laws are neither adequate nor extensive enough to protect children employed in agriculture. Twenty States have no minimum age for the employment of children in agriculture, either during or outside of school hours. Fourteen States do not have a minimum age to cover agricultural employment when school is not in session.

The extensive employment of young children in agriculture has persisted despite the fact that the death rate in agriculture is exceeded only by those in the extractive and construction industries. It is estimated that in 1960, nearly 90,000 children aged 14 through 17 did migratory farmwork. An estimated 100,000 to 150,000 additional children under 14 years of age migrated with their parents, many of whom were also employed on farms.

In a statement before the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor on April 10, 1963, the Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz summarized the hazardous aspect of child labor as follows:

> The time of day or time of year in which young children are employed in agriculture has no bearing upon its suitability for their safety and well-being. All available data point to the comparatively hazardous nature of farm employment. Data available to the National Safety Council indicate that of the 13,500 persons killed in work accidents in 1961, approximately one-fourth, or 3,300, were employed in agriculture. Agriculture is the only major industry which has experienced an increase in the death rate since 1951.

UNLIMITED CHILD LABOR INTERFERES WITH EDUCATIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

Agricultural labor is detrimental to children when it interferes with their educational progress. In many States, school attendance laws permit children under 16, or even under 14, to be excused from school to work in agriculture. Additionally, in some States migratory children—not being residents—are not covered by compulsory school attendance laws. These exemptions in many cases

create a serious interference with a child's education, and particularly with the education of the migrant child.

Returning tired and worn out to cramped, poorly lighted housing, after spending the afternoon and early evening working in the fields, migrant children find themselves unable to study. Local school officials, moreover, have been discouraged from assigning homework, because of after-school harvesting. These conditions obviously impose severe limitations on the educational development of our rural youth, especially the migrant child who is already burdened by environmental factors, and who seldom attains an education beyond the fourth-grade level.

The present bill (S. 523) is an attempt to break the chain of circumstances that force these migrant children into the unrewarding pattern of life shared by their parents. If these children can be saved from working prematurely in the fields, a large step will have been taken to give them the opportunity for a more worthwhile and productive adult working life.

Strengthening the provisions of the child labor law, moreover, will supplement work currently underway in the area of education and day-care services for migrant children. This committee has reported a bill (S. 521) to increase the educational opportunities available to migrant children and a bill (S. 522) to provide day-care facilities for migrant children. Both of these measures were passed by the Senate in the 87th Congress, and are strongly supported by the administration. Enactment of child-labor legislation will be a valuable adjunct to State, local, and voluntary efforts already providing such necessary facilities.

Considering the increased mechanization in agriculture and the commensurate increase in farm accidents, Senate bill 523 provides a sound, practical means of encouraging more adequate safety standards and more comprehensive protection of children against serious accidents and fatalities. Furthermore, by establishing a national minimum age for the employment of children in agriculture outside of school hours, this legislation (S. 523) will effectively discourage interruptions in the educational process for the migrant child.

THIS LEGISLATION PRESERVES BENEFICIAL FARMWORK

The bill (S. 523) is designed to protect children from harmful child labor and to preserve to the fullest extent possible the beneficial aspects of farmwork. Consequently, the bill does not apply where a child is working for his parent on the family farm. By providing that children 12 years of age or older can, with parental consent, perform agricultural work to which they commute daily from their homes, the bill preserves for local school children the beneficial work programs that exist in many rural areas of the Nation. The 14-year minimum age in the bill conforms to the minimum age adopted by over three-fourths of the States that have enacted agricultural child labor laws.

CHILDREN PROTECTED FROM PARTICULARLY HAZARDOUS WORK

To protect children under 18 years of age from injuries due to hazardous work, the bill provides that the Secretary of Labor can find and declare certain occupations to be particularly hazardous for children under 18. Although data are not available on a national scale, a California study of agricultural injuries in 1961 showed a large number of disabling injuries to farmworkers age 18 years or younger.

Year	Total under 18 years	Under 16 years	16 to 17 years
1950	485	128	357
1951	523	134	389
1952	525	145	380
1953	464	133	331
1954	440	95	345
1955	501	140	361
1956	499	132	367
1957	512	127	385
1958	434	92	342
1959	565	117	448
1960	539	117	422
1961	426	83	343

California had a total of 426 disabling injuries to workers under 18; of this total, 25 children were under 14. Another 58 of the children were between 14 and 15 years of age.

Because of the many diverse techniques used in modern farming, such as the use of high ladders, field packing and conveyor-belt operations, pesticides, mechanical devices, and power-driven machinery, the bill does not delineate what constitutes "particularly hazardous" employment. Rather, the bill follows the far more practical course of providing the Secretary of Labor the flexibility to determine what constitutes hazardous employment on a job-by-job basis and in light of the constantly changing conditions of modern farming.

So, Mr. President, when the vote is taken tomorrow, I hope Senators will realize that this measure is most necessary. A great social gap exists in this area; there is no protection against harmful farmwork for these youngsters during the periods when school is not in session. They work in a form of commerce which is the third most hazardous, and ranks next to mining and construction. Not only is it a dangerous industry, but the work is also debilitating. Many persons picture the child going out in the fields, with his dog, Shep, beside him, to bring in the cows. But youngsters who work in migratory farm labor are not bringing in grandpa's cows. They are working on their knees, picking beans and tomatoes, under a sun which is so hot that the temperature will reach 120 degrees; and from the standpoint of the development of both body and mind, the environment is the worst that young people could have.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I intend to submit my chief argument tomorrow, when I shall submit an amendment to the bill.

I should like to point out some of the salient objections to the bill. It leaves too much to the arbitrary will and discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, in dealing with the work in which young people under 18 years of age may engage. The entire intent and purpose seems to be to narrowly proscribe and restrict the amount of farmwork to be done by young people.

In my opinion, Mr. President, there is no greater character builder in the world than farmwork, and I think young people should be encouraged to work on the farms. I worked on a farm during the summers from the time when I was 11 years of age, and I am glad to have had that experience. I do not wish to return to that work, and I hope the people will not return me to it in 1966. [Laughter.] Nevertheless, I think it is good experience for all people; and I believe this bill is too narrowly restrictive. So I hope the bill will not be passed without at least the adoption of amendments which I believe will improve it.

REGISTRATION OF CONTRACTORS OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in connection with the so-called crew leader registration bill, Senate bill 524, which will be under consideration during the middle of the day tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement on that bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS OF NEW JERSEY

BRIEF DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

The bill (S. 524) establishes a system of Federal registration for interstate farm labor contractors, or crew leaders, as they are frequently called. These labor contractors are the middlemen in making work arrangements between growers and migratory farmworkers.

As defined in the bill, a crew leader is any person who recruits or transports, at any one time, 10 or more migrant workers for interstate agricultural employment. Every such crew leader must obtain an annual certificate of registration from the Secretary of Labor and must display the certificate at proper times as proof that he has complied with obligations specified by the legislation.

Certain entities are exempted from the registration requirements of the bill. The exempted entities are—

First, charitable, educational, or similar nonprofit organizations, and their full-time or regular employees;

Second, farmers, processors, and certain related businesses which recruit migrant workers solely for their own operations—and their full-time or regular employees; and

Third, persons engaged in obtaining foreign workers whose employment is arranged under the supervision of a foreign nation.

A crew leader within the registration requirements may obtain a certificate by submitting to the Secretary of Labor, first, information concerning his conduct and method of operation as a farm-labor contractor, and second, proof of public liability insurance on vehicles used in his business as a farm-labor contractor.

The Labor Department estimates that there are between 5,000 and 8,000 farm-labor contractors in this country, and that about half of all interstate migratory workers are crew members of these contractors. A system of Federal registration is made necessary by the unique role of the crew leader in the farm-labor market. While the employer's contact with migratory farmworkers is often temporary and impersonal, the crew leader

has a continuing close relation with the workers, the nature of which makes the worker and also his family almost totally dependent upon the crew leader's honesty and responsibility. The crew leader's functions include recruiting the workers at the beginning of the season, making work arrangements with growers and providing transportation to the work, paying the workers their wages, lending them money if necessary during the season, supervising them on the job, and handling all contacts with the grower.

Many crew leaders perform their functions in a satisfactory and responsible manner, but there is also much evidence that the workers' dependency in this one-sided relationship is violated and abused by some crew leaders. Department of Labor surveys have revealed numerous abuses such as the following: overcharging workers for transportation; abandoning a crew without means of transportation and failure to return workers to their homes; underpayment of wages; and illegal sale of liquor and dope.

Growers as well as workers are exploited. A typical abuse is the crew leader's accepting transportation advances but failing to report for work or reporting with a smaller crew than promised.

The frequency of criminal records among crew leaders has been disclosed as a result of the few State laws providing for crew leader licensing; in New York, for example, 52 crew leaders have been found to have criminal records out of a total group of 401.

The pending legislation deals with the problem of crew leader abuses by providing specific obligations which the crew leader must meet to continue in his business. He must, for example, inform workers at the time of recruitment concerning their prospective employment, to the best of his knowledge and belief; must post written statements of the terms of employment and housing; and, when he pays the workers, must keep proper payroll records.

By providing a means of identifying and locating crew leaders, the bill would also aid in the enforcement of existing laws. The Interstate Commerce Commission has limited authority to regulate the transportation of migrant workers with respect to their safety and comfort, but, as stated in the Commission's favorable report on the bill, the ICC now has no means of identifying the farm labor contractors and communicating the requirements to them unless they are actually found on the highway. Similarly, the crew leader is responsible under the Social Security Act in some cases for withholding and transmitting earnings; but the present difficulties in keeping track of crew leaders have made it almost impossible to check evasions in this area.

Nine States and Puerto Rico have recognized the crew leader problem by enacting registration or issuing regulations on the subject. The commissioners of labor in at least six of these States have said that State action is not enough and that Federal registration of crew leaders is also needed. States which do not now have registration laws have also recognized the need for Federal registration. From the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations of Delaware, a State with no registration law, the subcommittee has received this statement on the need for a Federal crew leader law:

"This is a bill we definitely feel should be passed. Most of the States surrounding Delaware have State laws requiring a registration of such contractors. Many of the contractors who have been unable to secure registration in these States have come into Delaware. We feel that until some such legislation is passed States without crew registration laws will be the dumping grounds of crew leaders with unsatisfactory experience. We also believe that this is the most effective way of curbing crew leaders from practicing unfair or unlawful methods with their workers."

The administration has recommended enactment of this legislation. Its favorable views have been presented by the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, and Commerce, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and by the Bureau of the Budget. I urge the Senate to approve this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, although we have not reached the final consideration of all the bills in this group which have been reported—there are six in all. Two bills remain, and have been on the calendar: the child-labor provisions bill (S. 523) and the so-called crew leader registration bill (S. 524). I believe it appropriate at this time to make certain comments in regard to the fine work done by the staff of the subcommittee. They have enabled us to reach this historic occasion in an area in which remedial legislation has been needed so long, but in which so little has been done until this committee, with its very professional and humanitarian staff, has prepared these measures for consideration by the Senate.

I also wish to express sincere gratitude to all of the cosponsors who joined us in the proposed legislation. I received help from so many quarters that if I should attempt to relate the names of all those who assisted, I would surely leave someone out.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the names of the staff of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

There being no objection, the names of the staff members were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STAFF OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON MIGRATORY LABOR

Frederick R. Blackwell, counsel.
Anne O. von der Lieth, associate counsel.
Harry G. Wilkinson, associate counsel.
Woodruff M. Price, research assistant.
Raymond D. Hurley, associate minority council.
Robert Locke, minority research assistant.
George Denison, associate minority counsel.

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

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

UNITED STATES-DOMINICAN RELATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we know that today Communist- and Marxist-oriented groups in Latin America are attempting to discredit the Alliance for Progress by branding it a tool of "American imperialism." They insist that the Alliance is but another manifestation of the plan to "Americanize" the hemisphere, to force all Latin American societies to pattern their governments and social institutions on the North American model. Social and political diversity, they insist, will not be tolerated.

Unfortunately, some American spokesmen tend to create the impression that these allegations are true—that the United States cannot tolerate political or social movements in Latin America that do not correspond to those in the United States. This is certainly a misrepresentation of our own policy and of our own political tradition. We do not aspire to creating exact replicas of the United States, in Latin America or anywhere else. What we desire are free, independent, prosperous nations whose political and social institutions reflect and embody their own cultural traditions. Unlike the Sino-Soviet bloc, we do not pressure our neighbors to choose between the United States and the Soviet Union. We encourage their commitment to free constitutional government, but we do not attempt to dictate how free constitutional government should be created or operated. That is decided by the individual country.

When the government of one of our neighbors in this hemisphere follows a course which is different from our own, we should not necessarily assume that this course is alien or inimical to U.S. interests. A recent example is the case of the Dominican Republic, which now has a freely elected, constitutional, democratic government after 38 years of dictatorship.

I attended the inauguration of President Bosch, the first Dominican Chief of State to be popularly elected in 38 years. He won his office with a broad popular mandate of 60 percent of the vote in elections which observers sent by the Organization of American States have termed "remarkable for their degree of freedom from fraud and violence." President Bosch scored this significant victory on a platform calling for a program, in his words, of "revolutionary but not radical reforms." After three decades of one of the most brutal dictatorships this hemisphere has known, the Dominican people are indeed in a "revolutionary" fervor to catch up with the rest of the world and to win for themselves the political, social, and economic advances which more fortunate people take for granted. We in this country properly applauded as the Dominican people thus rejoined the ranks of the representative democracies.

Let us look at the record of the Dominican Republic's Government over the past 3 months. As a member of the reform-minded, non-Communist, democratic element in the Caribbean which has produced such leaders and friends as President Betancourt of Venezuela, ex-President Figueres and President Orlich of Costa Rica, and Governor Muñoz-Marín of Puerto Rico, President Bosch's career has been one long, dedicated fight against dictatorship. He has recognized the damages wrought on his nation by the years of dictatorship and has drafted a program of reform within a democratic framework which he regards as a clear-cut alternative to communism. In a speech on March 12, President Bosch denounced communism as meaning "death, war, and destruction."

Like all moderate reformers with a meaningful program, he now finds himself under strong attack from both the

extreme left and extreme right as he begins to carry out his program. Some of the unfavorable stories that have recently appeared in the U.S. press may be traced to one or the other of those sources. While Radio Havana strongly attacks him as "a lackey of imperialism," those who oppose his reform program on social, economic, or political grounds thunder from the right. There have been even reports of collusion between the extreme right and extreme left in their opposition to him.

This is the pattern in Venezuela today, where the followers of the former dictator, Jiminez, and the Communists are joining in an attempt to destroy Venezuelan democracy by violence, disorder, and guerrilla warfare tactics. It is a common pattern throughout the world to see the red of the left and the black of the right unite to destroy, if they can, constitutional, established democracy.

Mr. President, President Bosch has publicly charged that the present effort to portray his administration as Communist-oriented is in effect a concerted campaign to topple his government. He reminds those who gratuitously compare his administration with the early days of the Casto regime that Castro, unlike him, was not popularly elected; the opposition in Cuba was being shot in 1959; the Cuban Armed Forces had been destroyed; and there was no voice but Castro's. By contrast, he points out, the Dominican Republic today has a Congress, free elections, a free press, and free commerce. In the brief 3 months he has been in power, he has moved forward with a caution unexpected in a "revolutionary," putting his principal emphasis to date on balancing his budget, paying his government's bills, instituting government austerity—including salary cuts for himself and other top officials and a reduction in government payrolls—conserving the credit worthiness of the Republic by paying off commercial arrearages and preserving the value of its currency. This program already has produced a substantial improvement in the country's exchange and credit positions.

I add, for the critics of the Dominican Republic, that this hardly sounds to me like a Communist-oriented government, particularly when a government seeks to pay off its obligations and to fulfill its responsibilities.

In his efforts to implement his campaign pledges of social and economic reform, President Bosch has demonstrated that he shares the goals and aspirations of the Alliance for Progress, particularly with respect to self-help—a basic and essential foundation for all Alianza efforts in Latin America. I have already referred to his measures to balance the budget and preserve the credit worthiness of the country, demonstrating a high degree of financial responsibility. In the area of social and economic reform, the Dominican Government is not only continuing apace the programs already begun by the predecessor government of the Council of State, but is also initiating a series of reforms and projects of its own. The agrarian reform program of the Dominican Government has been considerably strengthened by private donations of land and funds and by a reorganization of the agrarian reform institute designed to facilitate acceleration and expansion of the program. A law on cooperatives has been prepared and will soon be presented to Congress which will provide technical support to cooperatives by establishing a cooperative institute, and financial support through a cooperatives bank. In accordance with a project agreement in government planning and administration reform with AID, the Dominican Government is planning the establishment of a Presidential commission on administrative reform.

The Bosch administration is making full use of external sources of financing, from both the United States and Europe. The bulk of current U.S. grant assistance for economic and social development has been earmarked for a top priority goal of both AID and the Dominican Government—agricultural development. This would include agricultural credits to small farmers, livestock development, and farm-to-market roads. Project agreements already signed between AID and the Bosch government provide AID funds and technical advisers in the fields of education, public safety, and labor in addition to agriculture and public administration.

Much of the current criticism of the Bosch administration seems to center on the return of certain Communist and pro-Communist exiles to the Dominican Republic and over the degree of freedom permitted to them in their activities there. The return of these subversive elements actually began in January 1963 before President Bosch took office and at a time when all Dominican political parties endorsed repeal of the emergency law under which they had been deported. President Bosch has said that he believes that in principle every Dominican should be allowed to return to his native country. The point at which the national security becomes an overriding consideration is, of course, a decision for President Bosch and the Dominican people. It should be noted, however, that President Bosch firmly refused to tolerate illegal strikes by two unions—a sugar mill union and the government employees' union—led by pro-Communist elements, which resulted in their collapse.

I would not underestimate the dangers of Communist infiltration and subversion in the Dominican Republic. Obviously in terms of geography and conditions propitious for its propagation, it is a logical target. I believe that President Bosch and the Dominican people, having endured so much under the Trujillo dictatorship, are determined to frustrate those who would seek to impose another reign of terror, and to deprive them of their recently won liberties. The Department of State describes our policy toward the Dominican Republic as one of helping the Dominican people in all appropriate ways to make the difficult transition from tyranny to a viable democracy, offering a better way of life to the people and thus to fend off the threat from the extreme right and the extreme left. President Bosch and the Dominican people are proud, independent, and sensitive. He has publicly stated that he will get on his knees neither to Washington nor to Moscow. In extending our help and assistance, we do not ask this. We ask only that his objectives coincide with those of the Alliance for Progress and for so long as this is the case, he has and should have our active sympathy, cooperation, and support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Washington Post of June 6, 1963, entitled "Attack on Bosch," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ATTACK ON BOSCH

"'Communism means death, destruction, and the loss of our properties,' said President Juan Bosch at a speech delivered at the military academy after he assumed the presidency. However, it seems that these words were not heard by foreign newspapermen." This recent comment on a Dominican radio station reflects the growing sensitivity to a press campaign seemingly designed to prove that the first democratically elected successor to Rafael Trujillo is a Communist.

What lies at the root of charges by some Dominicans is Mr. Bosch's refusal to attack the Communists with the vehemence they deem necessary. The Dominican president is very much his own boss and he can be hypersensitive. From his vantage, he does not want to seem like a puppet of anyone and the kind of anti-Communist position his critics urge, he feels, would make him seem like a supplicant for U.S. favor.

Thus the attacks that some American journalists are pumping up give a weird perspective to Dominican politics. Here is a country that endured three decades of oppression under a dictator who was loudly praised in the United States. Through a miracle, an orderly transition to democratic government has taken place and a regime is now in power that is pledged to the kind of reform program that Washington asserts is necessary elsewhere in Latin America. Against this overwhelming plus, there is the apparent minus of Mr. Bosch's unwillingness to satisfy the hardline standards of some Dominicans and visiting journalists. In this case, is it really Mr. Bosch who is being neurotic?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the editorial places the situation in the Dominican Republic in proper perspective. It properly notes a word of caution, because there is an unstable political situation throughout the Caribbean, and particularly in the Dominican Republic, after many years of tyrannical dictatorship in that country.

All one has to do is visit one of the countries that has been ruled by a dictator to learn what terrible things have happened, and how large numbers of people have been destroyed, corrupted by the rule of a dictator. I have seen this in the Argentine. I have seen it in the Dominican Republic. I have seen it in Venezuela.

The most encouraging sign is that the people in those countries, particularly in Venezuela and the Dominican Republic, are determined to make democracy work.

It is to our advantage, and it is within our tradition, to attempt to encourage this kind of development.

In today's Washington Post, under the name of that illustrious columnist, Max

Freedman, is an article entitled "Bosch Contrasted With Castro." He states that sympathy and understanding are urged for the Dominican Republic. It is an article written from Santo Domingo. It reads, in part:

At the end of the first 3 months in office, President Juan Bosch of the Dominican Republic can present several interesting contrasts with Castro's regime.

Castro seized power by force and became a dictator. Bosch was elected president of the Dominican Republic by a huge majority after the dictator was overthrown. Castro shot his critics or put them in jail without a trial. Bosch has prevented mob rule and police brutality. Castro confiscated bank deposits and repudiated debts. Bosch has avoided all confiscation, is paying all debts and is seeking a stable and convertible currency.

Castro grabbed the land for himself and his party. Bosch has started a genuine program of land reform.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of this revealing and informative article by Mr. Freedman be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

BOSCH CONTRASTED WITH CASTRO—SYMPATHY, UNDERSTANDING ARE URGED FOR EFFORTS OF DOMINICAN PRESIDENT

(By Max Freedman)

SANTO DOMINGO.—At the end of the first 3 months in office, President Juan Bosch of the Dominican Republic can present several interesting contrasts with Castro's regime.

Castro seized power by force and became a dictator. Bosch was elected president of the Dominican Republic by a huge majority after the dictator was overthrown. Castro shot his critics or put them in jail without a trial. Bosch has prevented mob rule and police brutality. Castro confiscated bank deposits and repudiated debts. Bosch has avoided all confiscation, is paying all debts and is seeking a stable and convertible currency.

Castro grabbed the land for himself and his party. Bosch has started a genuine program of land reform, with the title to the land belonging to the farmer. Castro made the army the creature and servant of his personal ambition. Bosch has made no changes in the structure of the army, once the agents of Trujillo had fled or been destroyed.

Castro drove thousands of Cubans into exile. Bosch has created conditions which have brought hundreds of exiled Dominicans back to the country. Castro is a Communist and has turned Cuba into a Communist pawn. Bosch, a philosopher of freedom, wants liberty for his people and independence for his country.

Castro forced the Organization of American States to expel Cuba. Bosch wants the Dominican Republic to be a respected member of a stronger inter-American system. Castro is the servant of Russia. Bosch is the friend of America.

President Bosch knows his program will collapse without foreign capital and foreign skill to quicken the economic growth of the Dominican Republic. He also knows that many people are trying to discourage investment by spreading stories of his desire to confiscate profits or subject them to arbitrary taxes.

In reality, he is eager to welcome foreign investment on a large scale. He wants the American dollar to be a good neighbor seeking no special privileges, and respecting Dominican law. While these conditions are met, American investors need fear no confiscation or discrimination or harsh taxation.

Indeed, he is now working on an incentive law to attract capital for new or expanded industries. In many ways, this law will be more generous in its incentives than the law in Puerto Rico, which has been responsible for so much progress. It has to be, since conditions in the Dominican Republic are far worse and demand immediate action.

Always we return to this central point of early results. John Bartlow Martin, the U.S. Ambassador, has said this country has no wish to rule the Dominican Republic from Washington. Nor can the United States tolerate a sequence of events which would allow the Dominican people to be ruled from Havana or Moscow.

America's policy will be fully satisfied if the Dominican Republic remains free and independent. But these are mere words unless we realize that reform is the shield of independence, and social justice is the guardian of freedom.

In the past the United States has often blundered in its relations with the Dominican Republic. It has sometimes talked of annexing the island. It has sent the Marines to occupy the country. It has blustered and bullied. It found excuses during shameful years for the Trujillo dictatorship. These mistakes now belong to a vanished past.

Sensitive and well-informed, Mr. Martin is almost the ideal Ambassador to represent the United States. With his admirable staff at the American Embassy, and with the aid mission headed by Newell Williams, the United States is being excellently served in this important country.

The Ambassador and all these American officials have one message for the American people. Stop this sentimental talk of the showplace of democracy in the Caribbean. Remember the giant problems that still must be mastered. Remember too that President Bosch is not perfect and he will make false starts and take wrong turnings.

Do not be cast down by an ugly failure, nor uplifted by a brief success. Give President Bosch sympathy and understanding—and remember always that the understanding is far more important than the sympathy.

And finally, remember that the Dominican people have waited for long cruel years for a leader like President Bosch. They will not have waited in vain if the United States respects his purposes and supports his policies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it seems to me that we should keep a watchful eye on developments in the Dominican Republic. I have taken the time to comment on them today because I have been disturbed by what I believe to be prejudicial news items relating to the Dominican Republic.

I remind Senators that some years ago the Trujillo regime actually hired public relations experts to corrupt the news in this country relating to Trujillo, and to paint a favorable picture of that despotic dictatorship. Time after time news items carried favorable reports of the Republic as a land of law and order and of high living standards—all items bought and paid for. I want to make sure that this time the American people get the facts.

It is my view that when newswriters of the competence of Mr. Freedman visit a country—and there are other competent newspapermen who have done so—we should study their comments. I have visited that country only once, since the election of Mr. Bosch. I found that grave problems existed there. The problems are almost beyond human comprehension. Nevertheless, the Government of the Dominican Republic is determined to do something about conditions there. We are determined to help the country.

As has been said on the floor many times, we ought to try to help the people of the Dominican Republic make their country a democratic showcase. It is within a few miles of Cuba. It should stand as a living contrast to the dictatorship of Castro. As Mr. Freedman said, there are many contrasts. For one, there is an elected government, as compared with the Soviet puppet on the island of Cuba.

I hope the people of the United States will watch very carefully what is going on there.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 11, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 10, 1963:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Jay G. Hitchcock, Auburn, Ala., in place of K. D. Wright, retired.

John S. McGriff, Sr., Dutton, Ala., in place of W. S. Griffin, transferred.

Joyce B. Rodgers, Shorter, Ala., in place of B. F. Screws, deceased.

ARKANSAS

Jimmie R. Harris, Hatfield, Ark., in place of C. C. Smith, retired.

Otto C. Miller, Parkdale, Ark., in place of W. E. Place, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Frank W. Murphy, Chester, Calif., in place of Eunice Kiehl, retired.

Harold L. Hemmingsen, Glendale, Calif., in place of M. L. Green, retired.

Joyce A. Sibley, Nestor, Calif., in place of G. S. Sage, retired.

Royse E. Barnette, San Bernardino, Calif., in place of R. W. Davis, Sr., resigned.

COLORADO

F. Keith Bowhan, Hugo, Colo., in place of L. W. Dillow, deceased.

CONNECTICUT

Elizabeth J. Cohen, Colchester, Conn., in place of J. J. Shea, retired.

Donald P. Markham, East Hampton, Conn., in place of F. G. Thatcher, retired.

George F. Beebe, East Lyme, Conn., in place of E. E. Sexton, retired.

Richard E. Venus, Ridgefield, Conn., in place of J. L. Sullivan, deceased.

Joseph R. Kasper, Terryville, Conn., in place of D. P. Hurley, retired.

FLORIDA

Carl R. Garrett, Fort Walton Beach, Fla., in place of H. T. Stewart, resigned.

Myrtle I. Finch, Indian River City, Fla., in place of E. W. Shuler, resigned.

Edna M. McDonald, Middleburg, Fla., in place of E. M. McDonald, resigned.

J. Sidney Batten, Penny Farms, Fla., in place of Mabel Fast, retired.

GEORGIA

Sidney M. Hall, Hawkinsville, Ga., in place of R. P. Watson, retired.

IDAHO

Lucille L. Laws, Weippe, Idaho, in place of E. M. Pryor, transferred.

ILLINOIS

John A. Waters, Baylis, Ill., in place of Ralph McLaughlin, retired.

Edward J. Sichta, Clarendon Hills, Ill., in place of George Bigler, retired.

Arnold R. Pedersen, Cuba, Ill., in place of V. E. Burrell, retired.

Edwin G. Mengeling, Hampshire, Ill., in place of E. B. Watrous, deceased.

Norbert L. Gotway, Kampsville, Ill., in place of F. J. Zipprich, deceased.

Harry W. Van Hook, Mount Pulaski, Ill., in place of R. J. Horn, transferred.

INDIANA

Charles H. Boswell, Indianapolis, Ind., in place of W. A. Smith, retired.

Chalmers A. King, Muncie, Ind., in place of F. W. Mullin, retired.

Eurvon W. Adkins, New Salisbury, Ind., in place of O. F. Reinhardt, deceased.

Marvin M. Wright, Parker, Ind., in place of L. B. Dickey, retired.

Margery E. Brenner, Whiteland, Ind., in place of M. M. Shinn, retired.

IOWA

Thomas B. Barry, Danbury, Iowa, in place of W. C. Kinney, transferred.

Billy D. Bassett, Drakesvile, Iowa, in place of Bert Kirk, retired.

Kenneth R. Bowers, Essex, Iowa, in place of L. R. Carson, retired.

Wayne E. Exline, Exline, Iowa, in place of C. E. Wood, deceased.

Katherine M. Kennedy, Farley, Iowa, in place of E. P. Kelly, removed.

Loraine F. McLane, Garnavillo, Iowa, in place of E. A. Kregel, retired.

Arthur M. Lundberg, Lake City, Iowa, in place of W. E. Lovett, retired.

Walter D. Dunlop, Moorhead, Iowa, in place of M. E. Johannsen, resigned.

Don M. Wright, Moulton, Iowa, in place of L. R. Horn, retired.

Gerald W. Anderson, Stanton, Iowa, in place of H. O. Anderson, retired.

KANSAS

Harold H. Derby, Dresden, Kans., in place of P. T. Welter, transferred.

Arvin J. Mettlen, Lucas, Kans., in place of K. D. Bretz, transferred.

Opal G. Thomas, Mayetta, Kans., in place of N. F. Walsh, retired.

George R. Hess, Towanda, Kans., in place of La Vera Wheeler, retired.

Harold E. Good, Wellsville, Kans., in place of J. R. E. Simmons, retired.

KENTUCKY

Edna L. Peters, Lily, Ky., in place of R. P. Peters, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Beulah R. Amedee, Geismar, La., in place of L. M. Many, deceased.

Lawrence Harrington, Vinton, La., in place of L. J. DeVany, retired.

MAINE

Charles C. Lewis, Fryeburg, Maine, in place of W. R. Jordan, deceased.

MARYLAND

Jerome D. Laffey, Westernport, Md., in place of T. V. McGuire, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

John C. Hancock, Lincoln, Mass., in place of A. G. Davis, transferred.

Marion W. Butler, Oakham, Mass., in place of O. O. Butler, deceased.

John H. Higgins, West Wareham, Mass., in place of P. K. Gibbs, retired.

MICHIGAN

Norma L. Beckwith, Jones, Mich., in place of F. E. Kline, resigned.

Kermit R. Moore, Manton, Mich., in place of B. L. O'Brien, retired.

Harry L. Smith, Pickford, Mich., in place of Merrill Hillock, retired.

Gustav E. Leder, Portage, Mich., in place of V. M. Whisler, retired.

MINNESOTA

F. Lowell Johnson, Lake Park, Minn., in place of H. G. Torgerson, retired.

Lester R. Isackson, Leonard, Minn., in place of R. L. TeHennepe, transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

Roy Robertson, State Line, Miss., in place of E. D. Barkley, retired.

Mary E. Meteer, Union Church, Miss., in place of Annie Saxon, retired.

MISSOURI

Jerry M. Eidson, Camdenton, Mo., in place of O. C. West, retired.

Wayne U. Thomas, Deepwater, Mo., in place of G. E. Sell, transferred.

James Mote, Iberia, Mo., in place of J. E. Karr, retired.

William E. Griffith, Plattsburg, Mo., in place of L. V. Parker, retired.

Christopher C. McLemore, South Greenfield, Mo., in place of D. W. Duffy, retired.

MONTANA

William H. Kempfer, Philipsburg, Mont., in place of A. S. McKenzie, retired.

NEBRASKA

Waldo E. Smith, Arthur, Nebr., in place of L. M. Aufdengarten, resigned.

Victor W. Wendland, Holbrook, Nebr., in place of C. L. Frack, retired.

Kenneth P. Lewis, Lincoln, Nebr., in place of O. E. Jerner, retired.

Carl Tisthammer, Newman Grove, Nebr., in place of G. L. Christensen, transferred.

Gertrude M. Lane, Rulo, Nebr., in place of N. L. Morehouse, retired.

Marvin F. Anderson, Virginia, Nebr., in place of K. C. Swarts, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Norman E. Vittum, Ossipee, N.H., in place of L. C. Jones, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Charles P. Rue, Jobstown, N.J., in place of H. C. Cochran, retired.

Matthew J. Sheridan, Northfield, N.J., in place of V. R. Keller, retired.

NEW YORK

Thomas H. Brogan, Auburn, N.Y., in place of C. L. Messer, retired.

Frederick C. Piche, Deferiet, N.Y., in place of M. I. Callahan, retired.

Stanley T. Sokel, Eastport, N.Y., in place of C. A. Pitney, deceased.

Eva R. Weber, Yulan, N.Y., in place of Fred Hensel, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

James A. Jarvis, Dobson, N.C., in place of R. L. Folger, removed.

G. Cody Steagall, Draper, N.C., in place of J. L. Cassell, retired.

Milton B. Garner, Goldston, N.C., in place of E. C. Brooks, retired.

James V. Roberson, Lilesville, N.C., in place of R. A. Liles, transferred.

Benjamin T. Aycock, Wake Forest, N.C., in place of J. R. Wiggins, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Reid A. Hill, Emmet, N. Dak., in place of L. L. Grindy, transferred.

Emerald E. Knodel, Hurdsfield, N. Dak., in place of M. H. Houghton, retired.

Harold E. Nelson, Manvel, N. Dak., in place of O. M. Sproule, retired.

Gwendolyn R. Young, Rutland, N. Dak., in place of J. D. Prindiville, retired.

OHIO

Robert G. Prindle, Orient, Ohio, in place of J. L. Crawford, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Roger S. Wilcox, Seiling, Okla., in place of Anna Wilcox, retired.

OREGON

Nellie L. Netter, Aurora, Oreg., in place of H. A. Fleischhauer, retired.

Robert J. Cooper, Wilsonville, Oreg., in place of B. B. Aden, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Henry J. Minnig, Branch Dale, Pa., in place of H. M. McGovern, deceased.

Dale A. Daugherty, Evans City, Pa., in place of J. E. Sutton, retired.

Wade H. Kinsey, Jr., Ligonier, Pa., in place of C. F. Cairns, retired.

Charles A. Knoll, McKees Rocks, Pa., in place of N. C. McDermott, retired.

F. William Battaglia, Meadville, Pa., in place of F. B. Kunselman, retired.

Ralph W. Whipkey, Jr., Ohiopyle, Pa., in place of R. W. Whipkey, retired.

