

a basis for the pending complaint. The license laws of Virginia do not fill the void."

It is clearly unconstitutional to bottom any claim of Federal control of State action upon "custom or usage" involving acts which constitute merely private conduct.

The attempt to base Federal regulation of public accommodations upon the interstate commerce clause is equally unconstitutional.

"The broken package doctrine" is succinctly stated by the Supreme Court in *Dahnke-Walker Co. v. Bondurant* (257 U.S. 282, 290), as follows:

"Where goods in one State are transported into another for purposes of sale the commerce does not end with the transportation, but embraces as well the sale of the goods after they reach their destination and while they are in the original packages."

The claim that the intrastate sale or renting of goods which have moved in interstate commerce is in itself interstate commerce is in the teeth of the long line of cases illustrated by the statement of Mr. Justice Brandeis in *Pacific States Box & Basket Co. v. White* (296 U.S. 176, 80 L. Ed. 138):

"The operation of the order is intrastate, beginning after the interstate movement of the containers has ceased, and after the original package has been broken."

That this basis used in this bill to attempt to transform intrastate commerce into interstate commerce is untenable is demonstrated by the decision of the Court of Appeals of the Fourth Circuit quoted above,

Williams v. Howard Johnson (268 F. 2d 845 (1959)), as follows:

"We think, however, that the cases cited are not applicable because we do not find that a restaurant is engaged in interstate commerce merely because in the course of its business of furnishing accommodations to the general public it serves persons who are traveling from State to State. As an instrument of local commerce, the restaurant is not subject to the constitutional and statutory provisions discussed above and thus, is at liberty to deal with such persons as it may select."

See also *Elizabeth Hospital, Inc. v. Richardson* (269 F. 2d 167), decided by the Court of Appeals of the Eighth Circuit in 1959, which cites the decision of the Supreme Court supporting the rule as follows:

"We think that the plaintiff's operation of a hospital, to include rendition of hospital services to some persons who came from outside the State, is no more engaging in interstate commerce than was Dr. Riggall in rendering medical services to persons who likewise came from other States. The fact that some of the plaintiff's patients might travel in interstate commerce does not alter the local character of plaintiff's hospital. If the converse were true, every country store that obtains its goods from or serves customers residing outside of the State would be selling in interstate commerce. Uniformly, the courts have held to the contrary" (*A.L.A. Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United*

States, 1935, 295 U.S. 495, 55 S. Ct. 837, 79 L. Ed. 1570; *Lauson v. Woodmere*, 4 Cir., 1954, 217 F. 2d 148, 150; *Jewel Tea Co. v. Williams*, 10 Cir., 1941, 118 F. 2d 202, 207; *Lipson v. Socony-Vacuum Corp.*, 1 Cir., 1937, 87, F. 2d 265, 267, certiorari granted 300 U.S. 651, 57 S. Ct. 612, 81 L. Ed. 862, certiorari dismissed 301 U.S. 711, 57 S. Ct. 788, 81 L. Ed. 1364).

Congress cannot constitutionally enact a statute converting intrastate commerce into interstate commerce, as is here proposed, without upsetting every one of the original unbroken package cases and their long line of successors.

If Congress has the supposed power over hotels, motels, and lodging houses here sought to be asserted, then Congress has the right to regulate them in every respect even as to the rates they can charge for rooms. If Congress can say what guests they must take, then it can say what rates they must charge for their rooms, or even can tell them what they can put on their bill of fares, and maybe not to serve things that are objectionable to certain people.

If Congress can make a finding that the business of these private and independent operators constitutes "places of public accommodation," then we may as well make a finding that such private and independent businesses are "affected with a public interest" and regulate them like public utilities, guarantee them a return on their investment, or maybe just run them by the Government.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 27, 1964

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

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

God of all mercy, who art acquainted with our frailties, and forgivest even our craven denials of Thyself: Thou who knowest our hearts knowest that as we pause in contrite devotion at this daily arbor of quiet, we hate our sins of omission and commission that draw us from the glory of our better selves. By our very failures and fallibilities and by tasks too difficult for us, we are driven unto Thee for strength to endure and wisdom to rightly interpret the signs of these trying times.

In the cause of our free land and of our common humanity, may we be co-laborers with Thee in helping to build the city of God on the ruined wastes of this divided and disordered world.

May the benediction of Thy grace rest upon Thy servants, called to serve the Nation and the world in such an age. Here in the homeland, amid familiar scenes, or in far parts of the world, beset by danger, may Thy protecting care encompass them, giving them every new day, whatever may be the circumstances, the assurance that underneath are Thy everlasting arms.

Amid all life's changes, Thou who changest not, abide with us and guide us, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 23, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

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 on January 23, 1964, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 136) providing for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes.

REPORT ON U.S. AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACTIVITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 207)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 206(b) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, I transmit herewith a report for the calendar year 1963, on this Nation's aeronautics and space activities.

The year 1963 was a period of constructive development of our increasing space competence. It was also a period of searching evaluation of the national space program—an evaluation which resulted in broad acceptance of the policy of our attaining and maintaining space leadership, with due regard for our national security.

Our space program, in both its civilian and military aspects, is peaceful in purpose and practice. Moreover, it combines such objective with a policy of international cooperation based upon a mutuality of participation and benefits as well as the wide dissemination of knowledge.

Space progress is essential if this Nation is to lead in technology and in the furthering of world peace. Such progress requires the use of substantial resources, which must be employed efficiently and effectively in order that we obtain the maximum benefits with a minimum of waste.

In summary form, the accompanying report depicts the contributions of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the national space program during 1963.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 27, 1964.

HOUSING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 206)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

Our Nation stands today at the threshold of the greatest period of growth in its history.

By 1970, we shall have to build at least 2 million new homes a year to keep up with the growth of our population. We will need many new classrooms, uncounted miles of new streets and utility lines, and an unprecedented volume of water and sewerage facilities. We will need stores and churches and libraries, distribution systems for goods, transpor-

tational systems for people, and communication systems for ideas.

Above all, we will need more land, new housing, and orderly community development. For most of this population growth will be concentrated in the fringe areas around existing metropolitan communities.

I. HOUSING

Fortunately, the old pressures on our housing supply arising from depression and war-caused shortages have largely been overcome. But new pressures will develop as the number of new families rises rapidly in the late sixties. And great numbers of our families have yet to secure the true goal of every parent: Not merely housing but adequate housing.

Now is the time to direct the productive capacity of our homebuilding industry to the great needs of the neglected segments of our population. This is necessary in its own right and vital to the continued strength of the industry.

Satisfaction with the 1,600,000 new housing starts in 1963 cannot obscure the fact that too many minorities, too many families of low income, too many elderly, too many rural families, and too many military families have not shared in the housing improvement which those units represent.

Unless we act and act now, the promises of the national housing policy will remain empty slogans to large numbers in these groups.

A. HOUSING FOR MINORITIES

Over a year ago, President Kennedy issued an Executive order designed to assure opportunities for equal access to federally assisted housing. Already a half million dwelling units are—or soon will be—subject to that order. This administration will continue and strengthen its efforts to translate the pledge of that order into meaningful practice. The program proposed in this message will broaden the range of housing choices open and realistically available to those whom discrimination has too long restricted.

B. HOUSING FOR LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

For over a quarter of a century, the low-rent public housing program has been the primary source of additional decent housing for families of low income. Over 1,500 communities—350 of them since 1961—have recognized the need for supplementing private efforts by creating housing authorities to build and operate public housing with Federal assistance.

The 100,000 units of federally aided public housing authorized by the Housing Act of 1961 are now all committed. But still more communities and more families need such housing.

To continue this program for those who have no other effective opportunity for better housing, I recommend the authorization of 50,000 additional public housing units for each of the next 4 years.

Most of these units should continue to be new construction to provide a net expansion in the volume of housing available to low-income families. However,

we have at this time a real opportunity to make low-rent housing available more quickly and at lower cost in many cities by acquiring units from the existing stock of private housing and rehabilitating them, where necessary, for the use of low-income families. I recommend amendments to the Public Housing Act to facilitate acquisition of existing housing units within the proposed 50,000 units per year.

In other cases, leasing of standard units by local public housing authorities for use in the low-rent program is a feasible and economic approach. I recommend, in addition, that the authority for expanding low-rent housing include authorization for local housing authorities to lease 40,000 housing units over the next 4 years.

We have much more to learn before the housing needs of our low-income population can be adequately met. The small demonstration program provided for this purpose in the Housing Act of 1961 has permitted a number of promising experiments to get underway. I recommend an additional \$5 million be authorized to continue this program for at least 1 more year. During this period, attention can be given to special housing needs, such as those of our physically handicapped, as well as to means of helping low-income persons obtain adequate housing.

C. HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

I believe it especially unfortunate that many of those who do not have or cannot secure decent housing are elderly. Special attention to the needs of this group at all income levels should continue.

The expansion and improvement of public housing programs that I am recommending will be used extensively for lower income elderly. Federal insurance of loans will continue to encourage the construction of specially designed housing for elderly with adequate incomes. However, the existing authority for funds to finance the program of low-interest direct Federal loans which serves the moderate income elderly will soon be exhausted. I recommend that the low-interest direct Federal loan program for the elderly be extended and additional funds appropriated to permit loans of \$100 million during the coming fiscal year.

At present, the successful program of moderate-income housing provided through loan insurance at below-market interest rates enacted in 1961 is limited to family tenants. In many cases, admission of single elderly persons to such housing would be highly desirable. I recommend that single elderly persons be made eligible for housing financed by federally insured below-market interest loans.

D. RURAL HOUSING

The living conditions of our rural families—including the nearly one-third of our elderly who live on farms or in small towns—likewise deserve and need special consideration.

More than a million rural families still live in homes of such poor condition that they actually endanger the health and safety of the occupants.

Three million rural families live in homes that need major repairs.

A third of our rural homes do not have complete sanitary facilities.

Nearly two-thirds of rural homes are without adequate heating.

The rural housing programs of the Department of Agriculture, initiated in 1949 and strengthened in 1961 and 1962, have made a good start on meeting the problems represented by these statistics, but the 20,000 rural families helped last year represent only a small fraction of the job to be done. Primary reliance on direct Federal loans for this purpose is, however, neither necessary nor—in the volume required—realistic.

I recommend extension of the expiring authorization in title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to insure loans on rental housing for the rural elderly. Further, in order to accelerate the basic rural housing loan program, I urge that the Congress enact an insured rural housing loan program along the lines of that proposed by the administration in the first session of this Congress.

I further recommend early action on legislation along the lines of S. 981 to assist with the housing problems of domestic farm laborers—problems which are particularly acute for our 350,000 migrant farmworkers.

E. MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

The military man, in keeping with his profession, expects to endure—and frequently does endure—personal hardships during his career. We do not have the right to expect the same from his family. While the Defense Department properly relies primarily upon the private community to supply the major portion of its needs for decent and economical housing, an annual construction program to house the families of military personnel is required in those communities where the severest chronic shortages exist. Accordingly, I have recommended in the military construction program authorizations and appropriations for 12,500 additional units for fiscal 1965 to meet the most critical needs.

F. IMPROVEMENTS IN OTHER HOUSING PROGRAMS

Apart from the housing needs of the special groups already discussed, the partnership between private industry and Government—exemplified by Federal guarantees and insurance of private housing credit—has made possible good housing and widespread homeownership for millions of our citizens.

I intend to encourage—through legislative proposals, where necessary—even more effective cooperation between Government and industry for the joint benefit of homeowners, tenants, and the industry itself. To this end, I am proposing a number of modifications in the statutes governing our self-supporting mortgage insurance and marketing programs which will improve their efficiency and usefulness. Among these will be the following proposals:

(1) To provide relief in those isolated cases in which, despite the care exercised by builders and the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans'

Administration, substantial defects develop in new construction they have approved, I recommend that authority be provided for the FHA and VA to finance the correction of substantial deficiencies.

(2) To make certain that no legislative barriers exist to discourage or prevent mortgage lenders and the Federal Housing Administration from cooperating to help delinquent mortgagors in deserving cases, I recommend that FHA's claim and forbearance authorities be amended to encourage the temporary withholding of foreclosures against homeowners who default on their mortgages due to circumstances beyond their control.

(3) To expand our concerted effort to substitute private credit for Federal loans, I recommend provision of legislative authority for the pooling of mortgages held by the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, and the sale of participations in such pools.

II. URBAN RENEWAL

The Federal program of urban renewal is today our principal instrument for restoring the hope and renewing the vitality of older cities and worn-out neighborhoods.

The Federal assistance which provides local leaders and governments with incentives and the tools for revitalizing their communities has proven its worth in eliminating housing blight; in contributing to restoration of the economic base of our communities; and in helping reshape our central areas into effective nerve centers for our cities.

The Housing Act of 1961 doubled the previous urban renewal authorization to a total of \$4 billion. By the middle of this year, all of that increase will have been committed. I recommend that an additional \$1.4 billion of urban renewal funds be approved for a 2-year period.

Despite existing programs assisting families and persons displaced by urban renewal projects, the human cost of relocation remains a serious and difficult problem.

The vast majority of those displaced by urban renewal and public housing have relocated in better and standard housing, but some have not. For most, the cost of improved housing has been an unsought burden. For some, the inconvenience of displacement has meant only another slum dwelling and the likelihood of repeating this experience.

To assist further those families and persons least able to bear the burden of displacement, I recommend:

A. That an additional annual subsidy of up to \$120 per unit be available for local public housing authorities, where needed to provide access to such housing for displacees with extremely low incomes.

B. That low- and moderate-income families displaced by urban renewal receive 2-year supplemental relocation payments equal to the difference between rentals on standard housing in their communities and 20 percent of their gross incomes.

C. That low-income single persons displaced by urban renewal or other pub-

lic action be made eligible for public housing.

Similarly, small businessmen—especially those in leased premises—often incur economic loss and hardship as a result of displacement by urban renewal or public housing which is not offset by current compensation practices and moving expense reimbursements. To provide more adequately for these firms, I recommend authority for a separation payment of up to \$2,500 for small establishments.

At the time of the 1960 census, 7 million nonfarm dwellings were found to be deteriorating, including 2½ million occupied by their owners. Rehabilitation and preservation of existing housing wherever possible is a key element in the urban renewal process today. Elderly homeowners in urban renewal areas with low, fixed incomes are at a particular disadvantage in trying to meet the increased housing payments required by rehabilitation. To assist them, I recommend a program of Federal insurance and purchase of low-interest loans, with a deferral of amortization of principal, for home rehabilitation by elderly homeowners in urban renewal programs.

III. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The great expansion of our urban areas over the last 2 decades has too frequently been carried out in a sprawling space-consuming, unplanned and uneconomic way. All levels of government are spending vast sums to accommodate this tremendous urban growth with highways, sewer and water facilities, schools, hospitals, and other community facilities. Rural communities and small towns face similar pressures. If the taxpayer's dollar is to be wisely used and our communities are to be desirable places in which to live, we must assure ourselves that future growth takes place in a more orderly fashion.

I recommend that the urban planning assistance program and the open space program administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency be extended.

Although the planning requirements of these and various other Federal programs—such as the Federal-aid highway program—also emphasize orderly growth and development, much more can and should be done.

The pioneering efforts of progressive and imaginative private developers in planning totally new and complete communities indicate some of the exciting possibilities for orderly growth. In the tradition of the long-established partnership between private industry and Government in housing and community development, the Federal Government should encourage and facilitate these new and desirable approaches.

Such a partnership can help achieve the orderly accommodation of a significant part of our forthcoming urban growth by means of entirely new communities, complete with all public services, all the industry and commerce needed to provide jobs, and sufficient housing and cultural and recreational facilities for moderate- and low-income families as well as for the well-to-do. To realize such new community development, and to encourage the participa-

tion of private initiative on the greatest possible scale, I propose a program of grants and loans to States and local governments for the planning and provision of necessary public facilities and of loan insurance for private developers constructing such facilities.

Many existing communities face problems of expansion as well. Even though they may foresee enormous development ahead, they often lack the resources to build sewer and water systems and other facilities with adequate growth capacity. Building in such capacity in advance could result in tremendous savings and prevent costly duplication or premature replacement of inadequate facilities. I, therefore, recommend a program of public facility loans with deferred amortization to enable communities to plan and build ahead of growth.

Early acquisition of land for right-of-way and other public improvements is frequently sound public business. Many communities which are prepared to exercise foresight in acquiring land—and to save private owners from uncertainty and hardship—lack the financial capacity to do so. Such advance acquisition—which would assure location of such facilities in accordance with planned development—could also result in substantial savings, inasmuch as the increases in land prices that occur as development proceeds would be avoided. I, therefore, recommend that public facility loans, with deferral of amortization as required, be made available for advance land purchase or option by States and local governmental jurisdictions.

To encourage better planned new development on a neighborhood scale, and to preserve and increase the supply of improved land for homebuilding, I recommend Federal insurance of loans to private developers for acquisition and improvement of land for planned subdivisions.

It is essential that all of these programs be based on the existence of effective planning arrangements in the community or region. For planned subdivisions, there should be, in addition, assurance that the neighborhood itself is carefully conceived to maintain its residential integrity and will result in efficient land use.

In our great metropolitan areas, and in our rural communities as well, the difficult problems of growth and development require understanding and cooperation at all governmental levels. The Federal Government can assist and encourage, but, in the last analysis, the success or failure of programs of community development depends on those most directly involved.

IV. URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

Efficient transportation systems are essential to our urban communities. Each local system should be tailored to its particular needs—existing and prospective—and the proper mixture of good highways and mass transit facilities should be developed to permit safe, efficient movement of people and goods in our metropolitan centers.

A matching grant mass transit program along the lines proposed by the administration was approved by the

Senate last year (S. 6) and reported favorably to the House by its Committee on Banking and Currency (H.R. 3881). I urge early enactment of the mass transit program as basic to the development and redevelopment of our Nation's cities.

V. TRAINING NEEDS

The sound administration of local governments and the success of our federally supported programs of community development depend heavily on the competence of State and local public service staffs—on their ability, their imagination, and, especially, their training. Throughout the range of local functions—from traffic control to tax administration, from recreation to renewal—their efforts will influence greatly the quality of community living.

The substantial Federal investment in local community efforts justifies a deep Federal interest in the quality of local government employees and the expenditure of funds to help attract able people to local public service and help them develop the skills and perspective they need.

To this end, I recommend a program of up to \$25 million a year in matching grants to States for the establishment of urban public service training and research programs.

VI. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

If we are to deal successfully with the complex problems of our urban and suburban communities, we need governmental machinery designed for the 1960's, not the 1940's. The Housing and Home Finance Agency, established 17 years ago primarily to administer housing programs, has seen its responsibilities enlarged progressively by the Congress during the intervening years to include the broader aspects of community development as well. The Agency now administers such major community development programs as urban renewal, urban planning, public facilities planning and loans, open space, and mass transit. These basic changes in the Agency's role and mission are not adequately reflected in the Agency's current organization and status which remain much the same as they were in 1947. Action to convert the Housing and Home Finance Agency into an executive department is long overdue.

The size and breadth of the Federal programs now administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the significance of those programs clearly merit departmental status. A new Secretary of Housing and Community Development would be in a position both to present effectively the Nation's housing and community development needs in the highest councils of Government and to direct, organize, and manage more efficiently the important and closely interrelated housing and community development programs now administered or proposed for the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

I recommend that the Congress establish a Department of Housing and Community Development.

CONCLUSION

The dramatic increase in our Nation's population projected for the coming dec-

ades—over 300 million by the year 2000—and the increasing concentration of our population around urban centers will create increased housing needs and intensified problems of community development which must be anticipated and acted upon immediately.

How we respond to these challenges will have a lasting impact on the character of our cities and rural communities. Whether we achieve our goal of a decent home in a decent neighborhood for every American family rests, in large measure, on the actions we take now.

The substantive programs I have proposed in this special message will speed our solutions to today's problems and the predictable needs of tomorrow. I earnestly urge the Congress to give the attached draft bills the attention they merit.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 27, 1964.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Legislative Calendar be dispensed with.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of William Rummel, of Illinois, to be Comptroller of Customs with headquarters at Chicago, Ill., which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of protocols were submitted:

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

Executive O, Eighty-eighth Congress, first session. Protocol amending the Interim Convention on Conservation of North Pacific Fur Seals, signed at Washington on October 8, 1963, on behalf of the governments of Canada, Japan, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United States (Executive Report No. 1); and

Executive R, Eighty-eighth Congress, first session. Protocol for the Prolongation of the International Sugar Agreement of 1958; (Executive Report No. 2).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Cyrus Roberts Vance, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Stephen Ailes, of the District of Columbia, to be Secretary of the Army.

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

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Donald F. Hornig, of New Jersey, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology.

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

U.S. ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Army be considered en bloc.

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

U.S. AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Harold C. Donnelly, 647A, Regular Air Force, to be a lieutenant general, and to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of sec. 8066, title 10, of the United States Code.

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

U.S. NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, are the Navy nominations subject to debate?

Mr. MANSFIELD. They are.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about one of them, that of Vice Admiral Rickover, who is to be placed on the retired list.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

NOMINATION OF VICE ADM. HYMAN G. RICKOVER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this is the birthday anniversary of a great American, Adm. H. G. Rickover.

Admiral Rickover's contributions to the defense and security of the Nation have been heralded so many times in the past, that there are very few words of appreciation to express our debt of gratitude to this earnest, devoted naval officer.

Today, the United States has 36 nuclear submarines, of which 17 are Polaris

type and 19 are attack submarines. Another 50 nuclear submarines have been authorized. But these impressive statistics do not, alone, tell the dramatic story of Admiral Rickover's achievement.

Before we could talk of dozens of nuclear submarines, the first of these ships had to be built. It was here that Admiral Rickover made his fight, and triumphed against almost insuperable odds. In citing Admiral Rickover for this achievement, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in 1959, stated:

As a result of his unstinting drive, organizational ability, and technical leadership, the United States produced the world's first nuclear powered ships.

In a larger sense, Admiral Rickover, through the sheer force of his personality, has injected a fresh, healthy spirit into American life. The essence of his character was perhaps best captured by the majority leader of the Senate, now President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, who said, in 1959, to Admiral Rickover:

You are a symbol of the "can do" man. There are plenty of us who can find 15 reasons why something that ought to be done, can't be done, but there are very few of us who can cut through redtape, slash through the "can't do" folks and get on with the job. You have done that. You have brought pride to the Navy. You have been an inspiration and a stimulating example to every young man in this country.

Now, as he reaches the age of 64, Admiral Rickover goes on the Navy's retired list, with the permanent rank of vice admiral. But retirement is a poor word, for Admiral Rickover will continue to head the Nation's naval reactors program. Indeed, in the words of a resolution approved by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on December 20, 1963:

Continuity of management in the joint AEC/Navy nuclear propulsion program must be maintained and supported.

It is my hope and expectation that this fine man will continue to serve the Nation with distinction. There can be no retirement for a man with the heart and spirit of Admiral Rickover.

I express to the Admiral my heartfelt wishes for a very happy birthday.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief biographical sketch of Admiral Rickover.

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

**BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF H. G. RICKOVER,
VICE ADMIRAL, U.S. NAVY**

BACKGROUND

Born: January 27, 1900; graduated U.S. Naval Academy, 1922; selected for engineering duty only (EDO), 1937; assigned to nuclear reactor development, 1947; Assistant Chief of Bureau of Ships for Nuclear Propulsion, in charge Navy Department's nuclear ship propulsion program since 1947; Assistant Director for Naval Reactors, Division of Reactor Development, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission since 1949.

EDUCATION

B.S., U.S. Naval Academy, 1922; M.S. (electrical engineering), Columbia University, 1929; completion nuclear power instruction course, Oak Ridge, Tenn., 1947.

AWARDS

Awarded Legion of Merit for performance of duties as head of the Electrical Section, Bureau of Ships, 1946.

Made commander, Order of British Empire, 1946.

Awarded Gold Star in lieu of Second Legion of Merit for performance of duty in development of nuclear ship propulsion program, 1952.

Awarded Congressional Gold Medal for his accomplishments in successfully directing the development and construction of the world's first nuclear-powered ships and the first large-scale nuclear powerplant devoted exclusively to the production of electricity, 1959.

Presented the Distinguished Service Medal for exceptionally meritorious service from January 17, 1955, to January 17, 1961, while in charge of the naval nuclear propulsion program in the Department of the Navy and in the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, January 1961.

NUCLEAR PROGRAM (UNDER DIRECTION OF ADMIRAL RICKOVER) TO DATE

Design first nuclear submarine begun 1949; first atomic powerplant in the world, land prototype of *Nautilus* "goes critical" March 30, 1953; keel of *Nautilus* laid, 1954; *Nautilus* underway on nuclear power, 1955.

Today completed: 36 nuclear submarines, 17 of them *Polaris* subs; 1 nuclear aircraft carrier; 1 nuclear cruiser; 1 nuclear destroyer.

Also world's first nuclear powerplant built exclusively for generation of electricity completed 1957 (Shippingport, Pa.).

PUBLICATIONS

In addition to numerous articles, two books, and two reports to the House Appropriations Committee (issued as separate publications): "Education and Freedom" (1959), E. P. Dutton & Co.; "Swiss Schools and Ours: Why They're Better" (1962), Little, Brown & Co. (under auspices Council for Basic Education); "Report on Russia" (1959), Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives; "Education for All Children: What We Can Learn From England" (1962), Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives; "American Education—A National Failure," E. P. Dutton & Co. (1963).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I join in everything the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, the ranking Republican Member of this body, has had to say about our friend Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover.

Admiral Rickover has had to overcome almost insurmountable odds. He is obstinate, for which we can thank the Lord; he is determined; he is patriotic; he has made a real contribution to the welfare and defense of this country. He has achieved renown, not only because of the work he has done in the field of nuclear propulsion, but also because of his work in the field of education.

I am glad to join the distinguished Senator from Vermont in complimenting and congratulating this distinguished American on his birthday anniversary. Our congratulations and commendations to him are certainly well deserved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming will state it.

Mr. SIMPSON. Is the Senate now in executive session?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Chair whether the addition to rule VIII which was adopted last Thursday by the Senate applies to the consideration of the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, that rule does not apply to the consideration of the Executive Calendar at this time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Further inquiring, Mr. President, I gather, then, that as a name is called on the Executive Calendar, any Senator may be recognized, and he need not speak to the nomination in question; is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on Thursday—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the present status of the Executive Calendar?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Navy nominations are being considered en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Have the Navy nominations been approved?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No, the Navy nominations are pending. Does the Senator from Montana wish to have the President immediately notified of the nominations thus far confirmed?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations thus far confirmed.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Wyoming will yield briefly, let me say that I have not yet made a request in connection with the morning hour; but I intend to do so at the conclusion of the call of the Executive Calendar.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to have made clear for the record whether the new rule applies to the Executive Calendar. I gather from the interpretation by the Chair that when nominations are called up and they are subject to debate, any Senator can discuss any question in connection with any nomination.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is an old tradition and custom in the Senate. The distinguished minority leader has read Senate Resolution 89 and knows that the rule of germaneness of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], under the resolution agreed to by the Senate last Thursday, does not go into effect until conclusion of the morning hour.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The Senator from Missouri will state it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is the Senate in the morning hour; and, if not, when is it planned to enter the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is now in executive session, and there is no consideration of legislative business at this time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield briefly to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], without losing my right to the floor.

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

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S TELEGRAM TO GENERAL MACARTHUR ON HIS 84TH BIRTHDAY

As in legislative session,

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Wyoming in yielding to me at this time.

This morning an article was published in the Baltimore Sun entitled "Johnson Sends MacArthur Telegram on 84th Birthday."

The article expresses the respect and the high regard of President Johnson for General MacArthur, and also the respect and the high regard that is held by General MacArthur for President Johnson.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

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

JOHNSON SENDS MACARTHUR TELEGRAM ON 84TH BIRTHDAY

NEW YORK, January 26.—General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, celebrating his 84th birthday today, fingered a congratulatory telegram from President Johnson and remarked whimsically:

"I remember well decorating him with a Silver Star for his coolness and courage in an air mission in New Guinea.

"Had I known at the time he was to become President, I would have looked after his welfare better than I did—but he seemed well able to take care of himself."