William J. Shields, Tidioute, Pa., in place of L. B. Atkin, retired.

Elden C. Harris, Torrance, Pa., in place of N. M. Graham, retired.

James L. Roney, Unionville, Pa., in place of E. P. Eastburn, retired.

Clair J. Uber, Volant, Pa., in place of J. N. McConnell, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John E. Boulware, Belton, S.C., in place of B. W. Martin, retired.

Gilbert L. Shaw, Longs, S.C., in place of R. B. Whittington, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Duane A. Larson, Chester, S. Dak., in place of F. M. Hausman, retired.

Lyle E. Singrey, Hazel, S. Dak., in place of G. F. Johnston, retired.

Robert E. Iverson, Hudson, S. Dak., in place of E. A. Schlup, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Kenneth E. DePriest, Lobelville, Tenn., in place of N. L. Bates, deceased.

Byerly L. Morgan, Spring City, Tenn., in place of R. B. Gibson, deceased.

TEXAS

Joe H. Childs, Brownwood, Tex., in place of R. F. Stanley, resigned.

James I. Mills, Canton, Tex., in place of T. H. Todd, deceased.

Maxine H. Fuson, Hankamer, Tex., in place of H. R. Speights, retired.

Elva L. Davis, Hedley, Tex., in place of M. E. Jones, retired.

David E. Holster, Jr., Midland, Tex., in place of N. G. Oates, retired.

Willie M. Eubank, Nevada, Tex., in place of P. D. Davis, transferred.

Sidney L. Lockwood, Santo, Tex., in place of M. I. McDonald, retired.

Henry H. Hawley, Jr., Sweetwater, Tex., in place of C. E. Paxton, deceased.

James A. Terrell, Van Horn, Tex., in place of Clyde Wright, resigned.

UTAH

Fannie W. Lowe, Elsinore, Utah, in place of N. J. Barney, resigned.

Howard M. Hardy, Hinckley, Utah, in place of A. H. Reeve, retired.

Glenda L. Green, Wendover, Utah, in place of F. P. Russell, retired.

VIRGINIA

Mamie G. Turner, Carrollton, Va., in place of J. D. Nottingham, resigned.

Burton S. Hamersly, Farmville, Va., in place of D. W. Paulette, retired.

Marvin S. Minter, Providence Forge, Va., in place of J. R. Parker, Jr., resigned.

James W. Stafford, Sr., Radford, Va., in place of H. H. Howard, retired.

WASHINGTON

Samuel M. Howe, Mercer Island, Wash., in place of H. G. Riecks, transferred.

Hubert R. Cartland, Milton, Wash., in place of P. G. Stewart, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

William H. Foster, Freeman, W. Va., in place of J. O. Blanton, retired.

Marguerite L. Hammett, Willow Island, W. Va., in place of H. C. Johnson, retired.

WISCONSIN

George E. Pronold, Genesee Depot, Wisc., in place of F. M. Kuehl, retired.

WYOMING

Charles G. Taylor, Pavillion, Wyo., in place of Ruth Newbrough, retired.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 10, 1963:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

William H. Orrick, Jr., of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 10, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I John 5: 4: *This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.*

Most merciful and gracious God, may our lives daily be nourished and strengthened by a greater faith in Thee to overcome the world with all its trials and tribulations.

Deliver us from those paralyzing fears and pygmy anxieties which so often beset us.

May we never be afraid to accept high standards and lofty principles.

Inspire us to live and labor for a social order which will mean health and happiness for all the members of the human family.

Grant that whatever is noble and best may never be suppressed and crowded out during these days when our poor confused world has so many desperate needs.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 6, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 5207) entitled "An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. AIKEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE LATE HONORABLE OTTO KRUEGER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT] is recognized.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, it is with deepest personal regret that I take this opportunity to announce to the Members of the House the death of a former colleague, Otto Krueger, three-term Representative from North Dakota. Otto Krueger, or Otto, as his friends called him, was one of those individuals who had a great faculty for making friends and there are many of his former colleagues and associates here in the Nation's Capital who will be deeply grieved by this news.

Former Congressman Krueger passed away at Lodi, Calif., on last Friday, June 6, in a Lodi hospital. He was 72 years old. He leaves his wife, Ella, and three daughters, Mrs. Glen Soule, of Bremerton, Wash.; Mrs. John Ranlett, of Sacramento, Calif.; and Miss Dorothy Krueger, of Lodi, Calif.

Congressman Krueger was an unusual individual. He was one of not too many Members of Congress born outside of the United States, and of perhaps particular significance at this time, he was born of German parents in Russia, on September 7, 1890. He attended grade and high school in Russian and German schools and immigrated to the United States in 1910 and settled at Fessenden, N. Dak.

Otto Krueger served as a private in the infantry of the U.S. Army during World War I, with oversea service in the 91st Division.

Upon his return from military service in 1919, he ran and was elected county auditor of Wells County, N. Dak. Beginning with 1920, he served 10 consecutive terms as county auditor of his home county. He moved up from county auditor to State treasurer for one term in 1945 and to State insurance commissioner from 1946 to 1951. He was State budget director in 1951 and 1952 and State treasurer of the North Dakota Republican Party from 1948 to 1952. Otto was endorsed to run for Congress by the Republicans of North Dakota in 1952. He was elected and served for three terms during the 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses.

Otto Krueger was a good, hard working and popular Congressman. Had he desired to do so he could easily have been reelected, but because of a heart condition, he decided to retire. It was this development in North Dakota politics which was responsible for my becoming a candidate for Congress, and subsequently being elected. I always consider Otto my predecessor and I have found it difficult to live up to the record he established in the Congress. On the Appropriations Committee and on the Agriculture Committee, Otto fought for a sound fiscal policy on the part of the Federal Government and for sound farm legislation that would give the farmer price protection, but not make him a ward of the Federal Government. I can well remember Otto's indignation at what he considered to be unnecessary and politically inspired expenditures of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, Otto Krueger was my personal friend as well as my associate in politics. It was with profound sorrow that I learned of his passing on last Friday. Words are always inadequate to properly express our feelings at a time such as this when we suddenly receive a telegram or phone call advising that one more friend has passed on.

My wife Edith and I wish to extend our sincere sympathy to Mrs. Krueger and her three daughters in this hour of loss.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members may have 5 legislative days to insert their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in connection with the death of our former colleague.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NYGAARD].

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, as a personal friend of former Congressman Krueger, I was very shocked to learn of his death on June 6.

It had been my great pleasure to know Otto Krueger prior to the time that he was elected commissioner of insurance in the State of North Dakota, a position that he held for 5½ years. During his tenure as insurance commissioner and my simultaneous service in the State legislature dealing with problems that confronted his department, Congressman Krueger was always a forthright public official, always willing to do what was right and fitting in the position which he held. I found Congressman Krueger was very well informed with his department and could at any given moment provide in detail any information that was required of him by the legislature or citizens who dealt with his department in their business affairs.

Congressman Krueger later was elected to serve in the Congress, a position which he held with distinction for three successive terms until his failing health caused him to retire.

Through his years of serving the people as an official in local, State, and Federal Governments, he won many friends and will be always remembered as an outstanding citizen and public official.

Mrs. Nygaard joins me in extending our condolences to Mrs. Krueger and his daughters, Mrs. Glen Soule, of Bremerton, Wash.; Mrs. John Ranlett, of Sacramento, Calif.; and Miss Dorothy Krueger, of Lodi, Calif. We know he will be missed by everyone with whom he came in contact.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to include an item that appeared in the Fargo Forum, Fargo, N. Dak., on June 7, 1963.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

OTTO KRUEGER SERVED STATE, NATION 38 YEARS

Former U.S. Representative Otto G. Krueger, Republican, of North Dakota, formerly of Fessenden, was a Russian immigrant who served 38 years in public office as a North Dakotan.

Representative Krueger, 72, died Thursday in Lodi, Calif., where he had lived since 1959 when he retired from the House of Representatives. He died in a Lodi hospital after a brief illness.

He also leaves a brother, Bernard, and a sister, Martha, in Russia. Another brother, Karl, lives in Fessenden.

Krueger's funeral will take place in Lodi. Lodi's First Baptist Church will direct the services.

Besides his wife, Ella, he leaves three daughters, Mrs. Glen Soule, of Bremerton, Wash.; Mrs. John Ranlett, of Sacramento, Calif.; and Dorothy, of Lodi.

Representative Krueger served nearly 20 years as auditor of Wells County, and served as income tax auditor, treasurer, insurance commissioner, and budget director for the State of North Dakota before serving three 2-year terms as a U.S. Representative from the State.

Representative Krueger said of North Dakota at the time he was elected to Congress. "I came here as a lad from a strange country. You took me into your schools and you gave me work.

"January 25, 1916, was the happiest day of my life, for that is when I swore allegiance to the United States.

"I accept the honor of your electing me to Congress with a humble heart. It can happen only in America and it did happen in Wells County and in North Dakota, where an immigrant was elected to such a high office as a Representative in the Congress of the United States."

Mr. Krueger took off his pants and waded across the Warte River in 1910 to leave Russia. He refused to take an oath of allegiance to the czar, which he would have had to do because he was about to be drafted into a military academy.

He arrived in the United States in 1910, and came to Fessenden, where a friend of his father lived.

In the fall of 1911 he entered grade school, beginning in the sixth grade, to learn the English language. He graduated from high school and attended a Fargo business college.

He acquired U.S. citizenship in the minimum time permissible and, providing he would go to war for that which he believed in, enlisted in the U.S. Army and served overseas in France and Belgium during World War I, including the St.-Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne offensives.

In 1920, he sought election for the first time as Wells County auditor. He was, in his words, trimmed in the primary.

But by time for the general election women were permitted to vote, and 145 feminine votes put him into office. Votes of men and women were put in separate ballot boxes at the time, and Representative Krueger tied with the men, but had a lead of 145 among women.

He was reelected 10 times, and resigned in 1940 to take the management of an Ellensburg, Wash., hotel.

His time away from public office in North Dakota was short however—he returned in 1941 to become an income tax auditor in the State tax commissioners office, where he worked 2½ years.

In 1944 he was the candidate for State treasurer of the Republican organizing committee, a faction of the North Dakota Republican Party. It was his first try for statewide office.

In the November general election he polled 103,338 votes, more than his three opponents combined.

He served as treasurer only 8 months, however, until Gov. Fred G. Aandahl named him State insurance commissioner to fill out the term of a man who died.

The insurance commissioner's office had been a turbulent one in times prior to Representative Krueger's appointment, and in some respects it continued as he prosecuted the North Dakota Farmers Union insurance companies for its handling of funds.

He lost his case in district court, but was vindicated in State supreme court. He was reelected to the insurance post in 1946 and 1948.

In 1950 he sought the nomination of the Republican organizing committee for the governorship of the State, but the party's nod went to C. Norman Brunsdale, who was subsequently elected. Representative Krueger accepted Brunsdale's appointment to the State budget director's post shortly after he (Brunsdale) took office.

Representative Krueger served until he was elected to the U.S. Congress in November of 1952.

In the June primary, Representative Krueger edged Orris G. Nordhougen of Leeds, N. Dak., for the nomination, 76,866 to 74,959. In the November election, he ran second on the ticket to the late Usher L. Burdick, 181,281, and 156,829.

Representative Krueger faced, and defeated Nordhougen again in 1954. He was reelected again in 1956, and in 1958 announced his retirement from political candidacy when his term officially ended, in the first days of 1959.

Representative Krueger's political conservatism became evident as a Member of the House of Representatives, where he was a particularly active critic of Federal spending programs.

Although he was, as many of his North Dakota congressional colleagues, never a fiery orator, his appointments, during his first term, to the key Agriculture and Appropriations Committees, were evidence that he was an effective Member of the U.S. Congress. He was 68 when he retired.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. BERRY. I want to join at this time with the Members of the congressional delegation from North Dakota in extending my deepest sympathies and condolences to the family of Otto Krueger. Probably no one in Congress knew Otto Krueger better than I, other than the Members from North Dakota. Because my home is only 8 miles from the North Dakota line and only 90 miles from the capital city of Bismarck. I had known Otto as a State official in the State of North Dakota long before he came to Congress.

The fact that he was an immigrant, the fact that he came to the United States and adopted this country as his own, the fact that he served in every level of government, is one of the things that made Otto an outstanding Member of Congress.

After the apartment known as "Shotts Alley," across the alley from the New Senate Office Building, was constructed, Mr. and Mrs. Otto Krueger moved in and lived in an apartment almost adjoining ours. They were good neighbors. I knew Otto Krueger as a good father and a good husband. I knew him as a good neighbor, and, having served with him for 6 years in the House of Representatives, I knew him as a true statesman in every sense of the word.

Mrs. Berry and I join with the other Members of this House in extending our sincere sympathy and condolences to the Krueger family on this occasion.

THE LATE WARD JOHNSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I also have the sad duty of announcing to the House the passing of a former colleague, the Honorable Ward Johnson, of Long Beach, who served so ably in this House during the 77th and 78th Congresses. He was taken last Saturday, June 8, by a heart seizure. Former Congressman Johnson leaves surviving him his widow, his two sons, George and Walter, and, amongst all who knew him, a fond admiration for his achievements, a lasting respect for his humaneness, and a deep gratitude for the inspiration of his exemplary character.

During Congressman Johnson's service in the House of Representatives the U.S. Navy grew from its meager prewar power to the mightiest fleet ever to sail and dominate the oceans of the world. As an active member of the Committee on Naval Affairs during these World War II years, Ward Johnson made more than his full share of contributions toward this magnificent accomplishment. He knew full well the value to our Nation of invincible seapower and strived tirelessly to bring it into being.

He was born in Brighton, Iowa, in 1892, and had early service in the National Guard, careers in business, banking, the publishing of newspapers, and in the law. Aside from his service in the House of Representatives, Ward Johnson found in his practice of the law one of his greatest satisfactions. He was both loved and admired by the members of his profession.

I wish to extend my most sincere condolences to his fine family. Their grief and loss can only be lightened by the knowledge it is shared by so many Members of the Congress and so very many other friends who find in his passing a deep sense of personal loss.

THE RECORD OF BPA AND PRIVATE POWER COMPANIES

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, recently the Secretary of the Interior signed an Executive order including southern Idaho in the Bonneville power-marketing area. Since that time officials and sponsors of the Idaho Power Co. have been putting on one of the greatest propaganda barrages in the history of the State to confuse the people and to discredit Bonneville Power.

One of their mair charges is that Bonneville Power may result in the elimination of the private power companies, and at the least will certainly do irreparable financial damage to them. As a great American once said—"Let's look at the record."

Electrical World, the management newsletter of the utility industry, on April 8, 1963, stated:

Last year was the best ever for utility net incomes. Based on a sampling of 142 companies representing roughly 95 percent of

the total electric revenues from the utility industry, net incomes showed a 10.02 percent net gain over 1961 as compared with a 5.4 percent gain in 1961 over 1960.

It is interesting to note that the four major private power companies in the Bonneville power marketing area all showed substantial increases in profit. These four major private power companies in Washington and Oregon showed a total increase of $4,998,000 over their 1961 profits. This represented a gain of 12.3 percent as compared with the 10 percent which the industry averaged nationally. However, the Idaho Power Co. showed a decrease of $812,000 from their 1961 profits or a loss of 8.4 percent. The following table shows the 1962 and 1962 incomes of the private power companies operating in the BPA area as compared with those of the Idaho Power Co.:

Major private power companies in BPA area

	Net income		Gain	
	1962	1961	Amount	Percent
Pacific Power & Light	$20,842,000	$18,076,000	$2,766,000	15.3
Portland General Electric	9,025,000	7,880,000	1,145,000	14.5
Puget Sound Power & Light	8,589,000	7,746,000	843,000	10.9
Washington Water Power	7,063,000	6,819,000	244,000	3.6
Total	45,519,000	40,521,000	4,998,000	12.3
Idaho Power Co	8,856,000	9,668,000	[1] (812,000)	[1] (8.4)

[1] Loss.

These facts easily answer the question: Is Bonneville Power destroying private power companies? Far from it. Through healthy competition and mutual cooperation with BPA the four major private power companies in Washington and Oregon are thriving and what is more important they have achieved this increase in net income while charging the consumers lower power rates than those charged by the Idaho Power Co. A family using a thousand kilowatt-hours of power would have paid the company that served them the following average monthly bill in 1962:

Power company:	*Monthly bill*
Portland General Electric	$10.30
Pacific Power & Light (Yakima)	10.63
Puget Sound Power & Light	10.95
Washington Water Power Co. (Spokane)	12.05
Idaho Power Co	14.15

While there has been increase in rates by the four private power companies serving in the BPA area this year and the rates will be the same as 1962 under the rate increase recently granted Idaho Power Co., their 1963 average rate to a family using a thousand kilowatt-hours would be $15.18.

So the private power companies in the BPA area not only had a 12-percent gain in profits last year as compared with Idaho Power Company's decrease of 8.4 percent but they accomplished this while charging their customers from $2.10 to $3.85 per family less each month.

I, for one, am hopeful that Bonneville Power company will have the same effect on private power companies in Idaho that it has had on them in Washington and Oregon—that is higher profits for the power company and its stockholders and lower rates for the power users.

However, this is not going to be accomplished just by wishing it to be so. Dollars spent for full-page newspaper advertisement attacking BPA are dollars that must be collected from the consumers through higher rates. Power company officials who are spending time traveling the State speaking against BPA are depriving their job of giving the power user the best possible service at the lowest possible cost of their full attention and talents.

I would urge these power company officials to put Idaho ahead of the Idaho Power Co. If they would stop to realize that what is best for Idaho is also best for the Idaho Power Co., then they will take a page from the book of their counterparts in Washington and Oregon who are competing and cooperating with, not attacking BPA. I am convinced that the inclusion of Southern Idaho in the BPA marketing area will then prove to be not only in the best interest of Idaho through a faster growing economy and lower power rates but will also be in the best interest of the Idaho Power Co., through higher profits. That has been the record of BPA—private power company competition and cooperation in Oregon and Washington.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and that Mr. AVERY and others desiring to do so may extend their remarks immediately following.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include a Memorial Day address delivered by an American on British soil. It is as eloquent as it is brief. In 221 words, chosen as flowers from a garden, it epitomizes the spirit of patriotism and the sentiment of living remembrance of America's heroic deed.

The occasion was Memorial Day in the British island of Bermuda and the speaker was Col. Bing Morris, affectionately remembered by many Members of the Congress as a former manager of the Congressional Hotel in Washington. Colonel Morris is now the manager of the beautiful Carlton Beach Hotel in Bermuda, an American-operated unit of Hotel Corp. of America.

Bing Morris is one of many Americans whose work takes them to foreign soil. This fact does not—and as Colonel Morris points out, should not—deter them from remembering that they are Americans, and from observing those ceremonies that are significant and important to Americans.

Thus, on Memorial Day this year, Bermudians—British subjects—were treated to the stirring sight of a special flag lowering ceremony by and for Americans on that British island. The ceremony was conducted jointly with Bermuda's own American Legion post, and the flag was one that had flown over the Capitol in Washington. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the flag for this memorable observation of an American holiday on British soil was sent to Bing Morris by his long-time friend, the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Bing Morris' Memorial Day address follows:

My friends, when I was a boy, Memorial Day was called Decoration Day and it honored the dead of the War Between the States. There was always a great parade of prancing horses, brass bands, and the legendary 76 trombones. In the town square or on the city hall steps there was the oration by a local political dignitary, who generally referred to the thinning ranks of the boys in Blue and Gray. There are no longer survivors of the Blue and Gray days, and Decoration Day is now Memorial Day. For those of us who are Americans on foreign soil, there are two reasons that make it imperative that we recognize this holiday. One reason is that there is hardly an American anywhere in the world who did not suffer the loss of a loved one or a friend in our last wars. The other reason is that it is not unreasonable to consider that the doctrines of Americanism proudly reside in our hearts wherever in the world we may be, and for whatever reasons take us beyond the borders of the United States. I thank my fellow Americans, our visitors from other nations, and our Bermuda friends for giving us their time and attention, and above all, my thanks to the Bermuda Post of the American Legion for their kind assistance.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me, requested by my colleague from Illinois, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, I want to express my personal appreciation for the fine representation that my good friend is performing for the United States in Bermuda. I am referring, of course, to Bing Morris.

Bing Morris is very well known to many Members of the House, as he was manager of the Congressional Hotel for the Knott Corp. I question whether there is a citizen in the continental limits of the United States who has a greater love for his country and enjoys citizenship privileges as much as does Bing Morris.

Even though his profession presently requires him to be out of the country, his loyalties and thoughts are ever with the United States. It was my privilege to provide a flag that had flown over the U.S. Capitol to him for a special display in Bermuda on Memorial Day. Not only was this flag properly and prominently displayed, but at each table in the large

dining room of the Carlton Beach Hotel a special memorandum was placed to note that the particular flag did fly over the Capitol Building of the United States.

His friendship has long been a source of great satisfaction to me, and his love and affection for the United States and her principles should be an inspiration for every American.

TRIBUTE TO MARSHALL WISE, FORMER DIRECTOR OF CUBAN REFUGEE CENTER

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a dedicated and able public servant, Marshall Wise, the director of the Cuban Refugee Emergency Center in Miami, Fla., since March 9, 1961, has recently resumed his previous position as Director of the Miami Social Security Office.

On March 7, 1961, he was requested to assume the position of director of the Cuban Refugee Emergency Center with the understanding that it would probably be a 60- to 90-day assignment. This temporary assignment has stretched into a period of more than 2 years.

As director of the Cuban refugee program, he was faced with the difficult task of organizing a program to handle thousands upon thousands of refugees arriving daily, in many cases without family or friends and with little or no knowledge of the English language. He was called upon to provide them with, among other things, food, housing, clothing, medical care, jobs, job retraining, resettlement opportunities, and education for both the children and the adults.

Never before in the history of our country have refugees from oppression arrived upon our shores in such numbers, and never before have so many thousand refugees congregated in one metropolitan area.

The Greater Miami area, with a population of about 1 million, has had to absorb approximately 200,000 Cuban refugees. No community could withstand the almost immediate impact of a 15 to 20 percent increase in population without skillful leadership and Federal assistance. The situation was worsened by the fact that there already existed in Dade County, Fla., a serious unemployment problem—so much so that the U.S. Department of Labor and the Area Redevelopment Administration had long ago found that there was a sufficient number of unemployed American citizens to qualify Dade County as a class D labor surplus market area.

There existed no precedent upon which one could predicate a sound program. Therefore, to the newly appointed director and his small staff fell the entire burden of establishing a workable refugee program.

The vast majority of the refugees had to be given a basic course in the English language. Headquarters had to be secured for the various phases of the operation. Food distribution centers had to be established. Unaccompanied children had to be placed. Children had to be located in the public and parochial school systems. Problems of overcrowding, language barriers, and educational cost factors had to be overcome. Medical centers had to be established; cooperation with immigration and security activities had to be set up and maintained; proper and adequate housing facilities secured, medical attention for the ill and aged, and a myriad of other services far too numerous to enumerate were necessary.

He had to immediately set up an effective liaison for many agencies of the Federal Government including HEW, Department of Labor, Immigration and Naturalization, Public Health Service, the Office of Education, the State Department ,the Justice Department, Central Intelligence Agency, and others. Liaison had to be established with the Florida Department of Public Welfare, with the Dade County Public Health Department, and the Dade County public school system, local and county governments and with citizens' groups. Close cooperation had to be maintained with the University of Miami concerning professional refresher courses.

Close cooperation also was necessary with various chambers of commerce throughout the Nation; with the various trade, professional and civic associations, such as the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, AFL–CIO, American Bar Association, Kiwanis, Rotary, Lions, junior chamber of commerce, and others.

Close liaison had to be established with the Catholic Relief Services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Church World Services of the National Council of Churches, the Hebrew Immigrants Aid Society, International Rescue Committee, and the American Red Cross.

Tribute should be paid to the close working relationship which Mr. Wise has established with the Bishop of the Catholic Diocese of Miami which carried a principal share of the burden during the first year of the refugee exodus from Communist Cuba and still continues to bear an overly large part of the cost.

Close liaison had to be maintained with police and juvenile authorities, though credit should be given to the Cuban people for their actions have caused little, if any, problems in this regard. The refugees are worthy of the highest commendation, and with few notable exceptions the entire Cuban refugee group conducted itself peacefully and orderly as its members sought to find their place in a new community.

Many refugee organizations with varied views and objectives formed. It is a tribute to Mr. Wise's direction that he was able to maintain complete harmony at all times in his dealings and associations with these groups.

Through the efforts of Mr. Wise and his staff in cooperation with the various volunteer groups, over 60,000 Cuban refugees have been resettled throughout the United States. The resettlement program has received many favorable endorsements from communities which have accepted refugee families.

A brief description of how the Cuban Refugee Center operates and the complex nature of its administration as well as its broad area of responsibility will vividly demonstrate the very heavy responsibility laid on Marshall Wise's shoulders.

The Cuban Refugee Center, Freedom Tower, 600 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla., is the focal point for Cuban refugee registration, resettlement and relief activities. It also coordinates the Federal Government's program of aid to Cuban refugees under a broad directive from President John F. Kennedy. The Federal program is supervised by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony J. Celebrezze.

At work in the center are representatives of voluntary agencies experienced in resettling refugees in homes and jobs, in communities across the United States. The national organizations they serve have for many years resettled refugees who have come to the United States from many countries. All these organizations are members of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies. Represented at the center are: Catholic Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference; Church World Service, Protestant; United HIAS Service, Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society; and International Rescue Committee, nonsectarian.

The U.S. Employment Service, Department of Labor, also represented in the center, promotes job opportunities for qualified employable refugees, provides identification of the work experience of refugees, conducts aptitude tests and cooperates with the resettlement agencies in finding employment opportunities.

Cuban refugees, after registration at the center, are interviewed and classified as to job skills, number of employables in the family, friends, or relatives in the United States, and desired voluntary agency assistance. The processing procedure is as follows:

First. Reception and registration.

Second. Interview and classification.

Third. U.S. Employment Service interview for employable persons.

Fourth. Medical examination and X-ray.

Fifth. Voluntary agency interview for relocation and resettlement.

Sixth. Red Cross—for personal articles distribution.

Seventh. Florida State Welfare Department—for financial assistance, if necessary; also child welfare department, if necessary.

Eighth. Surplus food distribution.

Each refugee receives a medical examination following registration and before being interviewed by representatives of the resettlement agencies. The U.S. Public Health Service, working through the Dade County Public Health Department, provides supervision of the dispensary. In addition to a general health examination, each refugee receives a chest X-ray and inoculations prescribed by the attending physician.

Outpatient care for minor needs is provided by the dispensary. Treatment of serious or chronic conditions is available

through an outpatient program. Needs that cannot be met by the dispensary are referred to hospitals of their choice, such as Jackson Memorial, St. Francis, Mercy, Mount Sinai, and Gesu Medical Clinic—an arm of Mercy and St. Francis. A minimal fee is paid by the Center for each visit. Eligibility is restricted to those qualifying for cash assistance grants under the program described on a later page.

The American Red Cross has distributed personal kits to newly arrived refugees since the start of the refugee program.

Certification slips for used clothing issued by the voluntary agencies are redeemable at several church depots in the Miami area. Supplies of clothing have been received from New York and other cities serving as collection centers for clothing drives.

Under Federal auspices, broad scale aid for Cuban refugees in the United States began late in 1960 when, after a review of the situation, President Eisenhower inaugurated a program to deal with the most urgent needs.

Subsequently, President Kennedy recognized the Cuban refugee problem as one of national responsibility and beyond the means and scope of the individual States or the combined efforts of voluntary agencies. Accordingly, on January 27, 1961, the President issued a formal instruction to the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham Ribicoff, saying, in part:

> I want you to make concrete my concern and sympathy for those who have been forced from their homes in Cuba and to assure them that we shall seek to expedite their voluntary return as soon as conditions there facilitate that.

After a further personal evaluation of the refugee problem in the Miami area, a comprehensive program was formulated by the HEW Secretary, who assigned the Social Security Commissioner to coordinate the efforts of all Federal agencies affected by the President's directive. In January 1963, the Cuban refugee relief program was placed under the newly constituted Welfare Administration—Dr. Ellen Winston, Commissioner of Welfare. Director of the Cuban refugee program, based in Washington, is John Frederick Thomas.

By Presidential authority, $5 million had been allocated to the support of cooperative programs relating to the health, education, and welfare of Cuban refugees in the United States, for the period ending June 30, 1961. These funds were part of the money appropriated by Congress to the Mutual Security Contingency Fund and they represent the first expenditure of such funds within the continental borders of the United States.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the program was carried out with $38.5 million made available under authorities in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. On June 28, 1962, Public Law 87-510—Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962—was enacted which provided a legislative base for assistance to Cuban and other refugees from nations of the Western Hemisphere, and authorized appropriations for such assistance. Funds appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, amounted to $70,110,000.

Besides the Federal, State, and local agencies, support for the refugees has come from private firms and individuals as well as from educational, religious, cultural, and philanthropic agencies. All their efforts symbolize the President's personal concern and attest to his leadership in promoting the welfare of the refugees.

Through agreements with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Federal funds are being used to administer a wide variety of programs:

Operation of the Cuban Refugee Center and the maintenance of records.

Resettlement of refugee families in communities offering employment opportunities.

A transitional grant to resettling refugees who receive public assistance in Miami at the time of their resettlement—$100 for a family, $60 for an individual.

Financial assistance to needy families in the Miami area and to resettled families in other areas.

Consultations and advisory services to voluntary agencies with contractual responsibilities.

Hospitalization and medical care for the sick.

The care and protection of unaccompanied children.

Distribution of surplus food commodities to needy refugees.

Emergency welfare services for American nationals repatriated from Cuba.

Educational loans to needy and deserving Cuban students enrolled in American colleges and universities.

An adult education program, as well as an elementary and secondary education program for refugee children.

The retraining of refugee physicians, attorneys, and other professionals.

The establishment and operation of a Cuban refugee research project.

The Florida State Department of Public Welfare is the principal contract agency for administering immediate relief to the refugees in the form of financial assistance, child welfare services, and in the distribution of surplus food commodities. Professional social workers interview and screen the refugees and certify their eligibility to receive monthly financial assistance checks—a maximum of $100 per family and $60 per single case—and inhospital care for acute illness. Child welfare specialists in the Center look after the welfare and education of unaccompanied refugee children.

Through an agreement between the Florida State Department of Public Welfare and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, surplus Federal food commodities are distributed to needy families; this distribution is in addition to other grants-in-aid.

Beside the public and private welfare agencies, aid to the refugees is administered by organizations representing the principal religious faiths of the refugees.

Late in 1959 the Catholic diocese of Miami opened the Centro Hispano Catolico to serve the needs of refugees arriving from Cuba as well as from other Latin American countries. The centro's services include medical outpatient care, food, and used clothing distribution, and home visits for the sick.

The Catholic Welfare Bureau of Miami provides a variety of other services to refugees on referral from the Centro Hispano Catolico or from the Catholic relief offices in the center.

The Protestant Latin Refugee Center was established by the Protestant Latin American Emergency Committee to supplement the assistance given through the Federal program.

Jewish refugees from Cuba receive various forms of assistance from the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, a national organization.

Hardship cases are helped at eight denominational centers.

Refugees with technical skills and professional training receive special consideration. Lawyers, doctors, and engineers are being retrained to fit them for professional service in the United States; most of the retraining work is carried on with Federal aid by the University of Miami.

Cuban college and university students may receive education grants enabling them to resume their studies in the United States. Applications to university registrars are processed through the Office of Education, an agency of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I have hastily sketched the operations of the Cuban Refugee Center. But even this cursory rundown shows that successful operation under Marshall Wise is solid attestation of his excellent work.

An able administrator, a tireless worker, a dedicated public servant, a great humanitarian, are all words descriptive of Marshall Wise. They bear repeating. His efforts have gained recognition throughout not only the United States and the Western Hemisphere but all of the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

I welcome the opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. Wise which were delivered in his speech to the Downtown Rotary Club of Miami, Fla., on May 2, 1963. In it you will find the heart, courage, and talent of an outstanding public officer who deserves credit and recognition for a job well done. Accordingly, I am privileged to deliver his remarks to you:

> A little over 2 years ago—when I first came to this job—people in the community told me we were sitting on a powder keg that might blow up any minute. Eighteen months ago, when I last spoke to this group, I was told the same thing. All during the last 12 months, and once again during the Pepper-Fascell hearings, I heard local labor leaders and other concerned individuals voice the same cry.
>
> However, from where I sit, and from what I see, I've never believed these cries, and right here today I want to say to you, as members of the leading civic organization in this community, that we have not been, and we are not now sitting on a powder keg because of the Cuban refugees living in our midst.
>
> I am really not here to educate you. I bring you information which I hope will enable you to educate yourselves, if that is your desire.

I am not here to plead the special cause of the Cuban refugee, or to defend those who are defenseless. I bring you facts, not fiction, which I hope will enable you to decide whether their cause is a just one, and is deserving of your understanding and active support.

The moment the Cuban crisis erupted recently, Fidel Castro slammed the door through which thousands of Cubans had been fleeing their land since 1959. Planes which had been flying out more than 6,400 Cubans a month, for 19 months, were ordered to halt operations. An estimated 350,000 Cubans—many of whom had already paid for their passage and were waiting only for plane space—were locked in by the ban on emigration.

To be cut off from freedom—especially when freedom lies only a few tantalizing miles away—is a tragic fact of life affecting millions today in many parts of the globe. The tragedy is heightened when families are split—half in freedom, half behind walls. Many Cuban families, both inside and outside their native land, are suffering the agony which is so widespread in the world today.

I'm not going to repeat all the criticisms and complaints about the refugee influx that you've read in our local newspapers, or heard from your well-meaning neighbors and friends, or, may have actually been said by you, yourselves. Most of those I've read or heard, are based on pure fiction and prejudice—not upon hard, cold, facts.

It has been written and said that Cuban refugees are taking jobs away from needy Americans, and lowering the wage rates in Miami and south Florida. I'm sure that some of this has taken place, but the hard cold facts, available to all of you in the reports made by the Florida State Employment Service, the recent special survey on unemployment in Dade County conducted by the U.S. Department of Labor, the First Research Corp., and other professional fact-finding bodies, proves conclusively that these inflammatory statements just can't be proved.

It has been written and said that the influx of Cuban refugees was increasing the crime rate in our communities, yet the official report of the Miami Police Department, released just a few months ago, says that although the crime rate during the past 3 years has increased in Miami—and here I quote from the report—"Cubans were not a problem in the crimes reported on by the department." Lt. Tom Lipe, in making the report, said, "Cubans are good citizens as far as we are concerned."

It has been written and said that the influx of Cuban refugees would ruin south Florida's tourist industry. Yet industry reports show that 1962 was the best tourist year we ever experienced, and right now the tourist industry tells us that 1963 is going to be better than 1962.

It has been written and said that the influx of Cuban refugees would create slums and depress the real estate market. The most recent reports from the Miami Housing Authority, Area Redevelopment officials, the Mortgage Bankers Association, the Real Estate Appraisal Association and the Federal Housing Administration all agree that although there is an overcrowding situation no slums have been created and the real estate market, instead of being depressed, has been greatly helped by the influx of refugees into the area.