PRESIDENT SENDS WIRE

The President's wire read:

"Your country sends you, with affection and warmth, prayers for God's blessing on your 84th birthday. You are one of the authentic American heroes of this century.

"On behalf of the American people, please accept the appreciation of a grateful nation for what you have given and all you have done."

CADETS VISIT MACARTHUR

President Johnson went on active duty as a lieutenant commander the day after Pearl Harbor. He was the first Member of the House to do so. He served in the South Pacific and went on bombing missions which won him the Silver Star. He served for 8 months, returning when President Roosevelt ordered all Members of Congress out of service.

MacArthur, in his Waldorf Towers suite, also received five cadets from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y. One of the cadets was John Putnam Otgen, 22, of Elm Grove, Wis.

MacArthur told Otgen: "Your great grandfather appointed me. I knew him well."

Representative Otgen, of Wisconsin, appointed MacArthur to the Academy in 1899.

Read to the general was a letter from the West Point cadets which termed him "a man who exemplifies by his accomplishments, past and present, the true meaning of dedication to country."

The letter was read by Richa Allen Chilcoat, 24, first captain and brigade commander of the corps. He is the son of Mrs. Edna B. Chilcoat, of Millersville, Md., and Floyd D. Chilcoat, of Minneapolis, Minn.

OTHER CADETS PRESENT

The other cadets present were Dennis K. Culp, Jr., 23, of Fresno, Calif.; Norman Lee Grunstad, 24, of Ortonville, Minn., and Harold Paul Kindleberger, 22, of El Paso, Tex.

Also present was Maj. Gen. James B. Lampert, Academy Superintendent, and Brig. Gen. Michael Davison.

In acknowledging the cadet letter, MacArthur said: "High honors have come my way, but I shall believe that the greatest honor was being a West Point graduate."

Officers who served with MacArthur in World War II arranged for their annual birthday party for him. The private affair at the Waldorf was organized by retired Maj. Gen. L. J. Sverdurp, of St. Louis.

As in past years, no guest list was issued. About 100 persons attended, mostly his former comrades in arms.

As the general walked into the Basildon Room, a voice called the assembled guests to attention. They then sang "Happy Birthday."

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield briefly to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], without losing my right to the floor.

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

TRANSMITTAL OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1 AS ADOPTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, RATIFYING A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

As in legislative session,

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as the senior Senator of the State of South Dakota, it gives me great pleasure to present today, for appropriate referral, a certified copy of House Joint Resolution 1, as adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, ratifying the proposed 24th amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America relating to the qualification of electors.

Attached with the official certificate is a letter of transmittal from the Honorable Essie Wiedenman, Secretary of State for the State of South Dakota.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the official certificate from Secretary of State Wiedenman and the text of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, last Thursday, January 23, when news reached the Chamber that my home State of South Dakota had become the 38th State to ratify and make immediately effective the 24th amendment to the Constitution, the distinguished majority leader said: "I believe this is a great day in the history of the Nation."

No better description could be given to this event, Mr. President, than that

delivered by the majority leader. I would only wish to add that it is a proud and happy occasion for my State—in the year of its 75th anniversary of statehood—to become the legal instrument by which the proposed amendment became the 24th amendment to our Constitution.

South Dakota takes a back seat to no State in its desire and in its efforts to achieve equal rights and equality of opportunity for our citizens.

The action of the State legislature last week to add this further guarantee to our citizens' rights to vote is in keeping with my State's record in this vital area of human liberties. For example, we were among the first to make certain that our Indian citizens received the right to vote.

Mr. President, South Dakota marks this occasion—as does the Nation—as another illustrious chapter in our continuing success to make liberty a living, working vehicle by which each citizen can fulfill his honest and dedicated aspirations as a fundamental part of a free society.

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Wyoming in yielding briefly to me.

EXHIBIT 1

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Pierre, S. Dak., January 24, 1964.

HON. KARL MUNDT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR KARL: As directed by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, I am transmitting herewith a certified copy of House Joint Resolution 1, ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to the qualification of electors.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ESSIE WIEDENMAN,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

This is to certify that the attached instrument of writing is a true, correct, and examined copy of House Joint Resolution 1, as adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota on January 23, 1964, and filed in this office on January 24, 1964, and the whole thereof, and has been carefully compared with the original now on file in this office and found correct.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota at the city of Pierre, the capital, on this 24th day of January 1964.

[SEAL]

ESSIE WIEDENMAN,
Secretary of State.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

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

Whereas both Houses of the 87th Congress of the United States of America by a constitutional majority of two-thirds of each House thereof, made the following proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words and figures, to wit:

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

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment

to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

“ARTICLE—

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

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

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring)

SECTION 1. That said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this preamble and joint resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state of this State, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

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

POLITICAL SMOKE SCREEN ON LIVESTOCK IMPORTS

As in legislative session,

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on Thursday, January 16, 1964, Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, held a briefing for Members of Congress on beef imports. It was a well attended meeting which demonstrated the concern Members of Congress have for the problem which confronts our livestock industry.

The Secretary of Agriculture talked of the five different approaches that could be taken which might bring relief. He spoke of an international agreement, the use of the “escape clause” under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, legislation which he still does not favor, price supports which everyone should be against, and voluntary arrangements.

It was the latter, voluntary arrangements which he stressed. This is a difficult route because the countries importing beef to this country have such a good thing going that they will be very slow to give it up. However, it would be possible to negotiate voluntary agreements with the importing countries if our representatives would deal from a position of power and not hesitate to use that position of power if it became necessary. Secretary Freeman said that he was working on these possibilities but never did say that anything had been accomplished.

The Secretary was very careful with his wording. Never did he say what he had done nor did he say what he was going to do. He kept saying that action is important, but never did he say what type of action he meant. If we judge the administration by the image that Secre-

tary Freeman tried to present we would be led to believe that the Democratic administration was sympathetic to the livestock industry. I wish that it were sympathetic but I am afraid that this is just another political smokescreen sent up by the Democratic administration.

Secretary Freeman said, “Action is important.” Let us look at the record to see what action has been taken by this administration. In spite of several speeches and comments by the administration spokesmen, the only thing done in regard to the livestock industry by this administration has been the placing of beef, beef products, lamb, mutton, wool and wool products on the preliminary negotiation list so that the tariffs on these commodities might be eliminated or reduced by as much as 50 percent. This is just exactly the opposite of what should have been done and what the administration talks about doing.

The administration continues to send up smokescreens so that the livestock industry will be led to believe that the administration is doing all that it can for the protection of our domestic industries. For example, in the December 15, 1963, issue of Cow Country, a publication put out by the Wyoming Stock Growers Association, a Democratic spokesman said that after meeting three times with the President he had been assured that “at the next round of negotiations on trade and tariffs our representatives will take a strong stand in this area.” The administration did take a strong stand. Unfortunately, however, it stood against the beef industry. It placed beef and beef products on the preliminary negotiation list for the upcoming Geneva Trade Conferences—action which could result in elimination or reduction of tariffs by as much as 50 percent. This is just exactly the opposite of what the spokesman and the administration have tried to make us believe they were going to do on behalf of the livestock industry.

I, too, believe “action is important,” and I am willing to say what type of action. We must curb the excessive imports. The administration has the authority to do so, but has failed to act. I would prefer that we do it by voluntary agreement, but since that has failed, or at least the administration has failed to make any agreement, I believe we should pass the necessary legislation. Several Senators joined me in introducing appropriate legislation which would establish a reasonable quota on imports. This legislation has received wide support, and I am hopeful that action can be taken on the matter even though it has been opposed by the Democratic administration.

This beef imports problem is not the only instance in which the Democratic administration has used the big smoke screen to mislead our livestock men.

On January 18, 1963, a news dispatch came out of the office of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], which stated:

A group of Senators from wool and wool textile States said they received assurances from President Kennedy today that “something will be done” to restrict imports on wool products. Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of

Rhode Island, told newsmen “that the President promised to propose within a month measures to limit such imports.”

The Democratic administration did nothing to alleviate the problem. The only action that was taken by the administration was to place wool and wool products on the preliminary negotiation list as items which are subject to negotiation for a reduction in tariffs. This is exactly the same treatment that beef, beef products, lamb, and mutton received.

Mr. President, it is time for the administration to remove the smokescreens and speak with candor and honesty. The livestock men of America speak straight from the shoulder and they expect others to deal with them in the same manner. I call upon this administration to deal fairly and honestly with our cattlemen and sheepmen.

If the administration and the State Department are determined to establish a free trade policy, as I suspect they are, why do they not state that fact and quit misleading the livestock men by holding out a faint glimmer of hope? As it is now, we never know whether protection will be granted by our Government or not. A statement will come from the White House promising assistance, thus we in Congress do not push for protective legislation. Nothing ever happens until once again public pressure mounts and another smokescreen is sent up to divert the attention and gain political advantage for the Democratic spokesman. What we need is a clear policy and an honest declaration of that policy.

Many of us have appeared before the Tariff Commission on behalf of the cattle and sheep industries. We go there asking that livestock commodities be taken from the preliminary negotiation lists, which were prepared by the administration in violation of the promises issued by the White House.

Mr. President, the livestock industry needs protection, not a further reduction in tariffs as is contemplated by the President and his advisers.

I have submitted two statements to the Tariff Commission on behalf of our Wyoming livestock men. On January 10, I presented to the Tariff Commission my statement on behalf of the wool and wool products industries, and I ask unanimous consent to have that statement printed in the RECORD.

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

WOOL AND WOOL PRODUCTS

(Statement by MILWARD L. SIMPSON, U.S. Senator, before the U.S. Tariff Commission, January 10, 1964)

Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, I thank you for once again permitting me to appear before this Commission. One month ago I addressed you and at that time I urged you to strike from the preliminary negotiation lists, beef, beef products, lamb, and mutton. The excessive meat imports have brought great damage to our livestock industry. Remedial action must be taken. I hope that the administration will act under its authority to correct this imbalance.

Today I appear before you in opposition to the proposed reduction in tariff duties

on raw wool, woven wool fabrics, woolen wearing apparel, and miscellaneous wool textile products.

The sheep industry depends upon its successful marketing of both meat products and raw wool. When the price of either commodity is depressed the industry experiences financial difficulties. Presently both commodities are under severe attack by excessive imports.

The wool-growing industry in Wyoming is vital to our economy. We have 3,000 families in Wyoming who are in the sheep business. Because of their ingenuity and resourcefulness, Wyoming ranks second in the Nation in the production of wool.

The wool growers of Wyoming, like all wool growers, find themselves in a difficult position because their only market is the domestic textile industry. Consequently, when raw wool is imported for processing in our textile mills our domestic sheep industry is damaged. When woolen fabrics are imported both our sheep industry and our textile industry suffers. And, when woolen apparel is imported, the garment industry, as well as the sheep and textile industries, is damaged.

Today you are considering the possible reduction of tariffs of four classifications: wool fibers, woven wool fabrics, woolen apparel, and miscellaneous textile products. If tariffs are reduced on these commodities, many thousands of jobs will be thrown in jeopardy and millions of dollars will be lost. The woolgrowers of Wyoming and this Nation are in a unique position in that they must carry the burden not only of their own industry but of all the related industries if they are to survive.

If there is a reduction in tariffs on any of these commodities the sheep industry will be irreparably damaged. This is so because our woolgrowers supply the raw materials and any additional wool products imported will worsen the already difficult financial position of our sheepmen. This is the precarious position in which the woolgrowers are placed.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that the integrated wool industries have been the victims of ruthless political maneuvering. The wool growers and the wool manufacturers have teamed up to fight the excessive wool imports problem. The problem is at a critical stage and has been for some time.

The Democratic administration promised in May 1961 that it was "time for action" to alleviate this problem. In August 1962 the policy of the U.S. Government was stated officially to encompass limitation of wool product imports. Imports are now substantially in excess of the level at which our Government announced to this industry and the world that they would be held.

On January 18, 1963, a news dispatch came out which said "A group of Senators from wool and wool textile States said they received assurances from President Kennedy today that 'something will be done' to restrict imports on wool products." Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat of Rhode Island, told newsmen "that the President promised to propose within a month measures to limit such imports."

The Democratic administration did nothing to alleviate the problem. The only action that was taken by the administration was to place wool and wool products on the preliminary negotiation list as items which are subject to negotiation for a reduction in tariffs.

This is exactly contrary to the desired action. The case is clear—protection is needed, not a reduction of tariffs. I do not like to charge that "cheap politics" has dominated and controlled a very delicate situation but the facts are compelling.

Mr. Chairman, I am embarrassed to come before this distinguished Commission to ask

that you correct the wrongs of a politically oriented administration, but I do ask it. I ask you to strike from the administration's preliminary negotiation list wool and wool products. I am not asking you to fulfill the empty promises of the Democratic administration but only to correct this wrong which will bring irreparable damage to the wool growers of Wyoming and the other related industries unless corrected.

U.S. NAVY

As in executive session, The Senate resumed consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations in the Navy, which are being considered en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed. Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

OUR RELATIONS WITH PANAMA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, President Johnson and his advisers are working carefully to better our relations toward Panama, while taking into account the need to protect American interests. This fact is appreciated by the better informed citizens of our country, among whom can always be counted William F. Johnston, the distinguished managing editor of the Lewiston, Idaho, Morning Tribune. I ask unanimous consent that the excellent editorial from the January 18 issue of the Tribune be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EXTREMISM AND THE CANAL ZONE

Despite the belligerent attitude of Panama and the inevitable jeers from the Communist and far-right extremists, the U.S. Government is maintaining a sound and sensible course in the conflict over the Panama Canal Zone.

The Governments of Panama and the United States appeared to have reached an agreement on procedures to reduce tensions in the troubled zone a few days ago. The United States agreed promptly to submit the issues to an agency of the Organization of American States for mediation. This country also agreed to discuss directly with Panama all questions involved in the controversy. Panama appeared to accept these procedures.

Then President Roberto Chiari of Panama announced that he was unwilling to accept a mere promise to discuss differences. He insisted that the United States should agree in advance of any discussion to negotiate an entirely new treaty redefining U.S. rights in the Canal Zone.

The United States rejected this demand, explaining that it would not agree "under pressure" to surrender its rights under the

1903 treaty in advance of discussions on the issues.

Meanwhile, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, hobnobbing in Russia with Cuban Dictator Fidel Castro, proclaimed that the Soviet Union supports the Panamanians in the struggle to get rid of "oppression by the U.S. imperialists." He warned "imperialists" to act "before you are chucked out."

At the other extreme, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, was criticizing the U.S. Government for agreeing to any substantial negotiations or mediation in the Canal Zone crisis. He argued that the United States should sit tight on its "rights" in the Canal Zone under the 1903 treaty and use force as necessary to subdue any Panamanian objections.

Both Khrushchev and GOLDWATER distorted the record of the recent bloody riots in Panama.

The Soviet news agency, Tass, said that "Khrushchev ridiculed U.S. imperialists' concoctions that the events in Panama had been staged by Fidel Castro."

No responsible U.S. leader ever said, of course, that these events had been staged by Castro. The riots boiled out of long-standing Panamanian resentment of U.S. privileges in the Canal Zone. They were touched off by U.S. high school students who violated an agreement between this country and Panama that the flags of the two nations would be displayed equally in the Canal Zone. Certainly the Communist organizers in Panama encouraged and incited in every possible way by Castro agents, helped fan the sparks into a raging flame of revolt, but Castro does not direct public opinion in Panama.

GOLDWATER's implication that the United States is not in any way responsible for the riots and is fully justified in putting down by force any demonstrations is almost equally erroneous. The Panamanians do have legitimate objections to the way the United States has occupied the Canal Zone. Those objections must be discussed bilaterally and through the Organization of American States, if this country is to maintain the respect of Latin America. Reasonable and fair solutions must be sought in good faith. This is not 1903. The United States cannot maintain its position in the Canal Zone, in Latin America, or in the world by exclusive reliance upon military might to answer challenges to its methods in the Canal Zone.

What the next arrangements will be to protect U.S. interests in Panama without ignoring Panamanian rights nobody can predict at this stage. Certainly the notion of a "final solution" should be dismissed in this area of diplomacy as in every other area of a swiftly changing world.

The need for a new sea-level canal north of Panama, perhaps under international supervision, becomes steadily more apparent. Such a canal, less vulnerable than the Panama Canal to atomic bombing, would enhance the security of the United States and all nations depending upon the Panama Canal. It also would put the whole question of United States, Panamanian and international rights in the area in a better perspective.

Meanwhile, the United States must continue its willingness to discuss its position and procedures in the Canal Zone with Panama and with other nations. But it should resist all pressures to concede in advance of discussions that its treaty rights are invalid.

This middle way of negotiation of differences is a much more complex and difficult way than the extremists on either side would choose. Khrushchev naturally is fomenting all the trouble for the Americans he can when he warns them to get out of Panama "before you are chucked out." GOLDWATER wants to stand on the 1903 treaty without

compromise or conversation, using American military might to put down any challenges. The way of negotiation is neither as dramatic nor as simple as the way of ultimatums. But it is the way toward peace.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield for a point of order?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state his point of order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was merely curious as to how the Senator from Idaho obtained the floor without complying with the rule as to morning business and the call of the morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is in order. The Senate is in the morning hour. Under rule VII morning business is in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the Chair has not called the calendar of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator desires, under the provisions of rule VII, the Chair will call for the presentation of petitions and memorials.

Mr. MANSFIELD. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senate may be conducting morning business, but I do not believe it is in the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Montana that morning business is conducted during the morning hour. Morning business continues until it is completed within the limits of the morning hour as prescribed. Under the rule the morning hour terminates at 2 o'clock.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, morning business is prescribed under rule VII. I have not yet heard the Chair recite the "catechism" on morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has called for petitions and memorials. If no Senator wishes to present a petition or memorial, reports of committees are in order.

If there are no reports of committees, the Chair calls for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions.

If there are no bills or joint resolutions to be introduced, the next business will be the introduction of concurrent and other resolutions.

If there are no resolutions coming over from the previous day, further morning business is not in order.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, since the Chair has gone through the regular germane procedure covering morning business in the morning hour, I now ask unanimous consent that statements during the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Last Thursday, by a vote of 57 to 25, the Senate adopted an amendment to rule VIII. The fundamental and basic purpose of the amendment was to give dispatch—speed—to Senate business. The end result to be desired would be that the Senate could finish its work and probably develop a sine die adjournment at a reasonably early time in the year. The minority leader is most anxious to expedite the business of the Senate.

Heretofore we have indulged in the pleasure of 3-minute statements which are not covered by any rule. In consequence, the majority leader has asked unanimous consent that statements of one kind and another, some of them world-shaking and some perhaps not so world-shaking, might continue for as long as 3 minutes. Under the circumstances, I feel that with important proposed legislation about to be presented to the Senate, the Senate should be expeditious and should carry out the mandate and spirit of the new rule.

I should be deeply distressed in spirit if the majority leader should be offended by my wholehearted desire to cooperate in every possible way in the expedition of the business that should be engaging the attention of the Senate. I trust that the majority leader will not be offended if I register an objection. But my action results from a spirit of complete cooperation.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I assure the distinguished Senator that I am not in the least offended, but I am somewhat overwhelmed. It seems to me that I detect something going on in the brain of the minority leader. He has a purpose in mind. I hope he does not hold us too closely to the rule of germaneness at this particular moment. I would hope further that if he does intend to do so, as I am sure he does, that, before he clamps down on us, he would allow the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], who has been waiting patiently, to deliver a message to the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, I believe it has now been established that the new rule does not apply to nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. During the morning hour.

Mr. DIRKSEN. While the Senate is in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. During the morning hour.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The rule then does not apply. All nominations are debatable. So if a Senator wishes to occupy the floor of the Senate and deliver himself of a speech on the vagaries in the Panama Canal Zone, he need only pick out on the Executive Calendar, for example, the nomination of Joe Doak, who might be nominated for some office in the Army, Navy, Air Corps, judiciary, or one of the regulatory agencies, and the rule of germaneness would not apply.

He can then deliver himself of a speech on the Panama Canal Zone while addressing himself to that nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ruling of the Chair is that the rule of germaneness does not apply when the Senate is in executive session during the morning hour. After 2 o'clock, if the Senate has concluded the executive session, the rule of germaneness does apply, because the resolution contains the provision—

At the conclusion of the morning hour—

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am well aware of that language. I only make the point, in the interest of being helpful, that if a Senator has some world-shaking point that must be presented at once when he comes to the Senate, and the Executive Calendar is being called, he can address himself to the question of advising and consenting to some nomination on the Executive Calendar and then proceed to deliver his remarks accordingly.

But now, since the Senate is in legislative session, I have heard no request for a waiver of the rule—assuming that the morning hour is to be concluded before the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin delivers his speech.

May I respectfully inquire how long our distinguished friend intends to speak?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, has the distinguished Senator in mind a particular purpose?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no purpose. I am as free as the morning lark. I want to pursue only two questions. One is, Is the Senate still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is still in the morning hour. The question before the Senate is the unanimous-consent request of the majority leader. That request was to limit to 3 minutes statements made in the morning hour.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So far I have not registered an objection. If I register an objection, my friend from Wisconsin can circumvent the rule—in the best of spirit—by asking unanimous consent. In so doing, he will implement the argument I made last Thursday with respect to the adoption of the amendments to the rule.

First, I shall object to the 3-minute request by the distinguished majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then I shall not object—

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have the floor for a reservation of objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that the Senator from Idaho had yielded the floor.

Mr. CHURCH. For a point of order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not yield for a point of order, unless I have to. I want to ascertain the answer to this question, because the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin can ask unanimous consent to waive the rule.

I would have no objection, he can be assured.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I be heard on that question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I cannot see how the rule can be waived when it does not go into effect until after the conclusion of the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ruling of the Chair has been that the rule goes into effect at 2 o'clock, unless morning business has been concluded earlier.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But, Mr. President, the morning hour does not allow speeches, except brief observations in connection with the introduction of bills, and resolutions, petitions, and memorials.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What the distinguished minority leader has said is correct, but I call attention to the fact that, under rule VII, after calling for petitions and memorials, and so forth, the following is stated:

All of which shall be received and disposed of in such order—

And they have been—
unless unanimous consent shall be otherwise given.

At this time I ask unanimous consent, since it seems impossible to obtain a limitation of 3 minutes for discussion during the morning hour, that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin be granted 10 minutes to discuss a subject which is of importance to him, after the business of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] has been disposed of—10 minutes or more if he needs it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have not the slightest objection.

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

ON NAME CALLING

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it has become commonplace to refer to our time in history as the "age of conformity." Like many clichés, there is some painful truth to this one. Such current phrases as "lonely crowd," "organization man," and "status seekers" suggests that there is, in modern man, a certain spiritual emptiness. Indeed, much of the popular literature of our time suggests that modern man is in search of himself, yet seems unable to discover the values and standards to give him the identity he craves.

It is for this reason, Mr. President, that I call the Senate's attention to the column which appeared in the Sunday Washington Star, written by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate. It is Dr. Harris' point that the American, in his quest for status—in his fear of what Dr. Harris calls name calling—has let "the master of fashion and social patterns" rob him of his individuality.

What is needed, Dr. Harris suggests, are more Americans who have the moral courage to be different, to stand up for values, and withstand the name-calling slogans that rob little men of the capacity to act. Dr. Harris calls for "a man for all seasons" who is not afraid to be called an egghead or a square—who does what he thinks is right whatever the pressures of the "mass mind" at the moment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Harris' Sunday column in the Washington Star be printed in the RECORD.

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

ON NAME CALLING

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate)

In this day and generation the pressure for conformity is almost overwhelming. Any tendency to drop out of the goosestepping line is ridiculed by the masters of fashion and of the social patterns. Who can deny that in America we have to reckon with a mass mind whose opinions are largely molded by the press, the films, radio, television, and book clubs? Tastes, standards, ambitions, and responses tend to be stereotyped. If you are not to be dubbed "queer" you had better stay pat and follow the leader. If you dare break the decreed format you are sure to be the victim of name calling.

How the oncoming generation is influenced, often cowed, by fear of being the target of discounting labels. It has been said that "sticks and stones may break my bones but words can never harm me." But how far from the painful truth is that old jingle? Name calling does hurt. That, of course, is usually the purpose. However, those whose names shine forever in the annals of humanity's upward climb have been those who were not deterred by name calling. One of our poets surely had his eye on history's appraisals as he wrote—

"Count me o'er earth's chosen heroes,
They were souls that stood alone,
While the men they agonized for
Hurled the contumelious stone."

Now "contumelious" is quite a long word and the dictionary tells us that it means, "perverse in resisting authority; insolent; rebellious."

And often such stones are mere words. Always men who have risen above the dead level of the accepted and the commonplace, and who thus have disturbed the self-content of their contemporaries, have been stigmatized as cranks, heretics, fools, knaves, and bigots. It was with this in mind that recently a nationally read columnist, in listing some of the issues which cry out for solution in present-day America, called for "a fair fight which does not mean an absence of criticism, but an open discussion without epithets and name calling."

Name calling is always the sign of bankruptcy in ideas and arguments even as profanity is a symptom of bankruptcy in language. Unfortunately this pernicious practice seems for the moment to be effective. The fear of being the victim of it often makes people do what in their hearts they despise. Rather than to be put in a category of being "chicken" many a youth will risk anything, including his own previous, blameless reputation. A pastor I know was called in to talk to a lad arrested because of his association with some juvenile house-breakers. In the presence of the boy's shocked family their minister asked the lad why he had first considered going along

with such a gang. Shamefacedly he finally confessed, "I didn't want to do it—and said so at first—and they began to call me a 'sissy.' I couldn't afford to be called that name so I went along."

It is because of such warped judgments that those who are willing to accept discipline of mind and time and, who for the sake of the future will scorn delights and live laborious days, are contemptuously called "squares." And, the scornful reaction from jeering ignorance for those who take the high road of intellectual achievement is to label all such eggheads.

And so the dread of being called names is a potent factor in the behavior of multitudes of people. A keen observer of the accepted ways of our day, holding up his candid camera to modern, social habits, commented, "how often we find it true that the good fellow who gets a little drunk, and frequently rather than be called a 'blue-nosed Puritan,' makes an ass of himself, has taken the place in popular esteem in many circles, which used to be given the man who was distinguished by his good manners and intelligent ideas." Many dare not question accepted behavior for fear of being called names—such as victorian, puritanical, narrow-minded, old-fashioned, and intolerant. When a splendid example of modern young womanhood at its best confided that she had definite commitments to life based on firmly held standards which were not like chameleons who change their color with environment, I quoted to her approvingly an old Sunday School verse—

"Dare to be a Daniel,
Dare to stand alone—
Dare to have a purpose true
And dare to make it known."

What names were hurled at the whitest character who ever walked this earth—Jesus of Nazareth? Those who were shamed by His purity, by His firm refusal to conform to their hypocritical ways, called Him a blasphemer, a glutton, a wine-bibber, an agent of the Devil, a friend of sinners. But all such names are among the most precious bits of slander that ever slipped from envious lips. Name-calling dragged Jesus to two crossed beams of wood because He would not conform. But that emblem of torture across the centuries has become the greatest magnet in all the world.

There is a story about a man who asked the question, "What is the Devil?" And, before anybody could reply he answered his own question. His definition is a good answer with which to confront this name-calling generation. "The Devil," he said, "is not a huge monster with horns and a harpoon tail and a wicked glitter in his eye. The Devil is just taking the line of least resistance to avoid the scornful names you will otherwise be called."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

A NATIONAL FUND TO FIGHT POVERTY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, in his state of the Union address, President Johnson stated:

This administration today, here and now, declares unconditional war on poverty in America.

I am enlisting to serve in that war for the duration. And I want to offer a program today which will enable the President to win that war.

The President's declaration is one of the most significant pronouncements to come from the American Government

since the end of World War II. The President is to be applauded for his willingness to fight this unpleasant war, for his courage in directing the attention of a comparatively comfortable nation to a very discomforting problem.

The poverty which persists in America today is a problem which has concerned me deeply for a long time. It is a problem which has drawn renewed attention in the past year as a result of some enlightened work by writers who were willing to dig below the comfortable surface of American life and expose the tragic stories which lie hidden there.