It has been written and said that the refugee influx would ruin our school system and slow up the education of our own children. The facts are available to all of you and you can get them by talking to the superintendent of schools, or any of the other responsible officials of the Dade County school system. You'll learn from them that there has been, and still is heavy overcrowding, but that the quality of the Cuban students and the $9 million of Federal funds that has been given to help with the problem has really improved, rather than hurt, the school system.

And finally, it has been written and said that "they are using all our welfare funds to help the Cubans instead of the needy Americans." The truth is that no Dade County or Florida State funds have ever been used for this purpose. More than $80 million of purely Federal funds, contributed in taxes by all the people of the United States including you and me, have been used to give these needy refugees asylum, safety and minimum subsistence in the greatest democracy the world has ever known.

The hard, cold facts, and the real truth of the situation, as stated by competent local officials in recent public hearings is that we in Dade County really don't have assistance programs that are worthy of the name. Although Federal funds have been and are now available on a 3-to-1 matching basis for staff, and equal matching basis for general assistance—this means that for every dollar we are willing to appropriate and spend for general assistance the Federal Government will give us $3 for staff employment and a matching dollar for assistance payments—notwithstanding the fact that such an offer remains open to us we cannot seem to get our own elected representatives to provide the $1 that will automatically bring us matching funds to help the needy Americans in our own communities get back on their feet again.

Let's take a quick, short look at some of the plus factors, at some of the good that has resulted in the exodus of the Cuban refugee fleeing from communism, tyranny, and oppression to asylum, safety, and democracy in the Miami area.

1. I contend that the culture of this area has advanced to a point it would have taken another 10 years to reach without this impact.

2. Miami has been striving for many years to establish its right to the title "Gateway to the Americas," and I can't believe that anyone in North, Central, or South America would now attempt to dispute that claim.

3. All of the people of Latin and South America, and islands of the Caribbean are completely aware of the tolerance, hospitality, understanding, and welcome that the citizens of the Miami area have extended to the Cuban refugee.

4. Just think how our schoolteachers, church people, policemen, government agencies, salespeople, service trades, civic organizations, hotel people, and many of our citizens have learned to speak Spanish in order to deal with, serve, and host our Spanish-speaking exiles and guests. The progress we've made in this area alone will bring us cultural, as well as economic rewards, for all the remaining years of our lives.

5. Our churches and temples have found a rallying point and popular cause, and have greatly strengthened their ties as a result.

6. All our educational and cultural discussion groups have benefited tremendously by their association with the Cuban exiles, and as a result have learned much, in such a short time, about communism and how it works.

7. We're becoming world famous for our "Operation Amigo" project, and the Cuban refugee provided the bridge of understanding and stimulating spark which advanced the program.

Let's just look at the positive aspects of a few highlights you may not have thought about before:

1. Our public school system, although overburdened and badly crowded now, is being assisted by Federal expenditures to accelerate its rate of growth because of this heavy refugee load. When the refugee impact disappears, as it will in the not too distant furture, we'll be just that much further advanced and better able to provide for the future expansion that must come to care for our future normal growth.

2. The success of Interama as a permanent trade fair is a foregone conclusion, because we've proven to all the countries of Latin America that Miami is a host city to the Spanish-speaking world, without a peer to be found anywhere.

3. And last, but by no means least, the tremendous expenditure of Federal funds in this area, more than $36 million last year, and somewhere in the neighborhood of $70 million this year, has bolstered Miami's sagging economy during a time which could have been one of depression and retrogression without such a dollar flow.

Miami, an area whose economic bloodstream is fed and nourished by tourist visitors, has always been happy to welcome the "refugee" from the North who is fleeing from the cold weather.

Up to this time, the great majority of Miamians have also welcomed and tolerated the influx of refugees from Cuba, who are basically fleeing from communism and oppression.

However, we are seeing a small minority begin to resent this influx. We are beginning to hear them say, "America for Americans," and, "Miami for Miamians."

Maybe we should remind them that almost everyone in Miami is from somewhere else, and that America has grown great because of its willingness to provide honest opportunities for immigrants and refugees.

Maybe we should remind them that we welcome the Cuban refugee because the bloodstream philosophy of America is inscribed on our Statue of Liberty, a statue which is known to the rest of the world as; "The Mother of Exiles."

Maybe we should rededicate ourselves to these words:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me."

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on the rollcall vote on Thusrday on the bill, H.R. 6754, the agricultural appropriation bill, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PAN AMERICAN JET ALL-CARGO CLIPPERS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have spent a very interesting hour and a half this morning at Dulles International Airport inspecting the new Pan American all-cargo jet clipper. My purpose in mentioning this matter to Members of the House is that I consider the process of transporting air freight as developed by Pan American Airlines to be of significant value to the commercial and defense interests of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, should a cold war crisis erupt somewhere in the world and America's armed might called into action, men and equipment must be moved at

jet speed across continents and oceans. At such a time, the Pan American cargo jet would serve as a frontline reserve element in the free world's defenses. For example, Pan Am's jet freighter fleet—representing a private investment of nearly $60 million—would provide the fastest means of transport for large volumes of military cargo to most of the world's critical areas in times of emergency.

Committed to the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, Pan Am's eight freighters on routes between Air Force bases in California and Hawaii could carry nearly 19 million pounds per week of essential military supplies, such as rations, hospital equipment and medicines, military vehicles, and weapon components. Alternately, in all-passenger configurations, they could move 43,780 troops per week on the same routes. In mixed configurations, 109 personnel and nearly 30 tons of freight could be carried on one aircraft.

This important ability to transport quickly men and supplies is due in part to Pan American's palletized preloading system. This system provides a method by which cargo is assembled according to destination, loaded, and secured to pallets immediately upon arrival at the airport cargo terminal. Pallets are completely loaded and placed on a cargo train ready for hoisting into the cargo clipper immediately after it taxis to the cargo terminal.

It is possible, therefore, under this process, for the world's largest air transport to be completely loaded in 1 hour. Or, in other words, 40 tons of freight could cross the Atlantic in a 6½-hour flight—and then be unloaded in another hour ready for the return trip with an additional hour for reloading. This means that time saved in flight is not lost on the ground.

Mr. Speaker, in an equally important area, the Pan American new jet cargo freighter will be a stimulant to American international marketing. Used in connection with Pan Am's worldwide marketing service, the latter having opened new markets abroad to some 3,000 American firms, the jet clipper will be able to serve more businessmen who desire to operate overseas. As a matter of fact, in 16 days one of these new jet freighters could carry between the United States and Europe the entire tonnage of cargo hauled across the Atlantic by Pan American during all of 1952, a year in which the airline led the airfreight industry.

Thus, with a record of operating over 100 million ton-miles of cargo each year and with prospects of increasing Pan American's total freight 25 percent for the coming year, the jet cargo clippers with their new methods of loading will greatly enhance America's commercial and defense interests throughout the world.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, an invitation has been issued by Pan American to all Members of this body to inspect their new aircraft and its loading system in an effort to demonstrate their tremendous significance to this country. A plane will be at Dulles International Airport all of today and helicopter service is available. If Members will contact my office, arrangements can be made for them to see this most important jet clipper.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes following proceedings today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday, June 17, following the legislative program of the day, and the disposition of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ADMINISTRATION TO DO NOTHING ABOUT BURNING OF MILITARY MISSION OFFICES IN CARACAS

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, last week a Communist mob burned the U.S. military mission offices in Caracas, Venezuela, desecrated the American flag, destroyed valuable documents, and showed the world their contempt for the power and prestige of this Nation.

The report on the incident of the complete takeover of our military mission offices in Caracas is appalling.

Even more appalling is the report that our own State Department does not intend to protest this action to the Venezuelan Government, as they feel Venezuela will take all action necessary. Since when have we left the decision of action to be taken by us to the government of the foreign country? The whole purpose of our guards is to protect our interest and the duty of our State Department is to take immediate action against such attacks when occurring.

If I am correct in my thinking the sole purpose for our retaining guards at our foreign missions is to defend takeover or prevent assaults on the properties and materials maintained in foreign countries. Assuming this to be the purpose let us analyze the Caracas incident. We maintain guards throughout the world at a tremendous cost to the taxpayers—amounting to many millions of dollars a year—to defend our rights at the cost of their lives if necessary. They are aware of their duties and sworn to uphold them upon assignment. They are adequately armed with training to use the weapons at their command. In brief they are the United States of America, not six, eight, or whatever number of soldiers happen to be involved.

They should have been under orders to defend their positions at any cost. This is the price we must pay, if necessary, if we are to uphold the honor of our country and continue to demand the respect of the rest of the world established by our founders and perpetuated throughout our history until recently when our leadership seems to have changed from that of patriotic red-blooded Americans to a lot of international do-gooders more intent on appeasement of those who would destroy us than to stand firm and defend our heritage as passed on by our forefathers.

I am confident our foreign policy, as carried out under the New Frontier, is not what the overwhelming majority of Americans would pursue given a chance to formulate it according to their beliefs. I am further confident it is not a policy any citizen, instilled in good sound Americanism, could look to with pride.

Never in the history of our country have we been so often humiliated both at home and abroad as we have since the New Frontier took command.

There must be an end put to our sacrificing the honor of our country through weak leadership, appeasement, and infiltration of high offices by the "one-worlders" who put the welfare of our Nation secondary.

If the guards we have assigned to protect American interest abroad are in fact not permitted by orders to do so then why should the American taxpayer be saddled with this tremendous extra burden of maintaining them overseas? If they are not to defend our missions when attacked, and this is a clear indication they are not, then why have them there to be humiliated and further humiliate this great United States of America by such incidents? A lock on the door would have given more resistance at a far less expense. I say either give them the authority to defend to their last round or bring them home.

Let me say here this in no way is meant as a reflection on our military men. I feel confident given authority they would have defended to the last man the assault on that or any other mission were they permitted to do so. They are the best soldiers in the world because they believe in America and the Constitution upon which it was founded. Let us act as a nation to uphold this belief and cease selling America down the road to destruction by our so-called internationalists. Now is the time to act, and act forcefully, leaving no question to the rest of the world but what we will defend the rights of America and the principles upon which it was founded wherever challenged.

Weakness by officials of the U.S. Government only invites further attack by those nations who underestimate the courage and patriotism of American citizens.

THE PRESIDENT SHOULD STAY HOME

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, two articles in the papers over the weekend seem to me to contain very sound advice to our President. Mr. Eldon Griffiths, of London, wrote in the Washington Post on Saturday, June 8, a column entitled "Kennedy Should Stay Home," and the widely read Columnist John M. Hightower's article Saturday in the Washington Evening Star was entitled "Kennedy Trip Seen a Gamble."

Their very cogent and timely arguments coincide with my own views. This certainly does not seem to be an opportune time for the President to go to Europe. Italy has both her religious and political problems at this time; Germany is just in the throes of changing government leadership, and England has an unsavory political mess with the possibility of Prime Minister Macmillan being replaced by his own party. Also, our homefront is not without its complicated and harassing problems which are worthy of the President's obvious and unremitting efforts. So, I hope the alarming and embarrassing situations in the Western Hemisphere and in the United States will persuade the President to remain at home until he can travel abroad without leaving behind more unsolved, pressing situations than now exist.

The two articles referred to follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 8, 1963]

KENNEDY SHOULD STAY HOME

(By Eldon Griffiths)

LONDON.—A noisy debate is under way in Washington over President Kennedy's projected visit to Europe. This is a view from Europe: The President should stay at home.

The original purpose of his trip was to recover the American initiative, seized by French President Charles de Gaulle when he vetoed the New Frontier's grand design for Atlantic partnership. By making public appearances in Italy and Germany, Mr. Kennedy hopes to demonstrate that his Atlantic conception is vastly to be preferred to De Gaulle's narrower conception of a self-sufficient Europe.

He is also expecting to do some discreet lobbying on behalf of U.S. farmers who want a guaranteed share of the European market and for his multilateral NATO deterrent which is running into heavy water. If anyone can sell the Europeans on these projects, Mr. Kennedy thinks he can.

Unfortunately, the political context in which the President's visit was conceived has changed beyond recognition. Mr. Kennedy can still be sure that his welcome would be warm in Italy, tumultuous in Germany and a sensation in Ireland. But there are two decisive reasons why he postpone his trip. The first is that the governments of Europe are in a state of flux. The second is that the racial problem in America requires the President to stay at the helm in Washington.

The European objections to a visit at this time can be seen in every capital. Mr. Kennedy has not been invited to Paris. He has no plans to meet the most important man on the continent. He cannot, therefore, discuss the most vital problem in the Western alliance—the lack of confidence between himself and De Gaulle.

West Germany, by contrast, would entertain him royally. But with whom can the President get down to brass tacks? Konrad Adenauer will be glad to see him—but Adenauer is a lame duck, scheduled to retire in August. Nor can Ludwig Erhardt, his heir-apparent, speak with real authority. As yet, he cannot commit Germany on any issue of capital importance.

A similar climate of uncertainty pervades Italy. The new Pope, if there is one by the time Mr. Kennedy is due to arrive, will not be in any position to exchange anything more than formalities. And the same goes for the Premier-designate Aldo Moro, who is eager to win the leftwing Socialists' forbearance toward a center cabinet. Moro can do little more than shake the President's hand.

In Dublin, of course, it would be different. And Harold Macmillan is sure to be delighted by the change in the President's plans which will permit a 2-day stopover in Britain. But here, too, there is a drawback. The Labor opposition is likely to charge Mr. Kennedy with trying to help the Tories, and in addition, the British Government has not made up its mind on the central issue between the United States and Britain—the mixed-manned deterrent. Whitehall will be embarrassed if the President sought to sell this concept in person.

It is the racial problem in America that is the most compelling reason why the President should call off his trip. The summer months are likely to be a time of mounting tension. Impatience among the extremists on both sides would easily trigger mass rioting in the South. Heat waves in Detroit and Harlem, coupled with the letting-out of schools, could lead to violence in the North.

At such a delicate moment, when the United States is confronting profound domestic emergencies, ordinary Americans are bound to look to the President, and the President alone, for a lead. They are bound to feel that his place is not in Rome or Dublin. It is in Washington, D.C.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 8, 1963]

KENNEDY TRIP SEEN A GAMBLE

(By John M. Hightower)

President Kennedy has committed himself to a personal venture in allied diplomacy this month which holds greater risk of failure than promise of success.

But as high administration officials assess the outlook this weekend, the gamble is one that had to be taken. In their view, cancellation of Mr. Kennedy's plans to visit Italy and Germany would have produced a worse failure than any which the President risks by making the trip.

The decision anounced by Mr. Kennedy to visit Prime Minister Macmillan seems to raise the hazards with the certain prospect that Mr. Kennedy will become directly involved in the British struggle for power between Mr. Macmillan and Labor Party Leader Harold Wilson.

SCANDAL ROCKS BRITAIN

The struggle itself, meanwhile, is being intensified by angry outcries over the sex and security scandal which has rocked the Macmillan government.

The explanation offered in high administration quarters for Mr. Kennedy's offer to see Mr. Macmillan is that the Prime Minister had urged him not to bypass London on his flying tour around the borders of France.

Administration officials are acutely aware that while plans for the President's trip have been buffeted by the winds of adversity, French President Charles de Gaulle has displayed the image of a major European ally standing calm and confident amid a tempest of politics and diplomacy. The contrast is striking.

But administration officials consider the contrast misleading. Many, indeed, regard General de Gaulle's unruffled calm less as a product of strength than as a cover of the semi-isolation into which his plans have been put by his European neighbors.

SEEKS NUCLEAR SUPPORT

Some of Mr. Kennedy's must influential advisers insist that the President does not seek any concrete results from his trip. But the impression is strong that he would certainly welcome agreements with Mr. Macmillan and West German Chancellor Adenauer in support of his proposal for a jointly owned and manned allied navy armed with nuclear missiles.

It seems likely that one of the real reasons Mr. Kennedy decided to visit Mr. Macmillan was to try to get some parallel to the understanding already achieved with West Germany on setting up such a force.

But the nuclear force proposal has several strikes against it. While General de Gaulle cannot veto it as he vetoed Britain's bid for the Common Market last January, he can and has argued that it would be only an extension of U.S. power and not a real European force.

Furthermore, there is widespread dissatisfaction with the plan in Europe, including Britain. Many European military experts have argued it is costly and would be vulnerable to Soviet destruction.

Whether Mr. Kennedy's strong personal popularity, demonstrated when he visited Paris and Vienna and London in 1961, can overcome popular and military antagonism to the nuclear force plan is a serious question. Nevertheless the President clearly intends to make the try.

But the real reason for going through with the trip seems to be that Mr. Kennedy and his advisers felt a cancellation or major postponement would have had bad results throughout Europe and shown weakening allied unity to the Communist world as well.

The President was reluctant to include England because he did not want to be drawn into British politics nor did he wish to appear to be encircling General de Gaulle. In the end, however, Mr. Macmillan's insistence was overriding.

During the past 2 weeks, it was learned, the two men exchanged about a dozen messages on a great range of subjects.

PRESIDENT REENTERS THE TEST BAN UNILATERAL MORATORIUM TRAP

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the President's promise this morning not to test in the atmosphere unless someone else does, namely the Russians, amounts to no more than giving Premier Khrushchev the power to decide when and under what circumstances the United States will conduct tests.

This is hardly an advantageous situation.

It is most certainly a soft line.

The entire history of negotiation with the Communists shows that nothing is accomplished by soft positions. Only by taking a hard, demanding line can results be expected.

Going hat in hand to Moscow to beg for test ban treaty will prove fruitless.

It could prove dangerous to the national security.

I can conclude only that the President and his speech writers want a test ban treaty, but do not know how to bargain with the Russians to get it. Or, that they do understand Kremlin psychology, do not want a treaty and are taking the steps necessary not to get it.

A far better course would be:

First. Withdraw from negotiation the present draft comprehensive test ban treaty proposal.

Second. Place a definite time limit on our present draft treaty proposal for an atmospheric test ban treaty.

Third. At the end of the time limit, assuming the Soviets still are stalling, issue an invitation to all nuclear nations to sit down and write a simple fallout limitation treaty.

Details regarding a fallout limitation treaty will be found in my remarks of June 5 at page 10209 of the RECORD.

ARA IN THE SUGARBEET BUSINESS

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I should suppose that after a number of years of service in this Congress, there would be few things that could amaze me in the field of bureaucratic blundering. There are times when many of us become weary of calling these inconsistencies to the attention of our people. But I have for your consideration today what I consider one of the most glaring lapses of good thinking that has crossed my desk for some time. It concerns an instance where the Area Redevelopment Administration has entered the sugarbeet growing business in an area of the country where there is no history to substantiate the growing of such a crop. And I gather that if ARA and the Department of Agriculture have their way, a substantial amount of our new domestic beet quota may go to that area instead of to areas across the country that already have ideal soil for the growing of beets.

On March 6 of this year, the Area Redevelopment Administration announced that a $25,000 technical assistance study had been granted to determine the economic and engineering feasibility of establishing a sugarbeet refinery in Cayuga County, N.Y. This study was granted because Cayuga County had been designated as eligible to participate in the area redevelopment program due to substantial and persistent unemployment.

On March 20, also this year, ARA tells us that a $93,000 technical assistance study of the feasibility of growing and processing sugarbeets in Cayuga County, N.Y., has been approved. That is a total of $118,000 just to find out whether or not sugarbeets can be grown in an area that ARA has admitted is hilly and rocky. There is even some doubt as to whether harvesting machinery can function properly.

They are growing sugarbeets on a test area covering 250 acres of Cayuga County at this very moment, and a news release circulated in that area states that ARA is supplying the contracting farmers with the necessary seed, is furnishing them with the proper planting and harvesting machinery, and will end up by purchasing the crops from them at prevailing market rates.

The same release informs us that the Agriculture Department is reserving a special 50,000-ton sugarbeet allocation for Cayuga County and that ARA is scheduled to underwrite some 65 percent of the cost of the $20 million project. That release says further that the refinery, if finally approved, could not become fully operational until 1966, but that the Department of Agriculture intends to ask Congress to amend last year's law so that, if the tests prove successful, the project can get underway immediately.

Apparently Cayuga County would already have the allocation if it were not for one little technicality: Nobody knows yet whether or not the farmers there can raise sugarbeets on questionable soil. But ARA seems to be taking care of that little detail this summer with taxpayer-financed studies.

The point I want to make is that we have dozens of areas across the Nation, with some of the most suitable soils known for the raising of sugarbeets, who have been literally begging for acreage allotments. These areas, too, such as in my own native Red River Valley, have been declared ARA eligible because of persistent unemployment. The Cayuga project, then, is just another attempt to solve a problem in one area while creating new problems for other areas of the country. This is an outright attempt to ignore the known beet growing areas of the country for an unknown quantity in the dubious name of area redevelopment.

The great Red River Valley of Minnesota and the Dakotas, for instance, are not asking for ARA-financed studies. They are not asking for anything except permission to grow beets on some of the richest and most productive soil in the world. But this Government does not hear them, because we are so busy spending public funds on make-work projects that may never be feasible.

Mr. Speaker, such projects just do not make economic sense, nor do they alleviate the human suffering for which they are intended. The Federal Government simply pours thousands of dollars into areas that then compete directly with worthwhile, organized local effort elsewhere. The sorry part of this mess is that farmers in known sugarbeet areas are being hurt because of efforts to solve problems elsewhere, problems our farmers had no part in creating.

It is time we called a halt to make-work projects that do nothing except waste our money in one section of the country and create new problems elsewhere.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the close of business and following all other special orders previously granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

UNITED STATES CONCERNED AT RISE IN CUBA SHIP SAILINGS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the President's speech before the graduating class of American University. If that class was not afraid to meet the challenges of the sixties before the President's address, they must be scared to death now; for the President, reciting the latest New Frontier line, successfully expounded a fear of war psychosis which, if past performance is any indication, is intended to pave the way for further concessions to the Soviets.

The President stated that the people of the United States should reexamine their attitude toward Russia. What does this mean?

Are the American people, after reexamining, to decide that atheistic communism is not so bad? That the Soviet enslavement of millions of people behind the Iron Curtain is all right? That the brutality and slaughter of freedom-seeking people in Hungary should be regarded as a childish prank? That the brick wall separating families and loved ones in Berlin, in spite of treaties to the contrary, is merely an expression of Soviet architecture? Are we to overlook every treaty the Russians have broken which is, in effect, every treaty they have ever made?

I think the answers to these questions are meant to be "yes" if one places any credibility in the President's almost unbelievable statement that the antagonistic, saber-rattling utterances that come from Russia are not really indicative of the thinking of Khrushchev and the Soviets, but of his propagandists.

According to the President, freedom-loving countries can get along with the Soviet system of dictatorship and enslavement if we take the time and effort to increase our understanding of it, if we improve our communications with them.

This statement of New Frontier foreign policy is frightening, and the peddling of the scare of war philosophy by the Kennedy administration makes further concessions to the Russians in order to get along with them inevitable.

This sounds reminiscent, but in far more covert terms, of it is "better to be Red than dead." The American people do not regard these as the only alternatives. They choose to be alive and free,

and this can only be accomplished with a strong and determined foreign policy that is not frightened to death of and seeking accommodations with an enemy that has promised to bury us, has promised that our grandchildren will grow up under communism.

This basic expression of New Frontier philosophy is being applied to this hemisphere today, particularly with regard to Cuba. I have been stating for many months that the New Frontier is trying to work out some compromise, some accommodation looking toward a coexistence with communism in Cuba policy. Today the President confirmed my suspicions by expounding the ADA philosophy in foreign affairs.

Perhaps this explains why so little concern has been shown over the 50-percent increase in Russian shipping, including armaments, to Cuba since the quarantine, the continuing and now increased shipping by non-Communist countries to Cuba, Britain, and Canada in particular, and the accommodations between Cuba and even some of the Latin American nations that still recognize and do business with Cuba.

According to official figures of the Maritime Administration, during the first 4 months of this year, 113 known trips by 92 non-Soviet-bloc ships went to Cuba through May 31 of this year. There were 36 trips in April alone, and 16 of these were British. As a matter of fact, 33 of the 92 trips were British ships, 13 of which were tankers carrying precious oil for Castro's war machine.

Twenty-three of the ninety-two ships were under Greek registry.

In addition to the increased shipping by non-Communist-bloc nations, apparently with no effort to prevent it by the New Frontier, I am sure, a further accommodation to Castro and the Kremlin was the reported cessation of low-level surveillance flights over Cuba and the decreasing numbers of high-level surveillance flights.

This accommodation philosophy is further evidenced by the FAA order of 3 weeks ago which permits Cuban commercial planes to overfly the United States enroute from Canada so long as they stop for inspection. This latter condition, incidentally, gives Castro's Communist government use of and access to our airports in the major cities of the Northeast, including Dulles International Airport outside of Washington, D.C.

In exchange for this accommodation, Cuba has apparently agreed not to hijack or shoot at our commercial planes if they cross Cuba and this quid pro quo was accepted by the United States only last week when the prohibition against U.S. commercial flights over Cuba was withdrawn.

Thus, the mood is to be one of accommodation as spelled out by the President today unless the New Frontier awakens to the fact that it is not the mood of the American people. America demands firm leadership in ridding this hemisphere of Communism in Cuba and elsewhere as well.

The only reexamination of our attitude toward Russia should be one looking toward a firmer position, not toward how we can give in without losing too much face to the Communist demands as the price for coexistence.

All these concessions are supposed to be made in the name of peace, but the basic fallacy of this approach is that the Communists have never kept their agreements. It ignores the proven fact that the international Communist conspiracy has as its stated goal—repeated again and again—to bury capitalism and the United States.

To the Communists, conciliation, and concession are signs of weakness. We cannot afford to display weakness on any front or in answer to any challenge hurled at us by the Communists if our freedoms are to be preserved.

SHIPPING TO CUBA SHOWS NEW CAUSE FOR CONCERN

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, latest U.S. Government reports show that free world shipping to Cuba is on the increase—enough increase to cause real concern.

During the peak period of June to August 1962, when the Soviets were attempting their crash program military buildup of Cuba, a total of 164 non-Communist ships called in Cuban ports. Since January of this year there have been 89 non-Communist ships calling in Cuba; a figure which represents more than half of last summer's traffic.

What are the Soviets doing in Cuba to require such shipping? What is the reason that free world shipping for this year totals more than it did during the month of July 1962, when such traffic reached its peak? I think these are questions which weigh heavily in the minds of those who recall the events of last October.

I have repeatedly urged that this Government close its ports to ships from allied countries which call in Cuban ports. To date this Government has taken only limited action through a blacklist of such vessels carrying food-for-peace cargoes. Obviously this system has had little effect.

If U.S. ports were closed, as I have suggested, this traffic would come to a screeching halt. No nation would continue its shipping to Cuba if denied access to profitable U.S. cargo runs. Furthermore, such action would discourage the more than 20 allied tankers which have delivered Russian oil to Castro regularly since January, and without oil Castro's island fortress would come to a screeching halt.

Why should our allies shoulder part of the Soviet burden of supplying Castro? Why should we continue to silently approve this practice by allowing these allies access to our ports?

I urge that the United States close its ports immediately to those who value rubles over dollars, and freedom.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRANCIS E. WALTER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter from the Honorable Howard Beale, Ambassador of Australia, on the life and service of our late and distinguished colleague, the Honorable Francis E. Walter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the following letter from the Honorable Howard Beale, Ambassador of Australia:

EMBASSY OF AUSTRALIA,
Washington, D.C., June 7, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On behalf of the Australian Government, and of myself, I wish to convey to you and to the House, sincere condolences over the great and sad loss you have sustained as a result of the death of Representative Francis E. Walter.

Australia will remember with gratitude Representative Walter's long and fruitful association with the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration which made a most valuable contribution to the solution of the refugee problems following World War II; and to the large movements of population from Europe, which have been of great benefit to Australia's economy and have materially enhanced the role which Australia is able to play as a member of the free world.

Yours sincerely,

HOWARD BEALE,
Ambassador.

POPE JOHN XXIII

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Pope John XXIII is deeply and sincerely mourned probably by more people than any other man in recorded history. He was admired and loved equally by the great and the little people of the world, because he himself admired and loved, equally, both the great and the little people of the world. Whatever office he might hold, throughout his career, he never looked upon himself as magnified by that office, but used the office as a means of drawing closer to other people, and of helping them as much as possible. His greatness of soul most appeared in his consistent habit of looking upon himself, most sincerely, as insignificant. Thus belittling himself, Pope John was ready to devote his energies to any task, to risk his reputation in any cause, to hazard his health and his life itself in the service of other men.

Out of this greatness came the instinctive rightness of so many sudden, unexpected words and actions. To a delegation of Jewish rabbis he said, in the words

of Genesis XLV, 4, "I am Joseph your brother"; to Mrs. John F. Kennedy, after he had been carefully briefed in protocol and in the forms of American etiquette, upon seeing her, he forgot all his briefing, opened his arms wide, and called out "Jacqueline"; to prisoners whom he visited, he recalled the imprisonment of his own relatives; to one who had been his superior officer in the Italian Army, he gleefully identified himself as Sergeant Roncalli. Each step he took, as Pope, from his dealings with the Vatican staff and the people of Rome to his major acts such as the appointment of cardinals and the canonization of saints, was an advance in the recognition of the dignity and worth of man. In the crowd—all races, all nations, all faiths—he saw and loved each individual. This was borne out in his two great encyclicals, "Mater et Magis tra"—"Mother and Teacher"—and "Pacem in Terris"—"Peace on Earth"—directed to the solution of human problems of ordinary men. Also, the ecumenical council which Pope John convoked was aimed at renewal within the Roman Catholic Church, but also for the unity of all Christians. For this he is loved and mourned and prayed for, and for this he will be long remembered.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks an excellent article by the distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, from the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 6, 1963, entitled "The Miracle of Pope John," and an editorial from the Springfield Sunday Republican, June 9, 1963, entitled "Pope John XXIII, the Man of the Century."

The article and editorial follow:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, June 6, 1963]

THE MIRACLE OF POPE JOHN

(By Walter Lippmann)

The reign of Pope John has been a wonder which grows more astounding the more we think how amidst the angry enmities of our time he became so greatly loved. It is a modern miracle that anyone could reach across all the barriers of class, caste, color, and creed to touch the hearts of all kinds of people. There has been nothing like it, certainly not in the modern age. The miracle is a proof which we sorely needed that all the varieties of men do actually belong to one human family. Otherwise, so many could not have heard and understood and responded to Pope John.

That they have responded is proof that the enmities and divisions of mankind are not the whole reality of the human condition. There is in men a capacity, unplumbed and perhaps unmeasurable, to be reached by loving kindness. The miracle of Pope John is that he knew this and believed it and had faith to act upon it, and that he was proved to have been right. So, as he lies dead, he is revered and blessed by all sorts and conditions of men all around the globe.

We know that the miracle of Pope John will not transform the world. The condition of man is a hard one, and his struggle to survive and to prevail will not disappear with the appearance of a saint and the proclamation of a saving truth. We shall not suddenly become new men. But the universal response which Pope John evoked is witness to the truth that there is in the human person, however prone to evil, an aptitude for goodness. That is why we must never despair that the world can be better than the world we live in.

It is evident to anyone who reads the two great encyclical letters, "Mater et Magistra" ("Mother and Teacher") and "Pacem in Terris" ("Peace on Earth"), that Pope John, far from being naive and unworldly, had an encyclopedic and acute knowledge of the complex and stubborn problems of the daylight world. The encyclical letters do not suppose that the world can be cured before the problems that harass it are brought to solution. The encyclical letters are, therefore, directed to the solution of human problems by ordinary men. They are cornerstones of an imposing construction which, as it is carried forward, will become acceptable and increasingly self-evident to men who deal toward each other with respect for the human person and for his reason.

The belief that there are such self-evident concepts and propositions has been denied by many in the modern age. Yet our own American institutions were founded by men who had been taught to think it self-evident that men are capable of reason and that this is a universe which can be lived in rationally. The Founding Fathers inherited this belief. For modern secular men, who have been taught to reject it, an act of faith is needed. When the belief exists, as it did so profoundly in Pope John, it can become the intellectual core of what can be a human doctrine which transcends conflicting diversity.

The movement to bring the teachings of the church to bear upon "the process of radical change" in the modern "economic and political situation" begins, says Pope John, with Pope Leo XIII. The first of the great modernizing social messages is the encyclical "Rerum Novarum" of May 15, 1891, on "The Condition of the Working Classes." Pope John carried forward this movement not only in his two great encyclical letters but by calling together the Ecumenical Council.

What will now come of all this will be of critical importance not only to the Catholic Church but to all churches and to all governments. In any event, the modernizing movement can perhaps be arrested but it cannot for long be turned back. For what Pope John began will have very big consequences, and the history of our world will be different because he lived.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican, June 9, 1963]

POPE JOHN XXIII, THE MAN OF THE CENTURY

A few weeks ago a national magazine named Pope John XXIII as the man of the year. Now he is recognized as the man of this century, as Abraham Lincoln was the man of the 19th century.

There are striking similarities between Pope John and Lincoln. Pope John was born of peasant stock; Lincoln was born in a log cabin. Pope John made himself, in a few short years, the man of the 20th century because he strove for peace. Lincoln made himself the man of the 19th century because he strove for peace and, like the Pope, for equal rights for all men.

One is reminded of Punch's famous tribute to Lincoln: "A true born king of men." Once again the similarity persists. Pope John XXIII made himself "a true born king of men" by championing the cause of all men of whatever faith or color.

Lincoln has been described as "the man who forgot himself into immortality." Even in his dying moments, and in great pain, Pope John forgot himself and thought of others.

It is as the apostle of peace in a century already marked by the two greatest wars in history and the threat of even greater wars to come, that Pope John stands out. He followed in the footsteps of the founder of Christianity, Jesus Christ himself.

Pope John was the champion of those whom John Masefield, the English poet laureate, championed in his poem "Consecration"—the oppressed, the underprivileged of whatever race or color.

For all his brilliant intellect and extraordinary understanding of the many complexities of modern times, Pope John was truly a representative of the common people all over the earth; a man of humble origin who came from a large family, toiled in the fields as a boy, served as an ordinary soldier in wartime; a man who never forgot the great anonymous masses of humanity.

Although holding the papacy for only 4½ years, Pope John XXIII accomplished an enormous amount of good. When he became the pontiff, he formulated a program of four main points: internal renewal and reanimation of the Catholic Church, achievement of Christian unity, the promotion of world peace, and the advancement of social justice.

Entering into his task with a vigor that would have done credit to a man half his age, the Pope raised the College of Cardinals to its full strength and enlarged its international character. He spoke out repeatedly against the dangers of nuclear war and enjoined world leaders to strive for peace. He convoked the first world council of bishops to be held since 1870, and issued seven major documents of which two, "Mater et Magistra" and "Pacem in Terris," are already recognized as masterpieces of historical significance. They stirred and impressed even those who are indifferent to religion.

The Ecumenical Council, one of the most important to have been held in many centuries, was the highlight of Pope John's career, and showed clearly what he hoped would be the future trend of worldwide Christianity. The council took steps toward liberalization of ceremonies and a larger degree of autonomy by bishops, and laid the foundation for possible future moves through which all of the various separate Christian groups might someday be reunited.