In April of 1963, after reading some of these shocking reports, I spoke out on the subject myself. At that time I said we were entering the most challenging and the most exciting age in the history of human existence, but that the brilliant technology of our new society was leaving behind a great mass of humanity for whom the new age promises but one thing—a bare existence in a life of poverty.

I ask unanimous consent that my speech of last April, entitled "The Face of America's Poor," be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. NELSON. Poverty is un-American. It simply does not fit in with our image of America as the land of opportunity, the richest and most generous Nation on earth, the land where the poor and huddled masses of older countries broke the shackles of poverty and created a new life of freedom and abundance here.

So I am confident that once our people know the facts—once they look into the face of America's poor—once they see the threat which widespread poverty poses to the American dream and to our very security as a nation—they too will enlist in President Johnson's all-out war.

But first they must know: Who are the poor? Why are they that way? What must be done to cure this disease? Can it be safely ignored, since we have so many other things to do?

Let me look at those questions.

The poor are 35 million American men, women, and children. They are at least one-fifth of the population of the richest Nation on earth. They are more than 9 million American families with annual incomes of less than \$3,000.

They include more than 11 million children—1 out of every 6 of the youth of America.

Why are these people poor?

Some are poor because they are growing old; they are no longer needed by our fast-moving society and their meager savings are dwindling away. There are at least a million elderly Americans who live on less than \$600 a year.

Many are poor because they are so poorly educated that there is no place for them in an increasingly complex society which places a premium on skill and competence.

Others are poor because the farms on which they live are too barren or exhausted to support a family at today's prices.

And above all, of course many are poor simply because they are unemployed.

Let us take just a brief look at some of these causes of poverty. Let us take a look at facts which show that, contrary to what some people may believe, people are not poor because they want to be; they are poor because they have no choice.

And, contrary to what some people may say, poverty does not build character—it destroys it.

Poverty and poor education walk hand in hand. Deep poverty prohibits the pursuit of education. The children of the poor quit school to earn a living which their parents cannot provide. And their poor education thereby imprisons many of them into a life of drift and poverty.

Unemployment rates are much higher for young people who have dropped out of high school than for high school graduates.

Dropout rates for children in families with incomes below \$4,000 are twice as high as for children in families with incomes above \$6,000.

Yet these are not stupid children, as some might hastily conclude. In 1960, a survey of 240,000 high school dropouts showed that 54 percent had IQ's above 90 and 6 percent were above 110. These are American children who were deprived of their most valuable chance—a chance at an education—because they were poor.

Farmers are especially vulnerable to the disease of poverty. There is money to be made in farming today, despite the severe dislocations that industry has undergone, but the truth is that 93 percent of the farm income is earned by 60 percent of our farmers, which means that 40 percent of them must share the remaining 7 percent of farm income. There are 3 million people of working age living today on farms which gross less than \$1,200 a year.

Here, more than perhaps anywhere else, we see the ridiculousness of any conclusion that poor people do not want to work. These poor farmers, plagued by poor soil, short growing seasons, and the lack of capital needed to buy modern machinery, probably work harder than any other segment of our population. Yet they work a treadmill which simply leads them back to where they started, in a life of grim poverty.

Poverty is especially serious among Negroes. Negroes comprise less than 10 percent of our population, but they make up 21 percent of America's poor.

Ever since 1954, Negro unemployment in America has been twice as high as white unemployment.

Negroes as a group simply do not share in the benefits of life in America today. Forty-one percent of them have incomes of less than \$1,000 a year.

And Negroes as a group pay an especially cruel price for their poverty. Negro poverty is so severe and so widespread that many Americans come to equate the face of America's poor with the face of the American Negro—and many of our Americans do not want to look upon that face. The very poverty which puts our Negro citizens into slums

and hovels becomes a chain which keep them there.

Many people are poor because of the region in which they live. Our economy is marching ahead swiftly, but each new advance which benefits some part of our population causes some other part to slip backward.

This problem is shown most dramatically in the exhausted ghost towns of Kentucky and West Virginia. We in the Midwest have some of the same problem in northern Wisconsin, northern Michigan, and northern Minnesota where severe economic dislocations, combined with a decline in farm prices, have produced substantial poverty. The iron ore, the timber and fishing industries, on which these areas were so dependent, have all suffered in recent years. So have the farmers in the South.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a New York Times article on the economic problems of the Northern Great Lakes area be included in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, that gives us a brief picture of America's poor. Now the question is, should we try to solve this problem, or should we try to ignore it, admitting that it will grow worse day by day?

I submit that if we do not make a massive effort to solve this problem immediately, we will be endangering the future of our Nation.

America is caught in a world struggle which basically is a test of our system of government, our kind of free economy, against the police state government and the controlled economies of the Soviet Union and Communist China.

How do we summon one-fifth of our people to join in a sacrificial effort to defend our system—when that system has brought them and their children nothing but poverty? How do we convince these, our own people, that ours is the better way? How long can we expect to rely on a commitment from these people to support a system which has brought them heartbreak and despair?

And what about the world outside? Bad as the picture is regarding the poor in America, it is of course far worse in other countries. Most of the world is poor—shockingly poor—by American standards. As we fight for a role of leadership among the people of the world—most of whom are hopelessly poor—how do we convince them that we really have their best interests at heart if we ignore the poor in our own country?

We may be able to summon our own poor to a battle to save America by appealing to their patriotism. But we cannot make that appeal to the people of the world. They will make their choice on the basis of which system they believe is truly concerned about the worth and dignity of the individual people of the world, most of whom are poor, and we must show them that that is truly the basic difference between the American and the totalitarian systems.

One of the great values and strengths of our American system is that we are concerned about the worth and dignity of individuals. This is our tradition. This is our history.

If our failure to solve the problem of poverty does nothing more serious, it will certainly saddle us with a mounting bill for welfare services for all time to come, rob us of the productive abilities of a sixth of our people, and prevent America from growing and prospering as it really should.

Thus it is clear why President Johnson has declared that we must fight an "all out war" against poverty.

I wish to emphasize my willingness to support the President every step of the way in this battle.

Certainly the entire Nation is aware of the tremendous pressure on the new President to hold down his budget. This pressure has come from the Congress, from the business community, and from the American public.

There often is a gap between proposal and achievement, a gap between a President's willingness to support a cause and the willingness of the American people to underwrite its cost. This is partly because we are a busy Nation of 190 million people, preoccupied with our own problems and hopes for the future. But just as I am confident that the President is right in declaring war on poverty, I am confident that the American people are ready—right now—to support a truly major attack on the roots of poverty in America.

The response to my own speech on poverty last year helps convince me of that fact. The response to this speech has been the greatest of any I have given in almost 20 years of public speaking. "The Fact of America's Poor" has been reprinted in full in many of Wisconsin's leading newspapers; in the Christian Science Monitor; in labor union and senior citizens' newspapers and magazines all across the country. It even has been translated into Japanese and distributed in that country.

The response to the President's attack on poverty has, of course, been even more startling. All our communications media have shown a great willingness to throw themselves into the full coverage of this battle.

We can wage all-out war on poverty without in any way upsetting the carefully designed budget which the President has just submitted.

In declaring war on poverty, the President said:

I urge this Congress and all America to join with me in the effort.

I believe that the best way for us to join that effort is to provide the President with a really adequate war chest to finance all-out war on poverty, a war which we can carry through to victory.

Let us give him the tools he needs to finish the job he has begun.

I suggest that we increase the Federal tax on cigarettes by 5 cents per package and earmark all of this money for all-out war on poverty.

This tax will produce more than \$1 billion a year. I propose that we make this a 10-year effort—10 years in which we

will spend \$10 billion in the most creative, most productive way we can to destroy poverty as it now exists in America.

This is a tax which will do no harm whatsoever. And this is a program which will be of incalculable benefit to America forevermore.

All my research into this problem indicates that this is the ideal way to attack it. Political realism indicates that no major new programs are going to be undertaken this year within the limits of our regular Executive budget, which has already been severely trimmed. At the same time, I think there is much to recommend a clearly identified, earmarked tax such as a 5-cent tax on cigarettes to meet a problem as widespread and as explosive as the poverty of 35 million Americans.

Cigarettes actually are undertaxed today by any standard.

The Federal tax on cigarettes is 8 cents per pack. Twenty-two years ago—in 1942—it was 7 cents. It remained at that level until 1951. During this period the average per capita income rose from \$871 to \$1,475; thus, while average income almost doubled, the cigarette tax remained the same and as a proportion of income was, in effect, cut in half.

Since the 1-cent increase in 1951, average income has risen from \$1,475 to \$2,127.

The extent to which cigarettes are undertaxed in this country is strikingly obvious when we look at other comparable countries. I ask consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a chart prepared by the Department of Agriculture.

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

Estimated average retail prices and internal taxes levied on cigarettes in selected Western European countries and the United States, annual, 1960-62

[In U.S. cents]

Country	1960		1961		1962	
	Average price per pack of 20	Internal taxes levied on pack of 20	Average price per pack of 20	Internal taxes levied on pack of 20	Average price per pack of 20	Internal taxes levied on pack of 20
United Kingdom.....	57.0	45.0	54.7	43.2	55.0	43.5
Ireland.....	43.0	30.0	47.0	34.0	50.0	36.5
Norway.....	55.0	38.5	54.7	38.3	54.6	38.2
Sweden.....	52.6	44.6	52.8	44.0	52.8	43.7
Denmark.....	56.0	44.8	60.2	46.4	64.4	50.2
Finland.....	29.2	19.0	29.2	19.0	32.1	21.5
Germany, West.....	42.8	23.5	41.9	23.4	41.8	23.4
United States ²	27.0	12.5	27.5	12.7	27.8	12.9

¹ FAS estimate.

² Estimated average of all brands and types for the United States as a whole. No official average annual prices available.

Source: FAS and ERS, USDA, Jan. 22, 1964.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the average total tax on cigarettes in the United States is 12.9 cents—a Federal tax of 8 cents plus an average State tax of 4.9 cents. The average Englishman pays a tax of 43.5 cents—almost a half a dollar of tax per package.

The average Irishman pays 36.5 cents; the average Norwegian 38.2 cents; the average Swede 43.7 cents; the average Dane 50.2 cents.

Furthermore, the average hourly pay in these other nations is far below what it is in America. The Englishman who pays 43 cents tax on his cigarettes is earning only about 70 cents an hour, whereas the American who pays about 12.9 cents tax is earning \$2.50 an hour.

The fact is we could easily raise the cigarette tax not a nickel but a dime or a quarter and still be paying a far smaller percentage of our income in cigarette taxes than other Western nations.

Only a program of the scope of \$10 billion over 10 years can really make a significant attack on poverty. A smaller program might not even keep up with the spread of poverty which is expected to result from increased automation and swift-moving economic dislocations.

I have deliberately underestimated the yield of a 5-cent cigarette tax so as not to risk overselling this proposal. The best estimate is that a 5-cent increase would produce \$1.25 billion a year at to-

day's rate of consumption and the President's budget request actually forecasts increased consumption. However, my estimate of a 10-year yield of \$10 billion seems cautiously realistic in the event that some Americans may reduce cigarette consumption because of the recent report on the role of cigarette smoke in lung cancer.

Should the tobacco industry have any fears about the economic consequences of this tax, the obvious answer is that cigarette taxes in the past have not discouraged cigarette smoking. If this substantial increase should, however, cut down on cigarette consumption, the reduction almost surely would come among young people, to whom the 5-cent increase would be most significant. I do not believe that the tobacco industry today can complain if this should prove to be the case, for the Surgeon General's report shows now the serious correlation between the age at which a person takes up smoking and the incidence of lung cancer.

Now how can we best spend this war chest of a billion dollars a year for a decade?

The possibilities are tremendous. The yield from this cigarette tax increase could produce in any 1 year 135,000 additional housing units, for a nation with over 8 million substandard dwellings. Or it could build hospitals with 62,000 beds,

for a nation which needs 280,000 beds to meet its present backlog and 500,000 beds in the next 5 years. Or it could build nursing homes with 125,000 beds, to help fill a need for over 530,000 such beds. Or it could build almost 30,000 school classrooms, for a nation which between now and 1967 will need over 400,000 new classrooms.

It is my hope that, under this program, we can do all these things and more.

It is my hope that this money—specifically earmarked for war on poverty—will be used in the most effective possible manner for schools, libraries, hospitals, housing, recreational facilities, community centers, and for bold and aggressive work in slums and depressed areas to pinpoint the causes of poverty and root them out.

The money will not be used for hand-outs. It will be used to create jobs and to cure deep-seated social problems.

I propose that this 10-year, \$10 billion program be administered by the special assistant in charge of poverty which the President will soon appoint, and that the money be spent for specific projects which he develops with the approval of the Congress.

To get the program off to an immediate start, and to create jobs immediately in areas of especially desperate need, I propose that half of the first year's proceeds from this tax—roughly \$600 million—be earmarked for projects already pending under the accelerated public works program. These projects now total about \$700 million.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a table showing these pending public projects. If we completed these pending projects in the coming year, this alone would produce almost 1 million man-months of employment.

But for the remaining years of this 10-year program, I feel very strongly that the war on poverty should be coordinated at the highest level of our Government, to make certain that this \$10 billion is spent in the most effective way and to make certain that all the other existing programs of our Government work in harmony with the same goals.

For in the long run, the war on poverty must bring in almost every agency of Government. To cure poverty, we must have full employment; we must have a sustained high rate of economic growth; we must end racial discrimination; we must avoid regional recessions; we must improve youth opportunities; we must raise the standards of education and end school dropouts; we must fight disease and mental illness.

This is the job of the President of the United States and the agencies of his executive branch of the Government. They are mindful of their job, and they are doing their jobs well. We have imaginative programs underway in most of these fields. They are making America into a steadily more prosperous nation.

But today we are looking at the face of the American for whom these programs are not enough: The small mar-

ginal farmer who is unreached by a farm program which costs us \$5 billion a year. The worker who is not helped by the fact that a record 69 million Americans have jobs today—because he is one of the 4 million who do not. The slum dweller who sees little for him in a massive urban renewal program—except an eviction notice. The relief claimant in Chicago who is unimpressed by the fact that America is the best educated Nation in the world—because he is one of the 51 percent of relief claimants who is functionally illiterate. The Negro who knows full well that Americans regardless of color have more refrigerators and television sets than any other people in the world—but who is more concerned about the fact that he is one of 41 percent of our Negroes who earn less than \$1,000 a year, which is not even enough to buy food.

We have a great system of government and a great economy which has made America the most powerful Nation in the world and has made its people the most prosperous. But the prouder we become of these facts, the more sick at heart we must be about those 35 million people who are missing out on the American dream.

We must realize our greatness, but we must also be willing to admit wherein our system has developed serious weaknesses.

And make no mistake about it, where there is poverty and hunger and disease and ignorance in America today—and as I have said, it lives in one-fifth of our homes—we have failed.

We must preserve our great system and the elaborate framework of government which we have built around it—but we must make this special, added effort to meet the unmet needs, to reach the unreached person.

We spend \$50 billion a year on our military budget. At that rate it will total 500 billions over a decade. We will spend \$20 billion over a period of years to shoot a man to the moon. Certainly the investment of \$10 billion to destroy the roots of poverty—\$10 billion which we can raise without burdening our budget and upsetting our economy—is a prudent investment in the basic values of America.

Our President has declared war on poverty. We have within our grasp the men and material—and the money—to wage this war right through to victory.

I hope we have the vision to seize that opportunity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point some tables, an editorial, and an article bearing on this subject.

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

THE NEEDS TO BE MET

(Taken from p. 17, "Accelerated Public Works in Retrospect and Prospect," a staff report to the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, December 1963, 88th Cong., 1st sess., U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.)

Although great strides have been made to date, there remains a very sizable backlog of

needed work to be accomplished. This backlog coupled with an equal need for employment necessitates a continuation of this program. As was pointed out in the previous chapter it is not only the short-run employment gains which are important, but also the generation of continuing employment which a major portion of these public works projects create.

As shown in the State-by-State summary of table VI following, there are eligible projects pending before the ARA in excess of \$700 million in APW cost, and an additional \$93 million in projects for which specific data are not available. This backlog is comprised exclusively of State and local grant-in-aid projects, 86 percent of which are in the 50-percent grant category.

TABLE VI.—Estimated accelerated public works cost of pending projects as of Oct. 20, 1963, by States

	Thousands
Alabama.....	\$15,396
Alaska.....	9,812
Arizona.....	5,404
Arkansas.....	9,532
California.....	19,267
Colorado.....	3,878
Connecticut.....	1,176
Delaware.....	286
Florida.....	25,314
Georgia.....	6,083
Hawaii.....	59
Idaho.....	379
Illinois.....	17,082
Indiana.....	5,032
Iowa.....	447
Kansas.....	3,447
Kentucky.....	27,268
Louisiana.....	41,920
Maine.....	384
Maryland.....	2,704
Massachusetts.....	19,641
Michigan.....	77,901
Minnesota.....	20,788
Mississippi.....	11,885
Missouri.....	17,559
Montana.....	7,079
Nebraska.....	1,460
Nevada.....	258
New Hampshire.....	2,196
New Jersey.....	26,911
New Mexico.....	10,089
New York.....	45,064
North Carolina.....	9,674
North Dakota.....	656
Ohio.....	26,519
Oklahoma.....	8,861
Oregon.....	9,609
Pennsylvania.....	70,822
Rhode Island.....	4,756
South Carolina.....	3,113
South Dakota.....	3,178
Tennessee.....	17,845
Texas.....	21,026
Utah.....	6,789
Vermont.....	331
Virginia.....	2,026
Washington.....	8,444
West Virginia.....	25,378
Wisconsin.....	6,669
Wyoming.....	660
American Samoa.....	-----
Guam.....	-----
Puerto Rico.....	38,186
Virgin Islands.....	-----

Total..... 700,243
Pending projects for which specific data are not available..... 93,193

Total pending..... 793,436

Estimated revenue from increased cigarette tax
[In millions of dollars]

Period (fiscal year)	Basis of estimation	Total receipts	Estimated revenue increase from 5 cents per pack increase in tax
1963....	Actual receipts with 8 cents per pack tax.	12,011	-----
1963....	13 cents per pack tax, assuming no change in cigarette smoking per capita.	3,268	1,257
1964-74.	13 cents per pack tax, assuming no increase in annual national consumption.	132,680	12,570

¹ The President's 1965 budget estimates fiscal 1964 receipts at \$2,075,000,000, and for 1965 at \$2,140,000,000. The assumed increase from 1964 to 1965 is 3.13 percent.
² Assumed to be \$10,000,000,000 to allow for a decrease in smoking as a result of the higher tax and the effect of reports on the ill effects of smoking.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 27, 1964]

TO THE ROOTS OF POVERTY

President Johnson's declaration of an "unconditional war on poverty in America" will elicit a warm response from all who have been concerned about the persistence of privation and want in a society characterized by growing affluence. But a successful war on poverty cannot be waged without an attack on the root causes of poverty, and to conduct the latter, the administration must break with conventions in formulating its programs.

When poverty is defined as "the inability to satisfy minimum needs" the herculean dimensions of the task which the President has assumed become readily apparent. Families with annual incomes of less than \$3,000 at 1962 prices and no savings upon which to draw are deprived of many of the goods and services required to provide what have come to be regarded as minimum standards of shelter, nutrition, and health in the United States. In 1962 there were 9.3 million families with incomes of less than \$3,000, or nearly one-fifth of the total.

President Johnson in his economic message observed that "the sources of poverty vary from family to family, city to city, and region to region." And stating bluntly that "a solution will not be found in any single new program, directed from Washington," he urged a concentrated effort which would coordinate the existing programs of the Federal, State, and local governments as well as private efforts.

As a piece of high strategy, this approach is unassailable, but the crucial outlines of a well-rounded and effective program are lacking. And by including requests for new antipoverty expenditures under an "allowance for contingencies" fuel is provided for charges that the program has been hastily conceived for politically partisan purposes.

If an attack on poverty is to succeed, it must seek to change the whole social environment in which poverty breeds. It must simultaneously focus upon the education of the young, manpower retraining, technological change, the cohesiveness of family life, regional economies, and race relations. Action on all of these fronts is urgently required, but poverty cannot be eliminated in the course of a short campaign. This one will be long and costly, and it must be planned with precision.

President Johnson will gain a maximum of support if he makes it unmistakably clear at the outset that he is embarking upon a

long-range program for the solution of very difficult problems. And in order to differentiate this program from the ameliorative efforts, both past and present, he should convene a conference of authorities from the various disciplines who would evaluate current programs and make recommendations for a more consistent and closely coordinated effort.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 27, 1964]

IN SEARCH OF AN ANTIPOVERTY PLAN
(By Harvey H. Segal)

"Only a few years ago," Michael Harrington, author of "The Other America," observed at a Georgetown University seminar, "it seems to me that the majority of this Nation was blind to the very existence of the problem of poverty * * * The great fact of the beginning of 1964 is not that we have a program to abolish poverty, because, as I want to make clear later on, I don't think we have, but that we have opened our eyes. That is the heartening fact of this declaration."

Harrington's statement is a fair one. There is not yet a program for the elimination of poverty, only a growing feeling that there is something incongruous about the juxtaposition of affluence and misery. That sentiment must be translated into effective public policies, a task that involves much more than a few small budgetary requests.

The best brief introduction to the subject is the "Problem of Poverty in America" appearing in the latest annual report of the Council of Economic Advisers. There the statistical dimensions of the problem are clearly drawn. If poverty is defined as the inability to satisfy minimum needs, those needs can be specified along with a lower boundary level of family income that is necessary to acquire them.

There are no flawless income measures of poverty, but the CEA's choice of an annual family income of \$3,000 at 1962 prices provides a good working approximation. According to this measure, nearly 20 percent of all American families, 9.3 million, are living in poverty.

When the characteristics of poor families are analyzed, the pervasiveness and complexity of the problem becomes apparent. Is poverty confined to the unemployed? Hardly. Nearly half of the heads of poor families are gainfully employed. Nor is it predominantly a problem of the aged since only a little more than a third of poor families are headed by persons over 65. And since poor families are distributed between urban and rural places on a 54 to 46 percent basis, poverty is not a problem which is unique to either the city or the countryside.

The CEA points out that only \$11 billion a year, a fifth of the defense budget and less than 2 percent of GNP, would be required to bring all poor families up to the \$3,000 level. But they object, and rightly, that this "solution" would leave untouched most of the roots of poverty." It is causes, not symptoms, that should be attacked. And when one ponders these causes, he is soon grappling with more than economic problems.

There is a high degree of interaction between the causes of poverty linkages which create vicious circle effects. The children of the poor are usually poorly educated, and those with low levels of educational attainment are confined to the low-income occupations. And similar analyses can be made of the effects of racial discrimination or of the technological changes which are sometimes responsible for economically depressed areas.

Because the causes of the poverty are so intricately linked, because they are contin-

ually interacting, the attacks on the problems of poverty must be highly coordinated.

It makes little sense to plan a network of superior highways for Appalachia unless something very dramatic is also done to upgrade the skills of the labor force and, at the same time, attract new industries. While adjustments to technological change and displacement may be eased by the retraining of adult workers, inadequate school facilities for the young will perpetuate the problem in future generations.

What becomes apparent is that the partial approach to problems of poverty, whether it is confined to a geographical region, a sector of the economy, or individual industries, will not work well. To eliminate poverty, a multifaceted attack will have to be sustained over a long period of years at a high cost.

Dollars alone will not create a viable anti-poverty program although they are indispensable at the operational stages. What is first required is a master plan which sets forth the strategy of the attack, makes provisions for the coordination of Federal programs, and establishes relationships between them and the efforts undertaken by State and local governments.

Consumption of cigarettes per person age 15 years and over (1957)

United States.....	3,440
United Kingdom.....	2,590
Ireland.....	2,430
Norway.....	540
Sweden.....	1,050
Denmark.....	1,220
Finland.....	1,850
Germany (West) (1956).....	1,210

EXHIBIT 1

AN ADDRESS BY SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON TO SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT DINNER, ST. JOSEPH'S CHURCH, WAUKESHA, WIS., AT 6:30 P.M., SATURDAY, APRIL 27, 1963, HONORING REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

Mankind has entered the most challenging age in the history of human existence. Within our lifetimes, it now seems certain that America will shoot a man to the moon, and the fabulous mysteries of outer space, which have fascinated but eluded men for centuries, will be conquered by our own children. This age of breathtaking discovery should excite the minds of men everywhere and stand as a tribute to the power of human intelligence to solve the problems of the world. Yet as the brilliant technology of our new society hurtles us into outer space and tames the cosmic wilderness, we may forget that this same advancing society has left behind a great mass of humanity for whom the new age promises but one thing—a bare existence in a life of poverty.

It seems old fashioned today to talk about the poor. Everyone knows that America is more prosperous than ever before. Everyone knows that the New Deal of the thirties, the war prosperity of the forties, and the economic boom of the fifties struck a massive blow against poverty in America. Imaginative Government programs helped business back on its feet in the thirties. Unemployment compensation protected men thrown out of work. Social security gave the aged a resource for the day the paychecks stopped. We are striving today to continue the gains of the New Deal: Area redevelopment loans are helping depressed areas; small business loans are encouraging the entrepreneur; and we are fighting to add hospital care to the benefit guaranteed the elderly.

But it is a sad fact that these great changes of the last 30 years—this inspiring demonstration of the power of the cooperative effort

of our people—has not eliminated poverty. It has only concealed it.

The Bible says we will have the poor with us always. And they are with us today. The changes in our society have simply made them harder to see. What we have with us today has been described as "the invisible poor."

Are there really very many of them—enough to worry about? There are 40 to 50 million—one-fourth of the people of the richest nation on earth—not just uncomfortable but unable to get the mere necessities of life—living a shabby life of denial in what the New Yorker magazine has called a long vestibule on the way to death.

Who are they? They are the poor farmers, especially in marginal farming areas who eke out an existence on \$500 to \$1,000 a year, unreached by a Federal farm program which pours five billions into our economy each year.

They are the migrant laborers; the unskilled and unorganized workers in offices, hotels, laundries, hospitals, and restaurants. They are the victims of automation in a strange industrial economy which marches forward at the same time that millions of workers slip backward. They are the residents of depressed areas in the North, West Virginia, and the rural South. One-fourth of them are the Negroes and the Puerto Ricans—last to be hired and first to be fired—who get about half the average wage of a white man when they do find jobs.

They are our senior citizens, an estimated 8 million of whom live in poverty and 1 million of whom live on less than \$580 a year.

And finally, they are our citizens with special problems—the handicapped, the alcoholic, the hillbillies who forsake their ancient society in the mountains for a life of confused poverty in the cities.

Why are they invisible?

Because the great American middle class, twice as big and twice as prosperous as before, has moved to the suburbs and left the poor behind in the central cities; because these 40 to 50 million Americans don't have powerful organizations to plead their cause; because their lives of grimy dullness don't make bright feature stories or technicolor movies; because old folks don't live with their children any more, but in upstairs rooms in gray old houses that are never written up in the beautiful magazines; because the rest of us have become so gay and so prosperous that we don't want to look at them.

Do they have problems? Well, listen to these conclusions from a New Yorker review of several studies of the poor:

"The very poor are four times as disabled by chronic illness as the well-to-do. Their illness is three times as likely to be psychiatric. If they do have a psychiatric problem, it is far more likely to be psychotic than neurotic—when compared with the well-to-do. They need hospital insurance the most, but they have it the least. They pay more taxes in proportion to income than do most of the rich. They have a drab social life. Most of our clubs are for the middle class and the well-to-do. Over one-third of the children of the poor don't go beyond the eighth grade, and probably will perpetuate the poverty of their parents.

"Unlike the poor of the past, many of whom were new immigrants fired with hope for the future, the poor we have with us today are lacking in motivation and discouraged by the handicaps of age, race, environment, physical and mental defects.

"But most of all, they are handicapped because they are a disorganized minority, without a spokesman, without a voice, without the means to bring their case to public attention.

"The great Government programs which we have forged to meet their problems have met someone else's problems—but not theirs.

"Most of them do not qualify for unemployment compensation or workmen's compensation or social security or farm subsidies or ARA or SBA loans. And almost every time we pass a new Government program—we carefully exempt them. When the Fair Labor Standards Act was broadened in 1961 it was deliberately drawn to exclude 483,000 laundry and dry cleaning employees. Even the pending hospital care bill will exclude many because of its \$90 deductible feature, which is 10 percent of the annual income of 3 million Americans. The urban renewal bulldozers knock down the homes of the poor and replace them with shiny new apartments for the middle class, and the poor are compressed even more tightly and more invisibly in some distant slum.

"That is the face of America's poor which I wanted you to see. If you can't see them, I don't know who will. If we consign a fourth of our people to a life of poverty in the midst of our own prosperity we corrode democracy. And we confess that in solving the greatest problem of all—the maintenance of the dignity of our fellow men—we have not triumphed at all. We have failed."

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York Times, Jan. 13, 1964]
POVERTY BLIGHTS IRON ORE REGION—MINES IN NORTH WOODS AREA OF MIDWEST SHUT DOWN—U.S. HELP IS SOUGHT

(By Homer Bigart)

IRONWOOD, MICH., January 10.—The north woods, plundered for its timber and facing depletion of its iron ore, is sinking into poverty.

This brawny, lusty empire of 1.5 million people, embracing 81,000 square miles of northern Minnesota, northern Wisconsin, and upper Michigan, is a problem area whose difficulties are exceeded only by those of Appalachia.

Its unemployment rate is twice the national average. In many counties, one of every four men lacks a job.

The land of Paul Bunyan has been slumping steadily in recent years. Out of its virgin forests came the lumber that built most of the houses of the Middle West. But the forests were ravaged by the lumber barons.

Out of its iron ranges came the high-grade ore that provided the sinews for the American industrial effort. But many mines are closed. Their tipples rise ghostly and silent over the desolate land.

President Kennedy visited the region last September and said:

"Year after year this area has had the short end of every economic indicator."

He called upon the leaders of the three States to come up with a regional program for economic development.

Shortly before he was assassinated, the President pledged Federal support for a coordinated attack on north woods poverty. He scheduled a meeting with the Governors and Senators of the three States, at which he planned to announce creation of a Northern Great Lakes Regional Commission.

This body, modeled after the President's Appalachian Regional Commission, would promote a joint effort between the State governments and Federal agencies to rebuild the north woods economy.

The White House meeting was to have been held just before Christmas. It was postponed indefinitely after the President was slain. Now the Governors and Senators are awaiting an indication of interest by President Johnson.

They confidently expect that President Johnson will summon them late this month to announce the regional commission.

The President is not apt to disregard the political overtones. Distress is deepening in the area. Moreover, the President has promised a crusade to eliminate poverty, and this

will be a major theme of his campaign for reelection. The 43 electoral votes cast by Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota could be crucial in 1964.

Like Appalachia, the north woods suffers from the fact that it is predominantly a one-industry area. For 70 years iron mining has dominated the economy of this region as extensively as coal dominated West Virginia and eastern Kentucky, two of the States in the Appalachia area.

HIGH-GRADE ORE DEPLETED

Now the high-grade ore is running out. The inferior ore must compete with richer ores being imported from Labrador and Venezuela, and West Africa.

The Gogebic Range of Michigan and Wisconsin had 12 mines working as late as 1958. They employed more than 4,500. Today only three mines, employing 650, are operating.

The great Mesabi Range of Minnesota, which once produced nearly half the iron ore in the United States, gave work to 9,700 miners in the Hibbing, Minn., area in 1954. Today there are jobs for only 4,700.

Hibbing was so rich in 1900 that a committee, seeking to give away a substantial sum raised for charity, could find only three or four widows penurious enough to qualify.

Today there is no dearth of candidates for relief. Three thousand unemployed have registered for work in the area, and 734 have been jobless so long they have exhausted their unemployment compensation and must subsist as welfare cases.

Yet there are cases of prosperity, even of boom. In the Mesabi Range area, new settlements have sprung up as a result of the discovery of a process for converting taconite rock, with its 20 to 30 percent of iron, into 65 percent iron-rich pellets.

The taconite mines and plants have stretched the life of the iron country. But taconite will never attain the ore production nor provide the employment the range knew in the peak years.

Community leaders hope to diversify the economy by luring factories into the area and promoting tourism. The rugged land, with its myriad lakes, has a special flavor that entrances visitors. Isolated on the north by the endless Canadian wilderness, northeast Minnesota remains a frontier.

THE STREAMS FLOW NORTH

Here, where the streams flow north to Hudson Bay, there are a few hundred timber wolves.

One morning last year, Mrs. John Nevin, wife of the assistant director of the Minnesota Area Development Administration, looked out of her cottage on Lake Vermillion and was startled by what appeared to be a small island forming near the far shore. Then she saw sudden movement. The "island" dissolved into a deer struggling in the water against encircling wolves.

No wolves frighten tourists in Wisconsin and Michigan, but the region does boast a snow belt with the heaviest snowfall in the Middle West.

Ski resorts, some aided by loans from the Area Redevelopment Administration, have sprung up around Ironwood and around Hurley, Wis.

Each winter weekend, thousands of skiers rescue the stricken economy of these communities by spending an average of \$22 a day each.

Nowhere in the north woods will visitors find the grinding poverty that assails parts of Appalachia. Only in the Chippewa Indian reservations is there a squalor comparable to the blighted villages tucked away in the folds of Kentucky's Cumberland Mountains.

Cushioned by unemployment compensation and the supplemental benefits they receive as members of the United Steelworkers of America, the miners and their families face no immediate threat of hunger. Their

houses are just beginning to look rundown and of needing paint.

But the future is no brighter than Appalachia's. The tourist industry is not growing fast enough to offset the loss of jobs and income caused by the decline of mining.

PAINFUL TASK FOR CITIES

Many communities, proud of their fine schools and lavish community services, face the painful task of drastic retrenchment. The city of Ironwood installed a reform administration headed by Roy Ahonen, the son of a Finnish immigrant and owner of a sawmill. In 3 years Mayor Ahonen eliminated 40 city jobs and persuaded city employees to accept a pay cut of 10 percent. When he retired last year, Ironwood still faced grave problems, but at least there was a plan for economic recovery.

"The city had been living high on the tax revenue from mining companies," Mr. Ahonen recalled. "In 1925, mining properties comprised two-thirds of the city's total assessed valuation, but by 1952 it had dropped to one-quarter and in 1963 it was only 0.81 percent of the total taxable base."

He said his hardest decision was to eliminate the town band. A trombonist himself, Mr. Ahonen silenced, in the interest of municipal economy, the Nation's oldest municipal band, a band that had once gone to New York City to appear on the Garry Moore show. Also eliminated was the office of Gogebic County dogcatcher, which had a budget of \$7,000.

Ironwood hopes to retrench further by abandoning several decaying mine settlements on the southern outskirts. These locations, dreary clusters of boarded-up stores and shabby dwellings, are separated from the main part of town by the caves, a depression formed by the collapse of underlying mine tunnels.

Several hundred families still live in Ironwood's locations—Jessleville, Newport, Aurora, and Pabst—and the city spends a large part of its budget maintaining streets and public utilities in these sparsely populated neighborhoods. Ironwood proposes to eliminate Jessleville (205 homes), Newport (96), and Aurora (144), and move the families to the central zone.

This would cost \$1 million. Ironwood hopes to do the job with the aid of a Federal urban renewal loan.

PENNSYLVANIA PRECEDENT

The Government does not usually approve loans for the abandonment of settlements. But Carbondale, Pa., received a loan when the coal-mining city pleaded that part of the town was sinking into the mines. Ironwood hopes to follow the Carbondale precedent, arguing that the streets of Newport are shifting and subsiding.

Ironwood's neighbor, Hurley, has a reputation for toughness. Edna Ferber used Hurley as the setting for her novel "Come and Get It." Today 50 percent of Hurley's work force is unemployed, and saloons and bawdy houses are shuttered, leaving only about 20 licensed taverns for a thirsty community of 2,500.

"We are embarrassed to explain why the relief load is so small," said Armand F. Cirilli, welfare director for Iron County, of which Hurley is the seat. "We have only 22 relief cases."

"The fact is that everyone is leaving the area. We have always exported young people. Now we are exporting the middle aged. The county population shrank from 10,000 in 1940 to 7,830 in 1960."

A few miles west of Hurley is Montreal, Wis., an unusually attractive mining town, with elm-shaded streets and white frame houses set in deep lawns landscaped with balsam and pine.

There has been no work in Montreal since August 10, 1962, when the Oglebay Norton Co. of Cleveland closed a mine that had run

for three-quarters of a century and was producing 1 million tons of ore a year.

"We are in a changeover from a mining town to a place for retirement and recreation," said Montreal's Mayor Donald E. Fritz. "The population is down from 2,000 to 1,200. People who own houses are still hanging on. 'You can live well here on a small income. Rents are cheap, \$25 a month for a house, and a family of four can get by on \$136 a month for rent, clothing, and food.'"

Mayor Fritz went on: "The children of unemployed miners seem cheerfully unaware of the fact that their parents aren't working."

"I've been concerned about these children, but they look the same as the rest. Local organizations sent Christmas cheer packages to a dozen families."

NO DIRE NEED

"Nobody is begging for food," said Louis Leoni, chairman of the Iron County Board of Supervisors.

Herbert Kinney, county agricultural agent, said the decline in population had hurt the farmers, who sold all their dairy products locally.

In Madison, Wis., Douglas G. Marshall, professor of rural sociology at the University of Wisconsin, predicted that the population of the northern counties would continue to decline but at a reduced rate. He said the small farmers of northern Wisconsin lived so close to poverty that the slightest recession would force them onto the relief rolls.

Throughout the north woods thousands of miners' families are nearing the end of their unemployment compensation. When these payments stop, they face the alternative of going on relief or drifting to the cities in search of work. But most of them own their homes, and the real estate market is so depressed they cannot sell except at a big loss.

"The only way to get rid of a house is to give it away," complained Wesley Shubert, of Two Harbors, Minn., who has not worked since last May.

Two Harbors, a city of 5,000 on the north shore of Lake Superior, was a major outlet for ore shipments until a year ago, when the Duluth, Missabe & Iron Range Railroad, a subsidiary of the United States Corp., shut down its ore docks.

The railroad was the major employer in Two Rivers, with 250 men in car shops where only a dozen jobs are available today.

PRETTY DISGUSTED

"People feel pretty disgusted, all these years on the railroad and all of a sudden—bingo, no more work," said Leonard Morset, 52 years old, who was laid off last May 1.

He had tried in vain to get a job at the new taconite plant at Silver Bay, Minn., but it was taking only young men.

In the Mesabi Range, idle miners hope they will find jobs in the big taconite plant United States Steel says it will build at Mountain Iron—if Minnesota passes controversial legislation ending what Big Steel calls "onerous iron ore taxation."

The battle over the proposed constitutional amendment has been raging for years. A leading opponent was Vladimir Shipka, director of the State area redevelopment administration program, who was defeated last year in seeking reelection as a State senator.

Mr. Shipka has a reputation in the iron country for stubborn honesty.

"I don't think the Minnesota constitution should be used to protect the economic interests of any corporation or individual," Mr. Shipka said. "I don't feel United States Steel should get a special concession. People resent a corporation saying: 'Vote our way and we will give you a job.'"

But the promise of jobs in this distressed region has been potent enough to swing even the steelworkers union over to the amendment.

"I tell you something—this taconite amendment, by God it's our last hope," said Russel Munson, union representative in Hibbing. "If people vote the amendment down, we are finished here."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REVISED COST ESTIMATE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF AN EXPLOSIVE SAFE ASSEMBLY FACILITY FOR UNMANNED SPACECRAFT AT THE ATLANTIC MISSILE RANGE

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the revised cost estimate relating to the construction of an explosive safe assembly facility for unmanned spacecraft at the Atlantic Missile Range; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROGRESS OF FLIGHT TRAINING PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the flight training program, for the period August 1, 1962, to November 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the period July–November 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NOMINATION FOR MEMBER OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the nomination of John S. Crocker for appointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXTENSION OF RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of advisory committees of that Department, for the calendar year 1963 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS ON DISPOSAL OF EXCESS PROPERTY IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on the disposal of excess property in foreign countries; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Assistant General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the disposition of foreign excess property, during fiscal year 1963; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON HELIUM PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the helium program, during the fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC LAWS 874 AND 815

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, for the fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF ARIZONA LEGISLATURE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

A joint resolution on the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States

Whereas, on the 22d day of November, in the year 1963, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States, was stricken down by an assassin's bullet; and

Whereas the 26th Legislature of the State of Arizona, now convened in its second regular session, desires to record for posterity by this resolution both respect and tribute to the memory of our departed President: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Arizona:

John Fitzgerald Kennedy typified the exemplary American by devotion to his country, by devotion to his family, by participation in the affairs of government, and by concern for the welfare of people both in America and throughout the world.

He gave much in the defense of his native land against the foul designs of the enemy, and he joined with his fellow Americans in preparing again for conflict if it came, but he also joined with his fellow Americans in seeking the peace so that men, women, and children, wherever their abode, could accomplish the fulfillment of their lives without want or fear.

Many have and will pay tribute to our fallen President for his devotion to the public welfare and many have and will pay tribute to his devotion to public service because he was not lacking in the sincerity of his resolutions and the courage of his efforts to secure their fulfillment.

His fellow Americans recall in retrospect his devotion to his lovely and accomplished wife who shared with him and with pride observed the honors which a grateful people conferred upon him, and they will recall how Caroline and John not only kindled the warmth of his fatherly love but they also recall the affection for them imprinted in the hearts of people everywhere.

But now, alas, the hopes, aspirations, and ambitions of a valiant President have been thwarted. Just a few weeks ago he commanded the respect and leadership of a free world, full of youth and promise. His was a role of action filled with conflict and anxiety. Never did people anywhere, free or slave, doubt his dedication to the dignity of man and the value of their freedom, and it was the nobility of this dedication that could

have inspired him to proclaim to the world upon his inauguration: "Let every nation know * * * that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and success of liberty."

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was dedicated to God, to his country, and to his fellow man. He fought valiantly in war and in peace to preserve that dedication. He accepted the truism that all men are created equal and fought until the end to convince people everywhere that discrimination between persons because of race or creed is violative of every historic document inscribed and proclaimed by the patriots who founded this Nation.

The Legislature of the State of Arizona, in further tribute to our fallen President, requests and directs the secretary of state of the State of Arizona to transmit copies of this resolution, under his hand and the great seal of the State of Arizona, to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, the widow of the late President.

Passed the house January 13, 1964, by the following vote: 79 ayes, 0 nays, 1 not voting.

Passed the senate January 14, 1964, by unanimous vote.

Approved by the Governor, January 15, 1964.

Filed in the office of the secretary of state, January 15, 1964.

FUNDS FOR STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO INTERAGENCY COORDINATION, ECONOMY, AND EFFICIENCY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 288) to provide funds for the study of matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1964, through January 31, 1965, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1965.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$135,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. ENGLE, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 2465. A bill to consent to the Interstate Compact defining the boundary between the States of Arizona and California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUE:

S. 2466. A bill to amend the act of April 22, 1954, in order to authorize the renewal or extension of any license granted under such act to the Leahi Hospital of Honolulu, Hawaii (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request):

S. 2467. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. SPARKMAN (by request):

S. 2468. A bill to help provide adequate dwelling accommodations for more families who have low or moderate incomes, who are elderly, or who are subjected to the special problems of displacement from their homes by Government action; to promote orderly community development and growth; and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities;

S. 2469. A bill to vest the Federal National Mortgage Association with fiduciary powers to facilitate the financing of its own and other mortgages, to provide for sales of and investments in beneficial interests or participation in such mortgages, and for other purposes; and

S. 2470. A bill to authorize the Veterans' Administration to extend aid on account of defects in properties purchased with financing assistance under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. CASE:

S. 2471. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine and render judgment upon the claim of Harold Braun, of Montclair, N.J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 2472. A bill to authorize certain improvements on Big Stone Lake-Whetstone River, Minn. and S. Dak., for flood control, wildlife conservation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTIONS

FUNDS FOR STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO INTERAGENCY COORDINATION, ECONOMY, AND EFFICIENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 288) to provide funds for the study of matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY: SELECTED PAPERS"

Mr. JACKSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 289); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations 2,000 additional copies of the committee print entitled "Administration of National Security: Selected Papers," issued by that committee during the 87th Congress, 2d session.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, by request, for myself and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, for fiscal year 1965.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter of transmittal requesting introduction of the legislation and explaining its purpose be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of the bill.

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

The bill (S. 2467) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The letter presented by Mr. RUSSELL is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., January 24, 1964.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1964, and the Bureau of the Budget advises that its enactment will be in accordance with the program of the President.

This legislation would authorize military construction urgently needed by the Department of Defense at this time, and would provide additional authority to cover deficiencies in essential prior construction authorizations. The appropriation of money required for military construction is provided for in the Budget of the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1965.

Titles I, II, and III of this legislation would authorize new construction for the Active Forces totaling \$1,032,901,000, of which \$383,663,000 is for the Department of the Army, \$273,456,000 for the Department of the Navy, and \$375,782,000 for the Department of the Air Force. Title IV would authorize new construction totaling \$30,957,000 for the Defense Agencies.

Title V would authorize construction of 12,500 new units of family housing at a cost of \$222,953,000. In addition, it contains other legislative recommendations considered necessary to implement the Department of Defense family housing program. Title VI contains general provisions which set forth authorizations and limitations generally applicable to all construction authorized by titles I through V. Section 602(5) provides a limitation of \$711 million for all costs of family housing for fiscal year 1965.

Title VII totaling \$34,450,000 would authorize construction for the Reserve components, of which \$5,450,000 is for the Army National Guard, \$5,100,000 for the Army Reserve, \$6,500,000 for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$12,800,000 for the Air National Guard, and \$4,600,000 for the Air Force Reserve. This authorization is in lump sum amounts in accordance with the amendments to chapter 133, title 10, United States Code, which were enacted in Public Law 87-554.

This proposed legislation also provides additional monetary authority for deficiencies totaling \$431,000 on projects authorized under previous laws. Of this amount, \$367,000 is for the Army, and \$64,000 for the Navy. In addition, all authorization for military construction contained in laws enacted prior to November 8, 1963 (with certain specified exceptions) would be repealed as of October 1, 1965 by this legislative proposal.

The total authorization requested in this legislative proposal for all of the agencies mentioned, including military family housing, is \$1,809,739,000.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. McNAMARA.

PROPOSED HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, today the President has sent to Congress his housing message, and four bills were sent with it. If I correctly understand the situation, three of these bills will be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee, and presumably they will be referred by it to its Housing Subcommittee, of which I am chairman. If the fourth bill follows the course which was followed in the last Congress, that bill will be referred to the Committee on Government Operations. So I shall not introduce that bill, but shall wait for a member of that committee to introduce it.

Mr. President, the President's program is a very large and a very ambitious one. I am sure it includes many good provisions. I know it will have the effect of extending and improving some of the programs Congress has previously passed. On the other hand, it includes some provisions of which I do not approve. Nevertheless, Mr. President, by request, I now introduce the omnibus housing bill, for reference to the Banking and Currency Committee.

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

The bill (S. 2468) to help provide adequate dwelling accommodations for more families who have low or moderate incomes, who are elderly, or who are subjected to the special problems of displacement from their homes by Government action; to promote orderly community development and growth; and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, by request, was received, read twice by its

title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as for the other two bills, one of them provides for joint participation or pooling of FNMA and VA mortgages. I believe that will be a good development and I am very glad to introduce this bill, for reference to the Banking and Currency Committee.

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

The bill (S. 2469) to vest the Federal National Mortgage Association with fiduciary powers to facilitate the financing of its own and other mortgages, to provide for sales of and investments in beneficial interests or participation in such mortgages, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the third bill authorizes the Veterans' Administration to extend aid on account of defects in properties purchased with financing assistance under chapter VII, title 38, United States Code. This is a subject in which our Housing Subcommittee has been very much interested. So I am glad to introduce this bill, and I request its reference to the Banking and Currency Committee.

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

The bill (S. 2470) to authorize the Veterans' Administration to extend aid on account of defects in properties purchased with financing assistance under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2396) to revive the office of General of the Armies of the United States and to authorize the President to appoint General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to such office, introduced by me on December 18, 1963, be permitted to lie on the desk until February 15, 1964, for additional cosponsors.

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

COMMISSION ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 16, 1964, the names of Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. NELSON, and Mrs. NEUBERGER were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2432) to provide for a comprehensive study and investigation of the adequacy of the present system of compulsory military training under the Universal Military Training and Service

Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and other Senators) on January 16, 1964.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS BY HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE OF BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE ON 1964 HOUSING ACT AND OTHER MEASURES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President I announce that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee will begin hearings on February 3, 1964, on the President's 1964 housing bill, and other measures pending before the subcommittee. The hearings will run from February 3 through February 7, and also on February 10 and 11. They will be held in Room 5302, New Senate Office Building, and will commence at 10 a.m. each day.

The following is a list of bills, in addition to the President's 1964 bill, which are presently pending before the subcommittee which will be included in the hearings: S. 7, S. 9, S. 981, S. 1170, S. 1200, S. 1440, S. 1947, S. 1948, S. 2031, S. 2045, S. 2086, S. 2226, S. 2232, S. 2253, and H.R. 5048. In addition, should other proposals be introduced prior to the time the hearings commence, they will also be considered.

Persons wishing to testify on these measures should contact Mr. Dudley L. O'Neal, Jr., chief counsel of the subcommittee, room 5228, New Senate Office Building.

ADJUSTMENT IN ANNUITIES UNDER FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 795, S. 745.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 745), to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments on page 3, line 10, after the word "State", to strike out "is authorized and directed to" and insert "may in his discretion"; on page 4, after line 22, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 9. No part of the moneys now or hereafter contained in the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund shall be applied toward the payment of any increase in annuity benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act, except those benefits provided by section 10, until and unless an appropriation is made to such fund in an amount which the Government actuary estimates to be necessary to prevent an immediate increase in the unfunded liability to said fund.

And, on page 5, after line 5, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 10. Title VIII of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding the following:

PART J—COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS OF ANNUITIES

SEC. 882. (a) On the basis of determination made by the Civil Service Commission pursuant to section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, pertaining to per centum change in the price index, the following adjustments shall be made:

(1) Effective April 1, 1964, if the change in the price index from 1962 to 1963 shall have equaled a rise of at least 3 per centum, each annuity payable from the fund which has a commencing date earlier than January 2, 1963, shall be increased by the per centum rise in the price index adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum.

(2) Effective April 1 of any year other than 1964 after the price index change shall have equaled a rise of at least 3 per centum, each annuity payable from the fund which has a commencing date earlier than January 2 of the preceding year shall be increased by the per centum rise in the price index adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum.

(b) Eligibility for an annuity increase under this section shall be governed by the commencing date of each annuity payable from the fund as of the effective date of an increase, except as follows:

(1) Effective from the date of the first increase under this section, an annuity payable from the fund to an annuitant's survivor (other than a child entitled under section 821(c)), which annuity commenced the day after the annuitant's death, shall be increased as provided in subsection (a)(1) or (a)(2) if the commencing date of annuity to the annuitant was earlier than January 2 of the year preceding the first increase.

(2) Effective from its commencing date, an annuity payable from the fund to an annuitant's survivor (other than a child entitled under section 821(c)), which annuity commences the day after the annuitant's death and after the effective date of the first increase under this section, shall be increased by the total per centum increase the annuitant was receiving under this section at death.

(3) For purposes of computing an annuity which commences after the effective date of the first increase under this section to a child under section 821(c), the items \$600, \$720, \$1,800 and \$2,160 appearing in section 821(c) shall be increased by the total per centum increase allowed and in force under this section and, in case of a deceased annuitant, the items 40 per centum and 50 per centum appearing in section 821(c) shall be increased by the total per centum increase allowed and in force under this section to the annuitant at death. Effective from the date of the first increase under this section, the provisions of this paragraph shall apply as if such first increase were in effect with respect to computation of a child's annuity under section 821(c) which commenced between January 2 of the year preceding the first increase and the effective date of the first increase.

(c) No increase in annuity provided by this section shall be computed on any additional annuity purchased at retirement by voluntary contributions.

(d) No increase in annuity provided by this section shall apply to amounts being paid under authority of section 5 of Public Law 84-503, as amended, or any other law authorizing annuity grants to widows.

(e) The monthly installment of annuity after adjustment under this section shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

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 annuities paid from the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund on the date of enactment of this Act, based on service performed by annuitants which terminated prior to October 16, 1960, shall be adjusted under the provisions of section 821(b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, relating to the formula for reduction in annuity to provide for a surviving widow, as though such provisions had been in effect on the date of the annuitant's separation from the Service, and in accordance with the following:

(a) An annuitant who at time of retirement was married to a wife who is still living, whether or not he so elected at time of retirement or subsequently, may within ninety days of enactment of this Act, elect to provide the maximum survivor annuity, and if the maximum be less than \$2,400 the annuitant may elect up to \$2,400;

(b) The annuitant's current full annuity, exclusive of annuity increases, shall be used as a base, and the amounts of annuity increases which have been granted, either at time of retirement or subsequent thereto, shall not be affected by such adjustments;

(c) If, during the ninety-day period following enactment of this Act an annuitant dies without having made a new election in accordance with the provisions of this Act, leaving a wife to whom he was married at time of retirement, benefits shall be payable to her as though the maximum benefit had been elected, except that such annuity shall not be less than \$2,400, unless the annuitant has certified in writing his intention of not making a new election under the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 2. If a former participant whose service was terminated prior to October 16, 1960, and who elected a deferred annuity, dies before becoming eligible to receive an annuity, the annuity of the surviving widow, if eligible under the terms of the law in effect upon his separation from the Service, shall be computed under the provisions of section 821(b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

SEC. 3. In any case where an annuitant who retired prior to October 16, 1960, dies prior to enactment of this Act, leaving a widow to whom he was married at time of retirement who is not entitled to receive an annuity under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, and who is not receiving benefits as a widow under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the Secretary of State may in his discretion grant such a widow an annuity of \$2,400 per annum; or in cases where such widows are receiving less than \$2,400, the annuity shall be increased to \$2,400.

SEC. 4. No annuity shall be payable from the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund to the widow of an annuitant whose services terminated prior to October 16, 1960, who did or did not provide for a widow survivor at time of retirement, or subsequently, and who elects not to avail himself of the provisions of this Act: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deny to a widow an annuity previously provided by her husband or granted otherwise by law.

SEC. 5. No annuity for a survivor shall be computed on any additional annuity purchased with voluntary contributions pursuant to the provisions of section 881 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

SEC. 6. The provisions of this Act shall not apply to annuitants recalled to duty under section 520 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, who are separated subsequent to October 16, 1960.

Sec. 7. The following provisions of law are hereby superseded, except in no event shall existing annuity increases provided therein be reduced by the enactment of this section:

(a) Section 2 of Public Law 82-348 (66 Stat. 81).

(b) Sections 4 and 5 of Public Law 84-503 as amended by section 2 of Public Law 86-612 (70 Stat. 125; 74 Stat. 371).

(c) Sections 1(a) and 1(b) of Public Law 85-882 (72 Stat. 1705).

Sec. 8. Any adjustment in annuity provided by this Act shall commence on the day of the month following the expiration of ninety days after enactment, and the monthly rate payable after such adjustment shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

Sec. 9. No part of the moneys now or hereafter contained in the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund shall be applied toward the payment of any increase in annuity benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act, except those benefits provided by section 10, until and unless an appropriation is made to such fund in an amount which the Government actuary estimates to be necessary to prevent an immediate increase in the unfunded liability to said fund.

Sec. 10. Title VIII of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding the following:

PART J—COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS OF ANNUITIES

Sec. 822. (a) On the basis of determination made by the Civil Service Commission pursuant to section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, pertaining to per centum change in the price index, the following adjustments shall be made:

(1) Effective April 1, 1964, if the change in the price index from 1962 to 1963 shall have equalled a rise of at least 3 per centum each annuity payable from the fund which has a commencing date earlier than January 2, 1963, shall be increased by the per centum rise in the price index adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum.