Despite his lofty station, Pope John never lost the common touch; amazingly, he could be the supreme pontiff and yet a common man, at the same time. He tossed aside many old customs of protocol, in order to be closer to all the people. He would not eat alone, but in company with others. On impulse, he would leave his office to visit the poor, call on the sick, or simply talk with whatever ordinary people he happened to meet. He preferred to journey afoot, disliking any mode of conveyance that separated him from the people, or elevated him above them.

Through his own words, to the common people on many such informal occasions, Pope John perhaps best revealed his intensely human side. "You have a Pope," he once said, "who is himself a farmer's son and who has never felt humiliated or embarrassed because of his humble origin."

Again, speaking in reference to his portable throne, known as the sedia gestatoria, he said: "I would be most happy to walk on foot like everyone else. Then I think that if I went on foot, no one would be able to see me, and, therefore, I use it (the sedia) as an exercise of mortification."

And another time, speaking to a captain of the papal gendarmerie, he said: "Captain, you are a bigger noise than I am, because I was only a sergeant."

Such was the pontiff who is mourned now throughout the world; as humble as he was great, as close to the hearts of the common people as he was to God; one of the few really towering figures of our times: Pope John XXIII, a true "servant of the servants,"

whose name will be listed among those of the greatest in history.

And now we may pray that his great church will be inspired by God himself to choose a new leader who, as "a true born king of men" will reign over all hearts, as Pope John did, in his appeal for peace and good will on earth.

DETERGENT POLLUTION CAN BE STOPPED NOW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the privilege of testifying on the problem of detergent pollution before the Subcommittee on Natural Resources of the House Committee on Government Operations. My testimony follows:

I appreciate the opportunity to testify here today on the problem of detergent pollution of the Nation's surface and ground waters.

DETERGENT POLLUTION IS A SERIOUS AND GROWING PROBLEM

Detergent pollution is, of course, only one part of our total water pollution problem. But although it is a relatively new source of contamination of our water, it demands our attention. It will become increasingly severe as more detergents are used each year, as more water is used and reused in populous areas, and as water tables in suburban and rural areas become saturated with undegraded detergents.

Technically, the term "detergent" includes soaps and other cleaning agents. But in recent years, it has come to apply mainly to synthetic detergents, most of which are petroleum derivatives.

These synthetic detergents were among the celebrated "ersatz" products developed in Germany during the First World War. Cut off by the allied blockade from an adequate supply of natural fats, the basis for soap, the Germans turned to their able chemists who produced the first synthetic detergents for widespread use.

Synthetic detergents did not come into general use in this country, however, until after World War II. The availability of automatic washing machines, the spread of commercial self-service laundries, and the obvious superiority of detergents, particularly in hard water, led to a quick conquest of the market by the new products. Today, detergents constitute more than 75 percent of the volume of the entire soap and detergent industry in the United States.

The total sales of detergents last year amounted to about 4 billion pounds and are increasing at an annual rate of about 5 percent. About 75 percent of all detergents sold contain alkyl benzene sulfonate, called ABS for short, as the main cleaning agent. Although ABS is not the only culprit, it has rightly been in the limelight as the principle cause of detergent pollution. For reasons that are not fully understood, ABS is highly resistant to decomposition by natural processes in rivers and streams and ground water and by standard sewage treatment plants.

As much as half of the ABS that housewives send into streams on a given washing Monday will still be in the water system 3 weeks later. In sewage that is passed through usual treatment plants, only about 50 percent of the ABS is removed. In ground water, the problem is particularly severe. Once the water table is saturated, the rate of degradation will be very, very low. In fact, it may be years before our ground water is free of ABS contamination even if we halt additional ABS pollution.

Thus, the detergents that help the American housewife persist in our water supply long after she has finished with them.

DETERGENTS THAT RESIST DECOMPOSITION CAUSE MANY PROBLEMS

But is there any harm in the presence of ABS-based detergents in our water? The answer unfortunately is, "Yes, plenty."

First, they cause foam in drinking water. The committee members will undoubtedly remember the outrage of citizens of a new, expensive subdivision in nearby Mongomery County when they found sudsy water pouring from their faucets last year. A photograph of one of these disgruntled suburban householders is to be seen in the montage that I have had prepared. Water with a sudsy head is surely unappetizing. It scarcely meets the human desire for clean, pure water.

Of course, in some cases the presence of detergents in the water supply is accompanied by the presence of other pollutants, some of which are more injurious than ABS. This has given rise to what may be called the "sudsy detective apology." According to this fantasy, we should be happy to see detergent foam in our drinking glasses because it will indicate the presence of other pollution. The fact is that the detergent molecule travels much farther than other pollutants. It pollutes wells that otherwise would furnish pure, potable water.

The problem of improper well and septic tank installations itself is serious and deserves concern. But it can hardly be a justification for the continued use of "hard" detergents.

Detergents especially affront the natural beauty of our streams and lakes. It is distressing to see ugly mountains of foam in a serene woodland setting. The montage includes a number of photographs of this degradation of our scenic assets in New England, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Virginia, Texas, and New York.

Foaming in surface water used by water purification works has not yet become a problem in this country although Germany, for one, experienced considerable difficulty of this type as far back as 1959. And we may look forward to foam in municipal water unless we take timely preventive action.

Second, detergent pollution interferes with the treatment of sewage and adds considerably to the cost of sewage systems. The sewerage commission of my own city of Milwaukee has recently undertaken a study of this problem. It showed that the annual maintenance cost to deal with detergents amounts to $50,000. The problems caused by the detergents in treatment and plants include:

1. Fats, oils and grease are emulsified by detergents. The emulsified material is not removed in the plant's grease removal facilities, thus reducing the efficiency of the activated sludge process.

2. The efficiency of the aeration process is also reduced, required additional compressed air at added costs.

3. Settling characteristics of the partially treated sewage are reduced. As a result, more pollutants remain in the effluent that is returned to the water.

4. Detergent foam is deposited on walkways, buildings and roadways, forming a slippery slime that represents a hazard for employees. Special efforts must be made to clean off the besmeared surfaces.

The experience of the Milwaukee plant is duplicated throughout the Nation. Cleveland has reported the expenditure of $250,000 on equipment that will reduce but not eliminate the amount of foaming in its plant. On the montage, you will note photographs of foaming at other plants in several States.

In fairness, I note here that not all foaming in rivers and treatment plants is attributable to detergents. They are, however, the principal cause.

Third, detergent pollution represents an unnecessary hazard to human health. Large doses of ABS fed to test animals over a short period of time have not proved harmful. But the effects of continued ingestion of small amounts of ABS over a long period are still under investigation.

Fourth, detergent pollution is harmful to waterlife and wildlife. ABS is toxic to fish in concentrations that are already occurring in our waterways. The toxicity of detergents to shellfish was a factor in the action of the Maryland Water Pollution Control Commission in imposing regulations on the discharge of "hard" detregents into the streams of that State this year.

Fifth, in some instances billows of detergent foam have actualy endangered transport. In Germany, foam interfered with barge traffic and virtualy filled the locks of inland waterways. Motor traffic on neighboring highways has also been endangered.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in its May 21 report by Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze on my antidetergent pollution bill, said:

"Synthetic detergent wastes are a serious problem in water pollution control. They are markedly resistant to conventional waste treatment processes. Normal waste treatment plant operations are seriously impaired by the presence of detergent wastes, with a resultant decrease in efficiency and increase in cost of ordinary waste treatment. In many cases, use of receiving waters for public water supply and recreation purposes is rendered objectionable through the persistent foaming action characteristic of detergent wastes. The potential health hazard presented by these detergents is still under investigation. Chemical tests have indicated that these wastes are acutely toxic to fish and wildlife when present in water in large accumulations. We do not as yet know the adverse effects, if any, of these wastes on human health when ingested over a long period in the minute quantities in which they may be present in the public water supply. Remedial action is obviously necessary."

WEST GERMANY HAS ADOPTED ANTIDETERGENT POLLUTION MEASURES THAT WE CAN DUPLICATE

In thinking about this problem early last year, the German experience attracted my attention. I visited West Germany last November and talked with scientists and government officials. They told me that when the need for action became clear, a joint committee of industry and local, state, and Federal Government representatives was formed. The committee's studies led to the passage on September 5, 1961, of the detergent law which will ban, after October 1964, detergents that do not meet certain standards of decomposability. German industry is readying production facilities to comply with the law. Several kinds of degradable detergents, which reportedly will clean as well as ABS products and pollute the water far less, are soon to go into production.

The bill that I have proposed, H.R. 4571, adopts much the same approach. It would ban the manufacture or importation after June 30, 1965, of any detergent that did not meet standards of decomposability to be set by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The production of a degradable detergent is certainly possible by about that time. The ability of German industry to comply with the similar German detergent law by October 1964 is good evidence that American industry could live up to a similar law effective almost a year later. An industry spokesman has been quoted as promising that a degradable detergent would be on the market by 1965. There is no reason why passage of H.R. 4571 should hurt industry. The technical job of setting standards is left to the official best qualified to do so who can rely upon the advice of the scientists and other technicians of his department.

IS A VOLUNTARY SOLUTION REALLY POSSIBLE?

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has, however, suggested that before legislation is enacted, voluntary cooperation to eliminate "hard" detergents should be sought.

In his report on H.R. 4571, Secretary Celebrezze wrote:

"We are aware that the synthetic detergents industry is currently engaged in efforts to develop a product that will meet the objectives of this bill. The industry has set the end of the year 1965 as its target date for the production of such detergents. This target date is within 6 months of the deadline set by the bill. We are prepared to consult with and encourage the industry in its efforts and to explore thoroughly with the industry the synthetic detergent problem in all its ramifications (including biodegradability and other aspects) bearing on the prevention and control of water pollution. If reasonable progress toward resolving the problem is not obtained through such voluntary Government-industry cooperation, we would not hesitate to urge enactment of legislation to accomplish the objectives of H.R. 4571. The extent of industry's desire and willingness to proceed in this direction may be further assessed by the committee in the event that hearings are conducted.

"In conclusion, while we support the objectives of H.R. 4571 and would endorse the enactment of legislation along the lines of this bill if the voluntary approach is not productive within a reasonable time, we recommend that final legislative action on the bill be deferred to provide an opportunity for the voluntary solution of this problem."

If an agreement to eliminate detergent pollution can be obtained without legislation, I am all for it. But certain questions present themselves. I hope that the Department and industry representatives will be able to provide satisfactory answers.

1. Is it possible to make an agreement that will eliminate the manufacture or marketing of hard detergents by all companies?

This question is founded in the fact that there are many companies that produce and market ABS or ABS-based detergents. It is true that three companies—Procter & Gamble, Lever Bros., and Colgate-Palmolive-Peet—sold 420 of the 560 million pounds of ABS used by American industries in 1962. This still leaves a considerable amount—140 million pounds—that was disposed of by other companies. Some observers expect that a decision to abandon the use of ABS by one or more large users would cause it to decline in price. Wouldn't this encourage the continued, or even expanded, use of ABS by companies which did not participate in the agreement? Under such circumstances, the responsible companies would find themselves at a disadvantage relative to their irresponsible competitors.

Whatever the agreement made among American companies, foreign producers would be unaffected. How would it be possible to prevent a large importation of hard detergents, especially if there were a price differential between hard detergents and the new degradable detergents being offered by American companies?

2. Does the often-made promise of soap and detergent association spokesmen mean that the companies for which the association speaks are willing to convert completely to marketing of degradable detergents by the end of 1965? The 6 months difference between the effective date of H.R. 4571 and the date fixed by industry for the introduction of mass marketing of degradable detergents does not appear to be of crucial significance if the industry intends a complete switch to a product that will break down in our ground water and streams. But if the industry intends only to begin marketing a degradable detergent at the end of 1965 and to continue selling detergents that will pollute our water supply for a long time to come, we are faced with a very different proposition. Detergent pollution would then continue.

The detergent industry has often trumpeted that it is spending $5 million a year on research on detergents. It fails to mention that its spending to create a better product is an estimated 2 percent of its outlays designed to convince the public to buy the products that are polluting our water system.

3. Is the industry willing to make a binding agreement? It will not serve the public interest or indeed the longrun interests of industry to create the illusion that means of ending detergent pollution have been found and then to discover, in the moment of truth, that "unforeseen difficulties" prevent the conversion to degradable detergents.

4. Will States or localities consider the voluntary agreement of the detergent industry sufficient? If they should not, they could impose their own regulations. Some have done so already. We could end up with a patchwork of local and State ordinances that would impede interstate commerce and hurt the economy by balkanizing the detergent market.

WE CANNOT WAIT LONG TO FIND OUT WHETHER A VOLUNTARY SOLUTION IS POSSIBLE

So far, the attitude of the detergent industry has not been very encouraging. For example, Procter & Gamble spokesmen have contended in recent statements to Wisconsin and national journalists that a U.S. law banning the sale of nondecomposable detergents would be "unwarranted" and unreasonable. Yet P & G has been busily constructing a large new plant at Worms, Germany, where the company will have to comply with a law similar to the one I propose.

Efforts to obtain a voluntary agreement on detergents in Germany foundered when some industries refused to cooperate. It proved necessary to resort to legislation not only to accomplish the national goal of purer water but to protect the cooperative and responsible companies from unfair, unscrupulous competition. Perhaps we will have greater success in this country. I am certainly willing to try, under a time schedule that will leave time to protect the public interest if an effective, voluntary agreement proves impossible. We cannot wait long to find out whether a voluntary approach is feasible if we are not to delay unnecessarily the day when the problems of detergent pollution will begin to decline rather than increase.

If the industry is interested in voluntary steps to eliminate detergent pollution, I challenge it to begin immediate negotiations with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to work out a timely and effective agreement.

LET THE FEASIBILITY OF A VOLUNTARY SOLUTION BE TESTED IN THE NEXT 2 MONTHS

Chairman BLATNIK of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee has indicated that hearings on H.R. 4571 will be held shortly after August 1. I urge the representatives of HEW and the detergent industry to be ready then to present a draft agreement to end detergent pollution, with answers to the questions I have raised. The 2 months between this hearing and that should provide an ample opportunity to work out a voluntary agreement, if one is possible. If one is not possible, I shall expect the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as it states in its May 21 letter, "to urge the enactment of legislation to accomplish the objectives of H.R. 4571."

NET FARM INCOME DOWN DESPITE INCREASE IN GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS TO FARMERS

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, official reports show Kennedy supply-management programs have not helped farm income.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has reported a new decline in the farm parity ratio, and has predicted that net farm income this year will be down, despite an increase in Government payments to farmers.

My information is from the Economic Research Service of the USDA.

Net farm income is expected to be $200 to $300 million below the preliminary estimate of $12.9 billion for 1962.

Government payments to farmers in 1962 were estimated at $1,736 million, or 13 percent of the total net farm income for the year. These payments are expected to increase by $150 to $200 million in 1963.

Kennedy farm programs are costing taxpayers a billion dollars more this year than last year. Despite all this increased spending—including a 10-percent jump in Government payments to farmers—net farm income is expected to drop.

The May 15 parity ratio is 77, the lowest May 15 level since 1939. The parity ratio shows the relationship between prices paid and prices received by farmers.

In Illinois, the parity ratio is 71 for the second month in a row; the lowest level on record since 1934.

TO THE HUNGARIANS: ABANDON HOPE

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recent upsetting developments at the U.N. include surrender on the part of the United States to previous policy toward the admission of the Hungarian Communist delegates to seats in the U.N.

The Chicago Tribune, on Friday, June 7, carried a blistering editorial discussing this latest diplomatic retreat of the Kennedy administration, which I will insert in the RECORD at this point:

TO THE HUNGARIANS: ABANDON HOPE

The Kennedy administration has made the ultimate retreat before the savage Communist tyranny of Janos Kadar in Hungary. Since 1956, when Khrushchev's tanks and Asiatic divisions crushed the anti-Communist rebellion in Budapest, the Hungarian Communist delegation has been denied seats in the United Nations.

The issue has come up year after year in the general assembly's credentials committee. This year, Greece, which had until now voted with the United States against seating the Communists, announced that it would no longer oppose. This appeared to insure that Hungary would regain its place. The United States promptly announced it would not oppose accreditation.

This action is part of a pattern which has been developing. The first move came last December. Upon American initiative, the U.N. Assembly dismissed Sir Leslie Munro of New Zealand as its special representative on the Hungarian question. Munro's assignment was to make a continuing assessment of Communist repression of Hungarian liberty. He was no friend of tyranny, and Kadar and Khrushchev kept him from entering their countries. U.N. turned his duties over to U Thant, its secretary general, who is on cordial terms with Communists.

The next step, in May, found the State Department propositioning Congress for support to reopen full diplomatic relations with the Kadar regime. It produced a propaganda paper which suggested that everybody was much happier in Hungary.

On Wednesday, when Hungary regained its seat, the United States did not cast an opposing vote, but merely registered "reservations." Our delegate, Mr. Yost, did vote in turning away Red China, but because of the ideological dispute between Moscow and Peking, that will hardly be offensive to Khrushchev.

Significance can be read into the Greek switch on Hungary. The Greeks are on the American payroll and would be subject, presumably, to Washington's wishes.

As we said before, it all looks like part of a deal between Kennedy and Khrushchev, beginning with the accommodation which leaves communism inviolate in Cuba. After that the American Jupiter missiles in Italy and Turkey which were zeroed in on Russian targets were dismantled and withdrawn. Restraints have been placed on Cuban exile raids against Castro's island, and this is but one of many instances of a drive toward massive accommodations with Soviet power.

Everything is in the pattern of the paper credited a year ago to Walt W. Rostow, the State Department policy planner, who advanced the thesis that the Soviet Union was "mellowing" and "evolving" into a "mature" state with which we could achieve compatability. The insistent calls for "victory" for world communism which are dinned into our ears from Moscow attest that such notions are foolish and suicidal.

Hungary is the latest evidence that the administration's policy is one of surrender on the installment plan.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 1963, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States testified on H.R. 5490 containing President Kennedy's fiscal 1964 proposals for the foreign aid program.

We all recognize that the opinion and position of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States carries great weight and deserves every consideration. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States represents almost 4 million members. There are 30 thousand business firms which are direct members of the national chamber. In addition there are 33 State chambers of commerce which are organizational members, 3,800 local chambers of commerce, and 800 trade and professional organizations.

The policy positions of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States are always thoughtfully and carefully considered, studied, evaluated, and adopted. This makes them all the more meaningful.

This year's testimony on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States was presented by Mr. John O. Teeter, vice president of Pfizer International, New York City. He did an excellent job as did the staff of the chamber who accompanied him. All members of the Foreign Affairs Committee were very much impressed with the thoroughness, the detail, and the obvious study which Mr. Teeter had given his subject. He answered all questions ably and forthrightly. What was especially gratifying, however, and the principal reason I take this time, is not only to acquaint my colleagues with the position of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States as expressed by Mr. Teeter, but also to demonstrate the extent of the objective criticism and the affirmative recommendations in detail which were made. It was a most thorough presentation, extremely useful, and helpful for our consideration on the committee and I feel it will be extremely useful and helpful for the consideration of my colleagues.

It must be remembered that this policy statement was adopted at a national convention by 3,000 delegates from all parts of the country. This support of the foreign aid program is not new. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce for more than a decade has endorsed the principle of foreign aid. This year the chamber renews its support, noting that the program's objectives "are increasingly urgent to achieve," but also that the present program, despite numerous efforts to make it more effective, "has fallen far short of its objectives."

The chamber, therefore, proposes guidelines and specific measures to redirect the Act for International Development of 1961 in order to accomplish more fully its original objectives and particularly to make it a more effective base for private enterprise without which no U.S. government-to-government assistance program can hope to succeed.

In presenting the policy and recommendations of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, I express my commendation to Mr. John O. Teeter, who represented the chamber, as well as the staff and the committee members of the chamber's foreign policy committee, its joint subcommittee on foreign aid, its advisory committee on foreign aid, and its board of directors, for the diligent work and study on this vital subject. The statement of policy, together with the explanatory matter, are as follows:

TESTIMONY OF JOHN O. TEETER, FOR THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES ON FOREIGN AID—PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, JUNE 6, 1963

I am John Teeter, vice president of Pfizer International, New York City. My testimony on H.R. 5490 represents the views of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. I serve on the chamber's foreign policy committee, its joint subcommittee on foreign aid, and its newly created advisory committee on foreign aid.

In presenting the position of the national chamber on foreign aid, I want to emphasize four points:

First. There is no single foreign policy issue on which Congress both can and will act this session that is more important to the Government, the people, and the business community of this Nation than foreign aid.

Second. Congress must act this session—wisely and boldly—if the aid program is to be saved, from its enemies, its friends, from itself.

Third. The right answers to the seemingly unsolvable problems of foreign aid already have begun to take shape. A consensus now has begun to emerge—a consensus of what needs to be done to put the program on the road to recovery of its sound but elusive objectives. It remains for Congress to give direction and impetus to this intelligent approach to attainable goals.

Fourth. Until improvements are made in the program it is useless and wasteful to appropriate funds in the increasing magnitude requested by the Government. More money, misspent, can do more harm than good.

THE IMPORTANCE OF FOREIGN AID

With regard to the significance of this year's foreign aid legislation, the expressions the national chamber is receiving on the subject from its membership probably are as voluminous, as varied, and perhaps as passionate, as the opinions you are getting from home. And with good reason, too.

The most important reason is because an effective U.S. foreign aid program is essential to our national security and our foreign policy objectives. Properly conceived and carried out, foreign aid should, can, and does promote the American system; provide a counterforce to international communism; promote responsible local foreign development, and protect our increasingly important oversea markets and sources of supply, as well as our military security.

Foreign aid aims at fostering the national interest in several ways. It is designed to provide military protection at less cost than

the United States could undertake alone. Longer range, in addition to furthering political freedom and democracy abroad, it is intended to help develop strong free world markets in the less developed areas—markets whose strength and growth can expand and strengthen our domestic economy as well. In addition, foreign aid is an expression of deep American moral and spiritual instincts to render humanitarian help to other people in need.

The U.S. business community has a direct interest and stake in the accomplishment of these goals. It is on the free markets of trade and private capital that economic, political and social development and growth depend. The administrators of the aid program recognize this stake of private enterprise. They consistently point out that government-to-government aid cannot, by itself, either afford the costs of the program or accomplish its objectives, and that an increasing share of the task must be undertaken by the private sector.

To stimulate that participation, programs have been established by the U.S. Government to encourage U.S. investment in underdeveloped countries. These include investment guarantees, investment surveys, foreign currency loans, and long-term dollar loans. An overflow of applications for investment guarantees is an example of the response of business to the call for assumption of a major role in the development of less-developed areas. As of March 31, 1963, 1,000 applications for investment guarantees were in process, totaling over $3.5 billion. (The national chamber's position on the investment guarantee program is scheduled for consideration at a meeting of its board of directors later this month.)

Foreign aid contributes to employment in the United Sates of workers supplying goods and services to the recipients of foreign aid. These jobs have been created in part by the expansion of markets stimulated by aid funds.

An estimated 84 percent of all current aid disbursements are now "tied" to purchases of U.S. goods and services, and the Agency for International Development (AID) is seeking ways to increase this percentage to 90 to 95 percent—a step which, incidentally, considerably reduces the balance-of-payments strain of aid on the U.S. economy.

It is a true mark of its importance that foreign aid has so consistently been supported in principle for 15 years by the American people, through both political parties, three Administrations, eight Congresses and countless organizations representing business, labor, churches, and civic groups.

FOREIGN AID IN CRISIS

This year, however, it is apparent that support of the principles of foreign aid is not enough. Criticisms of foreign aid in practice—how programs are conceived and carried out—have been building up over the years to a point where they now threaten to place the entire program in serious jeopardy. As the report of the Clay Committee so well put it:

"There has been a feeling that we are trying to do too much for too many too soon, that we are overextended in resources and undercompensated in results, and that no end of foreign aid is either in sight or in mind."

Even this succinct summary only hints at the misgivings about the program shared by the businessmen who are affected by it, the taxpayers who finance it, the legislators who vote on it. In fact, the misgivings are shared by many of the officials who administer it. Never before have its goals, methods and worth been so seriously and simultaneously challenged. President Kennedy recognized this challenge when he commissioned the Clay Committee as a board of public inquiry to determine whether foreign aid—

(1) "is contributing materially to the security of the United States," and (2) "is directed to specific and attainable goals."

A major and frequent criticism of the foreign aid program, of course, is the cost. The American people have invested $100 billion in foreign aid of one kind or another since the end of World War II.

Public concern over the fiscal affairs of this country—the annual deficits, the mounting national debt, the drain of dollars and gold caused by an unfavorable balance of payments situation—is unquestionably an important element in the controversy.

But to put the troubles of foreign aid entirely on the amount of money involved is both an oversimplification and misleading. It is not only the amount of money, but the results of the expenditures that are at issue.

To people reared in a market-type economy, the question, "Are we getting our money's worth?" is important.

The debate is over not only "How much foreign aid?" but "What kind of foreign aid?" and "To whom?"

SOME ANSWERS TO THE PROBLEMS

Answers to the problems of foreign aid will not come easily, nor will they solve overnight either the program's inherent shortcomings or its inability to meet unreasonable demands upon it for quick, demonstrable payoffs. Nevertheless, a number of recent, responsible reappraisals of foreign aid at least point the way toward some practical, constructive action.

Here is a chart prepared by the chamber in an effort to map out as clearly as possible the policy directions indicated by this emerging consensus. Down the lefthand column we have listed the major parts of the aid program—all the way from its basic policy guidelines through such features as economic development, private participation incentives, the Alliance for Progress, multilateral aid, military aid and supporting assistance, to contingencies and budget account transfers.

Across the top we have delineated, first, the provisions of the present law relating to the categories in the lefthand column. The successive columns summarize the recommended improvements in each category which have been proposed this year by: the National Chamber in its March 15 Policy Statement on Foreign Aid; the Clay Committee; other responsible interested groups, such as the Commerce Department's businessman's Committee on the Alliance for Progress (COMAP), the Business Council for International Understanding (BCIU), the International Economic Policy Association, numerous Congressional subcommittees, study teams and individual members, and finally, by the President in his message to Congress of April 2.

In the next column, we have compared with these recommendations the actual amendments to the present law which have been submitted by the administration—in other words, the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, H.R. 5490, which is now before this committee.

A careful comparison of present law, suggested improvements, and the administration's proposed amendments is the very least exercise necessary to any meaningful evaluation of the current foreign aid program.

The chamber's evaluation (found in the last two columns)—including a second look at our own aid statement earlier this year—discloses what we in the chamber have now come to call the aid gap—between program and performance. Thus, in the next-to-last column, we have attempted to summarize the most obvious shortcomings of the present foreign aid program, as seen by its responsible critics.

If the identification of the program's most serious gaps is to be of any constructive use, it must be followed by positive corrective action. This we have tried to suggest in the final and most important column in the chart, headed "What's Needed."

Just as the "What's Needed" column is meaningless without the seven columns preceding it, so it could be regarded as presumptuous without a word of explanation about how it was derived and by whom.

For more than a decade, the National Chamber has reflected faithfully the views on foreign aid held by its vast membership. We have consistently supported the principles of foreign aid, testified for or against specific administration legislative proposals, and favored substantial savings in proposed foreign aid budgets. This year we specifically recommend positive, concrete new measures, developed with the assistance of over 300 leading U.S. businessmen and based upon policies approved by our membership.

Starting with our foreign policy committee and its own subcommittee on foreign aid, the chamber recommendations before you were shaped and refined by a joint subcommittee on foreign aid, made up of representatives of five of our standing committees (foreign policy, foreign commerce, national defense, finance, and government operations and expenditures). The product of this exercise then went to the chamber's board of directors, and finally to our new special advisory committee on foreign aid drawn from executives and representatives of companies affected by foreign aid one way or another. Through our staff, we researched all available information and opinion, held extensive and candid discussions with foreign aid specialists in Government, Congress, and the academic community, including a conference of our joint subcommittee with General Clay.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that the committee is more concerned with concrete recommendations than with the history of how we arrived at them, so I shall return to "What's Needed."

PURSE STRINGS FOR IMPROVEMENT

I should like at this point to call the committee's attention to the comparative budget analysis included as part of this statement, which shows the chamber's specific appropriations recommendations for each major budget item in the aid program.

You will note that we urge both specific reductions in the administration's revised requests, and specific support for a number of economic and social development programs. The recommended cuts are as follows: development loans, $160 million; development grants, $57 million; Alliance for Progress, $250 million; supporting assistance, $135 million; contingency fund, $100 million; military assistance, $205 million. Our total recommended reduction is $913,075,000.

It should be noted that of our recommended $913 million reduction in the last official administration figure of $4.5 billion, we suggest paring one-half from military aid, supporting assistance, and the contingency fund. Most of the remainder would be withheld from the Alliance for Progress until it is reorganized along lines suggested in the "What's needed" column of the chamber aid chart.

The programs for which we recommend full budgetary support are: International organizations and programs, $136 million; In-

ter-American Development Bank and Social Progress Trust Fund, $200 million; surveys of investment opportunities, $1.5 million (which item has now been dropped from the administration's revised requests); The International Development Association, $61.7 million; American schools and hospitals abroad, $22 million; assistance to Cuban refugees, $70 million.

I also want to call your attention to the attached explanation of the reasons for each cut. (This document is based on the administration's original requests, before they were revised downward by $420 million. However, the reasons for the recommended reductions remain the same.) We also explain our reasons for supporting the administration requests we approve in full.

The net effect of these proposals is national chamber support for a $3.6 billion authorization. This is within half a billion dollars of the amount General Clay has said the administration could live with.

To summarize, the national chamber aims at three specific objectives:

1. A return of foreign aid programs to the sound principles of long-range economic development laid out in 1961 in the Act for International Development and in the Foreign Assistance Act.

2. To develop the means for a vastly stepped up inflow of private capital, know-how, and initiative into the aid program. Our own aid planners tell us that such inflow is imperative if foreign aid is ever to reach its foreign policy goals.

3. The curtailment of appropriations in the increasing magnitudes requested by the administration, pending more demonstrable moves toward long-range economic development programs and greater private enterprise participation.

Next, I would like to discuss some of the highlights of the "What's needed" column of our chart.

WHAT'S NEEDED

You will note that the specific recommendations in the "What's needed" column are of three types. One calls for specific amendments to certain sections of the basic act. Another asks for a more precise expression of congressional intent—which can be done through language in the preamble, in the appropriations bill, in committee reports, or in some cases as part of the legislative history in debate on the floor. Finally, we urge the President and the administrators of the aid program to take additional positive action through Executive orders, regulations, and directives which require no additional congressional authorization.

Let me say a word about our view that the purposes, objectives, and priorities of the aid program require much more precise definition. We are aware that AID Director Bell already has taken several steps in the right direction. The Agency's presentation to this committee is one of the best we have seen. We also are aware that AID is preparing a still more detailed interpretation of its basic policy guidelines and criteria to serve as an operations manual in the field as well as at headquarters. We applaud the Agency's new efforts along these lines.

But this committee is aware that these are not the first in a long line of sincerely motivated assurances that measures to promote sounder long-range economic development and greater private enterprise participation are forthcoming. The new administration and Congress said the same thing clearly and convincingly in 1961 in the Act for International Development. As the "Aid gap" column shows, however, progress still is far from staisfactory. We therefore urge action by Congress to bind AID to its most recent promises. This could be done through legislative history, reports to Congress and the public, or appropriations bill controls, or by amendment to the basic act.

For example, the chamber urges specific amendments to the policy section of the law (sec. 102) to make more certain that economic aid funds are not used, as they have been in the past, for bailout aid for supposed financial or military crises. This is a kind of aid which, once begun, has been virtually impossible to stop. There is no better example than bailout aid to demonstrate the program's own violation of its stated objectives of long-range planning assistance.

We acknowledge the need for flexibility in administering the program. We do not propose to repeal the limited authority contained in section 610 to transfer up to 10 percent of the money in any aid fund to another aid fund, nor the authority under section 645 to consolidate unexpended balances. We do propose that this flexibility be restricted to funds authorized for non-economic aid purposes, and that no funds for economic development—whether financed from the development loan fund, development grant fund, or the economic funds under the Alliance for Progress—be used for other than economic development purposes. We further urge that when transfers and consolidations are made under sections 610 and 645, the funds be used for purposes for which they were authorized.

To encourage long-range economic development planning, we propose that economic aid be directed much more specifically to sound host-country programs, and less toward one-shot projects designed for their political or "showcase" prestige effort. We further urge that economic aid be spent primarily for those programs which place new emphasis on the use and development of the private sectors of the host-country economies, including both domestic and foreign private enterprise. We favor much greater selectivity in choosing from among the countless requests for aid which pour in from over 100 countries. We believe those who show the most progress should receive priority.

To stimulate self-help reforms, we propose that economic aid be made contingent on progress reports from the aid-recipient countries.

To promote vitally important private participation, we propose amendments and administrative steps to improve existing incentives.

To revitalize the Alliance for Progress, we propose legislation to establish an OECD-type institution to act as a central forum and clearinghouse for sound coordination of economic policies among the Western Hemisphere nations—coordination which is essential to the success of the Alliance.

We propose steps to increase the use of multilateral aid, not as a substitute for bilateral aid but as a supplement to it, which in numerous instances is more capable of enforcing sensible conditions than bilateral aid.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I request that the attachments to this statement be made a part of the official record of your hearings.

Thank you.

CHAMBER POLICY ON MUTUAL SECURITY

The chamber supports foreign economic and military assistance as instruments of U.S. foreign policy to strengthen the security of the United States and other nations of the free world through responsible political freedom, social progress, and individual endeavor.

In implementing these programs, particular emphasis must be placed on the role of private enterprise in economic development. To achieve long-term U.S. foreign policy objectives in each area and country, and to engender widespread understanding and support, the concept, scope, and administration of foreign assistance programs must be continually reviewed and improved. Other free world nations should share increasingly in bearing these responsibilities.

Comparison of budget requests and recommendations for the foreign aid program

[In thousands of dollars]

Activity	Revised administration request, fiscal year 1964	Chamber recommendation, fiscal year 1964	Initial administration request, fiscal year 1964	Congressional appropriation, fiscal year 1963	Chamber recommendation, fiscal year 1963	Administration request, fiscal year 1963
Development loans	[1] 1,060,000	900,000	1,248,000	975,000	900,000	1,250,000
Development grants	[1] 257,000	200,000	275,000	225,000	235,000	335,000
American schools and hospitals abroad	20,000	20,000				
Investment guarantees				30,000	100,000	100,000
Surveys of investment opportunities		1,500	1,500		3,500	5,000
Alliance for Progress	[1] 650,000	400,000	700,000	525,000	400,000	600,000
Social progress trust fund	200,000	200,000	200,000			
International organizations and programs	136,050	136,050	181,250	148,900	148,900	148,900
Supporting assistance	435,000	300,000	397,000	395,000	400,000	481,500
Contingency fund	300,000	200,000	400,000	250,000	200,000	400,000
Military assistance	[1] 1,405,000	1,200,000	1,480,000	1,325,000	1,350,000	1,500,000
Administrative expenses, AID	57,250	50,000	57,250	49,500	50,000	55,000
Administrative expenses, State	3,025	2,700	3,025	2,700	3,000	3,100
Hospitals abroad (local currency)	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,800		2,800
Total, foreign aid program	[1] 4,525,325	3,612,250	4,945,025	3,928,900	3,790,400	4,961,300

[1] Additional reductions in these activities subsequently suggested by General Clay would further lower total by $200,000,000 to $500,000,000.