(2) Effective April 1 of any year other than 1964 after the price index change shall have equalled a rise of at least 3 per centum, each annuity payable from the fund which has a commencing date earlier than January 2 of the preceding year shall be increased by the per centum rise in the price index adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum.

(b) Eligibility for an annuity increase under this section shall be governed by the commencing date of each annuity payable from the fund as of the effective date of an increase, except as follows:

(1) Effective from the date of the first increase under this section, an annuity payable from the fund to an annuitant's survivor (other than a child entitled under section 821(c)), which annuity commenced the day after the annuitant's death, shall be increased as provided in subsection (a)(1) or (a)(2) if the commencing date of annuity to the annuitant was earlier than January 2 of the year preceding the first increase.

(2) Effective from its commencing date, an annuity payable from the fund to an annuitant's survivor (other than a child entitled under section 821(c)), which annuity commences the day after the annuitant's death and after the effective date of the first increase under this section, shall be increased by the total per centum increase the annuitant was receiving under this section at death.

(3) For purposes of computing an annuity which commences after the effective date of the first increase under this section to a child under section 821(c), the items \$600, \$720, \$1,800 and \$2,160 appearing in section 821(c) shall be increased by the

total per centum increase allowed and in force under this section and, in case of a deceased annuitant, the items 40 per centum and 50 per centum appearing in section 821(c) shall be increased by the total per centum increase allowed and in force under this section to the annuitant at death. Effective from the date of the first increase under this section, the provisions of this paragraph shall apply as if such first increase were in effect with respect to computation of a child's annuity under section 821(c) which commenced between January 2 of the year preceding the first increase and the effective date of the first increase.

(c) No increase in annuity provided by this section shall be computed on any additional annuity purchased at retirement by voluntary contributions.

(d) No increase in annuity provided by this section shall apply to amounts being paid under authority of section 5 of Public Law 84-503, as amended, or any other law authorizing annuity grants to widows.

(e) The monthly installment of annuity after adjustment under this section shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

GERMANENESS OF DEBATE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As Senators are aware, the adoption on Thursday last of the rule providing for germaneness of debate for a limited period during the daily sessions of the Senate makes an entirely new and radical change in its parliamentary procedure.

The Chair will take advantage of this occasion to express the hope that, during the time the Senate is operating under the rule, the cooperation of the Members may be given in an effort to bring about its proper observance.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Chair take it upon himself to determine in any case whether a Senator is speaking to the question before the Senate, and indicate to him that he is out of order, if he be out of order, or is the rule of germaneness a rule which can be enforced only when another Senator brings it to the attention of the Chair on a point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the Chair is of the opinion that the Chair would have the right, under rule XIX, to call any Member of the Senate to order, but it would be more appropriate for the point of order to be raised from the floor. The present occupant of the Chair would usually require that the point of order be made from the floor by a Member of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. To amplify the ruling of the Chair, this is not actually a self-enforcing rule, and will be enforced only if a Senator makes a point of order. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the same as any other situation that would arise under rule XIX, but it would be enforced, in accordance with the customary procedure, by reason of a point of order being raised from the floor. It is not self-enforcing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I gather, then, that it would be in order at any time, when a

Senator is not addressing himself germanely to the business at hand, to take him off his feet by a point of order made by any other Member of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He would have to yield for such a point of order. His consent is not required, and he would have to suspend until the point of order as to germaneness was ascertained.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then he can be taken off his feet by a point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under rule XIX, he can.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ADJUSTMENT IN ANNUITIES UNDER FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 745) to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is Senate bill 745.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the Senate now operating under the Pastore rule of germaneness?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; the Senate is operating under the Pastore germaneness rule, adopted on last Thursday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the length of time during which the rule will apply?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the language of the resolution, the duration of time is 3 hours, starting at 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of S. 745 is to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

This bill would authorize about 164 Foreign Service officers who retired prior to October 16, 1960, and who provided annuities for their widows, to provide the annuities at the same cost as officers who retired after that date. This means the annuities can be increased and the cost to the retired officers reduced.

The bill also authorizes another group of about 116 Foreign Service officers who retired before October 16, 1960, and who made no provision for their widows, to elect the maximum annuity for their surviving widows in accordance with present law.

In addition, S. 745 would authorize an annuity of \$2,400 for about 27 widows who now have no annuity whatsoever and any other widows who would have no annuity if, assuming S. 745 is

enacted, their husbands died before they could avail themselves of its provisions.

By way of background, prior to the enactment of Public Law 86-723, which became effective October 16, 1960, the Foreign Service retirement system provided that the annuity payable to a surviving widow could not exceed 25 percent of a retired Foreign Service officer's average basic salary for the 5 years next preceding his retirement. Moreover, the annuity which he received was reduced by 50 percent of the amount of the annuity which he elected to provide for his widow.

Since enactment of Public Law 86-723, however, an annuity payable to a surviving widow can be as much as 50 percent of the amount which the retired Foreign Service officer receives as an annuity. In addition, the annuity of the retired Foreign Service officer who elects to provide an annuity for a widow survivor is reduced by 2½ percent of any amount up to \$2,400, plus 10 percent of any amount over \$2,400, which he specifies as the base for the survivor benefit.

Obviously, Mr. President, this discrepancy in the cost of survivorship annuities is so great that it constitutes an injustice to those who retired prior to October 16, 1960. For this reason, the Committee on Foreign Relations felt justified in reporting S. 745 favorably to the Senate, and it is my hope that it will be approved without delay.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that S. 745 provides that no increase in annuity benefits resulting from the enactment of this bill shall be paid until and unless an appropriation is made for that purpose. This provision would put the benefits of this bill on a pay-as-you-go basis, thus preventing further increases in the unfunded liability which has accrued to the Foreign Service retirement fund.

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

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is our understanding that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] have comments they wish to make in reference to certain sections of the Foreign Service retirement bill. Possibly they will be able to draft an amendment that would be helpful in the consideration of the bill.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who handled the bill for the committee, is necessarily detained on official business at the White House and therefore cannot be present. Therefore, I shall ask Senators to proceed with a discussion of their attitude on the bill and a little later, when the Senator from Alabama returns, I am sure we will be able to proceed to some conclusion on the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have no objection to proceeding, but we have the situation in the Senate that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and I, who are in agreement on the amendment, are the only ones who will listen to our arguments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall listen very attentively.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota will be persuaded very quickly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may be a little more difficult than that, but I shall be cooperative with the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am willing to proceed, but I wonder if it would not be well to declare a recess.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator proceed. We shall be in touch with the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in respect to the bill—S. 745—the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and I filed dissenting views. The bill contemplates amending the Foreign Service retirement law as it now appears on the statute books.

The Foreign Service Retirement Act was passed in 1924. At that time it was established on an actuarially sound basis. The Government contributed to the retirement fund a percentage of the employees' pay. The employees contributed an equal amount. Thus, when the law was enacted, the Government and the employees felt that the program was established on a statistical basis and would continue to remain actuarially sound, and that in the end it would provide a reasonable annual annuity for retired employees.

That was the situation which prevailed in 1924. But those who drafted the law were not at all conscious of the prospect that, as time went on, demands would be made for the liberalization of the provisions in the law. Thus, since the law was adopted, as the record will show, there have been 11 instances in which liberalized conditions and payments were made. The liberalization began in 1939 and continued through 1960.

Today the Senate is to act on a bill further to liberalize the law. My own belief is that if the people of the country actually knew what has happened with this fund, they would rise in vigorous protest against the present status of it. They will not learn of it because the newspapers will not carry the news that to maintain the fund in a sound condition today requires a contribution of 29.7 percent of the payroll—29.7 percent of the payroll will have to be paid into the fund if it is to be actuarially sound.

When the law was enacted, the amount paid in by the Government was 5 percent, and 5 percent was paid into the fund by the employees. I ask Senators to ponder that fact for a moment. On the basis of senatorial pay, if our retirement fund were to remain actuarially sound and Senators had to pay in approximately 30 percent of their pay, 30 percent of \$22,500 would have to be paid

into the fund. I have not computed the amount, but pretty close to \$7,000 would have to be paid into the fund in order to maintain its actuarial soundness.

That cannot be done. Neither the Government nor individuals are in a position to contribute that much money to the fund.

I have heard it is contemplated having the Government pay 23.2 percent of the aggregate payroll of the Foreign Service employees, while the employees would pay 6½ percent. That is shocking, and the taxpayers cannot endure it.

I notice that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RUBINOFF] have just entered the Chamber. I wish to state for their benefit that the retirement fund, if it is to be maintained actuarially sound under present liberalized conditions and payments, requires contributions of 29.7 percent of the payroll.

These are not my words. They are a quotation from a letter I received from those in charge of the fund.

If the Government pays into the fund 23.2 percent and the employee pays into the fund 6.5 percent, I submit that a very inequitable situation is allowed to exist.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What the Senator has just pointed out with reference to the foreign service retirement fund applies equally to the entire civil service retirement fund, which affects all Government employees—those on the payroll and all those who have been on the payroll.

As the Senator has pointed out, it would require an annual contribution on the part of the Government today of about 21 percent of the payroll to make the fund solvent. A contribution of 21 percent by the Federal Government means, even without a further liberalization, will cost the taxpayers of the Nation \$2¼ billion annually to keep the fund solvent. This is without any further liberalization.

In my opinion this retirement system should be kept on an equal matching basis. To do otherwise would only invite unwarranted increases with no regard as to cost.

When this system was started several years ago the civil service retirement fund was solvent. Today it is not solvent, except as it is anchored to the Federal Treasury and except as the taxpayers will underwrite the cost.

The pending bill endorses a new principle which, if enacted, would cost this year about \$1,300,000. This is just a beginning. In reality, if the principle were extended across the whole civil service retirement fund, it would cost several hundred million dollars. If Congress is to provide these benefits for 116 employees in one group, 164 in another, and 27 in another—and those are the figures we have—there could be no valid argument against extending to the 2.5 million Federal employees the same benefits.

It would then cost an additional \$400 or \$500 million to extend the new formula to the whole retirement system.

This is just the opening wedge. If Congress approves this formula today there will be no sound argument against the extension of it. We shall have provided an opening wedge for a program that will cost \$400 or \$500 million a year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur fully in what the Senator from Delaware has said. The principle that is sought to be established would inevitably have to be applied to the regular civil service employees retirement fund. If there were applied to the entire civil service retirement fund the principle which the bill contemplates applying to the Foreign Service retirement fund, how much did the Senator from Delaware say the cost would be?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was advised it would cost between \$400 and \$500 million a year. Under existing law with respect to both the regular civil service retirement and the Foreign Service retirement, when a man retires and designates his wife to be a beneficiary he takes a reduction in retirement benefits which is actuarially enough to offset the additional cost.

Under the present bill 116 employees retired and did not think enough of their wives to declare them beneficiaries if they became widows, but instead they asked for the full retirement benefits themselves. Notwithstanding their neglect, however, this bill will extend full retirement benefits to their widows. Yet the husbands had not declared them to be beneficiaries.

If that is to be our policy how could it be argued that employees in the postal service or other Federal agencies could not likewise elect to take higher retirement benefits during their lifetime and then, when they died, have Congress come along and say, "We will take care of the widows just as though you had declared them beneficiaries."

It would cost \$400 or \$500 million a year to provide such benefits for widows. Let me refer to page 1 of the committee report.

In addition, S. 745 would authorize an annuity of \$2,400 for about 27 widows who now have no annuity whatsoever and any other widows who would have no annuity if, assuming S. 745 is enacted, their husbands died before they could avail themselves of its provisions.

Why cannot these husbands take care of their wives now? In the first place, why do we refer to them as "widows" before their husbands have died? I have always thought that a wife is not a widow until the husband has died. The husbands have the responsibility of designating their wives as annuitants. I have no objection to applying this principle retroactively, to permit husbands who have retired to make the election, provided they take a reduction. We can amend the bill to provide that a man may make an election retroactively to cover his wife provided that the husbands will pay back into the Federal retirement fund the excess annuity which they have already collected as the result of not

having made such election in the beginning. If they have drawn the additional money over the years they should pay it back. They should only get what they would have obtained had they made the election originally.

I am willing to give them the right to make this election retroactively. However, I do not believe they should be paid for not having protected their wives in the first place.

If that is done, we shall open up the whole civil service retirement fund to a new abuse. Why do it for one class, and not for the other?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Delaware. I am now directing my attention to the second paragraph of the report under the heading "purpose of the bill";

The bill also authorizes another group of about 116 Foreign Service officers who retired before October 16, 1960, and who made no provision for their widows, to let the maximum annuity for their surviving widows in accordance with present law.

The Senator from Delaware referred to this item.

The bill contemplates allowing retired officers of the Foreign Service who did not designate their wives as beneficiaries in the event the retiree died before the wife, and thus received increased annuities, to make such a designation now.

There may be persons who have retired from a State service, who probably were asked, "Do you want to make your wife a beneficiary in the event you die before she dies? If you do, you will receive less money as your annuity; but if you do not, you will receive more money."

That is the identical situation which prevails in the Federal Government. It is a matter of not designating their wives and receiving a greater annuity, or designating their wives and receiving a lower annuity.

One hundred and sixteen of them have said, "I want the larger annuity, and I will not designate my wife as a beneficiary."

The bill as it is written gives them the right now to designate the wife as a beneficiary; yet it makes no provision requiring retirees to pay back the increased annuity which they have received.

One hundred and sixteen of them, who did not designate their spouses to be the recipients of annuities in the event the retiree died first, have received \$1,300 million by way of increased pay. That would be \$9,000 apiece. The bill contemplates allowing them to retain that excess pay and now to designate the wives as beneficiaries.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to finish this point first. Then I shall be glad to yield.

I am a lawyer, and I sat on the bench for 10 years. If this is the concept of justice in Congress, the body which creates law, God help the administration of law and justice in the United States.

THE GERMANENESS RULE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, with the understanding that what I am about to say will follow his speech? I should like to make

an insertion in the RECORD and speak for not more than 30 seconds.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will not challenge the Senator's right to do that. However, is the rule of germaneness in effect?

Mr. MORSE. I forgot all about the rule of germaneness.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will not object.
Mr. MORSE. Although I was against it, I will respect it. I shall come back later, and, instead of speaking for 30 seconds, I will speak for 30 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If no objection is made, when an irrelevant matter is sought to be introduced, is it automatically barred under the rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule is not self-enforcing. In other words, the Chair will not take the initiative.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If objection is not raised, the matter may be presented. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I raise no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I must raise objection, much as I regret to do so, because I wish to see the rule applied in its pristine purity for at least a few days.

Mr. MORSE. I cannot agree more with the Senator. I will make it 3 hours.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If we are to allow the designation of a surviving spouse as a beneficiary, it would seem, in fairness to the taxpayer, and with due recognition of the meaning of justice, that those who have received \$1,300,000 in excess of what they were entitled to receive should be required to pay that money back into the Treasury.

I suppose that constitutionally we have the right to do what is proposed in the bill. Apart from the Constitution, it is pertinent to ask: What right have we as Senators to give taxpayers' money away under the circumstances which prevail in the situation before us?

The Senator from Delaware has stated that if this situation is allowed to prevail with respect to the Foreign Service fund, retirees covered by the civil service retirement fund will justifiably ask for identical treatment. I do not know how many retirees are under the civil service retirement fund. I am quite certain that among them are persons who have not designated their spouses as surviving beneficiaries.

Suppose all of them were to say, "We want a law passed, similar to the one passed for the benefit of Foreign Service employees, to allow us now to keep all the excess payments which we received, but permitting us now to designate our spouses as beneficiaries." May I ask the Senator from Delaware if it is this category to which he had reference when he said that the cost would be \$415 million?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, only partly so. The point is, as the Senator from Ohio has said, that if we pass the bill and allow those in the Foreign Service who failed to designate spouses as beneficiaries to receive these benefits retroactively we should do so for all civil service employees who are in similar position.

Then there is another category; namely, the overwhelming number of

employees who did designate their spouses as beneficiaries. It is not fair to the 90 percent who did designate their spouses as surviving beneficiaries, with a reduction of 20 or 25 percent in their retirement check.

We cannot say that the employee who designated his spouse as the beneficiary is to get 25 percent less retirement benefits than the man who ignores his responsibility to protect his wife.

Ultimately we shall have to provide such benefits to all the 2,500,000 employees on the rolls today, plus those who have already retired. It would cost around \$400 or \$500 million a year to provide this additional benefit to all Government workers.

If it is proposed to give a special \$9,000 bonus, as the Senator has pointed out—and that is what it boils down to—for these 116 employees, why not provide it for all 2,500,000 employees? If that were to be done, a huge sum of money would have to be spent.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a question on the bill?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have been scanning the bill. In the opinion of the Senator from Ohio, does the bill put the Foreign Service annuitants in a preferred position over many other classes of Federal employees?

Mr. LAUSCHE. In one respect, as now contemplated, allowing at this time a retiree to designate his wife as a beneficiary, even though he failed to do so when he retired, and therefore received increased pay, it would put him in a preferential position.

But more than that, as to those who did designate their wives, and thus received a smaller annuity, should they not have the right to say, "Treat us in the same manner as you are treating the 116 who did not designate their wives"?

When the bill came before the committee for hearings, it was rather cursorily sent through the committee. Ample hearings to obtain information were not held. I am now giving the results of 2 months of labor on my part—the writing of letters and the making of calls to the Department of Labor.

In addition, as stated in the report on page 1, the bill—S. 745—would authorize an annuity of \$2,400 for about 27 widows who now have no annuity whatsoever. In that category, the retiree never designated his wife as the beneficiary. He elected to take larger payments. Now it is proposed to make those widows the beneficiaries of payments of \$2,400 a year. I should like to see that done; but why should these 27 be selected when probably 5 million widows throughout the country similarly need direct relief or help? That is another situation.

So far as concerns paragraph 1 of the "Purpose of the Bill," I think that provision is sound. Paragraph 1 reads:

S. 745 would authorize about 164 Foreign Service officers who retired prior to October 16, 1960, and who provided annuities for their widows, to provide the annuities at the same cost as officers who retired after that date.

That phase is equitable. If the officer retired before 1960, why should his benefits be less than those of a person who retired after 1960?

Mr. MORSE. In the opinion of the Senator from Ohio, does not legislation on this subject also raise for appropriate consideration the policies that are being followed in connection with the whole social security program? In the whole social security program, as the Senator has pointed out, literally millions of people, including widows, do not receive anywhere near the benefits which the bill seeks to provide. Is that not true?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is positively true. The principle would become applicable to every retirement fund operated by the Government. If we liberalize in this instance, and even liberalize beyond the extent of fiscal ability to carry the program into effect, we likewise must do so with respect to the social security and civil service retirement funds.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I said a while ago that when this fund was established, the structure was of such a nature as to insure its financial stability. The amounts paid in by the Foreign Service employee together with the amounts paid in by the Government were adequate to support the fund. It might therefore be asked, Why is the fund now inadequate? It is with reference to the answer to that question that I now wish to direct my attention. The first liberalization of the fund was introduced in 1939. That liberalization provided that officers who had served 30 years could retire at age 60 on a reduced annuity. The retirement age was reduced. When the retirement age was reduced, the burden on the fund was increased. Thus, the first assault on the stability of the fund took place in 1939. Also in 1939, survivor annuities for wives were first provided. I agree with what was done. I agree that a retiree ought to make provision for his spouse. In the original bill, an employee in the Foreign Service could not designate his spouse as a surviving beneficiary. But when the change was made, no thought was given to increasing the amount of contribution to the fund. The conditions were liberalized, but the contributions remained unchanged. So twice in 1 year a successful assault was made upon the integrity of the fund.

Then, in 1941, the act was changed, so as to permit retirement at age 50, with 30 years of service. That was one of the real attacks on the fund; retirement under those circumstances was permitted, even though the individual was capable of taking another job the day after he resigned. That happened time and again.

When that liberalization was made, no requirement to increase the contributions was imposed upon either the Government or the employees.

But in 1946, voluntary retirement was permitted at age 50, with 20 years of service. The taxpayers had to carry the load of that liberalization; no amendment to require increased contributions

by the Government and the employees was adopted.

If such had been proposed, the measure probably would not have been passed in 1946. What a liberal arrangement: the right to retire with substantial retirement pay at age 50, after 20 years of service.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What was the rate of retirement pay?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It was reduced, but it was still substantial.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But if the Senator from Minnesota contends that what was done was sound, I ask why the fund is insolvent now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The difficulty is that most of the funds are without adequate capital, because the Government does not keep up its prescribed payments. That is the regrettable fact.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is not a fact; the Senator is not conversant with the situation. Even if the Government paid the \$284 million which it owes, the Government's contribution and the employees' contributions would have to be increased to 29.7 percent of their salaries; and I say that is improvident and impossible of achievement, and the mere suggestion is an offense to one's intelligence. I have previously heard the argument that the Government has not paid its share.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And, of course, that is true.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is true; but the letter I have received shows that even though the Government pays \$284 million to keep the fund solvent, the employees and the Government must pay into the fund 29 percent of the salary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But that is for the long-range program of the annuity system or of the pension system. I think there is no doubt that increased payments will have to be made into the fund if there are to be increased benefits. The bill does provide, as the Senator properly points out, some increased benefits. I think a case can be made for the Senator's amendment which relates to certain elections to be made—at the time of retirement—as to the benefits to be provided; and the Senator from Ohio has already made that point.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The point I am trying to make is that in the course of 24 years, 11 liberalizations were made, without any requirement that the contributions be increased so as to maintain the fiscal stability of the fund.

I have already mentioned the one made in 1946: voluntary retirement at age 50, with 20 years of service.

In 1946 came the fifth liberalization: disability retirement was liberalized, so that when a participant in the system became disabled, if he had at least 5 years of service, his annuity would be

calculated on the basis of a minimum of 20 years of service.

I point out to the Senator from Delaware that, with respect to that liberalization, regardless of where the disability occurred—whether at work in the Foreign Service, or on a highway, or anywhere else, the Foreign Service employee thus became entitled to the benefits of this provision.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This represents an increase of approximately 400 percent in the benefits without any corresponding increase in the contributions by either the employees or the Government. As the Senator from Ohio has pointed out, that is one of the reasons why the fund is insolvent today and why it will be bankrupt—down to zero—by 1977, unless Congress takes action. Without any liberalization, by 1977 the fund will be completely bankrupt, under existing law.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The statement made by the Senator from Delaware is absolutely correct. I assume that his statement that the liberalization was in the area of 400 percent is correct, because when the law was enacted, it required contributions of 5 percent, whereas it now requires contributions of 30 percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was speaking of item 5. Under the law prior to 1946 if a man with 5 years of experience became disabled his annuity was computed on the basis of his pay during those 5 years.

In 1946 the law was again amended providing that upon disability a man with 5 years of service would get credit for a full 20-year period. This represents a 400-percent increase.

All of these increases have been piled up, one on top of the other. As to each one, it was said at the time of its enactment, "This is only a small cost, and we shall deal with the whole later on in the years to come."

These successive increases add up to a bankrupt retirement fund; yet instead of facing this situation the committee just reports out more bills, each time further liberalizing the benefits.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the sixth liberalization also occurred in 1946; at that time the law was amended so as to provide that the annuity would be based on the officer's 5-year average salary next preceding retirement, rather than on his salary for the 10 years next preceding retirement. So if the salaries of Senators are increased to \$37,000 a year, as has been proposed, and if the salaries of judges of the Supreme Court are increased to \$60,000, and if the salaries of Cabinet members are increased to \$35,000, this provision would have applicability in principle.

In 1946 the law required that the annuity be calculated on the basis of the average salary during the 10 years immediately preceding retirement.

It was changed to provide that the annuity shall be calculated on the basis of a 5-year average salary. Thus, instead

of being required to work 10 years to have an annuity as a Senator calculated on the basis of a contemplated increase to \$35,000, I would be required to work only 5 years on that item.

Liberalization No. 7. In 1955, it was changed by way of liberalization to the best 5-year average next preceding retirement. If we should fall into a period of economic depression and it became necessary to reduce salaries under the amendment made in 1955, the employee would be entitled to have the average of his 5 highest salary years used as the premise for figuring his retirement annuity.

Liberalization No. 8. In 1956, the limitation on years of service on which an annuity could be based was raised from 30 to 35 years, thus allowing 70 percent of the highest 5-year average salary as an annuity. Under the law, an employee of the Foreign Service can draw 70 percent of his highest 5 years of salary, provided he has worked 35 years.

Mr. President (Mr. NELSON in the chair), I do not know what their average salaries are, but under the law they are entitled to draw 70 percent of the highest 5-year average salary as an annuity.

In the discussions which have been held on the floor of the Senate dealing with the cost to the Government of hiring new employees, I have used the measurement that \$6,000 is about the average salary. I know that the Foreign Service is much higher than the \$6,000 average.

Liberalization No. 9. In 1960, the retirement system was changed to provide that Foreign Service staff personnel, after they have served 10 years in the Foreign Service, would become participants in the Foreign Service retirement system. This liberalization meant that a new category was allowed to come within the provisions of the law. They were not originally directly connected with the Foreign Service, and therefore were not covered. But in 1960, it was declared that staff personnel, after they served 10 years in the Foreign Service, were permitted to become participants. Prior to that time, they were covered by the civil service retirement provisions. But that payment is less than that of the Foreign Service, so they worked themselves into the Foreign Service coverage.

Liberalization No. 10. In 1960, survivor annuities were provided for children. When the bill was initially passed, it covered only the worker. Subsequently, it was liberalized to cover the wives and husbands of workers. In 1960, it was liberalized, as I have indicated, to also make provision for children.

This is laudable. It is consonant with the highest concepts of charity and service to a family. But, looking at it realistically, it is thoroughly apparent that when these liberalizations were made, unless additional contributions were made to the fund, the fund could not survive, but would eventually become bankrupt.

Liberalization No. 11. Also in 1960, the act was amended to provide for recomputation of annuities of those who

applied prior to 1956, to allow those with more than 30 years to be given added credit for the difference up to 35 years.

That is the end of the series of assaults that were made upon the financial integrity of this fund, except for the bill now pending before the Senate, which will be the 12th liberalization without any increased contributions in the fund, rendering it more unsettled and unstable than ever.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has pointed out that if the bill is passed, its provisions will become the precedent for arguments to be made advancing the application of similar concessions, definitely with respect to the civil service retirement fund. With respect to the social security fund, it is a delight to know that one can draw retirement pay having some semblance in amount to the needs of the recipient.

Although we rejoice, we should also recognize that unless the funds are kept actuarially sound, they will eventually become insolvent. Those who receive their benefits will get out more than they have paid in. Those who come along in the future will be likely to find that the basket is empty.

If and when that occurs—and it will occur with reference to the Foreign Service retirement fund—the proposal will be made to the taxpayers of the United States that the fund needs for its sustenance 29.7 percent of the Foreign Service payroll. If we, the workers, are to pay in 50 percent of the 29.7 percent, it will cost 14.85 percent of our payroll. I, as a worker, cannot afford that, and I would ask to be spared the responsibility of paying in that much money. But I would ask the taxpayers to allow me to pay in 6½ percent while they pay in 23.2 percent. We may be able to establish that principle in Congress. We would not put it over if the question had to be debated in every forum in the country.

If the subject were discussed in the squares of the various municipalities and in service clubs, the Senate would never pass a bill which would require the Government to pay into the fund 23½ percent while the workers pay 6.2 percent.

If we pass the bill, what would we do with regard to social security? What would we do with relation to the civil service employees' retirement program? If we should allow such conduct to continue, what would happen to a medicare program if and when a medicare bill should be passed? Supposedly it would begin on an actuarially sound basis. Perhaps every 2 or 3 years liberalizations would be made. Into what proportions would the burden of the Government grow?

It will be argued by the proponents of the bill that it would involve a very small sum of money. That is a fact. Not much is involved by way of payments. But the principle involved is a serious one.

In conclusion, I point out that the limitation of 5 percent of salary up to \$9,000 provided by the 1924 act was changed to \$10,000 on February 23, 1931; it was changed to \$13,500 on August 13,

1946; and removed altogether on August 5, 1955.

When the law was adopted in 1924, it required contributions of 5 percent of the salary.

As I said a moment ago, to keep the fund sound would now require a contribution of 29.7 percent. At the present time employees are paying 6½ percent a year and the Federal Government is paying 6½ percent of the aggregate salary. But those contributions will not do, because the fund cannot be sustained in that way.

On that basis I urge that the bill be rejected. It ought not to pass. It is not just; it is not fair; it can only contribute to the fiscal disability under which the Government is already suffering.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be suspended.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has appointed Mr. GARMATZ, of Maryland, Mr. LENNON, of North Carolina, and Mr. GLENN, of New Jersey, members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

The message announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 298) to amend the Small Business Act of 1958, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PATMAN, Mr. RAINS, Mr. MULTER, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. KILBURN, Mr. WIDNALL, and Mr. HARVEY of Michigan were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the

following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 1959. An act to authorize the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of Government employees assigned to duty in Alaska, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3368. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey by quitclaim deed a parcel of land to the Lexington Park Volunteer Fire Department, Inc.; and

H.R. 4801. An act to amend subsection 506 (d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding certification of facts based upon transferred records.

ADJUSTMENT IN ANNUITIES UNDER FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 745) to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. GORE addressed the Chair.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, does the Senator wish to speak on this particular bill?

Mr. GORE. No.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I must regretfully state that the new rule of germaneness will be in effect until a later hour. Will the Chair state the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Until 3:46.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And since this rule is in its early days of application, as I said a few moments earlier, I think we should retain it in its pristine purity until it is later adulterated by Senate practice.

I am sure the Senator is about to come forth with an amendment.

Mr. GORE. I certainly am.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thought that was the case, but I shall not yield for that purpose right now.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, is the senior Senator from Tennessee or the senior Senator from Minnesota recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota had the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I shall be more than happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee in a moment for the purpose of his offering a non-germane amendment to test the rule of germaneness.

The arguments made against this particular bill relate, of course, to its more generous provisions concerning one group of Foreign Service officers in the number of 116 who retired before October 1960.

At that time the retirement benefits were not as generous as they are now, and the payments into the retirement fund in relation to these benefits were considerably higher.

Also, this group of 116, to which the provisions of the bill refer, made no provision for their widows. In other words, because of the cost of the retirement benefits for the individual Foreign Service officer, the process of election of beneficiary, or of those who were to be

the recipients of an annuity, was limited to the actual Foreign Service officer rather than the officer and his surviving widow.

As the report on the bill (S. 745) indicates, the bill would authorize an annuity of \$2,400 to about 27 widows who now have no annuity whatsoever. It would also apply to any other widows who would have no annuity. If S. 745 were enacted they could avail themselves of its provisions.

The latter is a sort of saving clause, since it is possible that if the bill were made public law, some officers would not have time to make the election or selection provided for in the proposed legislation.

I have discussed the bill with members of the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee who have been closely associated with the development of the legislation. I can well understand the concern of the Senator from Ohio and of the Senator from Delaware. There is much merit in the argument that has been made.

However, the bill has been before the Foreign Relations Committee, not once, but several times. As I recall—and I stand corrected if I am in error—hearings were held on the bill before the Foreign Relations Committee in previous Congresses. After a number of hearings during the 88th Congress, the Foreign Relations Committee reported the bill to the Senate, with minority views. Three of our colleagues in the Senate have expressed dissent or opposition to the bill in minority views.

The bill has the approval of the Department of State and of the Bureau of the Budget. That means, of course, that it represents the views of the administration. I believe it would be fair to say that, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, the cost items have been carefully evaluated; and that with the State Department approval the equities involved and the sense of justice involved have been given careful consideration.

The report is very explicit with reference to the various sections of the bill. There is included in the report a section-by-section analysis. Also, some examples are given in the report, which I believe are rather helpful in understanding this complicated piece of proposed legislation. For example, the report points out that prior to the enactment of Public Law 86-723, the most recent revision of the Foreign Service Retirement Act, the Foreign Service retirement system provided that the annuity payable to a surviving widow could not exceed 25 percent of a retired Foreign Service officer's average basic salary for the 5 years next preceding his retirement.

In other words, if a Foreign Service officer received \$12,000 a year, the most the widow could receive would be \$3,000. This presumes that there would be a 5-year period immediately prior to the retirement in which the Foreign Service officer's salary would not have been less than \$12,000 a year.

If he had elected, under the retirement system, to have his wife included in the

annuity, the widow would be entitled to \$3,000.

The same revision in the law, known as Public Law 86-723, provided that an annuity payable to a surviving widow could be as much as 50 percent of the amount which the retired Foreign Service officer received as an annuity.

In addition, the annuity of the retired Foreign Service officer who elects to provide an annuity for a widow survivor is reduced by 2½ percent of any amount up to \$2,400, plus 10 percent of any amount over \$2,400, which he specifies as the base for the survivor benefit.

The committee report gives an example of this situation, which I believe will help clarify it. It indicates why there was a need for the provision contained in the pending bill.

To illustrate, according to the formula in effect for those who retired prior to October 16, 1960, a Foreign Service officer whose so-called high-five average salary was \$12,000 a year would, on the basis of 30 years' service, receive an annuity of \$7,200. This is calculated on the basis of 2 percent times 30 times \$12,000. That amounts to \$7,200. That is the formula. The maximum annuity he could provide for his surviving widow was 25 percent of \$12,000, or \$3,000. The cost to him for such a widow survivor annuity was \$1,500, or one-half of the annuity provided for her. Therefore, his reduced annuity would then be only \$5,700. That is for his widow and for himself.

Further, on the basis of the same figures set forth in the report, under the new formula in effect since October 16, 1960, the maximum annuity a Foreign Service officer may elect to provide for his surviving widow is \$3,600, or one-half of his annuity of \$7,200. It was \$3,000 prior to 1960. After 1960, the cost to the Foreign Service officer who elected to provide for his surviving widow would be about \$540. Thus, a Foreign Service officer who retired under the present law would be entitled to receive an annuity of \$6,660. In other words, it is \$7,200, less \$540, the cost of the annuity for his surviving widow; whereas the Foreign Service officer who retired under the old law could receive an annuity of \$5,700.

It is quite obvious on its face that there is a discrepancy. A Foreign Service officer who retired on October 15, 1960, would receive \$5,700. The officer who retired on October 17, the day after the law went into effect, would receive \$6,660. There is an obvious discrepancy in the case of the survivorship annuities. It is the committee's feeling that this constitutes an injustice to those who retired prior to October 16, 1960. For that reason the Committee on Foreign Relations felt justified in approving the pending bill.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur fully with the argument thus far made about the purpose of equalizing the rates between those who retire after 1960 and those who retired before 1960. My complaint is not with respect to equalization, but with respect to the preferential treatment

which, on the basis of increased annuities, they have received because they did not designate their wives.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand the Senator's position. He is more concerned about the provisions in the bill that follow.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is my understanding that that is the view of the Senator from Delaware also.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So far as adjusting the discrepancy I have described is concerned, that is concurrence on the part of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is concurrence on the part of the Senators I have mentioned.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; we concur.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The section of the bill that has caused the greatest concern relates to 27 widows of Foreign Service officers, widows who would be authorized to receive an annuity of \$2,400, who have had no annuity whatsoever, and as to whom no payment has been made into the fund to provide for them. The committee report describes this particular feature in rather concise and persuasive language. Section 3 of the bill provides:

Sec. 3. In any case where an annuitant who retired prior to October 16, 1960, dies prior to enactment of this Act, leaving a widow to whom he was married at time of retirement who is not entitled to receive an annuity under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, and who is not receiving benefits as a widow under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the Secretary of State may in his discretion grant such a widow an annuity of \$2,400 per annum; or in cases where such widows are receiving less than \$2,400, the annuity shall be increased to \$2,400.

This provision was designed to give what might be called social-justice or humanitarian consideration to the wives of Foreign Service officers, wives who were not provided for under the retirement system. I believe there is much justification for this provision. I have often said, and should like to repeat now, that when the Government employs a Foreign Service officer, it generally gets two such officers for the price of one. In the vast majority of cases, a Foreign Service officer, particularly one who serves overseas, has an effective assistant or associate or helpmate in the person of his wife. The Government does not compensate that woman, even though she may be doing as much good for our country in the role of wife of the Foreign Service officer as the Foreign Service officer himself.

One of the truly inspiring and exciting stories of our Foreign Service is the outstanding work that is being carried on year after year in country after country by the wives of U.S. Foreign Service officers. I believe it would make some of the best and most informative reading if more articles were written about the work being accomplished and undertaken by the wives of Foreign Service officers. Every Member of Congress who has traveled abroad knows that this is true. By their conduct and their sacrifices, those fine women bring honor not only to

themselves and their families, but also to our country.

We have an excellent Foreign Service, in the main. At times, I have been critical of the Foreign Service when it sought to take over what I thought was an operational program, such as foreign aid. I do not believe that is its role. But I am not critical of the Foreign Service when it performs the duties assigned to it by law, in the field of diplomacy, and in the staffing and manning of missions and consular offices. To the contrary, we are blessed with one of the finest Foreign Services of all the countries of the world.

The provisions of section 3 of the bill would provide a modest annuity of \$2,400, which should not bankrupt the richest of all nations. It applies to 27 widows who, through no fault of their own, did not come under the provisions of the previous Foreign Service retirement legislation. I see no reason to exclude those 27 widows from the modest benefit of a \$2,400 a year annuity.

It should be clear that this section and this amount do not apply in cases in which a widow is receiving benefits under the Federal Employees Compensation Act as the widow of a Foreign Service officer or as the widow of someone else. In other words, there would not be dual benefits.

This section also provides that the annuities of widows shall be increased to \$2,400 in cases in which the widows are receiving less than that amount. It should be noted that all widow annuities were increased to at least \$2,400 when the law currently in effect was enacted, provided they became payable by June 30, 1962.

So the purpose of this section, which has been the subject of controversy today, is to close the gap between the date June 30, 1962, and the date when the bill becomes law. It applies to a small number of widows of Foreign Service officers—the number is estimated as 27—who now have no annuity whatsoever, and to a few other wives who would have no annuity if their husbands died before they could avail themselves of the provisions of this act. That simply means within the short period of time between the passage of the bill by Congress and the signing of the act by the President and before the Foreign Service officer could make the election of an annuity for his surviving widow, if the Foreign Service officer were to die. So it is quite obvious that we are talking about a few persons—less than 100—under the most extreme and unbelievable circumstances.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am somewhat confused as to how the Senator can describe 27 women as being widows today on the premise that their husbands may die tomorrow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I said there was another group.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is not now speaking of the 27?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. The 27 are in the classification of widows; their husbands have departed this life.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I read from the third paragraph under the heading "Purpose of the Bill," on page 1 of the report:

In addition, S. 745 would authorize an annuity of \$2,400 for about 27 widows who now have no annuity whatsoever and any other widows who would have no annuity if, assuming S. 745 is enacted, their husbands died before they could avail themselves of its provisions.

In committee it was stated that the husbands were still living, and this provision was included on the prospect, as the Senator has just stated, that the husbands might die in the interval between the passage of the bill by Congress and the signing of the act by the President. A man who might die hereafter is not dead today; his wife is not now a widow. If he is living today why does he not do what every other civil service retiree must do: Go to the retirement division, declare his wife as his beneficiary, take the reduction in his pension check, as other workers must do, and pay back into the Federal Treasury the extra amount which he has drawn in previous years because he did not think enough of his wife to declare her as his beneficiary?

Let this man express for his wife a little of the same sympathy that he is asking the Congress to express. She certainly is not a widow until he is dead.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assure the Senator I have no desire to advance the cause of widowhood by presuming to suggest that the husbands of those who would be beneficiaries of this act are now dead, whereas they are alive. I merely point out that section 1(a) would modify the present Foreign Service Retirement Act, and section 3 refers to section 1(a), as well. I am saying that it is possible that if the bill is passed by both Houses and is on the President's desk by April 10, and if the President signs it on the afternoon of April 10, a Foreign Service officer who might want to avail himself of the provisions of this act, as an amendment to the Foreign Service Retirement Act, might have a heart attack even while he was affixing his signature to whatever papers were required to assure his widow these benefits. It is the purpose of section 3 to assure the widow that she would be entitled to the \$2,400 widow's annuity.

I do not think this is the most earth-shaking decision this Congress will be called upon to make, but at least, it is a matter of legislative detail that was given consideration by the Bureau of the Budget, by the State Department, and by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I presume that the Committee on Foreign Relations has some competence in this area, since it has handled most or all of the Foreign Service retirement and disability acts and the amendments to them. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is chairman of this subcommittee, and I know he has given very careful consideration to this proposed legislation. I would be less than candid if I did not admit that I am not an expert on all its details, but I believe section 3 is in the bill because it is needed. I do not believe it establishes a bad precedent. I think it demonstrates rather humani-

tarian consideration and concern for the wives of Foreign Service officers—a group very limited in number—who will have no annuity benefits at all unless this proposed legislation is enacted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I am happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Does not the Senator think it is the responsibility of this lady's husband, as in the case of other employees, to declare her a beneficiary?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Will the Senator from Minnesota agree to the inclusion of an amendment to require the return to the Federal Treasury of the extra amount of pay received because the designation was not made earlier? If so, I shall have no objection to the bill. If we allow such an employee to receive the extra amount during his lifetime and if we still take care of his widow afterwards, we should do the same for all civil service employees, postal workers and all other Government employees. But if we were to do that the added cost would be approximately \$400 or \$500 million a year. Why are not the widows of all employees entitled to equal treatment? Why single out just the 116 in 1 category and the 27 in the other whose husbands are living today and therefore could, if they wished to do so, name their wives their beneficiaries.

The only point is that in the absence of enactment of this bill they would receive a lower retirement pay—as other retirees would—and would have to return to the Federal Treasury the extra amount they have drawn from the Federal Treasury during the years in which they refused to name their wives their beneficiaries.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Those are the ones in the group of 116.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; both the 27 and the 116.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But in those cases the husbands have gone to their heavenly rewards.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think the Senator from Minnesota has confused the two groups. The 116 have passed away; the 27 have not yet died. But one category consists of widows. An act of Congress is needed in order to establish their eligibility.

My point is that their retirement benefits should be reduced in an amount corresponding to the extra amount which was drawn while their husbands were living.

I am willing to allow them their retroactive rights if they will pay for them. But I do not see why this group should get approximately \$9,000 more out of the retirement fund than any other civil service employee, Foreign Service officer, or other Government employee could receive? Why should they get that \$9,000 bonus merely because they failed to recognize their responsibilities to their own wives?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think there is considerable merit in that argument; and the Senator from Delaware always makes a good argument, and does so with great sincerity. I am merely endeavor-

ing to get both points of view spread on the RECORD.

I would say that it is not clear that under the bill certain benefits which would accrue to the widows of Foreign Service officers would not accrue to the widows of other Government employees.

We should bear in mind the fact that the members of the armed services and the members of the judiciary make no contribution whatever to their respective retirement systems.

In the case of the judiciary, the judges receive their full salaries after their retirement. Of course, I do not say the role of a Foreign Service officer is as important as that of a Federal judge, nor do I want my remarks interpreted as being at all critical of the judiciary retirement system. To the contrary, I think it is a very fine system, and I think it has worked for the benefit of our judicial structure and for the benefit of the Nation.

In fact, in view of the very low salaries paid Federal judges, it is clear that their retirement program is anything but extravagant. The same could be said of many others. When we realize that a Federal district judge receives less annual salary for presiding over a court in which some of the great cases are tried than the amount received by an attorney for handling one accident case, I wonder what has happened to equity and justice in the American judicial system.

If there has ever been a need for revision of our professional pay scales, it is now. The Federal judiciary is underpaid; the Federal law enforcement officers are underpaid. When I was mayor of a great city, I learned that if honest policemen are wanted, they must be paid fair salaries; or if an honest district attorney is wanted, he must be paid an annual salary which bears at least some resemblance to the fee which a defense attorney receives for trying one case.

Not long ago I talked to a resident of another State about the pay received by some law-enforcement officers of the Federal Government. When I consider their pay, I realize that their maintenance of such a high standard of morality, integrity, and ethics is one of the miracles of our time. The American people want justice, integrity, frugality, prudence, and all the other virtues of the saints, but would like to pay very low salaries in return.

I think that is unreasonable.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I could comment on the Senator's remarks in regard to the desirability of a pay raise; however, we now have a retirement bill before us.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was speaking about retirement equity. I was using it as an example related to proposed legislation applying to certain officers of the Government—legislation which is relevant to the entire governmental structure. But it must be remembered that neither members of the armed services nor members of the judiciary make any contribution whatsoever to their respective retirement systems. No complaint

is being made about it. I am using it as an example. I do not believe we should assume that, by dealing fairly with 27 widows, or 116 widows, who are not being adequately provided for—in one instance, because their husbands did not elect to take a certain system of retirement, and in another instance because they were not provided for by law—we are being overly generous, or that we are establishing a precedent which will cause trouble in the retirement program.

As I recall, a law was enacted in 1960, Public Law 86-612, which provided for annuities to a small group of widows in circumstances similar to those which we are now discussing. The amendment which would prohibit the granting of an annuity of \$2,400 to 27 widows, as provided for in the legislation before the Senate was included in Public Law 86-612 of July 12, 1960, and it was then provided as a compassionate grant to a small group of widows who were not provided for in other legislation.

The Congress did not rebel. I do not believe it is likely to cause a large Federal deficit. I do not believe that a widow who receives \$2,400 is going to be living it up at public expense, enjoying all the pleasures of modern-day life.

No matter how often we study the retirement system, new problems arise. As mayor of Minneapolis I once served on a teacher's retirement board in Minneapolis, Minn., and also on the Police-men's and Firemen's Retirement Board. There was not a single time after we had amended a law when some inequities did not arise. We tried to make the law as fair and comprehensive in its benefits as possible. After we had amended it, we found generally that an area was left untouched, which in turn pointed to another inequity which needed correction. This is within the nature of retirement system. In most cases, it would be impossible for the individuals concerned in this particular bill, if the Lausche amendment were to be adopted, to meet the requirements with respect to repayment for which the amendment provides.

Most of the retired Foreign Service officers involved received small annuities. Prior to 1960, if they received \$12,000 a year, which would involve a small fraction of the total number of Foreign Service officers, the total retirement would have been \$7,200. The large bulk of Foreign Service officers do not have a base pay period of 5 years of \$12,000 or more, and they surely did not have it prior to 1960. I do not have the figures before me, but I would judge that the mean annuity amounted to approximately \$12,000, rather than the maximum used in the example.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is there any figure in the record indicating the number of persons covered and the amount of aggregate salaries? I wish that figure were available.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would be helpful to have it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It would be helpful if we could obtain it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the staff member of the committee now in the

Chamber could provide that information. As the Senator from Ohio can see, we now have it before us.

The annuities seem to run anywhere from as much as \$2,000 and more to over \$14,000. I believe the Senator from Ohio would agree that, overall, the list seems to run approximately in the \$4,000 to \$8,000 range.

My point is that many retired Foreign Service officers were receiving small annuities and were therefore unable to provide annuities for their widows because of the high cost.

To provide an annuity of \$2,400 a year to a widow survivor would have cost, before October 1960, \$1,200. Now, however, it costs only \$300. So the situation prior to 1960, before the law was relaxed, and before the benefits were improved, was that a Foreign Service officer receiving somewhat modest pay would have been required to pay in as much as \$1,200 a year for an annuity of \$2,400. That same annuity for a widow costs only \$300 at present.

The bill is designed to permit the Foreign Service officer who did not provide for his widow under those high costs, to provide for her under the payment schedule after October 16, 1960. The average retirement year of retirees involved is 1950—all those retired between 1940 and 1960—and the retirees would have to put in several thousand dollars. Very few of such retirees, whose average age is 69, and who are in the lower financial brackets, could produce such a sum of money; and even those who could afford it would probably not find it to their advantage to meet the requirements. In effect, therefore, if such a requirement were made part of S. 745, the bill would permit little relief to those whom it is intended to benefit.

My argument in behalf of the bill is based upon the fact that considerable discussion and consideration of the subject of retirement benefits has been given by the appropriate committee of Congress. The Bureau of the Budget also carefully examined the measure, and its letter of approval has been made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on that subject, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Perhaps the staff member of the committee can advise us. Is it not a fact that up until this year the Bureau of the Budget opposed the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I could not answer that question definitely, but the staff member informs me that the Bureau of the Budget was not opposed to the precise language of the bill. I believe the most relevant question is whether the Bureau of the Budget is opposed to the bill as reported by the committee and whether we can provide for discretion on the part of the Secretary of State in connection with the annuities. I believe it is fair to say that the Bureau of the Budget approves the bill. The staff specialist informs me that it does.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bill which was before the Senate in the preceding session of the Congress was not approved by either the State Department or the Bureau of the Budget. The bill which came

before the Senate this year was approved by both the State Department and the Bureau of the Budget. It is my recollection that, in principle, both bills were identical. Between the periods 1961-62 and 1963-64 something happened to distinguish the situation, because the Bureau of the Budget changed its judgment and the State Department changed its judgment. They now say that the bill is satisfactory.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the recitation of the Senator from Ohio in relation to the attitude or the policy of the Bureau of the Budget is correct. When the act of October 16, 1960, was put into effect, and the benefits of that act, as well as some of its inadequacies and inequities, were analyzed by the Bureau of the Budget and the State Department, in a period of 2 or 3 years, there was enough case history to bring the Bureau of the Budget and the State Department around to a position in support of the proposed legislation. I believe I am correct in saying that the proposed legislation was introduced at the request of the State Department and the Bureau of the Budget.

The measure is not one which was spawned in the Senate, but rather represents the results of a study on the part of the State Department, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the analysis of the Foreign Service retirement system by the State Department and the Bureau of the Budget. I believe that is a fair statement of the situation.

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

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the motion to recommit, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add instructions to the the motion to recommit to amend the bill as follows:

On page 3, line 11, after the words "discretion by", insert the following:

Upon a finding by the President that such action would conform to practices of fiscal responsibility and would lessen the pressure for widows affected thereby either to enter the active labor force or to become unemployed.

And report the bill, together with such additional amendments as the committee may deem appropriate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is there any requirement that, under the so-called amendment to rule VII, the amendment be germane to the pending bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no such requirement.

TAX REDUCTION AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, one of the more appealing arguments in favor of a mammoth tax cut is that this action will result in a drastic decrease in unemployment.

This is, as I say, an appealing argument, because we want to insure insofar as we are able, the right and the opportunity for each of our citizens who wants and needs a job to have one. We want our people to be self-supporting, self-reliant, prosperous and secure.

The security of the intended beneficiaries of the pending bill is the motivating force which brings the bill to the floor of the Senate.

But it is far from certain that the tax cut will reduce our too high unemployment. Indeed, in my view, it is more likely, after about 18 months, to cause increased unemployment.

Those who are so enamored of aggregates and marco-economics need to look at our unemployment and see just what it consists of and what has caused it. In what geographical, age, health, and ethnic areas is it concentrated? Can increased general demand cure it without causing inflation?

To begin with, we are not suffering unemployment because of a recession or depression. On the contrary, the economic indicators are, by and large, at alltime highs. We are not in that desperate condition we faced during the great depression when almost any gamble seemed in order—no matter how inefficient, or how dangerous.

We are not suffering unemployment because of lack of capital or productive capacity. The corporate sector is highly liquid; and about 12 to 15 percent of plant capacity is idle. Certainly our basic productive structure is sound, and we would have no trouble increasing production in almost any area where demand is spurred. But would this put many of the presently unemployed to work? Some confuse poverty and unemployment, and the two are closely linked. But we should always keep in mind that we do not need to have poverty because of lack of production. Our situation economically is almost unique in recorded history. Characteristically and historically, there has been, in every society, a problem of insufficient total production. This is not our problem. We have an almost unlimited capacity to produce. Our basic problem is distribution, and the understanding of this fact is a necessary prerequisite to formulating any workable plan for an attack on unemployment and on poverty. There must be a proper distribution of the fruits of national production, and this is best achieved in our society by a proper distribution of jobs which pay a decent wage.

There are two general ways of attacking unemployment. An attack can be

directed toward increasing production and creating additional jobs. A slightly different type of attack focuses on a more equitable distribution of jobs without materially increasing total national production.

We need to launch this two-pronged attack.

How does a tax cut fit into this picture? I am sorry to say that it will likely make matters worse. This is particularly true of the type of tax cut contained in the tax bill, H.R. 8363.

The first type of attack must be concentrated on increased production in the public sector, for this is where our unfulfilled demands now largely lie—for better rapid transit systems, better housing for low income groups, better educational facilities at all levels, better highways, more and better hospitals and nursing homes, more clean drinking and industrial water. It is here that jobs could readily, directly, and with profit to society, be created. But this takes public funds which will be less available after passage of the tax bill.

Furthermore, to the extent this tax cut is effective in spurring increased investment, we are likely to build up a capacity which cannot be sustained by demand in the private sector, just as was the case in 1956-57. This may worsen unemployment in the not distant future, and especially so when accompanied with policies of economic retrenchment and monetary squeeze.

Those who would fight unemployment and poverty only by trying to increase overall demand do not understand the nature of the problem or the composition of the unemployed segment of our labor force, and the poverty stricken in the midst of our affluence.

Present unemployment is largely structural. It is concentrated in certain geographical localities, certain age groups, certain social and ethnic categories. Unemployment is daily being worsened, or at least made more difficult to cure, by technological advances—"automation," if one uses the term loosely.

From 1953 to 1962 investment in scientific research and development tripled. Partially as a result of this effort, we are now losing 2 million jobs each year because of the laborsaving effects of increasing productivity. Manufacturing employs about 1 million fewer production workers than was the case just 6 or 7 years ago, despite vastly increased production.

This may be all to the good, and I know of no latter-day Luddites, but we must recognize the fact that no longer does increased production through increased overall demand create jobs in large numbers for the unskilled. The seeds of inflation would be sown by a shortage of skilled labor long before profitable work could be found for the bulk of presently unemployed. Altogether too large a proportion of our unemployed are not qualified to hold down productive positions in our highly mechanized and automated economy, even if those jobs could, somehow, be created.

Unemployment, and poverty sprouting from such roots, cannot be cured by a tax cut. The type of unemployment

problem we have requires more specific treatment. We must concentrate more on the public sector as well as upon encouraging and assisting private enterprise to play its part as the mainstay of our economy.

The other half of our two-pronged attack centers around encouraging certain types of persons to delay or refrain from entering the labor market—some temporarily, some permanently. After all, unemployment is a product of the participation rate—the numbers of people who say they want a job—as well as of the total number of jobs available.

One obvious place to begin—and with profit to society—is to set up programs designed to delay the entry of young people into the labor market until they are better qualified. This would not only make for a more stable labor force, but it would also assist these young people individually to achieve a more well rounded life, as well as specifically to fit them for more productive jobs when they do enter the labor force. We have been altogether too timid about moving into this area. Education is the key here, not a tax cut. This kind of realistic and highly beneficial attack on unemployment will cost money, thus indicating the need for more, not less, Government revenue.

Another approach of this sort is to assist those wives and mothers who wish to devote more time to their homes and children and who really do not want to work, but who feel they must, to stay out of the active labor force. We could help them, in their homelife and society as a whole, if we took steps to insure that the head of the household earned a proper wage so the family could maintain a decent standard of living without the mother having to leave the home every day to seek employment.

This problem of security for the widows of former Government employees is involved in the pending bill.

It is not generally realized, perhaps, just to what extent women have increasingly come into the labor force since World War II. At the same time, relatively more men have been dropping out of the labor force. This may not be socially desirable. At least, it is a matter for consideration. In 1947, the participation rate for women was 31.0 percent. This figure rose in 1962 to 36.7 percent. During the same period of time, the participation rate for men went down from 84.5 percent in 1947 to 79.3 percent in 1962.

Let me make it very, very plain that I favor full employment opportunities for men and women alike—the opportunity for a decent job for any man or woman who is able and willing to work. But I am opposed to a social and economic structure which forces wives and mothers to leave their home and children daily to seek work because the father or husband is not paid a wage or salary which will keep the family in decent comfort. I am opposed, too, to a tax system that penalizes the parent as a taxpayer. Social security and Government retirement systems should include benefits for the widows of original workers or Government employees.