U.S. chamber comparative analysis of aid

	Present law (Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended)	Chamber recommendations (Mar. 15, 1963)	Clay Committee recommendations (Mar. 20, 1963)	Other recommendations [1]
Policy guidelines	Sec. 102 authorizes aid to less-developed friendly countries to promote peace, freedom, and free world security. Sets aid criteria: Sound plans and programs; social as well as economic aspects of development; self-help by recipient countries; long-range development. Urges multilateral participation, burden sharing, and free flow of private investment capital.	Clearly delineate program objectives and priorities relative to U.S. foreign policy. Identify specific aid purposes and finance from controlled separate funds. Emphasize long-range economic development planning; assure full role for private enterprise. Apply greater selectivity in choosing nations and projects to be aided. Apply stricter self-help criteria to point where local reforms are prime factor in qualifying for U.S. aid. Emphasize burden sharing through Development Assistance Committee of the OECD. Reduce short-run emergency aid for financial bailouts, military purposes, and politically inspired projects.	Tighten and sharpen objectives in terms of U.S. national interest. Condition aid on achievement of self-help measures. Apply greater selectivity; carefully examine aid for political as well as economic reasons; determine kind and basis of aid on economic grounds. Emphasize greater burden sharing through specific U.S. representations and OECD Development Assistance Committee; urge allies to apply softer terms.	Direct aid to specific foreign policy goals (Comap [2]). Apply greater selectivity (IEPA, Senator MANSFIELD, Representative MONAGAN). Limit extension of aid to countries not now receiving it (Senator MANSFIELD). Spell out aid conditions (Representative DAWSON). Define objectives, establish clear-cut criteria and standards, balance Government and private investment capital (Representative MEADER). Stress burden sharing. (IEPA, Senator MANSFIELD, Representative MONAGAN).
Economic development	Sec. 201 authorizes dollar loans to promote economic development, emphasizes long-range plans and programs to develop economic resources and increase productive capacities. Sec. 211 authorizes grants and technical assistance, emphasizes development of human resources.	Development loans should receive priority, carry increasingly harder terms, be prohibited from use for other than stated purposes. Speed shift from grants to loans.	Establish harder terms for development loans in some countries. Shift aid from subsidy and gift to loan basis. Specify duration of technical assistance. Land-grant college should contribute.	Channel increasing percentage of development loans through private enterprise; establish separate fund for Government loans for basic infrastructure (IEPA). Speed shift from grants to loans (Senator MANSFIELD, Representative MONAGAN). Gear aid to development level of recipient countries; short-term impact projects should evolve into long-range development plans (Senator HUMPHREY).
Private participation incentives.	Sec. 601 encourages private enterprise participation, requires President to (1) find and draw attention to investment and development opportunities; (2) accelerate negotiation of tax, commerce, and trade treaties facilitating private investment; (3) direct appropriate aid through private channels with practicable local private or governmental participation.	Encourage positive host-country planning for private investment, trade, and initiative—local and foreign; improve and redirect existing incentives for private participation. Employ authority for dollar loans to U.S. firms. Resolve U.S. Government policy confusion over whether to encourage U.S. private production investment abroad.	Stimulate private-sector incentives. Refuse aid to Government-owned industrial and commercial enterprises which compete with existing private endeavors.	Emphasize private investment (Comap, Representative MEADER). Encourage joint ventures between United States and local private enterprise (Senator HUMPHREY). Grant U.S. investment tax credit (Comap, Representative MEADER). Allow tax deductions for commercial risks (Comap, IEPA). Waive U.S. tax liability (tax sparing) on earnings on which host governments forgo local tax (Comap, IEPA). Guarantee 5 percent minimum aftertax return on earnings of private projects approved by Government (Comap). Establish new office of AID Deputy Administrator for Private Enterprise (IEPA). Create new Government-owned corporation to encourage private American investment in developing countries. (BCIU.)
	Investment guarantees: Sec. 221 authorizes guarantees of wholly owned U.S. investment against specific risks of war (insurrection and revolution), currency inconvertibility, and expropriation (confiscatory acts of government). Authorizes extended risk guarantees against any risks other than U.S. management fraud or misconduct. Sec. 224 authorizes similar guarantees of U.S. investment in pilot housing projects in Latin America.			Bring all Latin American countries into program (Comap). Liberalize bilateral guarantee agreements (Comap, IEPA). Broaden war risk to include riots and civil disturbances (Comap, IEPA). Increase authorized dollar volume outstanding; strengthen U.S. obligation (IEPA). Increase housing guarantee (Senator HUMPHREY). Support multilateral guarantee treaties (IEPA).
	Investment surveys: Sec. 231 authorizes up to 50 percent U.S. Government financing of surveys of investment opportunities.			
	Hickenlooper amendment: Sec. 620 requires suspension of aid to any country which nationalizes, expropriates, seizes, or imposes restrictions of similar effect on any U.S. majority-owned investment without appropriate steps to compensate within 6 months.		Support Hickenlooper amendment.	Encourage compensation for nationalization by host government (Comap [2]). Emphasize congressional disapproval of discriminatory measures; cut aid if host government obligations not met by end of 1963; reduce time requirement for compensatory steps from 6 to 3 months, authorize U.S. Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to evaluate expropriated property (IEPA). Compensate expropriation losses through reductions in prior-approved aid loans (Senator HUMPHREY).
	Foreign currency loans: Sec. 612 authorizes use of U.S.-owned foreign currencies. Sec. 104 of Public Law 480 (Cooley fund) authorizes 25 percent of proceeds from sales of surplus commodities for loans to private U.S. companies abroad or foreign affiliates, and to foreign firms which expand U.S. agricultural exports.		Expand Cooley fund loans.	

See footnotes at end of table.

program and recommended improvements

President's message (Apr. 2, 1963)	Administration amendments (Foreign Assistance Act of 1963)	The aid gap (between program and performance)	What's needed
Apply stricter standard of selectivity and self-help. Reduce and ultimately eliminate aid. Increase role of private investment. Continue aid for defense against external and internal Communist attack. Emphasize burden sharing.		Program objectives and priorities inadequately defined. Various types of aid not clearly identified. Long-range economic development planning frequently sacrificed on altar of quick political payoff. Emergency aid for financial bailouts, military forces, and politically inspired projects overemphasized. Selectivity and self-help criteria too loose. Private incentives inadequate. Burden sharing inequitable.	Congressional action to require definitive statement by administration of aid purposes, objectives, and priorities by geographical area, and to further require categorical commitment by administration to such definition. Amendments to sec. 102 to (1) specifically state intent of Congress that economic development funds be prohibited from use for emergency short-term budgetary, balance of payments, and military aid and other purposes, not essential to long-range economic development of recipient countries; and (2) further state intent of Congress that such emergency aid requirements be met through international institutions, such as International Monetary Fund, equipped to condition such aid on immediate economic and monetary reforms. Amendment to sec. 102 to require progress reports by recipient countries on self-help and reform measures planned and achieved, before economic aid is committed.
Emphasize economic development increasingly through loans. Apply stricter loan terms. Increase lending in countries which permit aid to be directed toward ultimate full self-support. Enlarge participation of private enterprise. Encourage land-grant and other university relationships with aid programs.	Amends sec. 631 to authorize President to select U.S. citizen to serve as Chairman of OECD's Development Assistance Committee. Amends sec. 635 to provide payment of reimbursable indirect costs to educational institutions carrying out authorized oversea programs.	Funds subject to misuse for nondevelopmental purposes. Loan repayment terms too loose. Shift from grants to loans too slow.	Amendments to secs. 201 and 211 to require economic development aid to any project to be programed in host country development plan specifically providing for appropriate participation of private enterprise. Amendment to sec. 201 to specifically exempt development loan fund from all contingency, transfer, and consolidation provisions of secs. 451, 610, 614, and 645. Amendment to sec. 201 to fix range of development loan terms. Executive regulation to require consideration of development loan before approving development grant. Support for administration amendment to sec. 231 to authorize appointment of U.S. Chairman of OECD's Development Assistance Committee.
Place initiative on increased role for private investment and other non-Federal resources in assisting developing nations. Amend Internal Revenue Code for a trial period to grant U.S. taxpayers tax credit for new investments and reinvestments in developing countries.	Proposes to amend Internal Revenue Code to authorize U.S. tax credit for certain investment and reinvestment in less developed countries.	Fail to provide adequate positive incentives to, and protection of climate for, local foreign private initiative.	Coordinated joint representations by U.S. Government and U.S. business to recipient nations, clearly stating necessity and practicality of including measures to stimulate private enterprise participation in economic development plans. Removal of legal ban on AID financing of private projects for which other free world financing is available. Tax-sparing treaties which waive U.S. tax liability on earnings on which host governments forgo local tax. Executive regulation to require use of statutory authority to make dollar loans to selected U.S. firms investing abroad in projects which AID determines as necessary to sound economic development in host country. Executive regulation to require use of statutory authority to subcontract Government-financed oversea projects to U.S. firms. Resolution of Government attitude toward U.S. private productive investment abroad, and substantial Government encouragement and protection of such investment.
Amend investment guarantee provisions to enlarge and clarify program.	Amends sec. 221 to relax 100-percent ownership restriction by defining "wholly owned" as "determined without regard to any shares, in aggregate less than 5 percent of total issued and subscribed share capital, required by law to be held by persons other than parent corporation." Doubles authorized dollar volume of outstanding investment guarantees against specific risks; increases volume of guarantees against extended risks, triples volume of Latin American housing guarantees.	Do not cover decisive risk of riot and civil strife. Do not cover U.S. joint or minority investments otherwise urged upon business by Government. Authority to cover commercial risks virtually unused. Terms too limited as to percentage coverage of equity and loan investment and reinvestment in expansion and modernization.	Consideration of amendments to broaden investment guarantee coverage. Chamber of commerce is studying amendments to sec. 221 to expand guarantees to cover— (1) Risks of riots and civil disturbances. (2) U.S. joint or minority ventures. (3) Higher percentage of loan investment and reinvestment. (4) Working capital loans.
Emphasize investment surveys.		Funds originally requested dropped from revised budget.	Amendment to sec. 231 to restore original budget request.
		Does not cover minority ventures.	Consideration of amendment to sec. 620 to extend protection to U.S. minority-owned joint ventures.
Emphasize Cooley fund loans.		Authority to make Cooley fund loans too restricted.	Amendments to Public Law 480 to increase to 50 percent the authority to lend surplus commodity proceeds to U.S. affiliates abroad, and to authorize local currency loans to foreign firms which expand markets for U.S. industrial (as well as agricultural) exports.

U.S. chamber comparative analysis of aid program

	Present law (Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended)	Chamber recommendations (Mar. 15, 1963)	Clay Committee recommendations (Mar. 20, 1963)	Other recommendations [1]
Alliance for Progress	Sec. 251 and Latin American Development Act authorize aid to Latin America to mobilize resources for economic development and adopt reforms to spread benefits of economic progress. Directs aid to human as well as economic resources.	Coordinate hemispheric aid, trade, and financial policies through institutions similar to OECD. Realistically determine attainable objectives. Encourage creation of more favorable atmosphere for private business. Support Inter-American Development Bank and social progress trust fund loans for development through private as well as public projects.	Condition continued aid on specified self-help and internal reforms on country-by-country basis. Demand achievement of attainable goals. Favor countries which undertake to meet principles of Punta del Este Charter and encourage growth of private enterprise and foreign investment. Insist on recipient country bearing local costs.	Increase Latin American aid; reappraise policies and programs; stress selectivity; increase local contributions; authorize increased local currency financing; establish Alliance for Progress Corporation to promote private investment (Comap). Stress improvement in local business climate (Comap [2]). Concentrate aid on countries demonstrating self-help and reforms (Comap, IEPA, Senator HUMPHREY). Stress regional economic integration; encourage development of rural cooperatives (Senator HUMPHREY). Increase support of voluntary aid associations (Senator HUMPHREY).
Multilateral aid	Sec. 301 authorizes grants through international programs. Sec. 205 authorizes U.S.-owned local currency loans for basic development through International Development Association.	Emphasize multilateral aid, making full use of private international consortia. Urge intensive study of problems of countries dependent on single commodities.	Shift aid programs gradually to international administration (e.g., International Development Association).	
Military aid	Sec. 503 authorizes military aid to any friendly country or international organization to strengthen U.S. security and promote world peace.	Phase out military aid; pare to minimum immediately—particularly in Western Europe. Press efforts to persuade NATO countries to accept larger responsibilities.	Cut military aid substantially over next 3 years, limit to internal security (small arms) in Latin America and other areas. Exclude combat zone aid from program. Reduce aid given in return for U.S. military base rights. Extend aid only extraordinarily to country in conflict with non-Communist neighbor friendly to United States.	Condition on economic self-help (Senator MANSFIELD).
Supporting assistance	Sec. 401 authorizes aid to friendly countries and organizations to promote economic or political stability.	Substantially reduce supporting assistance for supplies and wages for local military forces.	Cut supporting economic aid sharply over 3-year period.	Shift to economic development aid (Senator MANSFIELD). Eliminate in some countries (Representative MONAGAN).
Contingencies	Sec. 451 authorizes special fund for any economic aid in U.S. national interest. Sec. 614 authorizes special funds for any aid important to U.S. security, without regard to requirements of this law (except development lending requirements).	Cut these funds in line with establishment of specific funds for various aid purposes.	Support ample contingency fund.	
Budget account transfers	Sec. 610 authorizes transfer or consolidation of 10 percent of various funds (except Development Loan Fund). Sec. 645 authorizes continued availability and consolidation of unexpended funds.	Prohibit use of various aid funds for purposes other than those specified for each.		Prohibits transfers from new special development loan fund for private enterprise (IEPA).

[1] Recommendations of Commerce Committee for the Alliance for Progress (Comap), International Economic Policy Association (IEPA), Business Council for International Understanding (BCIU), and various Members of Congress.

[2] Separate comments of Comap members David Rockefeller, Henry Wriston, and Emilio Collado.

Recommended changes in the fiscal 1964 budget

[In thousands of dollars]

	Requested	Recommended reduction or saving
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT		
FOREIGN ASSISTANCE—MILITARY		
Military assistance	1,480,000	280,000
U.S. military assistance for equipment and facilities to Western European and other nations is being cut back. The cutbacks can be accelerated to provide considerable savings. Further savings can come from ending the practice of propping up showcase military forces of some countries. In addition, other industrial nations, increasing in wealth, should help bear more of the cost of this military assistance.		
Supporting assistance	397,000	97,000
As military assistance is cut back, supporting assistance for such things as food and wages for the personnel can also be similarly reduced.		
Development grants	275,000	75,000
Grants (or gifts) of money are charity which even the recipients as a rule don't want. They prefer loans. So does this country, but the shift from grants to loans could be faster.		
Contingency fund	400,000	200,000
The President is given this money for emergencies not otherwise provided for. A recent example was aid for Chilean earthquake victims. However, $200,000,000 should be enough for this purpose. Specific congressional authority should be required for further expenditures.		
Development loans—revolving fund	1,248,000	348,000
The fund was set up by Congress for long-range plans and programs in underdeveloped countries to build up economic resources such as factories, mines, farms, roads, and ports, and to teach men and women necessary skills. In many cases, however, money from the fund has been used to pay off unsound national debts, to prop up shaky currencies, and to bail out government in balance-of-payments crises. Although development loans as originally authorized by Congress are highly desirable, much of the money in the fund is not being used appropriately. The fund should not get as much this year as the $975,000,000 it got last year.		
Alliance for Progress	700,000	300,000
The Alliance for Progress is too disorganized to meet its goals. Aid, trade, and financial policies need to be coordinated throughout the hemisphere, as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development strives to do for its members. Programs of the Alliance need to be reexamined and made more consistent with what is possible to accomplish. Also the Latin American nations should be encouraged to create a much more favorable atmosphere for private business. Until steps are taken toward these ends no more than $400,000,000 can be put to good use.		
Administrative expenses—AID	57,250	7,250
AID is requesting $7,750,000 more for administrative expenses. Although the chamber is recommending considerable cuts in the AID program, it believes a $500,000 increase can be justified in light of the need for more talented and experienced personnel. So a $7,250,000 cut is recommended in the request.		
Administrative expenses—State Department	3,025	325
This recommendation would hold funds at last year's expenditures in view of no compelling justification for an increase.		
Peace Corps	108,000	8,000
This program is regarded as highly successful and useful. But the Corps is having difficulty getting enough specialists of the kinds it needs. So it is doubtful that it could efficiently assimilate a 100-percent increase in funds in its 2nd year. In view of its growth difficulties, the Corps should be held to about 90 percent of its request.		

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—Con.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE—MILITARY—continued

and recommended improvements—Continued

President's message (Apr. 2, 1963)	Administration amendments (Foreign Assistance Act of 1963)	The aid gap (between program and performance)	What's needed
Concentrate support on countries adhering to principles established in Charter of Punta del Este; precisely indicate required local policy change, reforms, and other self-help measures. Encourage economic integration.	Amends act to authorize subsequent use of unappropriated funds. Amends Latin American Development Act to increase Alliance for Progress funds.	Inadequate long-range planning, policy coordination, and private participation.	New legislation to establish Organization for Western Hemisphere Economic Cooperation and Development to coordinate aid, trade, and monetary policies of member nations. Realistic determination by administration of attainable objectives. Support for Inter-American Development Bank. Opposition to administration amendments to increase Alliance funds until substantive improvements in program are achieved.
Selectively supplement U.S. contributions to international lending institutions in conjunction with increased contributions from from other industrialized nations.	Amends act to reduce multilateral aid.	Present U.S. Government participation and private international consortia too limited.	Administration encouragement and protection of joint ventures by international consortia recommended by AID Administrator as necessary to host country economic development. Burden sharing made more equitable through OECD's Development Assistance Committee. Study of proposals to stabilize international commodity markets.
Emphasize economic rather than military aid, review both size and purpose of local military forces which receive U.S. aid; but anticipate need for new and expanded military aid.	Amends act to reduce military aid.	Still overemphasized; not adequately geared to recipient nations known capabilities in global defense strategy.	New ways and means to persuade NATO countries to accept additional responsibilities. Support for administration amendment to reduce funds, plus substantial further reductions.
	Amends act to increase supporting assistance.	Overused for questionable support for military forces.	Opposition to administration amendment to increase fund.
Increase contingency fund.	Amends sec. 451 to increase contingency fund.	Excessive commitment of funds for unidentified aid in unforeseen circumstances.	Amendment to sec. 451 (existing contingency fund) to limit to emergencies not provided for by other specific funds. Amendment to sec. 614 (special authority for national security purposes) to prohibit use of any other fund for these purposes. Opposition to administration amendment to increase fund.
	Amends sec. 645 to authorize continued consolidation of unexpended balances with other funds.	Permits funds to be used for other than intended purposes.	Amendments to secs. 610 and 645 to prohibit use of various aid funds for purposes other than those specified for each. Opposition to administration amendment to sec. 645 to authorize continued consolidation of unexpended balances with other funds.

Specific budget requests for which chamber support is approved

[In thousands of dollars]

	Appropriation requested
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT	
FOREIGN ASSISTANCE—ECONOMIC	
International organizations and programs	136,250
The national chamber supports in full the administration's revised requests of $136,250,000 for international economic aid programs, on 2 counts: (1) the chamber believes multilateral foreign aid, to which other industrialized nations contribute through international lending institutions, should be encouraged and emphasized as a practical alternative to U.S. financing alone; (2) the 13 programs financed under this account represent current commitments which the U.S. Government is obligated to fulfill.	
Social progress trust fund of the Inter-American Development Bank	200,000
The chamber supports the full $200,000,000 request for the Inter-American Development Bank's social progress trust fund. Its funds are used for loans for low-cost housing, potable water and sanitation, agricultural and technical aid basic to the raising of living standards in Latin America. Each loan must be matched by local financing 4 times its size, or 80 percent of the total cost. The loans are used to help establish private credit institutions and other private enterprise. The chamber also supports the administration's request for a $50,000,000 regular subscription to the Inter-American Development Bank.	
Surveys of investment opportunities	1,500
The chamber endorses the administration's request for $1,500,000 to help finance feasibility surveys of potential areas for U.S. private investment in the underdeveloped countries as vital to much-needed private business participation in the aid program.	

	Appropriation requested
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—Continued	
FOREIGN ASSISTANCE—ECONOMIC—continued	
Subscription to International Development Association	61,656
The chamber supports the administration's entire request of $61,700,000 in regular subscription to this international lending institution, which specializes in local currency loans to nations in need of basic development.	
American schools and hospitals abroad	20,000
The chamber supports the full White House revised request of $20,000,000 for American schools and hospitals abroad as necessary to provide U.S. citizens serving overseas with needed educational and health facilities, and—to the extent American hospital care is provided local foreign nationals—as worthy humanitarian projects which benefit the U.S. image abroad.	
Hospitals abroad (local currency)	2,000
The chamber supports the full White House request of $2,000,000 for the American-sponsored children's hospital in Poland.	
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE	
Assistance to refugees in the United States	70,000
The chamber supports the administration's full request of $70,000,000 for this necessary humanitarian program for Cuban refugees.	

NATIONAL SECURITY AND MANPOWER RESOURCES

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy in his budget message to the Congress has recommended a program to meet national goals that depends more heavily for its fulfillment on scientific research and development than any set of recommendations ever placed before this body.

To maintain a vigorous posture of military security, to sustain space exploration second to none, to stimulate domestic economic growth, to continue strides in medical advancement, to meet the problems of a highly urbanized society—for all these purposes we look more than ever before to the fruits of scientific discovery and their prompt conversion to technology.

Research and development appropriations proposed by the President amount to 15 percent of the total budget. These funds reflect a substantial increase since launching of the first sputnik dramatically revealed how intimately our Nation's leadership in the world would depend on a leadership in science and engineering.

We all know, however, that strength of our Nation's research and development is not simply a product of increased expenditures. Limitations on skilled manpower could throttle our effort even more critically than a limitation on budget. For the first time in our history, we may be confronted with a plurality of goals that may well outstrip our supply of scientists and engineers.

The appetite of today's technology for high-level technical manpower is tremendous. The space program furnishes one clear example of the increased sophistication in systems development; the interplay required between different scientific disciplines; the unprecedented demands for reliability. But civilian technology requires similar skills in improvement of our domestic transportation and communications systems, in keeping one technological step ahead of our competitors in world consumer and industrial markets.

In a sense, we stand at a crossroads. We have elected a number of national goals that require world technological leadership. Growth and diversity in research and development effort must be sustained. Yet the slack in the technical manpower system has been almost fully absorbed in our recent rapid expansion.

The dramatic explosion of scientific effort was made possible by a remarkable influx of gifted people in research and development functions from other occupations, by increased production of scientists and engineers through legislation which assisted World War II and Korean veterans to complete studies.

Only a few more people can be appropriately drawn away from nonresearch and development activities, or effectively accommodated in professional ranks without additional training. Moreover, considering the long leadtime for training, the new supply of scientists and engineers for the rest of this decade is already in college and thus fixed by current enrollments; and for the next decade these people are already in junior or senior high school. Growth and strength of our research and development effort will thus be critically limited by productive capacity of our educational system, and by utilization of those already engaged in research and development.

Long-term planning thus becomes essential because we cannot accept the consequences of a random development of our manpower resources to meet present goals. Moreover, the future is difficult to foresee, and we must be prepared to meet the unexpected—to exploit new scientific opportunities as swiftly in the future as we have in the past in atomic energy and in space.

The Committee on Science and Astronautics has felt a mounting concern for future manpower requirements, especially in terms of the constantly higher training required of all our technical personnel. Our concern is not unique.

The President, about a year ago—taking note of published reports on deliberate measures by the Soviet Union to develop its technical manpower—requested his Science Advisory Committee to take a careful look at this problem. With release by the White House of the first in a series of reports on manpower, I asked Dr. Jerome Wiesner, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology, to comment on specific problem areas, and on programs aimed at their solution. My letter and his reply are submitted for the RECORD following these remarks.

The impending shortage and the most urgent need for action that Dr. Wiesner describes relate to quality, not quantity. Fulfillment of our diverse programs to which we are already committed may be threatened unless strong action is taken to increase the output from our graduate schools, particularly of more engineers, mathematicians, and physical scientists who combine high talent and high training.

For example, in 1950 we turned out 2,000 Ph. D.'s in these 3 fields; in 1960, we graduated 3,000, an increase of 50 percent. But in 1970 we need a minimum of 7,500, an increase in the decade of 150 percent. For among other sources of demand for these graduates are the universities themselves; they must accommodate the first wave of the postwar baby boom who become college applicants in 1965.

I do not like to use the Soviet achievements as a yardstick for our own activities, but can we afford to sit back while the Soviets already have three Ph. D. engineers in their ranks to every one of ours, while they train more at an even faster rate?

In this country, only about 4 percent of the B.S. graduates in engineering go on to a doctorate. Out of a group of 10,000 citizens of age 30, only about 4 have a Ph. D. in engineering. This is far too few. The study conducted for the President suggests that the manpower requirements of this decade can be met only if more students studying science and engineering—those already in the college pipeline—are encouraged to continue on to full-time graduate study.

The major barrier to such advanced study is financial. Faced with a choice of a $7,000 starting salary and a very much smaller graduate stipend, many highly qualified college graduates—especially those with family responsibilities and those who incurred debts as undergraduates—decide that they cannot afford graduate education. Others extend their study by combining part-time study with part-time work, often becoming dropouts.

Another barrier is limited graduate facilities and faculty.

To remedy these problems, following recommendations to him by his advisers, the President has placed before the Congress a program of support for graduate students and for facilities that emphasizes the number of new starts.

Both because the Federal Government is a major consumer of scientific talent, and because the problem is urgent, the President proposes a program with Federal leadership, but involving a close relationship with State and local governments, industry, and the universities.

Fellowship and training grant subventions are proposed in budgets especially of the National Science Foundation, Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and extension and expansion of the National Defense Education Act.

These proposals would represent a deliberate first step whereby the Federal Government accepts the Nation's responsibility to assure adequacy of technical manpower resources to meet its commitments. They could provide more and better opportunities for advanced training of our able young people so that none need turn away from graduate study because of financial need, or because training facilities are inadequate or too far away.

The question has often been raised at this point whether an increase in the graduate student population would serve to undermine the quality of a graduate education. It is no doubt true that indiscriminate expansion of facilities without regard to available teaching strength, geographic location, and area of specialization, would very often do more harm than good.

But many outstanding schools would greatly appreciate a larger number of fellowships which would prevent the loss of good graduate students. Many other schools which show promise of becoming centers of excellence are so limited in funds that they cannot retain their best students for teaching and research assignments, or build much-needed laboratories and classrooms.

There are probably more untapped graduate manpower resources in some fields than in others. In the physical sciences, the percentage of students going on to receive Ph. D. degrees is as high as 18 to 20 percent. It may not be possible or desirable to increase output substantially in fields where such a high proportion do attempt graduate work.

But in other fields such as engineering where only 4 percent of those obtaining a B.S. degree go on to receive a Ph. D. it appears certain that a relatively large number of well-qualified students could be attracted toward graduate study.

In a recent survey by the Engineers Joint Council, 136 responding institutions that offer graduate engineering

curriculum reported 3,160 students are now on fellowships, that an additional 6,420 fellowships could be used if available. Only 33 current fellowships are unfilled. The normal sources of financial assistance for graduate students and graduate programs just cannot be expected to expand rapidly enough to remove this graduate manpower bottleneck. We should listen to the President's Science Advisory Committee when it recommends that "an immediate, vigorous national effort to increase graduate training in engineering, mathematics, and physical sciences" be undertaken.

It is clear from Dr. Wiesner's letter that this area of graduate study is but one deserving attention. There are other serious questions regarding need for technicians, opportunities for women, retraining of those whose skills have become obsolete, and the area of manpower utilization.

In a free democratic society, we do not assign individuals by decree of a centralized manpower board. Rather, we try to maximize the opportunities and the information about these opportunities, so that our young people can exercise an independent and informed choice. But we cannot be nonchalant about this issue in the cold war atmosphere that demands continued U.S. leadership. All elements of our society must study and act—industry, universities, the Executive, and the Congress.

Because of the serious nature of this matter, because of its extreme importance to the future welfare of the Nation, and due to the impact which our present action or inaction will have upon the lives of coming generations, it is my hope and intent to inaugurate a careful and comprehensive inquiry into the status of scientific manpower. This inquiry will require careful staff preparation, which I plan to augment as soon thereafter as feasible with committee hearings to draw testimony from the country's foremost experts in scientific and technical resources.

The main purpose of the inquiry, which the Committee on Science and Astronautics will be undertaking pursuant to its charter from the House, will be to identify the problems of sufficient scientific manpower and to separate the real from the apparent.

We do not kid ourselves that this will be an easy job, and we shall be indebted to many others who have inquired into some of these difficulties from time to time in the past. However, the completed task is an urgent one which can no longer be delayed.

FEBRUARY 15, 1963.

Dr. JEROME B. WIESNER,
Director, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. WIESNER: For some time those of us serving on the Committee on Science and Astronautics have felt a mounting concern for the future requirements the Nation faces with regard to its scientific and technical resources. This concern extends not merely to adequate research programs and well distributed facilities, but even more to that most crucial element of our national progress—scientific manpower and the constantly higher degree of training that it must have in these times.

I am aware, of course, that our concern is not unique. The recent report of your own Science Advisory Committee to the President has highlighted some of the growing difficulties in the field of scientific and technological training. Similar recognition of the problem has been evidenced by the National Academy of Sciences, the National Science Foundation, by industry and by the universities. Moreover, this same apprehension was in prominent display during this committee's annual conference last month with its Science Advisory Panel.

In my judgment, it is becoming imperative that the executive and legislative branches of the government join hands in this matter with an eye toward making the Federal effort to bolster research and technological training as effective as possible. While I think that the Nation in general has been doing a commendable job, I doubt if it will suffice in the future. The close association this committee has with the national space program and our recognition of the vast demands which this program alone is making upon our scientific resources leads me to the conclusion that better and more coordinated planning for the development of highly trained scientific talent is an absolute must in the years ahead. And, obviously, the needs of the space program are but a segment of the whole requirement.

With this background in mind, I am addressing you as Director of the Office of Science and Technology, to solicit your aid and suggestions in devising methods to pinpoint specific problem areas and in seeking avenues for their solution. It may be that a broad investigation by this committee of future scientific and technological requirements would be useful—in the course of which facts and information might be obtained from those in and out of government who are most exposed to the exigencies of our national scientific and technological effort.

Your thoughts and comments on this matter will be most welcome.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, D.C., March 27, 1963.

Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your recent letter on problems in scientific manpower, and your invitation to pinpoint specific areas deserving immediate attention are sincerely appreciated. Few other issues relate so critically to the successful fulfillment of our national aspirations—to the ability of this Nation to maintain our national security, to stimulate economic growth and to continue the march toward a world free of want and of war—as does the development of our human resources. Many vital commitments have already been made which depend upon contributions of science and technology. Meeting these commitments thus depends heavily on an adequate supply of scientists and engineers—adequate in both quantity and quality. Yet, while the abundance of these resources has been the concern of all sectors of our technological community, the formulation of plans to meet the aggregate needs has been the primary responsibility of none. It is for this reason that the President last year asked for an extensive special study of this area, a matter I shall refer to in detail subsequently.

The manyfold demands for technical manpower draw on the same pool of talent—for defense and space, for innovation of civilian products able to compete in a world market, for meeting such domestic problems as mass transportation and environmental pollution associated with a rapidly urbanized society, for medical advancement, and for the effective management of our resources in such a way that we can help upgrade the way of life of citizens throughout the world without downgrading our own. Superposed on these requirements is the need for science, mathematics and engineering teachers to meet the rapidly growing college enrollment. A sharp competition for manpower has resulted, particularly for the superior individual having advanced training. In that competition, not all sectors of demand have succeeded in meeting their needs, and the future outlook is not encouraging.

For the first time, we are confronted with a plurality of goals that may well outstrip our technical manpower resources.

Most these major goals should not be placed on an either-or basis. Thus, we cannot, in fact we need not, accept the hazards and risks of a random development of our manpower resources to meet present goals. Moreover, the future is difficult to foresee, and we must be prepared to capitalize on the unforeseen; we must be prepared to move as swiftly to exploit new opportunities as we have in space and earlier in atomic energy. Because of the long lead time in training, we cannot do this unless we have a cadre of able, well-trained people.

The Soviet Union's response to this same challenge is well known. They have embarked on a program to improve their capabilities by deliberately training very large numbers of science-oriented professional and semiprofessional personnel. They now graduate, for example, over twice as many baccalaureates in engineering each year as we. Far more significant in my own mind, they already have three times as many Ph. D. engineers in their manpower pool as we—26,000 as compared to our 9,000. The quality of these Soviet resources as measured by talent and high training leaves no room for complacency.

Faced with the same manpower problem as the Soviet Union, how, in a democratic society where each citizen must have a free choice of his or her occupation, do we meet this challenge?

About 1 year ago the President requested that his Science Advisory Committee take stock of our manpower resources and report on measures which should be taken within and without Government to meet our society's complex needs. The Committee's first report, released last December, is one of a series now under preparation, and concentrates on an especially urgent problem of impending shortages of engineers, mathematicians, and physical scientists who combine high ability and advanced training. Based on the Committee's recommendations for action, the President has included in his budget for fiscal year 1964 and in legislation now before the Congress a far-reaching program specifically focused on meeting this shortage. By linking Federal, State, and private efforts, this program would help immediately increase the number already in college—who have made this career choice and who are found qualified—to go on to graduate training.

The urgent need for more individuals having advanced training is clear. The variety and complexity of fundamentals that underpin scientific research have grown enormously. Many fields now embrace two or more disciplines, and require a thorough grounding in each.

Similarly, engineers are called upon to use more sophisticated scientific concepts in the

design of military and space systems which, in turn, manifest unprecedented demands for reliability, and economy. Civilian industry, which faces tasks such as the development of natural resources and the improvement of transport systems, must also advance by converting new scientific knowledge to technology, and for this purpose requires men who can draw upon understanding in fields of management, economics, law, behavioral sciences and natural sciences, as well as engineering. Research and engineering activities, whether pursued in the office, classroom, or laboratory, today require training well beyond that afforded in the 4-year undergraduate curriculum.

That even 1 year beyond the baccalaureate significantly strengthens the individual's capabilities is revealed by the large number of students now enrolled in part-time graduate study. In fact, over half of the graduate students in engineering are part time. As valuable as this part-time training may be, full-time attendance would be much better.

To keep pace with our national needs, it is the judgment of the President's Science Advisory Committee that we should and could increase the number of Ph. D.'s each year in engineering, mathematics, and physical sciences (EMP) to reach 7,500 in 1970, the number of master's or equivalent to 30,000. This annual production of 37,500 advanced degrees by 1970 should be compared with 15,000 in 1960, 11,000 in 1950.

A substantial fraction of these new graduates, incidentally, must be plowed back into the universities for teaching, and soon. The first wave of the postwar baby boom is already in high school and will move into the universities in 1965. Based on census statistics, the number of eligible college applicants will rise in just 1 year by over 20 percent. Faculty will be required to teach college majors in science, engineering, and mathematics. Additional graduates with specialized training will be needed for high quality teaching in colleges and high schools of future citizens who will work in nontechnical fields, but who must be more literate in science if they are to conduct their own affairs and perform public duties intelligently.

At the same time that the college-age population is growing, a larger fraction are entering college. We surely do not want to reverse this trend toward wider educational opportunity. In view of the time required to complete the graduate education necessary for teaching, we are dangerously near the deadline imposed by the unrelenting advance of new college enrollees. It is a little startling to realize that an upper limit to the 1970 crop of technical Ph. D.'s has already been established, since most of these are college juniors.

Parenthetically, the crop for 1980 is also probably limited by quality of math and science courses being taught today to our junior high school students.

It is my view that the baccalaureate base for increased graduate enrollment in engineering, mathematics, and physical sciences is ample to meet PSAC's 1970 goals.

In these three fields, roughly 8 percent of those with a bachelor's degree now go on to a doctorate. We believe that many more are both able and motivated. In fact, in physics and chemistry nearly 20 percent continue on to receive a doctorate. But in engineering, it is only 4 percent; in mathematics, 8 percent. To the Committee, enhancing our manpower supply is primarily a matter of quality, not quantity; not a matter of diverting more college students to science and engineering, but of providing for more students who have chosen this career route the opportunity to continue their studies. This means, first, sharply increasing the fraction of full-time students who go on to graduate study in mathematics and engineering; and second, with numerically increasing enrollments in physics and chemistry, assuring continuation of at least the same fraction who complete the doctorate.

Assuming that the proposition of baccalaureates in these three fields continues unchanged in relation to the total number of bachelors degrees (somewhere around 17 percent), the actual number of graduates will approximately double during this decade because of increased total enrollments. With 3,000 doctorates produced in 1960, a potential of 6,000 for 1970 is a minimum expectation. However, we have already noted that the fraction of engineers and mathematicians who now go on to the doctorate is far less than in other fields of science, and could be markedly increased without any drop in academic standards. This explains then, the 7,500 goal for 1970 rather than 6,000. Neither of these, however, will be realized unless significant steps are taken immediately to increase the opportunities for the students and the capacity of the institutions.

With regard to students, the major barrier to continuation of full-time graduate study is financial. Faced with a choice of a starting salary above $7,000, and a very much smaller stipend for graduate study, many highly qualified college graduates—especially those with family responsibilities and those who incurred debts as undergraduates—decide that they cannot afford graduate education. Others extend their study by combining part-time study with part-time work, often becoming a dropout.

Another barrier is inadequate graduate facilities. Increasingly, universities will be obliged to turn away students because of space or faculty limitations.

In addition, there is very convincing evidence that some geographical areas produce a much greater proportion of doctorates than others. In fact, 10 States are producing doctoral graduates at a rate nearly three times that of the remaining 40 States. Relatively few students are prepared to study more than several hundred miles from their homes. It would thus appear that we have a special problem in terms of meeting an unequal geographical distribution of centers of educational excellence.

The present barriers to graduate education—limitations in student support, number of faculty, and educational facilities—must be overcome. It is to that end that the President has proposed that the Federal Government take the initiative and provide the leadership needed to meet these national needs.

To meet goals for graduate education in the three fields of potential shortage—engineering, mathematics, and physical sciences—it is of critical importance that we increase the number of graduate students enrolling in the fall of 1964 from the 22,000 which may be expected on the basis of projected trends to some 30,000. The number of full-time graduate students should also be increased. Therefore, the President has proposed support for 12,000 qualified first year enrollees and for 14,000 graduate students beyond the first year of their training. These numbers should be compared to support for roughly 3,500 first year and 10,000 advanced graduate students in 1962. Emphasis, you will note, is on the number of new starts. Support would be provided within existing legislation, through NSF, AEC, and NASA fellowships, and through new NSF science development and training grant programs. Support would also be provided for research assistantships in accordance with present patterns. The President has also proposed that the NDEA fellowship program, which has been eminently successful, be extended and considerably expanded in H.R. 3000 now before the Congress, especially to accommodate increasing enrollments in these three fields. In virtually all of these cases, assistance to students would be accompanied by a grant directly to the college or university to help meet the true cost of education, and thus would assist the university to maintain an internal balance between fields.

The President also proposes Federal support for new physical facilities, including funds through NSF laboratory and science development grants, through NASA university grants and through a new program proposed in H.R. 3000, of graduate facilities to be operated by the Office of Education. These amounts total some $85 million, as compared to $24 million in 1962. Virtually all of these facilities funds would be on a 50–50 matching basis. Further details are given in an enclosed table.

The proposed program is designed to achieve a substantial and unprecedented acceleration in the rate of production in advanced degrees in these three fields. The proposition that the Federal Government should increase its responsibilities in this area is supported by three arguments: (a) the Federal Government supports almost three-fourths of all research and development conducted in this country, including major expenditures for space and military activities, and it is these programs of Federal origin that have created the shortage; (b) State governments and privately endowed universities face practical difficulties in raising the funds required for expansion in graduate education, especially in competition with funds that will be needed to meet the undergraduate surge; (c) because the demand for specialized manpower is nationwide, neither States nor communities feel it their exclusive responsibility to meet problems or contribute funds which, in the case of graduate education, may primarily benefit the economy of other communities or other States.

There is nothing completely new about Federal assistance for higher education. Past experience with the GI bill and the National Defense Education Act program, Federal agency supported mission-oriented research, and NSF-sponsored basic research, on the whole, has been eminently successful. What is new about the President's program, however, is an acceptance by the Federal Government of a Nation's responsibility to assure the adequacy of technical manpower resources to meet its commitments—by providing more and better opportunities for advanced training.

In this letter, it has been possible to convey only a few highlights of this very complex problem concerned with the supply and demand of specialized manpower. The ills are difficult to diagnose; prescriptions often uncertain in effect. I have wanted to respond to your very kind invitation, however, by bringing to your attention the findings of studies already completed for the President and of the important proposals which are now before the Congress to meet impending shortages in engineering, mathematics, and physical sciences. Our studies are continuing incidentally in relation to other problem areas.

The technical fields in which these manpower are engaged relate to the missions of a number of different Federal agencies. Moreover, the support for graduate education and research is involved in the budgets of a number of agencies. The problem, therefore, covers a broad spectrum of interest. I would certainly agree with your suggestion, and I am sure the President would be pleased if your committee would provide a forum to explore full implications of the technical manpower problem, as well as the possible consequences of delay and inattention to this issue.

Sincerely,

JEROME B. WIESNER.

Fiscal year 1964 proposals by the President for Federal assistance to graduate education in engineering, mathematics, and physical sciences

NUMBER OF FEDERAL STUDENT AIDS AWARDED

Fiscal year	Fellowships					NSF science development grants	Research assistantships [3]	National Defense Education Act student loans	NSF training grant program	Total administration proposals	PSAC recommendations [4]
	AEC	HEW [1]	NSF	National Defense Education Act	NASA [2]						
1st-year graduate enrollments:											
1962	80	0	770	400	30	0	1,750	380	X	3,410	X
1964 proposed	80	0	1,200	2,820	375	475	2,270	530	4,500	12,250	15,000
Beyond-1st-year graduate enrollments:											
1962	170	250	1,297	802	70	0	7,000	380	X	9,969	X
1964 proposed	170	400	1,990	[5] 1,360	1,775	175	9,100	[6] 530	0	15,550	18,000

FEDERAL GRANTS FOR GRADUATE FACILITIES

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	NSF laboratory matching grants	NSF science development grants	NASA university grants	Office of Education graduate facility grants	Total Federal grants	PSAC national program target [6 7]
Federal expenditures for construction and equipping graduate facilities:						
1962	17	0	7	X	24	X
1964 proposed	50	8	18	[8] 9	85	250

[1] Primarily chemists.
[2] Division of enrollments between 1st-year and beyond-1st-year categories estimated on the basis of current practices.
[3] Estimate of assistants employed under Government grants and contracts of DOD, AEC, NASA, etc.
[4] Report of the President's Science Advisory Committee, "Meeting Manpower Needs in Science and Technology," Dec. 12, 1962.
[5] Title I of H.R. 3000 (estimated fraction for EMP).
[6] Report of the President's Science Advisory Committee, "Meeting Manpower Needs in Science and Technology," Dec. 12, 1962.
[7] Includes non-Federal matching funds.
[8] Title II of H.R. 3000 (estimated fraction for EMP).

Source: Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) from June 18, 1963, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado and to include the address of the President of the United States at the Air Force Academy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. FASCELL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WICKERSHAM.

Mr. MORRIS.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. REIFEL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. ALGER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 11, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

908. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations) relative to the estimated cost of facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve, pursuant to Public Law 87–554; to the Committee on Armed Services.

909. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

910. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the fourth semiannual consolidated report of balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars, as of December 31, 1962 (pursuant to Public Law 87–195); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

911. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unemployment compensation payments to former Federal civilian employees and exservicemen for more than 1 benefit year based upon only one termination of employment. These payments are financed by Federal appropriations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

912. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the extensive use of first-class air accommodations, District of Columbia government. It is one of a series of reports by this Office showing the unnecessary use of first-class air transportation by various Government agencies and by their contractors at Government expense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

913. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

914. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of April 30, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

915. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 2 of the act of July 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 244), to provide that distribution system loan repayment contracts may be executed contingent upon the availability of appropriated funds"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

916. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the closing of the roll of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Indian Reservation preparatory to submission of proposed legislation for the termination of Federal supervision over the property and affairs of the Confederated Tribes and their members, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

917. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide further compensation to Mrs. Johnson Bradley for certain land and improvements in the village of Odanah, Wis., taken by the Federal Government"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

918. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 1(c)(ii) of the National Aeronautics and Space

Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 382); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

919. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 1(c)(ii) of the act of August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 382); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 4, 1963, the following bill was reported on June 7, 1963:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6755. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates; without amendment (Rept. No. 370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 5, 1963, the following bill was reported on June 7, 1963:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6791. A bill to continue for 2 years the existing reduction of the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted June 10, 1963*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3438. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 4818. A bill to amend section 25 of title 13, United States Code, relating to the duties of enumerators of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 6890. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain improved, voluntary methods of recruiting, training, transporting, and distributing agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6891. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 6892. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit women to withdraw their applications for reduced old-age or wife's insurance benefits in special cases where they filed such applications because of official misinformation and thereby suffered financial detriment without fault on their part; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6893. A bill to debar evidence obtained through electronic eavesdropping; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 6894. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., and St. Petersburg, Fla., through Brandenton, Fla., Sarasota, Fla., Venice, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla., Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., and Miami, Fla., to Fort Lauderdale, Fla., and Homestead, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 6895. A bill to consent to the Goose Lake Basin compact between the States of California and Oregon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 6896. A bill to provide for a national self-help dairy stabilization program and to provide for an adequate balanced and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 6897. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase all benefits thereunder by 10 percent and to provide that full benefits (when based on attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6898. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to improve and strengthen the actuarial status of the trust funds, to permit payment of child's insurance benefits after attainment of age 18 in the case of a child attending school, to extend the period within which ministers may elect coverage, to provide full retroactivity for disability determinations, to increase the annual earnings includible in determining benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 6899. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which may be earned without deductions from benefits in cases where a husband and wife are both beneficiaries but all or most of such outside income is derived by only one of them; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 6900. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain improved, voluntary methods of recruiting, training, transporting, and distributing agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 6901. A bill to consent to the Goose Lake Basin compact between the States of California and Oregon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 6902. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to conduct a survey of all streams which drain directly to the Pacific Ocean from San Mateo County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.J. Res. 464. Joint resolution to provide for a study of needed Federal-aid highway programs for 10 years following the termination of the present Interstate and Defense Highway program by requiring the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive investigation and study of highway traffic and needs based upon 20-year projections, and the changes determined necessary in the Federal-aid highway systems as a result thereof, and to report the results of such study and his recommendations for a 10-year highway program commencing June 30, 1972, to Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.J. Res. 465. Joint resolution to prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from requiring loyalty pledges of farmer-elected agricultural stabilization and conservation committeemen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.J. Res. 466. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. LAIRD: Memorial of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the Congress of the United States to defeat and reject the extreme and harmful changes in timber taxation proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to extension of the service area for the Sacramento Valley Canal; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the construction of a highway from the Florida Keys through the Everglades National Park to the west coast of Florida; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 6903. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kiyoshi Kimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6904. A bill for the relief of Marie Yvette Beaudoin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 6905. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kn Shill Lim Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 6906. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Andrena A. Whalen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 6907. A bill for the relief of Njdeh Megerdichian and his wife, Mary Megerdichian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

151. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Joseph A. Zerello, village clerk, village of Croton-on-Hudson, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution relative to the Board of Trustees of the Village of Croton-on-Hudson requesting legislation that would empower the Attorney General of the United States to go to court on his own to enjoin those who practice or enforce segregation laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

152. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, New Haven, Conn., requesting that there be republished in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Prof. Edward Higbee of the Uni-

versity of Rhode Island, entitled "Now the Nonfarmer Asks for Parity", appearing in the New York Times magazine section of June 2, 1963; to the Committee on House Administration.

153. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, New Haven, Conn., to take appropriate steps to honor former Member of the House of Representatives, Hon. Matthew Lyon, of Vermont, Kentucky, and Arkansas, the only Member to ever represent three different States at different times; to the Committee on House Administration.

154. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, New Haven, Conn., requesting legislation that would determine the exact, specific name of this Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

155. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, New Haven, Conn., relative to correcting the short title to petition No. 148, appearing on page 9937 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 3, 1963, which dealt with the bill H.R. 6160; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

156. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, New Haven, Conn., requesting that Governors Barnett and Wallace of the Dixiecratic South be "told off", and to neutralize and constitutionalize the power structure in Dixie, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Government Lotteries of Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, and Ecuador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to acquaint the Members of this House with additional Latin American countries where gambling is respected and treated as recreation and relaxation. Out of a total of 77 foreign countries where Government-run lotteries are legal and proper, none are as foolish as we are in refusing to recognize and capitalize on the human urge to gamble.

Chile operates two national lotteries. Last year, the gross annual receipts came to over $20¼ million of which the Government received over $3 million. Most of the moneys were earmarked and used for support of colleges, public health service, children's welfare program, hospital construction, Red Cross, and other charitable purposes.

Colombia is a small and poor country, yet it realizes the worth of lotteries. The total gross annual receipts in 1962, came to $33,360,000. The total net income to the National Government was almost $11½ million. These funds were earmarked for the blind and deafmutes, for hospitals, homes for the poor, and the aged, and other charitable institutions.

Costa Rica is another country that realizes that the natural gambling spirit of its people should be regulated and controlled for the benefit of its treasury. Last year, the gross annual receipts ran up to almost $10 million. The total net income to the Government was over $3¼ million. These funds were earmarked for the support of mental institutions and other charitable hospitals.

Ecuador, like a number of other Spanish-speaking nations, conducts a Government lottery not for the benefit of the general treasury but rather for the support of numerous charities. In 1962, the gross receipts of the national lottery of Ecuador came to $2,900,000 of which about $906,000 was turned over to various charitable groups and organizations.

Mr. Speaker, we in America could benefit immeasurably if moneys that now flow into the pockets of gangsters and professional gamblers could be diverted into a U.S. lottery and utilized for the benefit of our own people. Why can't we show the same intelligence and sound judgment as our Latin American friends? A national lottery in this country can not only strike a lethal blow at organized crime but pump into our Treasury over $10 billion a year in additional income which can be used to cut taxes and reduce our national debt.

Mr. Speaker, isn't it time that we stopped being reckless and careless with the tax and revenue advantages offered by a national lottery?

Proposed Increase in Taxes on the Domestic Petroleum Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, recommendations of the administration propose an increase in taxes on the domestic petroleum industry estimated by the Treasury at approximately $280 million annually, or $175 million annually. Both figures have officially been offered.

At the same time, the administration seeks to accelerate industrial activity to provide for an expanding economy

It is difficult for me to see the rationale in these proposals. I can reach no conclusion other than that an increase in taxes paid by oil will retard that industry's growth.

Were taxes on oil and gas production to be increased on the order of $280 million annually, or $175 million, or even $75 million, it would appear evident that the industry's expenditures for a year would be decreased by a like amount. Translating the Treasury's first estimate into capital for drilling operations, it could mean 5,000 fewer well completions. In terms of additions to crude oil reserves, assuming the industry would follow the pattern of the past 5 years, we would fail to develop some half billion barrels of new oil in a single year of reduced drilling activity.

Of course, with a cutback of $280 million in capital realization by the oil industry, not all the reduction in activity would be in the area of oil well drilling. There would be fewer gas wells, service wells, secondary operations, and a general retraction in all phases of drilling-production activity. However, the illustration I have offered serves to bring into focus the magnitude of the proposal to increase oil production taxes.

There is another detrimental aspect to the proposed tax increase. I refer now to exploratory, or wildcat drilling.

In this department, also, there would be a retardation of activity. A large number of exploratory wells, in some indeterminate number, would not be drilled in the search for new oilfields. Yet it is these year-by-year discoveries which provide the industry with its development drilling programs.

In this area the adverse effect would be cumulative.

In my own State of New Mexico—although we are rich in mineral resources—over two-thirds of the total value of all minerals produced is represented by petroleum.

I would be most reluctant to witness a further decline in exploration or development of the petroleum resources of the State of New Mexico. Yet, I am forced to the conclusion that this would be inevitable under the proposed tax program.

Oil, as an industry, enjoys a history of progress since its founding in Pennsylvania in 1859. The unusual hazards it faces in exploration for new reserves has been recognized by realistic tax measures. Since 1926, the depletion factor has been a part of its tax structure. This has served as a needed stimulant to offset the hazards to capital expenditures.

Prior to 1926 discovery depletion was the method used to recognize the peculiar nature of the wasting asset high-risk oil and gas producing industry. However, due to the highly complex nature of this method—percentage depletion was adopted. Now through the back door, the Treasury is seeking to make basic changes in the industry's longstanding tax structure which would be tantamount to a cut in the oil and gas depletion rate of up to one-third. Under the guise of correcting "claimed" defects in the application of existing tax provisions in the natural resources area, the President and the Treasury Department has recommended four specific changes which would—

First. Require a carry forward of intangible deductions for the purpose of reducing the net income from a mineral property in succeeding years upon which the 50-percent limitation is based.

Second. Revoke the taxpayer's option to combine several mineral interests into one property.

Third. Tax gains on sales of mineral properties at ordinary income rates instead of capital-gain rates to the extent of drilling, and depletion deductions (up to cost basis) taken after 1963.

Fourth. Revise the tax treatment of foreign exploration and development costs.

While each of these recommendations would adversely affect oil and gas producers, I particularly wish to point out the harm that would be done to small independent producers if recommendation No. 3—the so-called recoupment provision were enacted. Under present law, any taxable grain realized upon the sale of mineral properties held for more than 6 months is taxed at capital-gains rates. The proposed change would require that gains realized after 1963 be taxed as ordinary income to the extent of deductions taken after 1963 for depletion (up to depletable basis) and drilling costs. In other words, any profit realized from the sale of a mineral property after 1963 would first be considered recovery of prior depletion and drilling deductions which would have to be restored to ordinary taxable income.

Since the vast majority of all sales of mineral properties are made by small independent producers, the full impact of this proposal, which Treasury states will pick up $50 million each year, would fall on those taxpayers least able to absorb this increased tax burden. These smaller companies which discover many, many new oilfields are concerned principally with growth and most always reinvest the bulk of their available cash from the sale of such properties in the further search for and development of new properties. Relatively few independent producers who sell part or all of their properties quit the business; but rather they use the proceeds of the sale to pay their taxes, retire their indebtedness and use what is left over to start in again. The adoption of this particular proposal would severely limit the encouragement of smaller companies and individual operators to remain a vital and effective part of the domestic petroleum industry.

This Nation can ill afford to force out of the oil business these small, yet vitally needed independent producers who find and develop new oilfields and take the money from the sale of such fields to keep on looking for additional new oil reserves.

This proposal as well as all of the other Treasury regulations which adversely affect oil and gas producers should be rejected.

It is my conviction that the industry requires the same tax framework today as it has throughout its history—and for the same reasons—that have provided for progress in the past.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of June 8, 1963.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

CIVIL RIGHTS AND LAWFUL PROCEDURES

The week's events in the field of race relations indicate political motivation behind much of the agitation. The matter has been brought to a head for the people of Dallas by two events: (1) The ill-advised action of ignoring civil service procedures, and (2) the inclusion of Dallas on the Attorney General's list of cities having race problems. As to (1) the order to promote Negroes strictly on the basis of race and to bypass civil service procedures came from Washington. The local postmaster was forced to take action on instructions from his superiors. In bypassing civil service procedures all the postal workers have been downgraded which is bound to result in lowered morale. The merit system for promotions is the only way to insure justice and equity for all Federal workers. The evils of the spoils system became so bad it resulted in the establishment of the Civil Service Commission and the merit system for Federal employees in 1883. Promotions have been based on (a) ability and performance determined by examinations and rating: (b) seniority; (c) supervisory appraisal. All of these factors are ignored now in orders to make promotions on the basis of race. Also ignored with resulting grave injustice is veterans preference. A breakdown in the civil service system can only hurt all Federal employees including minority groups.

As to (2): Including Dallas on a list of cities having race problems was best appraised and dismissed by a Dallas business man present at the President's meeting who said: "I didn't know we had one." The tragedy of the attempts of the President and the Attorney General to force integration policies without regard to legal procedures is that these efforts are creating racial strife where heretofore it did not exist. The relationship between people must be solved locally by those of good will, and good relations cannot be established, nor justice maintained on any other basis. Every citizen must be guaranteed all the rights outlined in the Constitution which means that in the places where taxpayers' money is used and in areas classed as parks and public utility in nature, of course, there can be no discrimination. However, for the President by government action (and force) to define public utility for the purpose of invading private property is to use the 14th amendment to destroy the 5th amendment which forbids the taking of private property without due process.

As in all our relationships these problems must be solved by the people and for the people. In the Post Office to establish justice for all the postal workers and the people they serve. In other areas to protect the rights of all citizens, the majority as well as the minority groups whatever their race or national origin. If discrimination against Negroes is wrong, and it is, then discrimination in reverse—for the Negro and against the whites—is equally bad. The best guarantee the Negro has to attain justice is within the framework of the Constitution. The fight for equality, the battle to eliminate the injustices that do exist cannot be fought on university campuses or the streets of our cities; it cannot be won through Supreme Court decisions or Executive orders altering the Constitution. It must be won on the floor of Congress through proper legislation, through proper respect for law enforcement, and finally through proper religious motivation in the human heart.

TAX LEGISLATION

A tax bill, the President's No. 1 legislation, is a long way off. There is still no bill, that is, no language. The drafting of language is now beginning. When drafted, the basic tax areas—rate reduction, individual and corporate; and the areas of structural reform—will be considered separately, then collectively, as a package. The economic impact of each, also Federal revenue effect as tax-take of each, must be separately, then collectively, computed. Meanwhile, the Korean taxes consisting of corporate rate reduction, 52 percent to 47 percent; and various excises, must be considered for extension. Othervise, these wartime, temporary taxes, expire. There is ample reason for letting these taxes, a package producing $4.1 billion revenue, to expire. However, some feel the Korean taxes should be continued and considered as a part of the larger tax reshuffling requested by the President's $10.3 billion package of recommended changes. I favor letting the Korean taxes expire and then reforming what remains. The Ways and Means Committee agreed not to consider further any change in the taxation of natural resources embracing coal, oil, and the approximately 100 extractive minerals.

COMMUNIST GOALS

The Communist Manifesto of November-December 1960 in Moscow laid down a blueprint for the completion of world domination, prime target being the United States.[1] Their goals of muzzling our military and squashing anti-Communists are continuing to meet with success. Greatest impetus in their drive, of course, is their successful open penetration of the Western Hemisphere and discard of the Monroe Doctrine. Cuba can now be called the beginning of the end for American and Western civilization unless something halts final accomplishment of the blueprint. The Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee accurately assesses the danger in a recent report and lists the 11 clear and present dangers, as follows:

1. Cuba is an advanced Soviet base for subversive, revolutionary, and agitational activities in the Western Hemisphere and affords the opportunity to export agents, funds, arms, ammunition, and propaganda throughout Latin America.

2. Assuming without deciding that all strategic weapons have been withdrawn, there is the ever-present possibility of the stealthy reintroduction of strategic missiles and other offensive weapons, using the Soviet forces still in Cuba as camouflage and security for the activity.

3. Cuba serves as an advance intelligence base for the U.S.S.R.

4. The potential exists to establish electronic warfare capabilities based on Cuba.

5. The vital Panama Canal could be the target for sneak raids originating from Cuba.

6. Potentially, Cuba is a base from which the Soviets could interdict our vital air and sea lanes. It can now be used for the air, sea, and electronic surveillance of our military activities in the Southeast United States and the Caribbean.

7. Cuba's airfields could serve as recovery air bases for planes launched against the United States from the Soviet Union.

8. Advanced Soviet submarine bases could be established in Cuban ports with very little effort.

9. The continued presence of the Soviets in Cuba could require a further reorientation of the U.S. air defenses.

10. Cuba provides a base for the training of agents from other Latin American countries in subversive, revolutionary, agitational, and sabotage techniques.

11. The very presence of the Soviets in Cuba affects adversely our Nation's image and prestige. Our friends abroad will understandably doubt our ability to meet and defeat the forces of communism thousands of miles across the ocean if we prove unable

[1] S. Doc. 47, 87th Cong.

to cope with the Communist threat at our very doorstep.

A consideration of all these matters serves to emphasize the gravity of the threat to our national security which Cuba now represents.

Agricultural Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the vote was close yesterday on the question of whether to reduce the agricultural conservation program. Here are some statistics about the accomplishments of the ACP in my district:

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM: OKLAHOMA—SIXTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

During the past few years, a high proportion of the farmers and ranchers in the Sixth District have received cost-sharing assistance through the agricultural conservation program for performing conservation practices. These practices have substantially contributed to erosion control, water conservation, soil improvement, crop adjustment through the diversion of cropland to grass and legume cover and trees, protection against wind and water erosion, improvement and establishment of wildlife habitat, and revitalizing small streams by reducing siltation and bank erosion, controlling runoff, and recharging underground water sources.

The 1961 ACP expenditure for the Sixth District was $2,650,000. This amount was paid to farmers as the Government's share of performing ACP practices. Farmers match this by their own contributions, therefore in the Sixth District about $5,300,000 was spent in 1961. This money is spent in towns and cities. Either directly or indirectly, every person in the district benefits from this expenditure.

A wide variety of conservation measures are performed under the ACP. Among the principal practices carried out in the Sixth District under the 1961 ACP are the following:

Conservation practice:	*Extent*
Permanent cover for erosion control or land-use adjustment, acres	33,000
Increased acreages of cover in crop rotations for erosion control, etc., acres	26,000
Improvement of established cover for erosion control, acres	6,000
Improvement of rangeland by deferred grazing to permit natural reseeding, acres	80,000
Control of competitive shrubs on range or pasture land, acres	31,000
Wells for livestock water to improve grassland management, number	300
Dams, pits, or ponds for livestock water to improve grassland management, number	800
Establishment of sod waterways to dispose of excess runoff, 1,000 square feet	104,000
Construction of terraces to control erosion or conserve moisture, acres terraced	54,000
Construction of diversion terraces or ditches, or dikes, to control erosion, miles	150
Lining irrigation ditches to prevent erosion and conserve water, rods	6,000
Temporary cover to protect soil from erosion, acres	240,000
Stubble mulching to control erosion and improve permeability, acres	52,000
Leaving high-cut stalks or stubble in designated wind erosion areas, acres treated	52,000
Weed control as a step in controlling erosion in designated wind erosion areas, acres treated	4,500
Surfacing clod-forming subsoil to control wind erosion, acres treated	5,000

Farmer and rancher participation in the Sixth District has been as follows for the past 3 years:

	1959	1960	1961
Farms and ranches	9,900	10,800	13,800
Persons receiving assistance	10,200	11,100	14,300

The total participation over a period of years materially exceeds the number shown for any 1 year since many farmers and ranchers carry out practices only intermittently.

The ACP gives particular attention to the establishment of conservation practices needed on the land on farms in organized watersheds. This helps farmers meet the requirements and schedules for conservation plans and treatment which are prerequisite to planned structural works of improvement.

Under the 1961 ACP in the sixth district, numerous conservation practices were performed in 4 such organized watersheds involving 14 counties and 4,300 participating farms. The ACP cost sharing for these practices was $750,000. The farmers themselves contributed about as much more.

Beginning in 1936, sixth district farmers have been carrying out, under the ACP, many conservation practices which conserve our soil, water, woodland, and wildlife resources. They have made good use of these public funds, and indicate a willingness to accelerate the rate of installation of conservation measures if their economic position permits it.

Police Sgt. Edwin Adolphson, of Hawaii, Winner of Medal of Merit for Valor, Sets Example for Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, our daily papers are full of stories of crimes and violence and the part played by the police. Today I would like to call your attention to one policeman out of the 400,000 men in blue who has been awarded the Medal of Merit for Valor by the National Police Officers Association of America in a different kind of a situation.

Hawaii is surrounded by beaches—some perfect for swimming and surfing while others are treacherous with undertow that is not easily discernible to the average surfer who is intrigued with the mountainous waves that look perfect for surfing.

During the past 7 years Police Sgt. Edwin Adolphson has saved 100 persons from a watery grave by his constant volunteer patrolling of the west side of the Island of Oahu. To carry on his one-man weekend patrol which he started in December 1958, Sergeant Adolphson has invested over $10,000 out of his own pocket to equip his black sedan with the latest in rescue equipment. He is especially busy during the winter months trying to keep foolhardy surfers out of the giant waves. The sergeant, who will be 47 in November, remains in top physical condition, and dares to take his surfboard into the stormy seas whenever someone is in need of help.

Reporters often have trouble getting him to talk about his rescues, but always find him willing to praise the fire department, the Army Land Rescue Team, and the military and civilian pilots who have participated in rescue missions.

Last December more than 300 persons attended a dinner in Sergeant Adolphson's honor and presented him with gifts and awards from 22 civic and military organizations. Awards included the Merit Award, First Class, the police department's highest award, and the Military Order of Loyal Companions, the highest civilian award that can be made by the Army's Pacific Command. He was praised for his achievements, and the countless hours of overtime work he has contributed without any compensation.

Accounts of his experiences sound like an adventure book, according to "Valor," the association's magazine. A cash award of $250 from the Reader's Digest Foundation will be given to Sergeant Adolphson along with his Medal of Merit.

Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from Hawaii I am proud to add my words of congratulations to Sergeant Adolphson for his work in saving men's lives, and to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this account of his humane exploits, brief and inadequate as it may be.

Operation Yorkville, a Major Force in the Battle Against Obscene Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it gives me special pleasure to be able to report on some of the activities of a vital group which is leading the way toward community action against obscene literature. Operation Yorkville, organized just a few months ago in the Yorkville section of New York, has sparked enthusiasm far beyond the borders of that area.

Together with the fine work of the citizens-for-decent-literature groups across the country, Operation Yorkville has been effective in mobilizing the local

communities to work on their own problems in combating unsavory material on newsstands and other outlets. At the same time Operation Yorkville has encouraged an interest in the national problem and has been a leader in calling for more Federal action on this national problem.

I am pleased that this group has endorsed two bills which I have sponsored concerning obscene literature. These are H.R. 319, which is designed to allow postal patrons to protect their own mail boxes from unwanted and unsolicited obscene mail, and H.R. 470, which calls on the President to establish a Commission on Obscene and Noxious Material. A summary of these two bills will be found at the close of my remarks today.

I call to the attention of the House that hearings have been scheduled on H.R. 319 and related bills before the House Postal Operations Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI]. These hearings will be June 25, 26, and 27.

It is a pleasure for me, as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, to work with the chairman because he is also very interested in doing all possible to control the traffic in obscene literature. Other members of our subcommittee have also been very helpful in our consideration of this problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include some interesting articles which appeared in the recent Bulletin of Operation Yorkville, Bulletin 20, dated May 24, 1963. And I will conclude by including the summary of H.R. 319 and H.R. 470.

FRATERNAL ORGANIZATIONS IN 26 STATES JOIN HANDS WITH OPERATION YORKVILLE

In just 6 months Operation Yorkville has grown into Operation America. Fraternal organizations in 46 States have endorsed and pledged cooperation with Operation Yorkville in its attempts to keep obscene literature out of the hands of children by supporting community standards. Many have already wired and sent letters to the President of the United States, voicing their community standards, and urging him to action. Typical of communications received at Operation Yorkville headquarters: "The Massachusetts State Council does hereby endorse the action of Operation Yorkville * * * in requesting President John F. Kennedy (1) to send a message to Congress calling attention to the danger caused by the nationwide epidemic of obscene material flooding the country, urging a broad and continuous investigation and competent study of the problem and the adoption of appropriate legislation, including, but not limited to, bills now pending; (2) to issue a call to the nation for moral and mental fitness; (3) to alert the press to the evils of pornography and to ask cooperation of the entire Nation in establishing decent community standards as guidlines for elected representatives." "Riverton, Cheyenne, Sheridan, Rock Springs, Cody and Casper * * * Wyoming has been heard from and you can be assured of our continued support." From Virginia: "Operation Yorkville is a courageous and highly commendable campaign and merits active support * * *. We have an obvious obligation to do our utmost to prevent the corruption of an entire generation of American youth through the distribution of filth for the profit of irresponsible publishers." The entire Colorado congressional delegation has been contacted asking for their support of pending legislation.

OBSCENITY IS A NATIONAL PROBLEM

Wires and letters urging the President to action on the flow of obscene literature are converging on the White House from 46 States. As a voter you have a right and an obligation to request such action. The President has said that the problem of obscenity should be dealt with locally. The dealer around the corner is a matter of local concern, true. But when obscenity is sent through the U.S. mails, it is a matter of national import; when obscenity is brought in from abroad, it is a matter of national import; when the Supreme Court sees fit to review a case (*Roth* v. *U.S.*, 1957) and define obscenity, it most certainly becomes a matter of national import. If the Nation is to be concerned with the physical fitness of our youth, it must first look to the mental and moral fiber of that youth. Mental fitness must precede physical fitness. A generation which is swallowing huge doses of obscene poison, and thus becoming obsessed with sex and perversion, cannot be mentally alert, able, and fit. Obscenity is, therefore, a national problem and must be dealt with nationally as well as locally. It must receive the attention of the most important elected official of the Nation, the President of the United States.

OPERATION YORKVILLE STORIES BRING DEALER PLAINT TO NATIONAL JOURNAL

Two Operation Yorkville articles (Mar. 23 and Apr. 13) in America, a national journal of opinion, brought letters to the editor from Arkansas, Colorado, and Chicago.