A tax cut for corporations and for those in the high income brackets hardly fits in here. If a tax cut must be had, then tax relief for parents of the largest numbers of children would be fairest and of greatest benefit.

In this connection, also, we need to look more closely into the area of the minimum wage, overtime pay, and the length of the workweek.

Unemployment can be partially cured, of course, by increasing production. But, as I have said, the increased production that is needed is not in the private sector where there are neither shortages nor reasonably full utilization of capacity, but in the public sector. A tax cut does not fit in here at all. Worse still, the capacity of the Government to provide for our pressing public needs will be seriously and permanently impaired by a drastic reduction in revenue.

Mr. President, I shall have much more to say about the unemployment and poverty aspects of the effects of the tax bill. This is one of the key considerations. This bill will not cure unemployment and poverty, despite many statements to the contrary.

Altogether too many have followed the ladder of faith in arriving at support of this bill—a faith unfounded on fact, that faith which is “the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.” Because we have high unemployment, the problem ought to be cured. A tax cut, it is felt, might possibly help. Because a tax cut might help, the feeling grows that it will help. Through some couéistic magic, then, we repeat this mental process until we finally arrive at the point where we tell ourselves, without reservation, that a tax cut will cure unemployment.

Self-delusion is dangerous. It is doubly dangerous when high hopes are built on a false premise.

I am anxious to join a real war on poverty. A skirmish of words is not enough.

Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment to the motion to recommit.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senate has received a message from the House that it has passed the bill (S. 1309) to amend the Small Business Act, with amendments. I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House to that bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1309) to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, strike out lines 3 through 7, inclusive; on page 1, strike out lines 8 and 9, and insert:

That (a) paragraph (2) of section 7(b) of the Small Business Act is amended to read as follows:

On page 3, line 7, strike out “Sec. 3.” and insert “Sec. 2.”

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the House amended this bill by striking out the section of the bill which would have increased the authorization of the Small Business Administration's revolving fund for the use of its programs under the

Small Business Investment Act of 1958 by \$34.3 million. The House accepted the other provisions of the bill.

This amendment was reported to the House by the House Banking and Currency Committee after Mr. Eugene P. Foley, Administrator of the Small Business Administration testified that:

I have checked our books and our operations, and I personally believe that we could do without the authorization that was approved by the Senate. I think we could probably get along without it the balance of this fiscal year. Also this would be in keeping with the President's keen desire for frugality in Government.

I am delighted that the House amended the bill in this fashion. I did not vote for this increase when the bill was considered by the Banking and Currency Committee, and I spoke against it when the bill was before the Senate. I stated in my minority views in our committee report regarding this \$34.3 million increase as follows:

I cannot vote for this increase. With our budget still unbalanced, our defense costs continuing at a high rate, and a large tax cut likely to be passed early next year, Congress should not increase the size of these authorizations. The SBIC program can and should be operated within its present authorization limits.

Now that SBA has come to the same conclusion, I am glad to say that the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who handled this bill on the Senate floor, has agreed with me to accept the House amendment and send the bill to the President at once.

I am particularly glad that we can act promptly on this bill, because it contains a provision of importance to the Great Lakes area. The House accepted the amendment sponsored and supported by Senators HART, HUMPHREY, MCCARTHY, McNAMARA, NELSON—the Presiding Officer—and myself, which makes disaster loans available to companies that have suffered economic injury due to the unfortunate botulism episode in the Great Lakes area. I was happy to join with my colleagues from this area in sponsoring this amendment, and I hope that the assistance which will be made available to small businessmen who qualify under this amendment will prove of great benefit to them in this very unhappy period. I will do all that I can to see that the Small Business Administration begins processing the applications for loans under this provision as quickly as possible.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am delighted that S. 1309 is before the Senate today for concurrence in the amendments of the House.

This is not a major piece of legislation as compared with many that come before the Senate. It does not involve the expenditure of billions of dollars. And yet it will help some of our people very much indeed, and it is an encouraging example of the fact that the Congress can and does respond to the needs of our citizens.

To give just a bit of the legislative history, S. 1309 started out as a bill to enlarge the SBA revolving fund and to broaden the disaster loan section to cover

all types of natural disasters. After the hearings had been held by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and after the bill had been reported, an unusual kind of disaster struck the commercial fishing industry of the Great Lakes: The discovery of botulism E in smoked fish from the area.

The FDA recommendations with respect to smoked fish were widely misinterpreted and had a devastating effect on the market—not only for smoked fish, which had been the source of the problem, but on fresh and frozen fish which had not been embraced within the FDA warning. Almost overnight some 20,000 people in the Great Lakes area were without a means of livelihood: The fishermen, the processors, the wholesalers, and even many retailers—some as far away as California and New York.

To respond to this emergency, and to tide the industry over until solutions could be found, I introduced on the Senate floor, an amendment to S. 1309 which would broaden the disaster loan section to cover the small business concern unable “to process or market a product for human consumption because of disease or toxicity occurring in such product through natural or undetermined causes.” Joining me in cosponsorship of this amendment were Senators McCARTHY, HUMPHREY, McNAMARA, PROXMIRE, and NELSON.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who had introduced S. 1309 and was managing it on the Senate floor, very kindly agreed to accept the amendment. It was in the bill as it went to the House, and is in the bill as it comes back from the House.

The provision of disaster loans will not be the full answer for this industry. We need to find new ways of marketing the chub in an appetizing and economically competitive fashion. We must counteract the false notion that fresh and frozen fish emanating from the Great Lakes are possibly harmful. And we need to explore whether there is a means of compensating those who have suffered very substantial loss because of the FDA-recommended destruction of already-caught fish. But the amendment which I offered—and the Senator from Alabama kindly accepted—will be of very great help while we work out these other problems.

I hope the Senate will send the bill to the President and that it may soon have his signature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJUSTMENT IN ANNUITIES UNDER FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 745) to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, with reference to S. 745, the Senator from Ohio has made a motion to recommit. There has been some discussion on the bill. I was under the impression that Senators were pretty close together before the discussion. An agreement has been reached. The Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Delaware—other Senators may have been present at the discussion—have agreed upon an amendment, which will be offered by the Senator from Ohio. I understand that if the amendment is agreed to, the Senator from Ohio is willing to withdraw his motion to recommit.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the pending question the motion to recommit?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senator may withdraw his motion to recommit.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I withdraw my motion at this time.

The amendment which I am offering would impose upon a retiree who did not designate his spouse as a potential surviving beneficiary, thus procuring increased annuities, as a prerequisite to the right of now designating his spouse as beneficiary, the obligation of paying into the fund the excess payments received by the retiree. If retiree A did not designate his spouse as the potential surviving beneficiary, he would have the right only to so designate the spouse now provided he paid back into the Treasury the excess amount which he received.

That is the objective of my amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That, of course, would be not to exceed what he would have had to pay.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am in agreement with the purpose of the proposed amendment. The adoption of this amendment would mean that the retiree and his wife, together, will receive only what they would have received originally had the husband when he retired declared her the beneficiary. Is that correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The excess amount which they have collected during the intervening period, while he had not declared her as a beneficiary, would have to be paid back into the fund before they could start drawing the additional annuity. Is that correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I join in support of the amendment. It is only fair, in the interest of all other Government employees, to insist that this rule be applied. I appreciate the work that the Foreign Service officers are doing, and I am aware of the fact that they are entitled to retirement benefits.

But they already have liberal benefits. It was stated earlier, in rebuttal of the arguments, that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and I were being unduly harsh toward some poor, destitute widows.

I should like to place in the RECORD, figures to show that this is not quite the case with respect to the retirement benefits under discussion. I shall list some of the benefits that are being drawn by some persons in this category and who are affected by the proposal before the Senate today. I shall not mention any names.

In case No. 32 the average 5-year salary of the employee was \$25,000. He retired on a pension of \$17,500 a year. He could have named his wife as his beneficiary by taking a reduction in this amount, but he did not do so. Under the pending bill we were asked to take care of the wife of a man who was drawing \$25,000 a year while he was working and receiving \$17,000 a year in retirement benefits, but who did not think enough of his own wife to declare her his beneficiary. The amendment provides that he must repay to the Treasury the excess amount that he has received. Why should he not pay it back into the Treasury?

In case No. 9—I shall not read all of them—the average 5-year salary of the employee was \$25,276.40. He drew a pension of \$14,698.86. That is over \$1,000 a month. That is not quite pauper status even by New Frontier standards.

In the third case, the average 5-year salary was \$14,812.78. The retiree drew a pension of \$10,368.95.

In case No. 221, the average 5-year salary was \$18,784.74. The pension was at the rate of \$12,159.32.

Under the bill without the Lausche amendment which is now being offered an additional \$9,000 bonus would be paid by the taxpayers to these same retirees solely because the employees failed to take care of their own responsibilities by designating their wives as beneficiaries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table of 20 such cases, showing the average 5-year salary and the amounts of the pensions involved. These men were well able to have taken care of their wives.

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

Case No.	5-year salary	Pension
9.....	\$25,076.40	\$14,698.86
3.....	14,812.78	10,368.95
12.....	13,500.00	8,100.00
63.....	13,500.00	8,100.00
75.....	13,669.76	10,068.83
114.....	13,812.40	9,688.68
124.....	13,804.65	9,012.88
132.....	25,000.00	17,500.00
198.....	14,534.37	10,238.03
221.....	18,784.74	12,159.32
250.....	14,163.90	10,414.73
258.....	12,038.10	9,819.34
266.....	16,877.45	10,167.51
284.....	14,510.71	9,278.98
289.....	14,151.92	8,460.45
370.....	15,077.28	10,554.10
402.....	16,787.04	10,006.28
415.....	16,291.29	9,530.40
432.....	13,500.00	8,100.00

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have submitted this table to show that we are not dealing with persons who are living in poverty. Many people drawing social security benefits live on substantially lower pensions. Many employees with far less retirement credits have designated their wives as the beneficiaries and taken the reduction. The employees in the categories provided in the bill, who were drawing pensions of from \$10,000 to \$17,000 a year, should have assumed an equal responsibility to provide for their wives. Having failed to do so, they should be required to repay the excess amounts into the Federal Treasury.

Some of the retirees are still living and drawing their pensions. They can well take care of their own wives before they pass away. They have a responsibility to do so.

As was said earlier, there have been numerous liberalizations of the retirement payments without a corresponding increase in the contributions. This has reduced the retirement fund to the point of bankruptcy. If additional appropriations are not made by Congress over and above what is being now added, by 1977 the retirement fund will be bankrupt.

When the American people learn that they will have to pay as high as 21 or 22 percent more into the retirement fund to keep it solvent, which means an additional contribution of \$2.5 billion on a \$10 billion annual payroll, there will be open revolt.

Rather than having this issue met by Congress, each year there is a parade of bills similar to the one before the Senate today, in which everyone carries a flag, shouting what he wants to do for the poor widow. Under the present trend the widows of America will be pauperized, their retirement fund will become depleted, and they will become dependent upon the charity of the American taxpayers.

I hope the amendment will be adopted. If it is not, I shall join with the Senator from Ohio and insist that the bill be re-committed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I offer my amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, between lines 20 and 21, it is proposed to insert the following:

(d) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, no election under paragraph (a) by an annuitant who did not elect a survivor annuity at the time of retirement shall be effective unless there is paid into the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund by or on behalf of the annuitant an amount equal to the amount by which (a) the total annuity received by the annuitant prior to the effective date of any adjustment in his annuity pursuant to an election under this section exceeds (b) the total annuity which he would have received prior to such date had he elected, at the time of his retirement, a survivor annuity bearing the same ratio to the maximum survivor annu-

ity which he could have elected at such time as the survivor annuity which he elects under this section bears to the maximum survivor annuity which he could elect under this section. The Secretary, under circumstances determined by him in each instance, may permit payments required by this subsection to be made in installments.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, to make the record clear, for 1962 the contributions made to the fund by the Government and by the employees were \$6,065,000. The amount disbursed was \$5,524,000. That is a difference of only \$541,000 between the amount paid out and the amount received. It is because of that situation that the actuarial experts in the State Department have said that even though the Government pays into the fund the \$282 million which it owes, the future contributions will have to be 29.7 percent of the payroll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Delaware. I am perfectly willing to agree to the amendment as it has been proposed in order to have the bill disposed of, because I believe the two sections that are taken care of under the bill, with the amendment, are certainly more deserving. However, I should like to say to the Senator from Delaware that I do not believe that either of the cases he has cited is necessarily a case in which the employee did not provide an annuity for his wife. The employees to whom the Senator referred are still living. The table shows what the average income is and what the retirement income would be.

But in order to provide retirement benefits for the widow after the employee dies, these officers are still paying the much larger amount that was required before 1960. The bill would enable them to reduce their payments to the same amount to which we allowed other Government employees to reduce in 1960. In all fairness, I thought that should be said regarding those cases. I have nothing further to say.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In 1962 an inequity was created which, it was said, would not cost much. Two years later it is proposed to correct that inequity by expanding the benefits to everyone all over again, and calling it the correction of an inequity. I do not think there is too much of an inequity to any employee of the U.S. Government who has retired on a \$17,500 pension. He has much to be thankful for without asking for more.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have agreed with the Senator on the amendment. I think it goes a long way toward doing equity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate, S. 745, which would adjust annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, is essentially a legislative proposal for equitable relief.

I am quite well aware of the objections of the minority in this matter. While I believe that sound actuarial rules should be employed wherever possible, I see this

as little justification for inflexibility when equity demands action.

No one is claiming that these retired Foreign Service officers deserve such annuity adjustments as a matter of right. But in carefully examining the facts, the apparent inequities that have resulted with a change in the retirement laws vis-a-vis those persons who retired prior to October 16, 1960, call for corrective action. I see no justice in the fact that those persons who retired after the 1960 date could provide an annuity for their surviving widows at one-third the cost required of those who retired before that date. The disparity in cost, the difference in annuity benefits of \$600 more for those under the new statute, and the practical consideration that this bill will affect only approximately 300 persons, leads to the inevitable conclusion that it is just and should be enacted.

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. 745) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the compromise has substantially improved the bill. On the other hand, I think weakness still remains in it. Despite the improvement, I shall not be able to vote for the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 745) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That annuities paid from the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund on the date of enactment of this Act, based on service performed by annuitants which terminated prior to October 16, 1960, shall be adjusted under the provisions of section 821(b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, relating to the formula for reduction in annuity to provide for a surviving widow, as though such provisions had been in effect on the date of the annuitant's separation from the Service, and in accordance with the following:

(a) An annuitant who at time of retirement was married to a wife who is still living, whether or not he so elected at time of retirement or subsequently, may within ninety days of enactment of this Act, elect to provide the maximum survivor annuity, and if the maximum be less than \$2,400 the annuitant may elect up to \$2,400;

(b) The annuitant's current full annuity, exclusive of annuity increases, shall be used as a base, and the amounts of annuity increases which have been granted, either at time of retirement or subsequent thereto, shall not be affected by such adjustments;

(c) If, during the ninety-day period following enactment of this Act an annuitant dies without having made a new election in accordance with the provisions of this Act, leaving a wife to whom he was married at time of retirement, benefits shall be payable to her as though the maximum benefit had been elected, except that such annuity shall not be less than \$2,400, unless the annuitant has certified in writing his intention of not making a new election under the provisions of this Act.

(d) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, no election under paragraph (a) by an annuitant who did not elect a survivor annuity at the time of retirement shall be effective unless there is paid into the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund by or on behalf of the annuitant an amount equal to the amount by which (A) the total annuity received by the annuitant prior to the effective date of any adjustment in his annuity pursuant to an election under this section exceeds (B) the total annuity which he would have received prior to such date had he elected, at the time of his retirement, a survivor annuity bearing the same ratio to the maximum survivor annuity, which he could have elected at such time as the survivor annuity which he elects under this section bears to the maximum survivor annuity which he could elect under this section. The Secretary, under circumstances determined by him in each instance, may permit payments required by this subsection to be made in installments.

Sec. 2. If a former participant whose service was terminated prior to October 16, 1960, and who elected a deferred annuity, dies before becoming eligible to receive an annuity, the annuity of the surviving widow, if eligible under the terms of the law in effect upon his separation from the Service, shall be computed under the provisions of section 821(b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

Sec. 3. In any case where an annuitant who retired prior to October 16, 1960, dies prior to enactment of this Act, leaving a widow to whom he was married at time of retirement who is not entitled to receive an annuity under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, and who is not receiving benefits as a widow under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the Secretary of State may in his discretion grant such a widow an annuity of \$2,400 per annum; or in cases where such widows are receiving less than \$2,400, the annuity shall be increased to \$2,400.

Sec. 4. No annuity shall be payable from the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund to the widow of an annuitant whose services terminated prior to October 16, 1960, who did or did not provide for a widow survivor at time of retirement, or subsequently, and who elects not to avail himself of the provisions of this Act: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deny to a widow an annuity previously provided by her husband or granted otherwise by law.

Sec. 5. No annuity for a survivor shall be computed on any additional annuity purchased with voluntary contributions pursuant to the provisions of section 881 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

Sec. 6. The provisions of this Act shall not apply to annuitants recalled to duty under section 520 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, who are separated subsequent to October 16, 1960.

Sec. 7. The following provisions of law are hereby superseded, except in no event shall existing annuity increases provided therein be reduced by the enactment of this section:

(a) Section 2 of Public Law 82-348 (66 Stat. 81).

(b) Sections 4 and 5 of Public Law 84-503 as amended by section 2 of Public Law 86-612 (70 Stat. 125; 74 Stat. 371).

(c) Sections 1(a) and 1(b) of Public Law 85-882 (72 Stat. 1705).

Sec. 8. Any adjustment in annuity provided by this Act shall commence on the first day of the month following the expiration of ninety days after enactment, and the monthly rate payable after such adjustment shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

Sec. 9. No part of the moneys now or hereafter contained in the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund shall be applied toward the payment of any increase

in annuity benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act, except those benefits provided by section 10, until and unless an appropriation is made to such fund in an amount which the Government actuary estimates to be necessary to prevent an immediate increase in the unfunded liability to said fund.

SEC. 10. Title VIII of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding the following:

"PART J—COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS OF ANNUITIES

"SEC. 882. (a) On the basis of determination made by the Civil Service Commission pursuant to section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, pertaining to per centum change in the price index, the following adjustments shall be made:

"(1) Effective April 1, 1964, if the change in the price index from 1962 to 1963 shall have equaled a rise of at least 3 per centum, each annuity payable from the fund which has a commencing date earlier than January 2, 1963, shall be increased by the per centum rise in the price index adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum.

"(2) Effective April 1 of any year other than 1964 after the price index change shall have equaled a rise of at least 3 per centum, each annuity payable from the fund which has a commencing date earlier than January 2 of the preceding year shall be increased by the per centum rise in the price index adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum.

"(b) Eligibility for an annuity increase under this section shall be governed by the commencing date of each annuity payable from the fund as of the effective date of an increase, except as follows:

"(1) Effective from the date of the first increase under this section, an annuity payable from the fund to an annuitant's survivor (other than a child entitled under section 821(c)), which annuity commenced the day after the annuitant's death, shall be increased as provided in subsection (a)(1) or (a)(2) if the commencing date of annuity to the annuitant was earlier than January 2 of the year preceding the first increase.

"(2) Effective from its commencing date, an annuity payable from the fund to an annuitant's survivor (other than a child entitled under section 821(c)), which annuity commences the day after the annuitant's death and after the effective date of the first increase under this section, shall be increased by the total per centum increase the annuitant was receiving under this section at death.

"(3) For purposes of computing an annuity which commences after the effective date of the first increase under this section to a child under section 821(c), the items \$600, \$720, \$1,800 and \$2,160 appearing in section 821(c) shall be increased by the total per centum increase allowed and in force under this section and, in case of a deceased annuitant, the items 40 per centum and 50 per centum appearing in section 821(c) shall be increased by the total per centum increase allowed and in force under this section to the annuitant at death. Effective from the date of the first increase under this section, the provisions of this paragraph shall apply as if such first increase were in effect with respect to computation of a child's annuity under section 821(c) which commenced between January 2 of the year preceding the first increase and the effective date of the first increase.

"(c) No increase in annuity provided by this section shall be computed on any additional annuity purchased at retirement by voluntary contributions.

"(d) No increase in annuity provided by this section shall apply to amounts being paid under authority of section 5 of Public

Law 84-503, as amended, or any other law authorizing annuity grants to widows.

"(e) The monthly installment of annuity after adjustment under this section shall be fixed at the nearest dollar."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT TO CORRECT INEQUITY IN ITS APPLICATION TO ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 794, House bill 5377.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5377) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act to the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Retirement Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I wish to explain briefly House bill 5377. It would apply to the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of his office the same annuity compensation formula which now is applied to other congressional employees. The bill would amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to bring the employees of the Architect of the Capitol under the same system by which other congressional employees are covered. It is necessary that this be done, because at the present time employees under the Architect of the Capitol, working side by side with regular congressional employees, and serving in many similar capacities, still are not privileged to enjoy the level of retirement compensation which is available under the congressional system; they are under the regular civil service retirement system, rather than the congressional retirement system.

From time to time it has been pointed out that a slight amount of special consideration in connection with retirement benefits is given to congressional employees, for the reason that they do not have permanent status, but are subject to the whims of political fortune. The same situation applies to the employees of the Architect of the Capitol; under the existing system, they do not have permanent status, either. Therefore, the bill is designed to apply only to those employees, who are quite limited in number; there are 1,175 of them. Two-thirds of them—814, to be exact—are now, by statute, under congressional control—both those under the Senate Rules Committee and those under the operational committees of the House. Some of the employees in that category are already under the congressional retirement system—for example, those in the Senate restaurant. This bill is designed to correct an inequity which now obtains.

I believe that this measure—which, incidentally, was approved unanimously in the committee—is a good one, and should receive favorable consideration by the Senate.

The cost of the increased retirement benefits would be approximately \$315,000; that is a close calculation.

Mr. President, I submit the following additional explanation of the bill:

H.R. 5377 would accord to the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of his office the same annuity-computation formula that is now applied to other congressional employees. It would amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to bring the employees of the Architect of the Capitol under the same retirement system by which other congressional employees are covered. Provisions of the congressional retirement system are more liberal than those of the civil service system, designed for the employees of the executive branch, under which the Architect and his employees are now covered. The Architect and the employees of his office, however, are unquestionably congressional employees, whose efforts are solely directed toward serving the Congress. Accordingly, this measure corrects an inequity. In common with other congressional employees, neither the Architect nor his employees enjoy civil service or any other job security protection.

It should be pointed out that employees of the Library of Congress, the General Accounting Office, and the Government Printing Office—agencies of the legislative branch—are not included under the congressional retirement system. However, those agencies are semiautonomous, operating under their own rules and regulations with the agency head supervising personnel administration. The regular year-round work force of the Architect of the Capitol consists of 1,175 employees of which 814 are subject by statute to congressional committee or commission control. These employees are thus subject to similar conditions of employment as other congressional employees. A breakdown of these 814 employees is as follows:

There are 369 who are employees of the Senate Office Buildings subject to the control of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration; 381 are employees of the House Office Buildings and Capitol Power Plant subject to the control of the House Office Building Commission; 64 are employees of the Senate and House Wings of the Capitol subject to the control of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and the Speaker of the House, respectively.

I shall provide for the RECORD a table showing a breakdown of positions under the Architect of the Capitol, which I ask to be inserted in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

Oddly enough, some employees of the Architect are already included in the congressional retirement system. Not included in the 1,175 total are employees of the House and Senate restaurants, who are under the Architect of the Capitol and who have been defined by the Comptroller General to be employees

of the House and Senate and who are consequently covered by the congressional retirement system. It follows that if some employees of the Architect receive the more liberal benefits, so should all.

Upon enactment of this proposed legislation, the requirements and limitations of present law applicable to the retirement of congressional employees will apply to employees of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol. Accordingly, any such employee who qualifies for congressional retirement rights must have had at least 5 years of service and must have made contributions to the retirement fund to cover his last 5 years of civilian service. These conditions assure that no "windfall" can result from the enactment of this measure. Further restrictions are provided by section 2(f) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, which authorizes the Architect of the Capitol "to exclude from the operation of this Act any employees under the Office of the Architect of the Capitol whose tenure of employment is temporary or of uncertain duration." This provision is in accordance with the authority of the Civil Service Commission to exclude from Retirement Act coverage temporary or intermittent employees of the executive branch.

It should be emphasized that H.R. 5377 extends no civil service retirement rights to anyone not already entitled to retirement rights. It simply liberalizes the rights of a certain class of employee already covered to make them equal to the rights of other employees with similar or identical conditions of employment.

This measure can affect only 1,175 individuals. Its annual cost as estimated by the Civil Service Commission is \$315,000.

I urge passage of this bill as a reasonable move to correct an obvious inequity, which is easily visualized when one sees an employee of the Architect of the Capitol, who is not covered by congressional retirement, working alongside an employee of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate or House who is covered.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a table in connection with this matter printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Positions under the Architect of the Capitol

Appropriations	Wage board positions	Unclassified positions	Classification Act positions	Statutory positions	Total positions
Salaries, Architect of the Capitol	1	3	26	3	33
Capitol buildings and grounds	96	44	16		156
Capitol Grounds	49		6		55
Senate Office Buildings	286	54	21	8	369
Legislative garage	7				7
House Office Buildings	284	76	21		381
Capitol Power Plant	78		4		82
Library buildings and grounds	57		2		59
Subtotal	858	177	96	11	1,142
Care of the building and grounds, Supreme Court	31		2		33
Total	889	177	98	11	1,175

Hearings of 1964—Breakdown of regular force under the Office of the Architect of the Capitol engaged in structural and mechanical care of the Capitol Building and Grounds, Senate and House Office Buildings, Capitol Power Plant, Library of Congress Buildings, U.S. Supreme Court Building, and legislative garage

Capitol Power Plant: Engineers, mechanics, helpers, and laborers	82
Electrical substations and transformer stations (located in Capitol, Senate Office Buildings, House Office Buildings, Library of Congress Buildings, and U.S. Supreme Court (Building): Operators, mechanics, helpers	12
Air conditioning—operation and maintenance: Engineers and mechanics	62
Structural care of buildings and operation of miscellaneous equipment: Maintenance mechanics and helpers (plumbers, electricians, carpenters, painters, sheet-metal workers, heating room attendants, public address system operators, subway operators)	170
Elevators—maintenance and repair: Mechanics and helpers	29
Elevators—operation: Elevator operators	143
General domestic care of buildings: Laborers, full-time	201
Charwomen, part-time	300
Capitol Grounds—care and maintenance: Gardeners and laborers	49
Legislative garage—care and operation: Superintendent and helpers	7
House garage (old building)—care and operation: Superintendent and helpers	10
Professional, administrative, and office force: Architect, engineers, administrative and clerical assistants, and miscellaneous	110

March 1963, total employees 1,175

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a question?

Mr. MCGEE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. As I understand, if this bill is enacted into law, the employees of the office of the Architect of the Capitol will be covered by what is known as the Congressional Retirement Act.

Mr. MCGEE. That is correct. I point out that the employees affected by the bill are permanent employees.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. At the hearings, was there a suggestion that some other group of employees might subsequently wish to be taken out of Civil Service Retirement Act coverage and included under the congressional retirement program?

Mr. MCGEE. No such suggestion was made, and no such interest was manifested. However, those who discussed the details of this measure did state that other groups on the periphery of Capitol Hill are not now covered by this program. But they are on rather a semiautonomous basis—such as those in the Library of Congress, and the like. However, no such request was made.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it possible that, next year, those groups will also ask to be covered by this program?

Mr. MCGEE. I have no way of knowing that. I would think it highly questionable that the committee's decision in regard to rectifying one inequity should be based in part on a consideration of what others might do thereafter.

It seems to me that the case for the passage of this measure in the interest of this particular group is so clear that the Senate should pass this bill on its merits. Thereafter, the Senate may consider separately a bill dealing with other groups who might wish to be included.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. MCGEE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think the answer to the question asked by the Senator from Ohio is most emphatically "yes"—that other groups will make similar requests in another year.