From a dealer in Chicago came these remarks: "I have been reading with interest your reports on Operation Yorkville. I should like to present the magazine vendor's side of the problem * * * I had a rule of thumb years ago that I followed. I would not put any magazine on my rack that I would not leave at home in my living room * * *. We had to return 10 to 15 percent of the material that was sent. Today, with the flood of pornographic stuff that we get, we have to return 50 to 60 percent * * *. The magazine business is strictly a push business. We have no control over what is sent to us. We must take it or leave it. We then have to go through every bundle and separate the good from the bad * * *. Why don't we buy from another distributor? Because there isn't any. In the city of Chicago, magazine distribution is a monopoly. So you can see what a problem it is to keep a clean magazine rack."

From a woman in Arkansas: "Cheers for Operation Yorkville and cheers for America for publishing an account of constructive action."

A man in Denver had this to say: "Splendid and considerate. Your wonderfully illuminating remarks about 'prurient interest.' New York is to be envied and Operation Yorkville parents sincerely admired on all three counts: For being rightly concerned about the danger of pornography, for their courage in taking public action, and especially * * * for their use of the Roth versus United States definition."

OPERATION HAWTHORNE GETS UNDERWAY

An Operation Yorkville team traveled to Hawthorne, N.Y., Thursday, May 9, to help Operation Hawthorne get underway. Among the civic, educational, and religious groups represented at the meeting were: The Hawthorne Police Department, the Hawthorne Fire Company, the Hawthorne Elementary School Parent-Teachers Association, the Columbus Avenue PTA, Westlake Junior High and High Schools, the Rotary Club, Lions Club, Board of the Town of Mount Pleasant, Mount Pleasant School District No. 1, leaders of the Boy Scouts, Cub Scouts, and Girl Scouts, American Legion and American Legion Auxiliary, Knights of Columbus, the Trinity Lutheran Church, the Hawthorne Reformed Church, Holy Rosary School, and the Catholic Youth Organization.

Operation Oceanside and Operation Larchmont are successfully at work: Operation Yorkville meetings were held last week in Staten Island, North Plainfield, N.J., and with the New York Rotary. Meetings are scheduled for coming weeks in Brooklyn, Queens Village, and the Bronx.

The Rotary Club of New York at their May 16 meeting at the Hotel Commodore sent the following telegram to the President:

"Letter going forward today expressing our concern about the pornography reaching our children. May we request you as our Chief Executive to protect our children from this grave danger. We promise our complete support."

EXCITING MEETING IN NUTLEY, N.J.

Mr. James P. Foley, chairman of the Nutley Decent Literature Campaign conducted an exciting meeting in the Nutley High School auditorium, May 16. This group was addressed by Dr. William P. Riley, of the New York Citizens for Decent Literature, and by Mrs. Doris Townsend and Mrs. Mildred Cronin of Operation Yorkville. Those attending signed a wire to the President and sent cards urging action.

TWENTY THOUSAND SIGNATURES ON PETITIONS TO COMMISSIONER

To date, 20,000 signatures have been received on "Petitions of Gratitude" to Police Commissioner Michael J. Murphy for the recent police raids on obscenity distributors in Queens and dealers in Times Square.

N.Y. LAW WILL BRING OBSCENITY PUBLISHERS INTO THE OPEN

Late in April, Governor Rockefeller signed into law a bill which the District Attorneys Association said will "help considerably in enforcing the laws on obscenity." The law, which goes into effect on September 1, will require the name and address of the publisher to appear in every publication "which is so composed or illustrated as a whole to be devoted to the description or the portrayal of bondage, sadism, masochism, or other sexual perversion, or to the exploitation of sex or nudity." Governor Rockefeller said the purpose of the law is to expose "all those responsible for the publication of materials which are obscene or offensive to public morals." Such exposure, he said, will make it possible for law-enforcement officials to "bring to justice the real culprits responsible for the dissemination of this unwholesome literature." How effective the law will be in stopping the flow of obscenity remains to be seen, but it is a beginning. It will be interesting to see whether publishers of lurid literature will stand up and take credit for their dirt, or will discontinue publication.

MAN OF THE WEEK—REV. ROBERT E. WILTENBURG

Reverend Wiltenburg, pastor of Immanuel Evangelical Lutheran Church, is a member—along with Dr. Julius G. Neumann, Rabbi, Congregation Zichron Moshe and Rev. William T. Wood, S.J., pastor of St. Ignatius Loyola—of the sponsoring committee of Operation Yorkville. Appointed to the post by Dr. Dan M. Potter, executive director of the Protestant Council, Reverend Wiltenburg has been a member of the committee and a guiding spirit of Operation Yorkville since its inception.

The fact that Operation Yorkville has become such a tremendous force in the community is due, in no small part, to Reverend Wiltenburg's clear thinking and eloquence. Operation Yorkville has been told that its phenomenal success has been due to the fact that it has not made the major mistakes

(extreme pressure, etc.) that have been made in similar campaigns. This is because one of the hands at the helm has been that of Reverend Wiltenburg. His calm, reasonable approach to the problem of obscenity has helped keep Operation Yorkville on the right path.

Reverend Wiltenburg is an active, energetic member of the New York Rotary. Among other important Operation Yorkville meetings he has arranged, was a New York Rotary luncheon gathering on May 16. The assemblage was addressed by Dr. Bernard Pacella, an eminent psychiatrist, James P. O'Donnell, assistant district attorney of Queens County, and by Rev. Morton A. Hill, S.J., secretary to Operation Yorkville. Operation Yorkville's Dr. Julius Neumann gave the invocation, and Reverend Wiltenburg was toastmaster.

Ministering to Lutherans in a wide Yorkville geographic area, Reverend Wiltenburg has become prominent for his interest in community affairs. He lives in Queens with his wife and four children. Operation Yorkville is proud to have him as one of its driving forces.

TEENAGERS PETITION PRESIDENT JOIN OPERATION YORKVILLE

The following communication was received this week at Operation Yorkville headquarters from the Teenagers' Decency Campaign, Post Office Box 637, Stamford, Conn.:

"We are joining Operation Yorkville, citizens for decent literature, and other organizations in sending letters and telegrams to President Kennedy asking him to take action on pornography which is undermining the moral character of this Nation, stunting its moral and spiritual growth.

"This is the kind of action which is necessary if we are to rid this Nation of the vile literature which can be found on almost every newsstand across our country. This is the kind of unity which we have been seeking and we urge you to join us in this effort by sending either a letter or telegram to President Kennedy as soon as you can. Please ask your friends to do the same."

SUMMARY-ANALYSIS OF H.R. 319 AND H.R. 470—BILLS TO CONTROL OBSCENE MATERIAL, INTRODUCED BY REPRESENTATIVE GLENN CUNNINGHAM, OF NEBRASKA

H.R. 319, INTRODUCED JANUARY 9, 1963; REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

A bill to protect postal patrons from obscene mail matter and Communist propaganda

This measure is based on the principle in old English law that a man's home is his castle. It assumes that a man has a right to protect his home against the delivery of obscene material and Communist propaganda by the Post Office. Such material is often sent to homes because they are on a list which is sold or rented to various firms by "list brokers" and which falls into the hands of a dealer in obscene material.

Specifically, any person is authorized to return any such matter to the Post Office Department if it is addressed to him or his minor child with a request that the Department notify the sender to remove the name and address of such person from each mailing list owned or used by the sender.

The Department will give appropriate notice to the sender.

Should the sender continue to send mail to the same addressee, the person would return it to the Department. The Postmaster General could immediately cancel or suspend any and all permits issued by the Department to the sender.

In the case of such matter from abroad, the Postmaster General notifies the postal authorities of the country of origin. Continued mailing of such matter from abroad to the person in this country can be followed by withholding of all mail from oversea sender to the person in the United States. In addition, the Postmaster General could refuse to deliver any and all matter within the United States sent by the foreign sender.

The bill also defines "minor child" to mean unmarried persons under 21 years, furnishes several definitions, and provides an exclusion for second-class publications mailed to bona fide subscribers and certain other mail.

H.R. 470, INTRODUCED JANUARY 9, 1963; REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

A bill creating a Commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matter and Materials

This measure provides for the establishment of a 17-member Commission appointed by the President and composed of representatives of Government, clergy, and mass media.

The Commission is charged with investigation of the relationship between noxious matter and antisocial behavior; recommending coordination between the levels of Government for control of obscene matter; informing the public in regard to traffic in obscene matter; enlisting cooperation of leaders in mass media; recommending additional legislation and administrative actions, and taking other steps which would be appropriate.

Authority is granted for advisory committees within States. Cooperation of Federal agencies is specified.

Recommendations are required by January 31, 1964, although this date is subject to confirmation or change by committee action dependent upon progress of the bill through Congress.

Text of the President's Address at the Air Force Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the graduation ceremonies of the Air Force Academy. It was an ideal day with a tremendous crowd and the President gave a forceful address. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

It has become trite to say in graduating addresses that commencement signifies a beginning instead of an end. Yet this thought applies with particular force to those of you graduating from your Nation's service academies.

For today you receive not only your degrees, but your commissions—and tomorrow you join with all those in the military service, the foreign service, the civil service and elsewhere who have chosen to serve the great Republic at a turning point in its history.

You will have an opportunity to help make that history—an opportunity for a service career more varied and more demanding than any that has ever been open to the officers of any nation on earth.

There are some who might be skeptical of that assertion. They claim that the future of the Air Force is mortgaged to an obsolete weapons system—the manned aircraft—or that the Air Force officers of the future will be nothing more than so-called "silent silo sitters." But nothing could be further from the truth.

It is this very onrush of technology which demands an expanding role for this Nation's Air Force and Air Force officers, and which guarantees that an Air Force career in the next 40 years will be even more changing and challenging than the Air Force careers of the last 40.

CHANCE TO EXPLORE

For some of you will travel where no man has ever traveled before. Some of you will fly the fastest planes, reach the highest altitudes and lift the heaviest payloads of any aviator in history. Some of you will hold in your hands the most awesome destructive power that man has ever conceived.

Some of you will work with the new leaders of new nations which were not even nations a few years ago. Some of you will support guerrilla and counterguerrilla operations that combine the newest techniques of warfare with the oldest techniques of the jungle.

And some of you will help to develop new planes that spread their wings in flight, detect other planes at unheard of distances, deliver new weapons with unprecedented accuracy, and survey the ground from incredible heights.

In short, the future of the Air Force is no more tied to any particular kind of weapons system than the future of the Navy was tied to the battleship several decades ago. The fact that the greatest value of these new weapons of massive retaliation lies in their ability to deter the very war which would require their use does not diminish their importance.

Nor will national security in the years ahead be achieved simply by piling up bigger stocks of bombs or burying our missiles under bigger piles of concrete. For in an imperfect world—where human failures and follies have too often been the rule instead of the exception—the surest way to bring on "the war that cannot happen" is to sit back and assure ourselves that it cannot happen.

NO MERE STALEMATE

The exisence of mutual nuclear deterrents cannot be shrugged off as a mere stalemate. For our national security, in a period of rapid change, will depend on constant reappraisal of accepted doctrine, on alertness to new developments, on imagination and resourcefulness, and new ideas.

"Stalemate" is a static term—and no one of you would be here today if you believed you were entering an outmoded service requiring only custodial duties in a period of nuclear stalemate.

I am impressed by the unusually fine scholastic achievements of the students and graduates of this Academy, as demonstrated in successful competition with the Nation's best colleges for Rhodes and other selected scholarships, and in the graduate record examination.

I am also impressed by the fact that more than one out of five of your all-military faculty members has a doctor's degree and all the rest have master's degrees. This is good.

For the Air Force officer of today and tomorrow requires this kind of scholarship. He requires a breadth of learning and outlook which was rarely required in earlier days.

NEED BROAD TALENT

You will need to know economics and history and international affairs. You will need an appreciation of other societies and an understanding of our own Nation's purposes and policy.

General Norstad's leadership in NATO—and General Smart's outstanding tour of duty as our senior military representative in Japan—are examples of Air Force officers whose broader talents enabled them to serve their Nation in key positions. Many of you

will have similar opportunities—to represent the Government of the United States in some part of the world or some part of an international organization—or to negotiate with both military men and civilians from either Allied or adversary camps.

Your major responsibilities, of course, will relate to the obligations of military command. Yet, as last October's crisis in the Caribbean so aptly demonstrated, military policy and power cannot and must not be separated from political and diplomatic decisions.

Whatever the military motives and implications of that reckless attempt to place offensive missiles on the island of Cuba may have been, the political and psychological motives and implications were equally important.

We needed in October—and we shall need in the future—military commanders who are conscious of the enormous stakes involved in every move they make—who are aware of the fact that there is no point where a purely political problem becomes a purely military problem—who know the difference between vital interests and peripheral interests—who can maneuver military forces with judgment and precision as well as courage and determination—and who can foresee the effects of military moves on the whole fabric of international power.

POLITICAL CHALLENGES

We need men who can cope with the challenge of new political situations as well as new enemy weapons—who can keep their forces flexible as well as reliable, and alert without being trigger happy.

For we live in a world where the principal problems are not susceptible of military solutions alone. The role of our military power today, in essence, is to free ourselves and our allies to pursue the goals of freedom without fear of enemy attack.

But we do not have a separate disarmament policy, and a separate foreign aid policy, all unrelated to each other. They are all bound up together. Our goal is a coherent overall national security policy—one that truly serves the best interests of this country, and the interests of all freemen, and the interests of all who aspire to be free.

It is worth noting that among the two military problems most in the news today—the efforts of this country and its European allies to work out the difficult issues involved in a proper sharing of nuclear responsibilities and a proper balance between nuclear and nonnuclear forces—are both problems that cannot possibly be dealt with in narrow military terms alone.

Both require—on the part of military and civilian negotiators alike—great political wisdom and diplomatic skill as well as modern military knowledge.

The Federal Budget and the National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of all my colleagues in the Congress the very informative speech on "The Federal Budget and the National Economy" by the Director of the Budget, the Honorable Kermit Gordon, to the 13th annual conference of the National Society for Business Budgeting on May 16 in San Francisco.

In his lucid and enlightening speech, Mr. Gordon discusses two major questions in any examination of our Federal budgetary policy.

Whether we are using the Federal budget wisely to attain our Nation's goals of continued prosperity and of a satisfactory economic growth rate, and whether the Federal Government is spending too much.

Mr. Gordon's speech was called to my attention by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Douglas Dillon, and I would like to insert his thoughtful letter into the RECORD as an introduction to the text of Mr. Gordon's speech. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to introduce both Secretary Dillon's letter to me and Mr. Gordon's address into the RECORD.

Mr. Dillon's letter follows:

JUNE 7, 1963.

The Honorable HALE BOGGS,
House of Representatives.
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HALE: As you requested, I am happy to send you a copy of the very excellent speech Director of the Budget Kermit Gordon made on May 16.

With logical analysis and a wealth of supporting detail he has cogently restated the two most significant facets of the President's overall financial plan. First, he has shown why tax reduction and revision in 1963 is the prime tool in the kit of measures to restore economic vitality and achieve an adequate rate of economic growth. Second, he has reiterated the hardheaded program of expenditure control that embodies the Government's determined commitment to prudent financial management.

I commend his speech to your careful study.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

The text of Mr. Gordon's speech follows:

THE FEDERAL BUDGET AND THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

(Address by Kermit Gordon, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, before the 13th annual conference of the National Society for Business Budgeting, San Francisco, Calif.)

When I took office as Budget Director last December, my predecessor handed over to me the combination to the safe, a $98.8 billion budget for the next fiscal year, and his commitment to address the National Society for Business Budgeting on May 16. In the intervening months we have made some changes both in the combination to the safe and to the 1964 budget, but I am pleased to say that the engagement with this society has remained inviolate.

I consider it a stroke of good fortune that my first speaking engagement outside of Washington should be with a distinguished organization of business budget officers. I have heard it said that only a man who has suffered the affliction himself can really understand the ordeal of a friend with a case of shingles. There must be a similar bond of compassionate understanding among budget officers. I can look at you and say to myself, "It's comforting to think that these people have probably lost as many friends as I have in the last 5 months." And you can look at me and say to yourselves, "No matter how many headaches are waiting for me when I get back to my desk, I'll still be lucky compared with this fellow."

With the reassuring knowledge that we are united in the bond of a common burden, let me turn to the subject of my talk. I want to examine the two major questions which people have in mind when they discuss and debate Federal budgetary policy. The first of these is the fiscal policy question: Are we using the Federal budget wisely to help achieve the broad economic goals of sustained prosperity and a satisfactory rate of economic growth? The second is the expenditure policy question: To put it in its bluntest form, is the Federal Government spending too much?

I. FISCAL POLICY

In the heat of public debate about spending, taxes, deficits, and debt, I think we sometimes lose sight of the fact that we have achieved in the United States a rather broad consensus in support of the idea that Federal budget policy should be designed to help compensate for inadequacies or excesses in private demand. Most of us, I think, will accept the idea that if total private and public demand for goods and services presses too hard on total supply, we will have inflation; that if demand falls considerably short of potential supply, we will have idle plants and idle workers; and that it makes sense to try to adjust the relationship between Government spending and taxes to help avoid both of these evils.

Those who doubt the existence of such a consensus should consider whether there would be much support today for the kind of policy we followed in 1932—given the same conditions. In 1932, you remember, the economy lay prostrate under the onslaught of the great depression. Real gross national product was 28 percent below the 1929 level, and nearly one worker in every four was unemployed. Because of the collapse in production and incomes, Federal revenues fell 50 percent from 1929 to 1932, and largely for this reason, the 1929 budget surplus turned into a 1932 deficit.

The Congress considered what it ought to do in the circumstances. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee said on the floor of the House:

"Now, my friends, I want you and the country to gird yourselves with stamina, with backbone, and with courage to meet this emergency. All must make tremendous sacrifices. The budget must be balanced. To do it, additional taxes must be levied."

So Congress proceeded, in 1932, to raise income taxes. This action was in accordance with the prevailing doctrine of the period, which held that the only sound rule of fiscal policy was to try to balance the budget each year. Indeed, the conviction of Congress that it was doing the right thing was reinforced when it received a communication bearing the signatures of 62 faculty members of a great university urging an immediate increase in taxes. But the result, almost certainly, was to aggravate and deepen the depression. The fact that few people today would urge the same policy in the same circumstances is evidence that we are not as deeply split on the issues of fiscal policy as the temperature of the debate might suggest.

In saying this, I have no desire to paper over the many major differences of emphasis, attitude, and prescription which do exist; but I think it is useful, as we turn to an examination of our present economic problems, to recognize that we start from the common premise that Federal budgetary decisions should be made in the light of the needs of the economy.

What is the present state of our economy? If we look back only to the beginning of the year, we find reassuring signs of a quickening pace of economic advance, which gives promise of bearing out the more optimistic forecasts of GNP in 1963. If we look back further—to January 1961—we find a 28-month record of uneven, but sustained, economic expansion from a recession trough.

But if we look back as far as 1953, we find a more revealing and sobering picture. We find an economy that has been operating considerably below its potential for 5½ years. Even now, with more than 2 years of expansion behind us, we are producing at a rate $30 to $35 billion a year below our comfortable capacity; the average operating rate in manufacturing is perhaps 10 percent below the preferred rate; and more than 5½ percent of the labor force is unemployed.

Whether we look at total output, employment, or investment, the evidence of slowdown since 1957 is clear. In the postwar decade 1947–57, our total output rose at the brisk rate of about 4 percent a year; since 1957, our progress has slowed to 3 percent. In the postwar decade, unemployment averaged 4.3 percent of the labor force; since 1957 it has averaged 6 percent, and has not in any month fallen below 5 percent. From 1947 to 1957, private fixed investment averaged 11 percent of GNP; since 1957, it has fallen to an average rate of 9 percent.

A persistent gap has opened up between our achievement and our potential, and in many subtle ways we have been paying a high price for our lagging performance. Our growth rate compares unfavorably with that of most other industrialized countries. The overhang of idle capacity has dampened domestic investment incentives and has encouraged the flow of American capital abroad, with consequent strain on our balance of payments. High unemployment rates among our youth have bred discontent and frustration. Our chronically depressed areas have been denied the rejuvenating effects of a strong demand for labor, which would tend both to attract new industry to areas of labor surplus and to draw idle labor into more prosperous regions. Because of the absence of good alternative employment opportunities, many of our agricultural workers continue to earn low incomes and our underlying farm problem persists. In a stubborn effort to save their jobs, workers seek to institute restrictive work rules and to shorten the workweek; and some industries, in a similar effort to insulate themselves from the general economic climate, seek to price their goods so as to earn normal profits on subnormal volume.

The immediate cause of our unsatisfactory economic performance these last 5½ years is, in my opinion, inadequate total demand. We have simply not been able to sustain a rate of climb in demand sufficient to absorb our unemployed and put our idle capacity back to work. The effort to diagnose this condition has led to a search for remedies, and this search has led directly to our Federal tax system.

We are weighed down by the burden of an income tax system which, though modified somewhat, is still essentially the system we adopted to restrain excessive demand in wartime. Its power to extract income from the bank accounts of individuals and corporations is so great that the Federal budget would have shown a string of handsome surpluses rather than deficits in the years since 1957 if the economy had been operating close to full employment. We have been witnessing the paradoxical truth that tax rates set so high as to absorb an excessive proportion of full employment GNP will block the road to the achievement of full employment and will yield disappointingly low revenues. In the six budget documents submitted from January 1957 through 1962, a cumulative budget surplus of $8½ billion was forecast; yet the actual budget outcome was a cumulative deficit of $33 billion. In each year of the past six, revenue estimates were based on an expected resumption or continuation of brisk economic expansion—and in each year the dampening effects of the tax system helped to keep the estimate from being realized.

This, very briefly, is why we believe that the needs of our economy require a substantial further revision of our income tax system in 1963. I stress the need for further revision to remind you that tax changes instituted last year—the liberalization of depreciation rules and the enactment of the 7-percent investment tax credit—had the effect of reducing business tax liabilities by about $2½ billion a year and started us on our way toward the adoption of a growth-inducing tax system. You will remember that these tax changes were greeted skeptically by the business community when they were instituted; but the skepticism has melted in the presence of hard evidence that business investment this year is responding to the stimulus of these tax reforms.

The President's tax program which is now before the Congress has the following main elements:

1. Taxes are to be reduced by $10½ billion, in three stages, during 1963, 1964, and 1965.

2. The $10½ billion net cut is made up of $13½ billion of gross tax reduction offset by $3 billion of revenue-producing reforms. In turn, the $13½ billion gross reduction consists of roughly $11 billion in personal and $2½ billion in corporate taxes.

3. The top bracket rate of the individual income tax to be reduced from 91 to 65 percent and the lowest bracket rate from 20 to 14 percent.

The tax program has two major objectives: First, to provide a sizable increase in market demand by sharply reducing overall tax rates; and second, to provide a tax structure, through sharp cuts in top-bracket rates and reduction in corporate taxes, which will encourage increased risk-taking and a higher tempo of business investment. It is thus a program which will narrow the gap between performance and productive potential, while at the same time stimulating a more rapid growth in that potential itself. The President's tax proposals constitute the most important economic policy issue before the Congress this year, and I am glad to say that the prospects are bright for the enactment of a constructive and invigorating tax program.

But, many people ask, is this the right time to cut taxes? Rather than cutting taxes when we already have a big budget deficit, shouldn't we defer tax reduction until we have a surplus in the budget?

This is an important question, and it deserves a straight answer. The answer, in my opinion, has two parts:

First, I believe we are more likely to reach a balanced budget in the next few years if we cut taxes now than if we do nothing. If we fail to act, we risk a continuation of the experience of the last 5½ years—undercapacity operations and excessive unemployment. An economy operating at undercapacity is unlikely to generate the tax revenues needed to balance the budget. It is instructive to note that we have had budget surpluses six times since the war, and in every case save one the surplus has occurred in the setting of full employment. Our experience lends support to the view that it takes full employment to generate the revenues needed to balance the budget. If we cut taxes now, we will have a somewhat larger immediate deficit, but a better prospect for reducing and eliminating the deficit in the years ahead through the increase in tax revenues returned by an expanding economy.

Second, if we were by some chance to achieve a balanced budget without a tax cut, we would probably find that a tax cut in such circumstances would be badly timed. As we have seen, balanced budgets and full employment tend to go together. Unless a slump is in prospect, to cut taxes in a setting of full employment and high utilization of capacity is to court the danger of excessive demand and inflation.

Another main objection which is raised to tax reduction at this time stems from the fear that the immediate deficit associated with tax reduction will cause inflation. This is a legitimate concern; the American people fear inflation, and properly so. Moreover, there are times when a Government deficit will cause inflation: When demand is pressing against the limits of supply, a reduction in taxes or an increase in Government expenditures will tend to raise prices. But there is no alchemy by which deficits are automatically transmuted into price increases; it is the state of the economy which determines whether deficits will cause inflation. For example, we have deficits in five of the last six years, but our price level has been more stable than that of any other advanced industrial country with the exception of Canada. The reason, of course, is that at no time in this period have we had the pressure of excess demand. Although the President's tax program is designed to stimulate private demand, we do not believe that it will overstimulate demand and cause it to overtax capacity. Even if excess demand pressure should develop—though we think it most unlikely—the tools of monetary policy can be brought quickly into play to damp down the pressure.

Hence, whether one appeals to economic logic or to recent economic history, there is little basis for the fear that the President's tax program is inflationary. The opposite danger is greater—that failure to enact the tax program will leave us with the same set of economic ills which has troubled us for the last 5½ years and will increase our vulnerability to recession.

I do not mean to leave the implication that the President's tax program is the solution to all of our economic problems. I do believe, however, that the enactment of the program will help to create a climate of economic vitality and expansion in which many other problems—ranging from agriculture to automation—will be easier to solve.

II. EXPENDITURE POLICY

Now, I would like to turn to the expenditure policy question: Are we spending too much? Is fiscal responsibility dead in Washington? Is the budget out of control?

These are questions which trouble a good many thoughtful people, and they deserve a considered answer.

We can start by acknowledging the fact that Federal spending has been increasing steadily. As President Kennedy said last year:

"It is true that in recent history each new administration has spent much more money than its predecessor. Thus, President Roosevelt outspent President Hoover, and with allowances for the special case of the Second World War, President Truman outspent President Roosevelt. Just to prove that this was not a partisan matter, President Eisenhower outspent President Truman by the handsome figure of $182 billion. It is even possible something of this trend may continue."

But to ask whether we are spending too much implies a comparison with something. Simply to compare dollar expenditures in 1963 with expenditures in 1923, or 1953, or even 1962, overlooks the fact that we are today a different nation than we were in any of those years. Our needs are constantly changing, our resources are constantly changing, and even the unit of measurement has changed from earlier years.

In his 1960 budget message, President Eisenhower made the same point: "Inescapable demands resulting from new technology and the growth of our Nation, and new requirements resulting from the changing nature of our society, will generate Federal expenditures in future years * * *. We must

not forget that a rapidly growing population creates virtually automatic increases in many Federal responsibilities."

Here are some examples: Between the fiscal years 1962 and 1964, the number of tax returns will rise 2.5 percent; the volume of mail will grow 6.4 percent; visitors to our national parks will increase by 7 percent; the number of veterans or survivors receiving pensions will rise by 10 percent; aircraft landings and take offs at airports with Federal towers will go up by 11 percent; beneficiaries under the old-age and survivors insurance program will increase by 16 percent; the number of patents granted will rise by 20 percent; and passports issued will increase by 25 percent.

Consider what has been happening to our population. By the end of fiscal 1964—the budget for which we are now debating—there will be 10 million more Americans than there were the day President Kennedy took office. This means that we will add to the United States in this short period a number of people which is more than half the population of Canada. And since 1939, we have added to our population a number of people substantially greater than the present population of France.

Consider, also, the growth in our output of goods and services—our gross national product. Measured in the same current dollars we use to count Federal expenditures, our GNP has increased more than fivefold since 1939. It has increased 57 percent in the last decade.

Finally, each Federal expenditure dollar buys less today than it did in earlier years. Though we have had relative price stability for the last 5 years, our price level has more than doubled since 1939 and is about 10 percent above its level a decade ago.

The single most important fact about the trend of Federal expenditures over recent decades is the vast expansion of our national defense program, which now takes 55 percent of our budget. Who in 1939 even dreamed of atomic energy, of missiles, of supersonic planes, of a cold war with 2,700,000 servicemen in uniform during peacetime and defense research budgets of $9 billion? Our defense budget in 1939 was 1 percent of gross national product, in 1949, 5 percent, and in 1963, 9 percent.

But apart from national defense, Federal budget expenditures have been tightly contained in recent years. As a proportion of gross national profit, they are substantially lower today (at 7 percent) than they were before the war in 1939 (at 9 percent) or after the war in 1949 (at 10 percent). Even including national defense, Federal budget expenditures in recent years have been remarkably stable as a proportion of GNP; during the latter 1950's, they averaged about 16½ percent of GNP, and that is where they are today.

Nor do the statistics give much comfort to the common view that the Federal Government is eclipsing and eroding the State and local governments. A quarter of a century ago, nondefense expenditures in the Federal budget were just about equal to total State and local expenditures; today, these Federal expenditures are about 60 percent of State and local expenditures. Of the more than 9 million civilian employees of governments in the United States today, about 7 million are employed by State and local governments, and 2,500,000 by the Federal Government. Since 1948, State and local employment has risen by 81 percent, while Federal civilian employment has risen by 22 percent—or by less than the rate of growth in the population as a whole.

In 1952, we had 1.6 Federal civilian Federal employees for each 100 people in the population. By 1957, the figure was down to 1.4. Today we have 1.3 Federal employees to serve every hundred people.

Let me add that, of these 2,500,000 Federal civilian employees, 1 million are employed by the Defense Department, about 600,000 by the Post Office Department, and about 200,000 by the Veterans' Administration. Everything else that the Federal Government does is accomplished by 650,000 employees, and this number is substantially smaller than total employment in the telephone industry.

But what about the trend of expenditures in the budgets of the Kennedy administration? The 1964 administrative budget calls for a $4.5 billion increase in expenditures over 1963. The whole of this increase, indeed, more than the whole of the increase, is accounted for by expenditures for national defense, space, and interest. All other expenditures, taken together, will actually decline from 1963 to 1964. In the process of putting together the 1964 budget, $19 billion was trimmed from agency requests.

If all three Kennedy budgets—1962 through 1964—are looked at together, they tell essentially the same story. The great bulk of the increase—actually 70 percent of it—has been in the defense, space, and interest category. Over the 3-year period from 1961 to 1964, budget expenditures for all other purposes taken together will increase by $4.5 billion. This compares with an increase of $5 billion in the same category over the preceding 3 fiscal years.

These figures lend little support to the assertion that the budget is "out of control." Just a week ago today, President Kennedy explicitly endorsed a statement of the Committee for Economic Development which said: "We believe that Federal expenditures should be made only when they are clearly more valuable than equal expenditures that could be made by individuals and business if equivalent income were left in their hands, or by State and local governments." And the President continued:

"I accept this standard and I am prepared to defend the expenditures proposed in my budget on this basis."

To sum up, I believe that this administration has proposed a fiscal policy which gives promise of restoring to the American economy the confidence and vitality which characterized our first postwar decade. And I believe that we have pursued a prudent expenditure policy which has responded to the urgent needs of national security and domestic well-being, but which has neither indulged in loose spending to give the economy a shot in the arm nor countenanced spending for the sake of spending. I am sure that we have erred in matters of detail, and I know that we can profit from informed and responsible criticism. But I believe that our budget policy is serving faithfully and constructively the interests of our national economy, our national security, and our national well-being.

Unemployment U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Howard K. Smith's TV program "News and Comment" is always a fine one, but I thought the program presented on Sunday, June 2, was particularly timely and of special interest to those of us now giving careful consideration to legislation designed to improve the unemployment situation existing today. I commend this script to my colleagues for their careful perusal in the event they missed the actual presentation:

UNEMPLOYMENT U.S.A.

The United States has the richest standard of living in the world—and it is still rising.

At the same time, the United States has the highest rate of unemployed, idle, unproductive humanity in the Western World—and that, too, may rise.

The eminent American economist, Robert Heilbroner:

Mr. HEILBRONER. If all forces stay more or less as they are, including this most important force of a rising number of kids seeking jobs, we could very well have around 10 million unemployed people by 1970.

The man in charge, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz:

SECRETARY WIRTZ. Unemployment is going to get worse and worse and worse. And the projection is quite clear, and what we have got to expect is it will go toward 6 percent and 7 percent within the next 2 or 3 years. That's if nothing is done.

The two biggest new categories of unemployed are young people and Negroes. Edward Washington, who belongs to both categories, admits boys like himself are ripe for trouble.

E. WASHINGTON. You would get into trouble with the police if you dropped out of school and can't find a job. These days boys around my age like to have clothes, and money and then that leads up to robbery.

DON DIXON. You mean if they can't get work?

E. WASHINGTON. Yes, sir.

DON DIXON. They'd get the money some other way?

E. WASHINGTON. Yes, sir.

Tonight, "News and Comment" on the causes—and the possible cures—of the spreading American cancer: unemployment.

Mr. SMITH. Good evening. It is notoriously difficult to get the U.S. Congress to act on our national problems until after catastrophe has struck. The great depression of the thirties might have been avoided or mitigated had Congress faced its responsibilities in time. World War II, which killed more humans than any war in history, might have been avoided had Congress acknowledged and faced the problem of stopping Hitler while he was weak.

Today in the face of growing new problems, Congress is almost asleep. As a result there is no doubt that a new catastrophe is abuilding. What form it will take this time is not certain; but very possibly it will be a series of violent social explosions in the midst of our cities. The current rise of crime five times as fast as population—robberies, muggings, rapes—is the merest harbinger of bigger troubles to come.

As suggested in this cartoon by Herbert Block of the Hall Syndicate:

The detonator or fuse will be unemployment, idleness, national neglect of strong young restless Americans entering the work force but finding no jobs.

The way of intelligent behavior is to study a problem before it becomes one. So Reporter Don Dixon went out and interviewed 16-year-old Edward Washington, a polite, well-read young Negro school dropout who cannot find a job. Washington had not fallen victim to the bitterness growing among increasing numbers of idle youth, both Negro and white, but with frustration it can come.

DON DIXON. When did you leave school, Edward?

E. WASHINGTON. I left school in February of this year.

DON DIXON. Why?

E. WASHINGTON. Because I didn't feel that I had the proper clothes to wear like other boys had, you know, and I thought I would get out—come out of school and get me a job and get the clothes I want to wear to school.

DON DIXON. So, have you been able to get any kind of job at all since you left school?

E. WASHINGTON. No sir.

DON DIXON. What sort of work were you looking for?

E. WASHINGTON. A busboy. Some kind of domestic work like that.

DON DIXON. Is that what you would like to do? Why did you decide to go look for a busboy's work?

E. WASHINGTON. I decided to go look for a busboy job because in looking through the papers that was the only thing I seen in looking in the ads.

DON DIXON. What would you like to do? What sort of job would you like to get?

E. WASHINGTON. I would like to be a printer or something like that.

DON DIXON. Is there a demand here for printers do you know?

E. WASHINGTON. No, sir.

DON DIXON. Well, if you did get a job as a busboy, what sort of money does it pay?

E. WASHINGTON. It pays 25 a week. $25 a week.

DON DIXON. You can't very well live on that.

E. WASHINGTON. No, sir.

Mr. SMITH. How big is the unemployment problem? Leading officials say when 2 percent are unemployed that, in fact, constitutes full employment and that should be our target.

Some economists say 3 percent is good enough, and we should aim at that less difficult figure of unemployed workers.

President Kennedy's economic advisers think we cannot quickly get down to that figure, and say getting it down to 4 percent unemployed is an interim goal.

In fact, unemployment today hovers around the figure just below 6 percent which everyone agrees is far too high.

And you heard experts predict that if things go on as at present, the figure will soon rise to 7 percent and more—a percentage that can grow to 10 million without work, nearly as many as in the great depression.

Why, in our increasingly rich Nation are increasing numbers condemned to the frustration of joblessness, a prospect that threatens us with social upheavals, with recessions and even with losing the competition with communism.

The simplest statement of why unemployment exists is our increasing productive industry does not distribute enough purchasing power for people to buy up all the increasing output of industry.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, once a professor of economics, thinks artificially high prices keep the public from buying enough of industry's output.

Senator DOUGLAS. I think if we had a perfectly competitive economic system, that prices would be reduced to the point where there would be a sufficient quantity of goods and services demanded to employ 6½ or 7 percent who really are unemployed now. But instead of that, we have a high degree of monopoly, price agreements between firms, imperfect competition and cartels. And as a result, prices are kept up on stilts and the sum total of price tags on goods which are produced, or which could be produced is in excess of the sum total of monetary purchasing power in the pockets of people. So I would favor, as an immediate step, building purchasing power up to the level of prices.

Mr. SMITH. William F. Butler is vice president of Chase Manhattan Bank. He puts the problem differently: lack of stimulation to the economy has caused growth to lag.

Mr. BUTLER. It seems to me that the basic cause has been the slowdown on our rate of overall economic growth after 1957. In this period our growth rate has been a little better than 2½ percent per annum and this is not a fast enough rate of growth to provide the number of jobs necessary to deal with the unemployment problem.

Mr. SMITH. Leon Keyserling, who was President Truman's chief economic adviser: productivity has risen by automation much faster than purchasing power.

Mr. KEYSERLING. You have an increase in your productive power and your social prosperity has to increase fast enough to take up that increase in your productive power. What we have had in the past 2 years is a rate of growth that looks good, but only about half as high as the rate of growth needed to absorb the growing size of the labor force in view of the increasing technology in automation.

Mr. SMITH. James Callaghan of the British Labor Party being groomed to run the British economy as Chancellor of the Exchequer sums up the causes of unemployment.

Mr. CALLAGHAN. First of all you get changes in traditional industries, where industries decline and leave areas semi-abandoned and derelict. Secondly, you get the failure on the part of the Government to pick up sufficient purchasing power to put it into the hands of the people. I think that's a very important reason. And, thirdly, of course, you can get external problems that can infect your own domestic economy.

Mr. SMITH. The cause of unemployment is lagging demand—not enough money to buy up goods at a time when automation is increasing the number of goods being turned out; this happening at a time when the number of people hunting jobs has suddenly leaped upward.

Economist Robert Heilbroner:

Mr. HEILBRONER. It's the fact that the big bunchy baby boom has moved up and now bunches and bunches on the labor market, upon the colleges also, by the way. That creates a very special problem, and they are very important problems. There's a real chance that if we do not rev up our growth rate very considerably, that in 5 or 10 years we may face a level of unemployment that can only be called darned serious.

Mr. SMITH. Unlike the foregoing speakers who are commentators on the problem, the man who has the problem is Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz. We asked him why unemployment currently is up.

Secretary WIRTZ. Because there are so many more of us. Every day. Every year. In the last 12 months we have added over a million jobs—about a million jobs to the economy. So employment goes up and unemployment goes up too. That's the center of the problem. The postwar baby crop which busted out the walls of the schools is now hitting the work force. That, plus the effect of machines on the economy, represents a short answer to your question.

Mr. SMITH. Now, why is it that we did so well from the war up to 1957 and relatively much less since 1957?

Secretary WIRTZ. Well, when you say so well that the economy is moving along right now at a good rate in terms of gross national product and so on and so forth. But something that people forget is that the impact of automation on the economy came during those fifties, when the work force growth was low because of the war and the postponed effect from it. Now we are getting the confluence of both automation and the increase in the economy, so even though the economy as a whole is doing well in terms of full employment, we are not doing well.

Mr. SMITH. How many jobs do we have to create each year?

Secretary WIRTZ. We have to create for the next 4 or 5 years a million and a half new jobs each year to take care of new people coming into the work force. It's growing that fast. In addition to that, we have to create jobs to replace every job which a machine takes away. Now, that's a hard figure to arrive at, but it's running right now between 25,000 and 30,000 a week. And in addition to that, we have got to create jobs which will bring our present unemployment down from—oh, about 5½ percent to the figure 4, 3, 2, hopefully. The combination to these means the answer to your question. Something in the neighborhood of 2 million jobs a year for the next 4 or 5 years. It's a big order.

Mr. SMITH. Now you have been quoted as saying that even though we don't have enough jobs to go around, the amount of work to be done in this Nation is tremendous and that we could use all the people we have if we would use them sensibly. What about that?

Secretary WIRTZ. If we would set out to do the things we want to do in this country—some things in the private sector: pulling up the low incomes to the level they ought to be; some things in the public schools we ought to meet; the hospitals; get rid of the slums; we could have a manpower shortage in this country very easily, if we set out to do the things we can do, want to do, and a good many of them we will do. That's where the answer will come.

Mr. SMITH. The problem of getting enough purchasing power to the people to stimulate industry to employ more people is crucial. In America in the depression thirties, unemployment remained high because with all the Government spending, not enough was spent.

In America after World War II the situation was the opposite. War put a stored up purchasing power equal to a hundred and fifty billion dollars in Americans' pockets, and they spent it. Also, rising expenditures of the Marshall plan and the cold war injected more purchasing power. The result was a period of full employment.

The year 1957 is the year the postwar boom is considered to have ended. Surplus purchasing power was used up. Defense spending continued to rise but it went no longer into industries turning out masses of weapons and employing millions of workers; it went into new weapons requiring fewer high-paid workers. Also, to reduce rising labor costs, industries automated at a furious rate, reducing the need for manpower. And now the postwar baby crop is coming of age, demanding more jobs faster.

To illustrate the problem: this is a schematic oversimplified design of how the economy works:

One, the consumer buys goods;

Two, the store then orders more goods from the factory; and

Three, the factory invests in increasing its plant in order to make more goods; this employs more workers and puts money into hands of consumers.

But now, the new plant is automated and employs fewer people, distributing less money. Flow of dollars, once swift, from consumer to store, now slows down too.

The store orders less from the factory.

The plant cuts down on its production, causing unemployment.

The debate about what we should do involves dissension about where we should restimulate the flow. Robert Heilbroner thinks the flow should be stimulated at the investment point:

Mr. HEILBRONER. Today if you had to put your finger on the buyer in the economy who is not so much the consumer, it is business. Business buys for capital expansion.

Business is buying new plants, new buildings, new machinery. That's the sector which is, in a sense buoyant enough, but disappointing. It could be higher.

Mr. BUTLER. The problem in our economy for 6 or 7 years has not been a lag in Government spending. Government spending has been going up 6 percent for a year on the average. The lag has been in business investment in new plants and equipment. The investment that provides new and better machinery and thus supports the creation of new jobs. Such investment if not increased in this 7-year period has been steady. Our problem is to provide the incentives, the encouragement to increase investment in new plants and equipment and thus achieve real and lasting prosperity.

Mr. SMITH. Economist Leon Keyserling disagrees. He thinks the stimulus should be aimed directly into the pockets of consumers.

Mr. KEYSERLING. The reason business isn't investing still more is that they do not foresee enough more demand for their products to invest even more rapidly than they are in the building of plants and equipment. Therefore, the whole concentration of stimulatory policy, in my view, should be on the expansion of consumption, demand for other products. That takes two forms: consumption among 180-odd million American people, privately, and consumption by Government—public spending—of the things that a nation needs and can't get privately.

Senator DOUGLAS. I would say that the remedy is to raise purchasing power to the level of prices. This does mean an increase in the national debt, because it would be effected either by cutting taxes without commensurately cutting expenditures or choking off private demand through curtailing credit, or by a public works program. In either case what you do is put an injection of monetary purchasing power into the economy to build up total demand.

Mr. SMITH. The President's plan is aimed to please both those who want him to stimulate investors, and those who want him to stimulate the consumers. His plan is a tax cut and a tax reform that will give both investors and consumers more money to spend. Like many plans aimed to please everybody, it may please none.

We asked the investor's man, William Butler, if the President's plan will solve our problems:

Mr. BUTLER. No; I do not believe it will. It seems to me that the President's tax program is spread out over too long a period—3 years or longer in the case of the corporate tax—and this dilutes its impact so that it will not do the necessary job.

Mr. SMITH. Keyserling, who prefers to stimulate the consumer:

Mr. KEYSERLING. I don't think the tax program itself will do very much to help this problem. First, because it is too small. Second, because I think it isn't distributed in a way that will maximize its effectiveness. And third, because I think many other things besides taxation are even more important than tax reduction to deal with this unemployment problem.

Mr. SMITH. We have never hesitated taking stands on this program and won't hesitate now. I think Mr. Keyserling is right. The economy is sluggish and doesn't provide enough employment for people because about one-fifth of Americans live in poverty and haven't enough purchasing power to give the economy the stimulation it needs. The logical thing to do would be not to have a feeble tax cut to benefit well-off people who don't need it. The logical thing would be more Government spending to get money to the bottom one-fifth of Americans, spending on their sadly neglected education, on replacing their slums with decent neighborhoods, and so on.

However, even the President's rather weak tax cut is getting nowhere in Congress. What is it that impedes action to cure what the President has called our No. 1 domestic problem—unemployment?

The tendency of unemployment to rise amid our great wealth can only be halted and reversed by vigorous action, especially by Government spending which will no doubt increase our deficit. There is a deep-rooted and wrong American prejudice against Government spending and deficits. Almost every modern American President has deferred to that prejudice with calamitous results.

In the early thirties, President Hoover thought that restricted Government spending would bring prosperity just around the corner. In fact, it deepened depression.

It is easy to forget that Franklin D. Roosevelt's winning campaign in 1932 was that he would balance the budget and restrict Government expenditure. He became famous for doing the opposite, but not enough to end the depression.

In the 1952 campaign, Eisenhower promised one thing—to balance the budget. In office he failed to do that 5 years out of 8, and created the biggest peacetime deficit in our history, but in trying to obey the myth presided over a series of recessions.

Kennedy's key campaign promise was to get the economy moving. He has not notably succeeded, and that is greatly due to not facing the need for much more Government expenditure.

British Politician James Callaghan offers an apt comment on deficit spending.

Mr. CALLAGHAN. We show a deficit you know. But by altering the way which we made up our accounts we could show a profit if we wanted to. And we do confuse, I think, capital items with revenue items. Where's the profit when you put in a sewage scheme or when you build a school? There isn't any but it shows a deficit. And yet these are capital items which are going to yield a return, although not a direct financial return.

We are altering our system of accounts in Britain because we want to make this more clear. We've been held up to the world as running very heavy deficits. By altering the accounts we needn't alter our policy. We will just look better. This is absurd you know, really, and I do think we've got to be very careful not to become the prisoners of words on this question of deficit financing.

Mr. SMITH. Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz.

Secretary WIRTZ. I think in connection with these programs we propose—the Manpower Development Training Program, a better education program, a youth employment act, ,that kind of thing—we are told that the cost is such that we can't afford it. I wish I could someway get across the idea that it would cost us today—does cost today—just in round figures about a thousand dollars to retrain a man, to salvage a boy or girl who would otherwise go into the slag heap, about a thousand dollars. That boy or girl will represent a cost to this economy of this country of about a thousand dollars a year if we don't train him or her.

The economics someway get out of joint. When I hear about the concern of passing debts on to the next generation, my reaction is that the worst possible debt we could pass on to the next generation is a boy or girl who is untrained and who is going to cost the next generation $1,000 or more a year. That is the debt we can't pass on. The thing that we can't get across, apparently, is that a good many of the things we do as a Government are the kind of things companies do as companies; they invest in the future. And the investment cost should not be charged against our present concept of expenditures.

If we could get across the idea that when we train a person, put $1,000 into the education of a person, it is an investment for the future. When we build a park, when we build a highway, when we build a school, when we build a hospital, those things are investments for the future and shouldn't be charged against the present. It's not just a matter of deficit spending. It's a drawing of the distinction between immediate out-of-pocket costs and the investment thing. I agree, in principle, with what is suggested. I think it would be better if it were put in terms which got away from the idea of deficit spending. That's an oversimplification.

Mr. SMITH. We asked Secretary Wirtz, Will we get full employment back?

Secretary WIRTZ. That's a question the American public will have to answer. My answer to it is that we can get it down there. It takes the decision to do the things we want to do. But I'm talking, not—I'm talking hard business sense. If we do set out to do these things, if we develop a tax program, a manpower program and do these things we want to do, I think it can be moved down past the 4 percent, 3 percent, toward the 2 percent which is probably the ultimate limit because there are always people moving from one job to another and there are always a few who can't be employed. I think it is a practical target to shoot for 3 percent and a 2 percent.

Mr. SMITH. Some friendly advice from British politician Callaghan.

Mr. CALLAGHAN. I think yours is a tough problem. I think you have got to educate. Could I make one general plea: that we shouldn't, any of us, allow ourselves to become the prisoners of words and of old-fashioned ideas no matter what they are. The real test is how are we going to make human beings live and fulfill all their values and all of the qualities of which they are capable? And we ought, if we find our ideas are destroying human beings and their right to survive, then we ought to be willing to put those ideas on one side.

Mr. SMITH. We have nothing to add that will improve on that. Good night.

Philippine War Damage Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, when the Senate amendment to last year's War Claims Act was briefly before the House on May 14, 1963, many Members felt that it should not be brought up as a rider to the supplemental appropriations bill, but should be considered in connection with legislation reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee. It will shortly come before the House in that manner as a result of the action of the Senate in adding it to the Foreign Service Buildings Act, H.R. 5207. It is now before a conference committee.

The Senate amendment changes last year's act—Public Law 87-616—by providing that any further payments shall go to the Philippine Government rather than to private claimants. It was adopted as a result of disclosures before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during its investigation of the Foreign Agents Registration Act—printed hearing of April 18, 1963.

Supporters of the Senate amendment believe that the disclosures in the Senate investigation compel such a change in the 1962 act. They contend that the Senate investigation disclosed that the activities of lobbyists and others having a personal interest in further payments to private claimants were largely responsible for nurturing and gradually building up an impression both in the Philippines and in the United States that the 1946 act resulted in a moral obligation to pay private claimants the full 75 percent of their approved claims; that there was no such moral obligation; that in this and other ways the lobbyists stirred up a demand for further payment of war damages to private claimants.

They contend that the above activities were much more than ordinary lobbying, and amounted to international blackmail. They contend that but for these and other activities and deceptions, the Congress would not have passed the 1962 act in the form in which it was passed; that is, with provision for payments to private claimants; that the proper remedy is to adopt the Senate amendment; and that this amendment would be the most effective way of cutting off the payment of further fees to the lobbyists, would prevent windfalls to large private claimants, and would accomplish more nearly the purposes of the original act of 1946, which was to rehabilitate the Philippine economy.

The first question is as to what the activities of the lobbyists and their confederates actually were.

ACTIVITIES OF LOBBYISTS

Correspondence between Mr. O'Donnell in the United States and Mr. Delgado in the Philippines reveals the extent of their activities in stirring up a demand for further payments of war damages to private claimants. This correspondence was produced under subpena during investigation by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Foreign Agents Registration Act—hearing April 18, 1963.

Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Delgado had both been members of the Philippine War Damage Commission which adjudicated claims under the 1946 act. Mr. Delgado was the Filipino member. He was a man of large influence in the Philippines, and close to the Government. He had served as Resident Commissioner of the Philippines in Washington, as justice of the Philippine Court of Appeals, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Philippines Senate, as a Permanent Delegate for the Philippines to the General Assembly of the U.N.

I quote from this correspondence as follows:

January 13, 1952, letter to Francisco A. Delgado: "I am afraid that enthusiasm on the part of the interested parties and the Government here have cooled off. * * * I will discuss the subject in an effort to arouse enthusiasm and get the ball rolling."

February 9, 1952, letter to Delgado: "This is in response to your letter of January 22, requesting a copy of a list of about 120,000 claimants which matter you have referred to Mr. Charles. I regret that I have been unsuccessful in procuring these names. In connection with the war damage claimants, I discussed this matter thoroughly with Ambassador Romulo, who feels that if the final 22½ percent is to be realized, it can be accomplished, if at all, from this Congress. I know that the Ambassador will give us unqualified support in such an endeavor. It is regrettable that we did not make up this list before we left the Commission, but this is little solace now."

January 18, 1954, letter to Delgado: "Considering Magsaysay's popularity here, it would be my recommendation at this time that you work toward Magsaysay making a request upon our Government for this 22½ percent which has been promised as a matter of law. All of these actions, together with our work here, can keep this proposed legislation in the limelight and ready to move at the appropriate time."

October 31, 1955, letter to Delgado: "Insofar as Mr. Miller is concerned, you and I know that we used his services to keep the war damage legislation alive. He is one of the few who were left who were members of the Insular Affairs Committee that passed the original act and, perforce, he has great standing in the House * * *. I am at a loss to understand the action you report of others in endeavoring to interject other lobbyists into this picture * * *. I have worked for 4 years meeting with Members of the House and Senate on this proposed legislation * * *. Any deviation from this program I believe would be fatal."

May 7, 1957, letter to Delgado: "The climate here has been greatly improved insofar as the Philippines is concerned. Accordingly, I am having Congressman Miller reintroduce the war damage bill, which he will do within the next few days. A copy of his statement is enclosed herewith for your information."

March 10, 1958, letter to Delgado: "All in all, I believe that our next effort to obtain the actual passage of a law directing the payment of the balance of the war damage awards has a better chance than at any time during the period of our efforts to keep the subject alive by the introduction of bills in each Congress as it convenes * * *. What concerns me now is our position in the picture * * *. The only chance for legal counsel to be compensated for the efforts resulting in the legislation is through an advance arrangement with the major claimants * * *. I think we should get our ducks in a row at this time * * *. I [shall] proceed after you have made the arrangements aforesaid to adopt a definite plan of action in which I shall outline the part to be played by the claimants and possibly Government officials in promoting the legislation on a vigorous scale in the Congress."

May 10, 1958, letter to Delgado: "I am very much interested, indeed, in having the sugar companies which you enumerate as well as any other who might want to join, sign retainer contracts which will assure us of a position in the legislative picture as well as compensation if our efforts should meet with ultimate success."

January 27, 1959, to Jose Romero (Philippine Sugar Association): "As I advised you in my cable, unfortunately Congressman ZABLOCKI left Monday heading a congressional delegation to the funeral of the former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Congressman Gordon, of Illinois. As you know, he is most friendly and as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East of the House Foreign Affairs Committee should be the natural one to introduce our bill. In this Mr. Miller and Majority Leader MCCORMACK agreed. On the other hand, the Ambassador I know was very anxious to have this bill introduced while he was in the Philippines—thus my cable to you."

February 9, 1959, memorandum to Romero: "As I cabled you, ZABLOCKI wanted to wait until his subcommittee conferred with Bohlen in executive session next week before introducing our bill, but since Congress was adjourning for Lincoln's Birthday, I prevailed upon him to do it today. Miller introduced a bill simultaneously.

"The enclosed editorial from the New York Times of the 8th is very good and very timely. I hurriedly changed ZABLOCKI's introductory speech to accompany the bill, copies of which are enclosed, using the editorial to advantage."

February 10, 1959, letter to Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo: "Enclosed herewith please find a copy of H.R. 4311, introduced by Congressman ZABLOCKI, together with an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 9.

"The delay in the introduction of this bill was occasioned by the fact that the Congressman and I had to do much research with respect to the amount and other details of which you are only too familiar before embarking on this program."

February 9, 1960, cable to Don Manolo Elizalde, Philippine Sugar Association: "Interests of members the sugar association and all war damage claimants are greatly impaired by demands for direct payment of balance of $73 million to Philippine Government and reported insistence of Philippine Foreign Secretary on payment of 100 percent, amounting to more than $150 million plus expenses of administration. Members of Congress, who for years have favored appropriation for completing unpaid balances of war damages to claimants, are now vehement in refusal to participate in what appears to be political struggle among factions in your country and with United States * * *. Many Congressmen on the committee hearing our bills have publicly stated that irrespective of reported position of our State Department favoring same they will not vote for legislation to pay war damage funds in any amount to Philippine Government instead of claimants directly as originally intended. I strongly urge you and your association to advise your Government to take immediate realistic stand in support of Zablocki-Miller bills."

November 13, 1961, memorandum to Philippine Sugar Association: "The proponent of the bill (ZABLOCKI) with whom the counsel for the Philippine Sugar Association has been and is in constant communication gave complete and conclusive answers to the arguments (before the House Rules Committee), but it was apparent that the congestion of the committee's calendar and the importance of some administration legislation, such as that providing for a Peace Corps, did not permit the members of the Rules Committee to give adequate consideration to these replies."

August 4, 1961, memorandum to Philippine Sugar Association: "It is anticipated that the war damage bill will be reported out favorably by the House Foreign Affairs Committee on Wednesday.

"In order to speed up its consideration I had today in the Senate introduced a similar bill by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, Democratic whip and a senior member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. As soon as this bill is printed copies will be forwarded to you. Attached herewith is Mr. HUMPHREY's statement as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 4, 1961."

It is clear from this correspondence that the activities of Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Delgado went far beyond ordinary lobbying. As a result of their experience on the Philippine War Damage Commission, they saw the possibilities of earning large legal fees if legislation were passed to provide further payments to private claimants. They embarked on a broad scheme with ramifications in the United States and in the Philippines to bring about such legislation.

It has even been charged that the cancellation by the President of the Philippines of his trip to the United States after the House defeated the Philippine claims bill on May 9, 1962, was part of

a contrived scheme intended to point up the Philippine contention that the United States owed the money.

The correspondence quoted above justifies the charge that a powerful moving force behind the passage of the 1962 act was private gain rather than public welfare or national security.

MORAL OBLIGATION

The question whether there really was a moral obligation to make further payments to private claimants goes to the heart of the Senate amendment, as that amendment cuts off such further payments, and in adopting it the Senate denied any such moral obligation. The adoption by the Senate of that amendment implies that the evidence presented to show that the alleged obligation was a "promise," a "debt," a "legal obligation," was misleading, and based in part on reprehensible activities and undisclosed personal interests.

The question of moral obligation should be reexamined by the House in the light of the recent disclosures. In reexamining that question, the starting point must be the provisions of the 1946 act.

The Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 authorized the appropriation of $400 million, and authorized the Philippine War Damage Commission "to make compensation to the extent hereafter provided on account of physical loss or destruction of or damage to property in the Philippines occurring after December 7, 1941, and before October 1, 1945, as a result of various war activities, including enemy attack, action by the Armed Forces of the United States, and looting and pillage." It then provided—section 102:

> In case the aggregate amount of the claims which would be payable to any one claimant under the foregoing provisions exceeds $500, the aggregate amount of the claims approved in favor of such claimant shall be reduced by 25 per centum of the excess over $500.

The Commission was given discretion to make immediate payment of claims under $500, and the first $500 of larger claims, and a proportion of the remainder, due consideration have been given to total funds available for distribution. The act then provided:

> After the time for filing claims has expired, the Commission shall determine the amount of money available for the further payment of claims. Such funds shall be applied pro rata toward the payment of the unpaid balances of the amounts authorized to be paid pursuant to section 102 of this title.

What this somewhat complicated language amounts to was that $400 million was to be disbursed by first paying claims under $500 in full, and the first $500 of other claims, and the balance of the money was then to be used pro rata in payment of larger claims up to 75 percent. The money was sufficient to pay them only up to 52½ percent.

Any fair appraisal of the committee hearings and reports would indicate that the primary intent of the act was to provide for the disbursement of $400 million, and that there was no intention to create an obligation to pay up to 75 percent.

The whole emphasis of the 1946 act was on rehabilitation of the Philippine economy, and the report of the House Foreign Affairs Committee stated:

> The bill is not a private claims measure to reimburse individual or organizations for damage incurred in war. The primary function of the payments is to assist and encourage rehabilitation and rebuilding of the economy and social structure of the Nation.

Contemporaneous evidence indicates that the 1946 act did not create an obligation to make further payments beyond the original $400 million. The much-respected Bell mission to the Philippines of 1950 felt that the 1946 act imposed no such obligation, as it recommended:

> That further war damage payments to individuals would not contribute materially to economic development in the Philippines, and that continuing assistance by the United States should be for development projects in agriculture and industry related to the specific needs of the Philippine economy rather than as additional war damage payments to individuals.

Since then over $1.5 billion of U.S. aid has gone to the Philippines, and Philippine people are drawing $80 million a year in benefits from the Veterans' Administration for widows and other beneficiaries.

Other contemporaneous evidence is the failure of the Foreign Affairs Committee to report out a bill on which it conducted hearings in 1950 to authorize further funds in order to bring payment of Philippine war claims up to 75 percent. The committee must have felt that its action only 4 years before had not resulted in any obligation to make these further payments.

Other contemporaneous evidence indicated that there was general appreciation in the Philippines of the payments made under the 1946 act, and that there was little demand for further payments until that demand was stirred up by lobbyists.

Our Government in 1959 concluded that there was no obligation to make further payments to private claimants. Mr. Dillon, then Under Secretary of State, testified to this effect on February 25, 1960, before a Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Part of his testimony was quoted by the subcommittee chairman at page 7041 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 30, 1963, but other parts are also material.

He said that President Garcia on his visit to the United States in June 1958 discussed with him the settlement of 19 Philippine claims against the United States, 1 of which was for "additional war damages." Mr. Dillon testified:

> We do not think that there is any legal obligation to do this. We think that the appropriation of the original $400 million at that time was a complete act.

He went on to explain, however, that the circumstances were such that there could have been misunderstanding about this, and that when the Philippine Government made a series of claims, "we felt this one had certain merits and that we should in all justice ask for appropriation of enough money to take care of it."

In August 1959 the administration agreed upon a settlement with the Philippine Government under which the United States would pay $73 million to the Philippine Government, subject, however, to a setoff of a United States claim against the Philippines of about $20 million. This $20 million was in fact paid April 10, 1961—Foreign Relations Committee hearing June 12, 1962, page 20.

Mr. Dillon wrote to Speaker Rayburn on March 3, 1960, recommending legislation to carry out this settlement, submitting a draft bill, and saying:

> The executive branch believes that rebuilding, replacement, or repair of war-damaged private property in the Philippines is no longer practicable. Moreover, in view of the time which has elapsed since the original claims were approved, and since the U.S. Philippines War Damage Commission went out of existence on March 31, 1951, it is not considered practicable for the U.S. Government to assume any responsibility for the payment of the balance of approved individual private property claims.

The Foreign Affairs Committee, however, reported in June 1960 a bill—H.R. 12078—providing for further payments to private claimants. That bill was not reported out of the Rules Committee, and the Foreign Affairs Committee in August 1961 reported a similar bill—H.R. 8617. This was defeated in the House on May 9, 1962, but the House subsequently passed another similar bill—H.R. 11721—which became Public Law 87–616.

The above facts, and particularly the contemporaneous evidence, are persuasive in showing that there was no moral obligation to pay approved claims up to the full 75 percent.

The Senate investigation has shown that the claim that there was a moral obligation was largely promoted and contrived by lobbyists and others having a personal interest. These same people spearheaded the testimony before the committees of Congress in support of the alleged moral obligation, without disclosing their personal interest.

It is true that there were some members of the 1946 committee who wanted to provide for payment of the full 75 percent, and much has been made of their statements. But the hearings, reports, and debates of 1946 show that the majority of the committee did not go along with them.

The vote of the Senate on May 1, 1963, of 58–26 to pass the amendment to the 1962 act was in effect a vote that there was no moral obligation. Members should read what was said then, and what was said when the question came up again on May 23, 1963.

THE HOUSE SHOULD ADOPT THE SENATE AMENDMENT

From the facts stated above as to the activities of the lobbyists, and as to the nonexistence of a moral obligation to make further payments to private claimants, it is clear that if the recently disclosed facts had been known to the House in 1962, it would not have passed the 1962 act in the form in which it was passed; that is, with provision for payments to private claimants.

If so, the proper remedy is to amend the act in the manner provided for in the Senate amendment. It will be asked why, in view of all of the above facts, the proper remedy would not be to rescind the 1962 appropriation and not pay the

money even to the Philippine Government. A motion was made in the Senate on May 23, 1963, to bring about this result, but was defeated 45–22.

The reason why the $73 million should be paid to the Philippine Government is that our Government agreed with the Philippine Government in 1959 upon such a settlement. Mr. Dillon's testimony on this subject was discussed above in considering the question of moral obligations and the fact that this settlement denied any moral obligation to make further payments to private claimants.

It was there pointed out that Mr. Dillon testified that the Philippine claim for additional war damages was brought forward by President Garcia in 1958, that the administration then felt that the 1946 act might have given cause for misunderstanding, and that it was desirable to settle the issue.

It is not relevant to wonder whether, if the facts since disclosed had then been known, this settlement would have been made. However that may be, our relations with the Philippines on this subject have progressed to the point where it would be highly undesirable to rescind the 1962 appropriation entirely.

If the $73 million is paid in a lump sum to the Philippine Government, that Government will receive it without strings, and can use it either for payment to claimants, or for economic rehabilitation, or in such other manner as it deems fit. Such a result will fulfill more closely the purposes of the 1946 act than would the payment of huge windfalls to private claimants, which would result if the Senate amendment is not adopted. And our Government could properly take this $73 million into consideration in making further provision of economic or other aid to the Philippines.

Senator Sparkman has strongly confirmed the statement made above that Congress would not have passed the 1962 act in the form in which it was passed had the facts since disclosed been known at that time. He presided over the Foreign Relations Committee during practically all of its hearings on the 1962 act. The committee had before it bills for further payments to private claimants and for a payment directly to the Philippine Government. He stated that had he known the facts which have since been disclosed:

> I certainly would not have voted for that bill (the payment to private claimants). I would have voted for the bill which would have provided payment directly to the Philippine Government. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 1, 1963, p. 7581.)

The Senate acceded to this view and passed its amendment providing for payment directly to the Philippine Government on May 1, 1963 by a vote of 58–26. On May 23 it again passed the same amendment, attaching it to the Foreign Service Buildings Act, this time on a voice vote.

CONCLUSION

In view of the facts stated above as to the activities of the lobbyists and as to the nonexistence of any moral obligation to make further payments to private claimants, the House should certainly not approve further payment to private claimants which would confirm the results secured by the reprehensible activities which have been disclosed.

Those disclosures indicate that passage of the 1962 act was secured as a result of a broad scheme, international in scope, pursued by devious methods. There is still time to undo the results so achieved by passing the Senate amendment. Merely cutting off further fees to lobbyists is an insufficient remedy. House Members should not place themselves in the position of confirming the results secured by the lobbyists by the means which have now been disclosed.

The House should accept the Senate amendment.

U.S. Flag Symbolizes National Heritage and Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Flag Day is June 14. No day is better for an American to pause and reflect on those matters of serious import to him as an individual and as a citizen-member of that great Nation, the United States of America.

With all our national traits of exuberance and enthusiasm, our acceptance of the need for struggle and hard work to accomplish our personal and national goals, we all too seldom take time out to recapitulate all the glories of American citizenship. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that Flag Day gives us all an opportunity to pay homage to our great tradition and to rededicate ourselves to the perpetuation of our highest aspirations and ideals.

No nation's flag is merely a handful of gaily colored bunting. It may seem to be that, but it is much more. As Henry Ward Beecher said:

> A thoughtful mind when it sees a nation's flag, sees not the flag but the nation itself. And whatever may be its symbols, its insignia, he reads chiefly in the flag, the government, the principles, the truth, the history that belong to the nation that sets it forth. The American flag has been a symbol of liberty and men rejoiced in it.

Mr. Speaker, it is not sufficient for all Americans to recognize and celebrate Flag Day with appropriate ceremony. True patriotism demands daily recognition of the continuing symbolic importance of our flag. Do we display the flag on all prescribed occasions? Do we conform to the regulations protecting it? Are we alert to failures to so do? These are some of the many questions we should ask ourselves.

It is one of the basic guarantees of citizenship that a citizen of the United States, acting solely as an individual, has the privilege and duty to exert a responsible role in demanding for the U.S. flag the honor and protection it deserves. That such individual initiative may win desirable community action is best illustrated by a recent incident in Dade County, Fla.

Due to the increasing number of polling places, some of them temporary, there has been somewhat of a problem in always procuring proper display of the flag. We realize, Mr. Speaker, that Public Law 829, 77th Congress, section (f) declares:

> The flag should be displayed daily, weather permitting, on or near every polling place on election day.

This legislation sets up criteria for the displaying and treatment of our flag and leaves it up to the proper local officials to voluntarily conform.

Many citizens probably made passing note of the absence of the flag, but failed to follow the matter further. It was left to a constituent of the Fourth District of Florida, which I have the honor to represent, to implement his deep feeling that the symbolism of the U.S. flag and the precious freedoms alined to it never can be too often brought to our attention and granted our support and respect.

I am speaking of Mr. Norman R. Kirk, of Miami, Fla. He made it his business to notify the authorities of Dade County and his Congressman of the oversight in displaying of the flag. As a result of his protest and further inquiry by me, I am proud to state that County Manager Irving C. McNayr, of Metropolitan Dade County, Fla., has authorized the purchase of flags for every polling place in Dade County, and our Nation's flag should be flying there at the next election.

The simple sincerity of Mr. Kirk's words expresses so well every citizen's feeling about the U.S. flag that I wish to share them with my colleagues. The following vital excerpts from his letter are his plea:

> I am a retired naval officer with 30 years' service. Our flag has been my inspiration for many years, and as my years diminish, I am proud to bask in its security, stature, strength, and prestige.
>
> My letter brings me to this point: when I voted last November the American flag was noticeably missing. I contacted the Miami Herald; a flag was procured for that polling place by midafternoon, through what channels I do not know.
>
> Last month (February 1963), at my voting precinct, again no flag. * * * Again on March 12, 1963, I went to vote, again no flag.
>
> So, I am requesting, if no law presently exists covering this act, that one be enacted making it compulsory to display an American flag at all polling places in Dade County.
>
> I have spent too many of my years assisting in the preservation of our flag to find it missing at the very initial basis of our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, we may well conclude our remarks with the reminder that the American flag was bought at the price of dedication by generations of citizens, by a lifetime of service by members of our Armed Forces, such as Norman R. Kirk, and by the supreme sacrifice of the lives of many true patriots. Let us then, on Flag Day and all other days, render to it the reverence and homage which it deserves.