They will be here next year. This is another of the typical actions by the Senate. No single one costs much in itself, but added together they equal millions. What we are doing in the case of this small group of Federal employees is raising their retirement benefits about 40 percent over and above what they would get under existing law. Those in the next group will ask, "If such benefits are to be extended to one group, why stop?" The group involved today consists of 282 part-time charwomen, 121 patronage elevator operators, and the employees who operate in the Senate post office. Why should employees in the Senate post office for the same payment into the retirement fund be entitled to a 40-percent increase in retirement benefits over the employees working downtown?

Mr. MCGEE. There is one good reason why he has greater entitlement, if any of us have, and that is that the employee downtown has the advantage of civil service status and thus has protections in his job that employees in the Capitol who are not under the same provisions do not enjoy. We have the rationale for a more favorable retirement system because of the uncertainty of employment on the Hill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Since when is the employee downtown guaranteed a job? If a reduction in force is put into effect, he loses his job and it is just as painful to him as to anyone who works on the Hill. Merely because we work in the Capitol is no reason why we should be declared indispensable. I am not too sure that the country would not be better off if some of us were to leave, but I believe—

Mr. MCGEE. The Senator from Delaware is saying that, not I.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, I say it; and I would also say that I could think of a few suggestions in that connection. To say that because we work in the Congress the Government should pay us better retirement benefits than other employees merely because our position is not permanent, is not valid. After all, we are not working at a permanent job. We know that at the end of our terms we will not come back unless we are reelected. Why should it be otherwise?

After all, none of us are indispensable. Mr. MCGEE. The issue is not one of repeal of the congressional retirement system. That bill is not under consideration at the present moment. The bill

to which we are addressing ourselves is simply extending consideration in equity to a small group which it seemed to the committee, unanimously, was entitled to the same consideration as other congressional employees. The issue is not whether a mistake was made in setting up the congressional retirement system.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has stated, we are expanding still further the overall cost. We already have a \$28 billion deficit in this fund. By 1977, as the retirement chief pointed out, the fund will be bankrupt and insolvent unless Congress raises the contributory rates of both the employees and the Government. I venture to say there will not be as much enthusiasm when it comes to raising the contributing rates to 30 percent of the payroll, as there is enthusiasm for a bill which expands the benefits.

Mr. MCGEE. We have been holding hearings on that side of the problem as well, and there may be something said on that later, but that still is not the subject of this particular legislation. The issue has been resolved as the principal one at issue, and was resolved by unanimous vote, and presumably that unanimous vote is not about to be reversed. Therefore, we assume it stands. However, the only issue is the question of inequity, the group that has to operate under the cloak of congressional jurisdiction with the same hazard to which the Senator has made reference, without enjoying the same privileges that go with the retirement system. Otherwise, the system operates the same. They are operating here in exactly the same way as their counterparts in the State Department downtown.

I disagree with the Senator on that specifically because employees downtown enjoy many protections under the civil service system. It is more difficult to remove them and they are not exposed to the vagaries of policy hazards and favoritism.

Mr. LAUSCHE. This bill is sought to be passed because the annuities they represent, provided under congressional coverage, are greater than the annuities provided under civil service.

Mr. MCGEE. That is the nub of my point.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand that the agencies on the periphery which will not be covered by the congressional program are the employees of the Library of Congress, the General Accounting Office, and the Government Printing Office?

Mr. MCGEE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator from Wyoming able to state the number of employees working in these three offices that will remain under civil service coverage and not under congressional coverage?

Mr. MCGEE. I cannot give the Senator the number of employees in those three offices. They were not considered at any time in this proposed legislation for congressional coverage. All that I can detail is the number of specific clas-

sifications of the 1,175 who, under the Architect's Office, will be covered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand that the General Accounting Office is an adjunct of Congress?

Mr. MCGEE. It is an agency of the legislative branch. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Its employees will continue under coverage in the civil service and not under coverage in the Congress?

Mr. MCGEE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How will we be able to deny employees of the General Accounting Office, the Government Printing Office, and the Library of Congress the right to come under the congressional coverage if we put the Architect's Office in?

Mr. MCGEE. For one reason, and that is that the employees of the General Accounting Office and the Government Printing Office, are appointed through civil service procedures. They acquire competitive status that is not enjoyed by the employees of the Architect's Office. The 1,175 employees are subject only to the same loose control as the rest of the employees of the Capitol.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand, then, that at this time the Senator from Wyoming feels that employees of the Architect's Office are justly entitled to be placed under this bill, while employees of the Library of Congress, the General Accounting Office, and the Government Printing Office should not be placed under it?

Mr. MCGEE. Yes; because they are subject to different conditions of employment. That is the reason for the selection of the Architect's Office group.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Wyoming keep this statement in mind, if and when bills come before the Congress to place any one of the three aforementioned agencies under congressional coverage?

Mr. MCGEE. I shall certainly keep that point in mind. I have heard nothing else about that. Many speculative matters are injected into the debate today. I am making this argument for the group which seems to be getting short changed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What I am saying may be speculative, but on the basis of past experience I believe, just as certain as that night follows day, that within the next several years each of these agencies will come before us saying, "You have served the Architect's Office. You must also serve us"; and we shall have no answer to give them.

Mr. MCGEE. The answer is that employees of the Architect's Office have no status under civil service, and are not subject to the control of the Civil Service Commission. They are subject only to the wishes and intentions of the legislative branch.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I hope what the Senator from Wyoming has said will be demonstrated to be true at some subsequent time, when I believe measures will come before the Senate to bring the entire group under the congressional coverage.

Mr. MCGEE. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. One further question. What is the cost per annum of the bill?

Mr. MCGEE. Three hundred and fifteen thousand dollars is the cost per year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I will vote against the measure because I believe it establishes the precedent for a subsequent appearance before Congress of other groups that will be asking for the same liberalized consideration.

The arguments which I made against the bill (S. 745) providing for adjustments in Foreign Service annuities, upon which the Senate voted a half hour ago, are applicable to the bill now before the Senate. On passage of the measure my vote will be in the negative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading the the bill.

The bill (H.R. 5377) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

TROUBLES PLAGUING THE COTTON INDUSTRY

Mr. MECHEM. Mr. President, I should like to speak to the Senate today about a situation which cries for attention. I refer to the troubles which plague our cotton industry.

New Mexico is a great agricultural State, and I consider myself fortunate in serving her on the Senate's Committee on Agriculture. Farming is one of New Mexico's mainstays—a bulwark of her economy. A couple of figures will show the important role of cotton in this connection—cash receipts for farm products in New Mexico in 1962 surpassed \$270 million. Better than \$55 million of that came from cotton.

That is more than 20 percent of New Mexico's total income from agriculture. I might note, in passing, that my home county—Dona Ana—is the State's leading cotton producer and ranks among the large cotton-growing areas in the United States.

While New Mexico produces both upland and long staple cotton, my remarks today will be confined primarily to conditions relating to upland cotton.

The current predicament which finds us with unmanageable quantities of surplus cotton, coupled with a domestic price higher than the world price, has been reviewed time and again. There is little need to go into that now, beyond a passing mention. Present conditions make it difficult for our textile manufacturers to compete in the foreign markets.

Many proposals are before the Congress. They deal with an extremely technical subject. By their very number and complexity, not to mention their

diversity, they can lead to confusion in the cotton industry.

We already are heavily involved in Government subsidies, both to growers and users. The Government uses public tax money to support domestic raw cotton prices, while at the same time providing exporters with a subsidy to make our cotton competitive in world markets.

I would like to indicate what seems to me a sound and workable approach to the problem. But first, let us review some recent legislative history.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will open hearings on cotton legislation tomorrow. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana, as chairman of the committee, is to be commended for setting aside the time for these urgent hearings. It is most important, not only to the cotton industry and the areas dependent upon it but also to the Nation at large, that we in the Congress try to analyze this situation thoroughly and come to some basic conclusions on the direction we want to go.

During the next few days, as testimony is brought before the Agriculture Committee, I intend to lend my utmost support to our distinguished committee chairman, to the distinguished ranking minority committee member and to other members of the committee in seeking this objective.

In any look at the American cotton dilemma, a few salient points stand out.

First, the enormous cost. I wonder how many taxpayers realize that more than \$1 billion of their money was spent on the cotton program alone in fiscal 1963. More than \$1 billion from a Federal budget of \$93 billion. This is no small problem touching a single industry; rather, every U.S. taxpayer feels the bite from his paycheck as our Government wrestles with the cotton problem.

Second, Congress 5 years ago enacted legislation which set the country well on the road to solving this entire matter—only to have Executive actions in recent years frustrate the apparent intent of the 1950 act.

As a result, instead of progress since 1961, we have seen our problems multiply through what many consider ill-advised actions. We are burrowing deeper and deeper beneath a mountain of cotton. What the cotton industry needs now is fresh air, before it finds itself smothered by its own product.

In 1958 Congress set up new procedures for setting the price support level. It also specified new ways to determine Commodity Credit Corporation resale prices and acreage allotments.

Four annual transitional steps were outlined in the act, so far as price supports were concerned. They called for a change to a discretionary system of determining supports, with a floor of 65 percent of parity. In addition, it was provided that in 1961, and thereafter, the Commodity Credit Corporation—CCC—resale price for unrestricted use must be at least 115 percent of the support level, plus reasonable carrying charges.

Under the old law, a formula system was used to determine price supports within the range of 75 to 90 percent of

parity, depending on supply, and the resale price was set at 105 percent.

The law enacted in 1958 gave cotton farmers a choice for 1959 and 1960 between two alternative programs. Under choice A, a farmer could plant within his assignment and enjoy a relatively high price support. Under choice B, he could plant as much as 40 percent more than his allotment and receive a lower price support. For 1959, the support level was 80 percent of parity for choice A, and 65 percent of parity for choice B; for 1960, the levels were 75 and 60 percent, respectively.

The law provided another transitional step which was to have become effective in 1961. This would have put us back once more on a single price support basis, set at not less than 70 percent of parity. It also would have put into effect the minimum CCC resale price of 115 percent of the support level plus carrying charges. Moreover, the 1958 act provided that, from 1961 on, cotton price supports should be related to the average grade and staple length of crop—not based on Middling—seven-eighths inch—as in the past.

The Agricultural Act of 1958 wisely enacted by Congress was designed to make the cotton industry stronger. It aimed at adjusting price supports to a more competitive basis over 4 transitional years. The intended outcome would have been to expand markets, increase acreage allotments, and increase per-family net farm income.

Now, what happened? After the 1958 legislation went into operation, the cotton picture brightened considerably—at first. In the first 2 years of the intended 4-year cross-over stage, the following things took place:

First. The position of U.S. cotton in competition with oversea products became stronger.

Second. Consumption of upland cotton by domestic mills increased from an average of 8.2 million bales in 1957 and 1958 to 8.5 million in 1959 and 1960.

Third. Exports soared in that same period from an average of 4.2 million to 6.9 million bales per year. Total use went up from an average of 12.5 million to 15.4 million bales per year; carryover was lowered to 7.2 million bales average in 1959 and 1960 from the 8.6 million of the preceding 2 years.

Fourth. Due to all these factors, the national cotton acreage allotment was increased to nearly 18.5 million acres in 1961—the highest in 7 years.

But all this progress toward happier days for the American cotton industry and the American people insofar as they are affected by it was suddenly disrupted by actions in the Department of Agriculture.

The Congress in 1958 clearly indicated its desire for gradual withdrawal from high price supports and strict controls. Support prices would gradually be reduced, along with other changes aimed at creating a healthy, vigorous cotton industry capable of standing on its own feet.

And so long as the intent of the Congress, as clearly expressed in the Agricultural Act of 1958, was followed, the

highest hopes of the sponsors were on the way to realization. Things changed in 1961.

Early in 1961 the Secretary of Agriculture increased the support level for upland cotton to 82 percent of parity. That action made the support rate 33.04 cents per pound, gross weight, basis Middling 1-inch cotton or 31.88 cents per pound based on average quality. It also increased the average spot market price Middling 1-inch from 30.96 to 33.67 cents. These things pushed the export subsidy upward from 6 cents a pound to 8½ cents. And even that substantial increase in export subsidy failed to maintain our world competitive position.

Far from raising the price support and export subsidy, the Secretary should have done precisely the opposite—lowered both of them.

It is of interest to note, at this point, that the Secretary of Agriculture would have been deprived of this discretionary authority if the Senate's version of the 1958 act survived in conference with the House.

The 1958 legislation set forth as the final transition step on cotton a change in the minimum support level—for the 1962 crop—to 65 percent of parity. The act authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to set supports for 1962 at anywhere between 65 and 90 percent. But the floor was lowered for each year.

Once more, in 1962, the Secretary made no effort to move out of the support business nor to lessen the burden on the taxpayers. He set the support level at approximately 82 percent of the January parity price for upland cotton. That meant a support for producers of at least the higher of (a) 32.47 cents per pound, gross weight, basis Middling 1-inch cotton, or (b) a national average of 31.88 cents per pound, gross weight.

In the fall of 1962, the Agriculture Department set a national marketing allotment of 14,367,000 bales and a national allotment of 16 million acres for the 1963 upland cotton crop. This was the minimum legal amount and constituted a reduction from 18,101,718 acres allocated in 1962. Then, to follow it all up, support prices were continued at the same high levels for the 1963 cotton crop, making 3 straight years in which the unwise deviations from clearly indicated congressional intent were persisted in.

Now, what do we find when we compare the years 1959 and 1960, when the cotton program enacted in 1958 was still receiving a fair trial, with the years 1961 and 1962 when it was not?

Exports fell from an average of 6.9 million bales yearly to 4.1 million. The carryover rose to about 11 million bales at the end of the 1962 marketing year on July 31, 1963. It had fallen to 7.1 million bales only 2 years earlier. Moreover, carryover now is expected to rise still further—to 13 million bales—by August 1, 1964. This will be the highest carryover since 1956, if it materializes.

How does this affect the taxpayer? One indication comes in the Department of Agriculture's report 5 weeks ago showing that investment by the Commodity

Credit Corporation in cotton—counting loans and inventories—is more than \$1 billion higher now than it was only 2 years ago.

Basic principles contained in the 1958 act are, it seems to me, sound. There is no doubt, certainly, that in the two years that it was allowed a chance to operate, we made great advances toward improvement of the supply-demand bind in cotton.

Some of the proposals being advanced now as solutions to the cotton problem would lead to chaos both in production and consumption.

It would be unthinkable for us to neglect, in connection with any of our farm programs, taking into account the effect they might have on consumers. The program I am advocating for cotton is pegged to the market system—the only accurate indicator of supply-and-demand conditions.

The market system operates to the advantage of efficient growers and all consumers by rewarding individual ingenuity and enterprise.

A Government payment program, on the other hand, could tend to increase costs to consumers by restricting low-cost production, encouraging high-cost production, and wasting resources.

Imposing limitations on the payments a farmer could receive, after prices had been artificially lowered by a payment program, would keep low-cost producers from expanding.

At the same time, high-cost producers would be encouraged to continue non-economic production so as to qualify for the greatest possible amount of Government payments.

In a market-directed economy, it is the consumers who decide—through their buying of millions of items all across the land—what should be produced and in what quantities. When the Government does the deciding on what should be received by producers, it is the Government that decides—in effect—what is to be produced. Some misgiving is inevitable, and resulting distortion of production patterns would mean higher costs for these things that consumers really want.

When the Agricultural Act of 1958 was passed with bipartisan support in Congress, I had the honor of being Governor of the great State of New Mexico. I recall well the confidence which passage of that legislation created not only among cotton producers in my state, but throughout the Nation's textile industry.

I propose we build on the permanent provisions of that act. I favor keeping all of the main features of that program. It has received only a half trial. It was put into practice only 2 years of a contemplated 4. And during those 2 years, it produced the results which the country had desired.

Why was it scuttled? Why should we try sweeping and far-reaching new remedies to the cotton situation now, as some propose?

One key feature of the act of 1958 as it passed the Senate was the provi-

sion relating the price support for upland cotton to 90 percent of the previous 3-year market price. Many of us were disappointed when that provision was deleted in conference. Certainly we can agree now, more than 5 years later, that this action is not unrelated to some of the difficulties which cotton is experiencing these days.

The main provisions of the cotton legislation I propose are as follows:

First. National allotment of upland cotton at not less than 16 million acres. The allotment should be based on estimated domestic consumption and exports, with certain specified adjustments authorized as in the 1958 act.

Second. Additional provision should be made for as much as another 310,000 acres as a national acreage reserve to be used as provided in the 1958 act.

Third. The cotton allotment should be increased—as provided in the 1958 act—as domestic cotton consumption and exports go up and carryover of cotton declines.

Fourth. Price supports on upland cotton should be set at 90 percent of the previous 3-year average market price.

Fifth. Price supports for upland cotton should not be less than 60 percent of parity in any year.

Sixth. Commodity Credit Corporation sales of stocks of upland cotton for unrestricted use should not be less than 115 percent of the support rate. This would give the market a chance to operate.

Seventh. Provision should be made for additional research, aimed at reducing upland cotton production costs.

Eighth. The cotton export sales program provided for in section 203 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 should be continued unchanged. Its main provision says: "Such quantities of cotton shall be sold as will reestablish and maintain the fair historical share of the world market for U.S. cotton" even though the State Department and the Labor Department think we should abandon all production of cotton.

Ninth. All other permanent provisions of the 1958 act and other acts relating to cotton should be continued unchanged.

I am prepared to join with my colleagues in introducing legislation designed to carry out these principal features.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK H. WASKEY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Frank H. Waskey died Saturday morning, January 25, in Oakville, Wash., of a heart attack.

Frank Waskey was Alaska's first Delegate to the Congress. He came to the 59th Congress and served from August 14, 1906, to March 3, 1907. He was not a candidate for reelection. Those with long memories in Alaska political history have said that Mr. Waskey undoubtedly could have had long tenure in the Congress had this been his desire. He was an enormously popular man, an able man. From the time of his retirement

until very recent years, Mr. Waskey and his wife lived at Dillingham in western Alaska. His later years were spent in the State of Washington and in nearby Maryland, where his daughter, Mrs. Carl Howe, lives.

Death came to Frank Waskey only a few months before he would have observed his 89th birthday. Born in Lake City, Minn., on April 20, 1875, he moved to Nome in 1898. A kind and gentle man, Frank Waskey was likewise one of strong convictions. He was only 31 years old when he came to the Congress as Alaska's first Delegate. This was 6 years before passage of the Alaska Organic Act which permitted the establishment of an Alaska Legislature and conferred other, although limited, home rule privileges. Even after he had left public life, Mr. Waskey maintained a lively interest in public affairs. He firmly believed in the proposition of statehood for Alaska, and envisioned it as the only correct political goal for the area which had existed so long under territorial status.

I counted Frank Waskey as a personal friend. On that basis I shall miss him, and deeply. I shall also miss his wise and good counsel. Alaska will miss him. He is gone now but there is a sure place in Alaska history for his achievements and his character. Surviving are Mrs. Waskey and their two sons and two daughters: Frank H., Jr., of Falls Church, Va., John, of Glendale, Calif., Mrs. Donald Goe of Walla Walla, Wash., and Mrs. Carl Howe, of Olney, Md. To them, Mrs. Bartlett and I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. GRUENING], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by him in tribute to Frank H. Waskey.

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

MY FRIEND FRANK WASKEY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR GRUENING

Alaska has good reason to be proud of the men who served the Territory as delegates to Congress in the years before admission to statehood. The last Alaska Delegate, as we know, was BOB BARTLETT, who has, with me, been a member of this body since Alaska became a State. The first Delegate was Frank H. Waskey, a man I am proud to say was my good friend. Frank Waskey died last Saturday at Oakville, Wash., at the age of 88.

It had not been an easy matter for Alaska to gain action in Congress permitting the Territory to send a Delegate to Washington. Finally we succeeded in the 59th Congress and President Theodore Roosevelt signed the act so providing on May 7, 1906. Our first Delegate, Frank H. Waskey, was elected in time to take the oath of office on December 3, 1906. He had been elected August 14 in what was reported by the Alaska newspapers at the time as a landslide.

The first candidates from Alaska did not file as Democrats or Republicans but were proposed at caucuses of the principal economic or occupational groups. Frank Waskey was the candidate of the miners of interior and western Alaska. While he was elected for the short term entitling him to a seat in the 59th Congress, he was not a candidate for the long term which would

begin with the 60th Congress. Thomas Cale of Fairbanks was elected to that term.

The first Delegate had sterling qualities which recommended him strongly for the position. Born in Lake City, Wabasha County, Minn., on April 20, 1875, and educated in the public schools of Minneapolis, Frank joined the gold rush to Alaska and started mining at Nome in February of 1898. February is not a notably hospitable month of the year in that part of Alaska and the comforts of life we now enjoy were lacking in the new mining camp. Only the strongest and ablest survived and stayed with the country. Frank Waskey was one of these. He became president of a mining company, director of a bank and director of a publishing company. He was a natural and popular candidate when Alaskans acquired the right to send their nonvoting representative to far distant Washington. In the words of the Sitka Alaskan, one of the newspapers published in Alaska in those days:

"Our choice for Delegate should be an Alaskan in every sense of the word. One of those oldtimers who came into the country to seek his fortune, or at least to make his living out of the resources of this great country. We have such men right here in our midst. Men of integrity, wisdom and sound business qualities, men of solid education and the highest reputation. Men who have built up homes for themselves and their families out of, to speak figuratively, a mere bundle of shingles. Men who have come to stay and have stayed even through reverses and uphill climbing, always having in view the welfare of the Territory as well as their own."

An enlightening commentary on the changes which have occurred in transportation in the past half century is found in the fact that Frank Waskey started toward Washington from Nome as soon as the results of the August 14 election were known. He arrived at Seattle October 13 and in Washington, D.C., October 30. He was not sworn in as Delegate until December 3 for the reason that the 1st session of the 59th Congress had adjourned prior to his election and the 2d session did not convene until December 3. It is an interesting commentary further on the change in the workload of Congress that that 2d session of the 59th Congress was able to finish its business and adjourn March 3, 1907.

Appointed a member of the House Committee on Territories, Delegate Waskey introduced three bills during that brief session. Only one of his bills became law. This was a measure to relieve the Tanana Mines Railroad in Alaska from taxation during the period of construction and for 5 years thereafter. The Tanana was a narrow gauge railway which operated briefly in the vicinity of Fairbanks. Delegate Waskey spoke out strongly for a larger measure of home rule for the Territory of Alaska and one of the bills he introduced was in furtherance of an objective long cherished both before and after that time by all Alaskans. This was the building of wagon roads in the Territory.

After retiring from his brief fling at public life Frank Waskey returned to Fairbanks where he prospected until 1915. He served as U.S. Commissioner at Fortuna Ledge, 1915-18, and during World War I was registration officer, food commissioner and chairman of the Council of National Defense at that Yukon River village. He added the pursuits of fur buying, rock collecting and dealing in curios to his career as a prospector.

After he left Alaska, Frank Waskey lived in Oakville, Wash., and Olney, Md. He remained active in mind and body, and it was my good fortune to have many helpful encounters with him during the period he

lived at Olney, and I was breaking into the business of representing Alaska in the Congress, a trail which Frank Waskey had blazed more than 50 years earlier. Although he lived in this area for about 2 years, Frank Waskey explained to me at the time he left to return to the Pacific Northwest that "Maryland is lovely and the city of Washington's only glaring fault is too much vehicular traffic. For some time, Mrs. Waskey and I have felt that we belong in the West and as close to our Alaska as circumstances will permit."

Frank Waskey will always be close to Alaska. He played an important part in the history of the 49th State, and, therefore, in the history of our Nation. To his widow and his four living children, I express on behalf of all Alaskans our warm regard and sad farewell to their husband and father.

THE CITIZENS STILL RULE AMERICA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, out in the Far West, George Todt of Los Angeles continues to give the readers of the Los Angeles Herald Examiner daily doses of sound Americanism which add up to his conviction that the voting citizens still rule America and that given all the facts we have enough people in this country, who cannot or will not be fooled, to compel Washington to listen to the wishes of the people.

George Todt has a wide and well-merited reputation for calling the shots as he sees them and for producing for his daily newspaper columns challenges to all Americans who still have enough faith in themselves and their system of government so that they are unwilling to surrender their personal freedoms by transferring to the Federal Government more and more of their money and their rights of self-determination in the hope that a paternalistic central government will eventually provide them with everything that they desire from the cradle to the grave. His clarion call to proud Americans to "speak up or shut up" when they are confronted with public policies and programs which they resent is one which needs to be read and heard by more and more Americans.

I am sure speakers, editorial writers, and others who are called upon to discuss public trends with their associates will find these "package presentations" by George Todt useful themes to develop and to amplify.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks some selected columns from the recent writings of George Todt. They speak for themselves. In them, I am sure many citizens will find much food for thought.

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

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, Jan. 5, 1964]

THE LIBERAL PRESS
(By George Todt)

The largest television audience since the heinous ambush of former President John F. Kennedy by a vile Communist assassin in late

November will likely be on tap today to watch Senator BARRY GOLDWATER on Meet the Press.

The dynamic Arizona solon will bring some much-needed color to the political lists and it now promises to be an interesting campaign, both in the primary and general election. I believe GOLDWATER will win both contests.

Certainly, it will be no easy matter—as many of the trump cards in the loaded liberal power group appear stacked heavily against him.

A great number of persons pay continuous lip service to our vaunted free enterprise system, but actually play it down the line for opposing Fabian socialism in practice.

The surprising truth is that our people know only too little what many-sided Marxism is all about. They are against it in general principle—but seldom know basic, fundamental reasons why this is so. Is the subject taboo?

For some unfathomed reason, large liberal segments of the mass communications media in the United States have often wrapped Socialist-type legislation and ideology in red-white-and-blue bunting.

Then they have sandbagged the public later into thinking it was the finest kind of Americanism.

In GOLDWATER, the public is going to see some clear lines of demarcation between our traditional free enterprise and British-type Fabianism—and he will make the relative positions indelibly clear without fuzzy thinking or doubletalk.

Of course, it will be necessary for the Arizona contender to get his views to the people via mass communications. There are presently too few voices in the media sympathetic either to GOLDWATER or free enterprise. It is unfair.

Before long, the public itself will demand a remedying of the present imbalance where so-called liberal voices outnumber conservative in the opinion-forming areas by estimates up to a ratio of 100 to 1.

If the newspaper syndicates and broadcasting networks do not move voluntarily to give GOLDWATER adequate representation to make a fair nationwide presentation—they will lay the groundwork for future trouble for themselves.

The mass communications industry can stand an infusion of new blood at long last—and there are plenty of bright, intelligent young GOLDWATER-minded people ready, willing, and able to perform if not discriminated against.

In the forthcoming battle between liberal and conservative positions, GOLDWATER is entitled to an equal break in the court of public opinion. And the public will be watching jealously—and zealously—to see that he gets it.

At this point someone is bound to ask the ancient question, "But don't we have a Republican press?" The answer is that indeed we do not.

For example: In 1,750 daily newspapers, across the Nation 80 percent of the owners and publishers are Republican, mainly conservative. But 90 percent of the working press—where it counts—is Democrat, usually liberal.

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, Jan. 16, 1964]

BARRY, A VOTEGETTER
(By George Todt)

Not long ago I read in a Los Angeles metropolitan newspaper where a political writer—once close to the Eisenhower and Nixon campaign apparatus—stated rather pointedly that Ike is looking for a GOP candidate who can appeal to Democratic voters as well as those who label themselves Republican.

CHALLENGE TO IKE

If this be true, then it is wondrous to contemplate whether the former President has taken a good, second look at a dynamic young Senator who hails from a neighboring State just east of the Colorado River.

His name is BARRY GOLDWATER, general, and in a balliwick which only has about 18 or 19 percent registered Republicans—he received 57 percent of the total Arizona vote in the 1958 election.

This meant, of course, that he must have had about two Democrats voting for him for every Republican who even lived in the Copper State.

Can any of the suggested candidates beat that, general? Anybody on the GOP side, I mean? And don't forget BARRY had Walter Reuther running against him, too.

In fact, Reuther threw the entire weight of his ADA (Americans for Democratic Action and COPE) political machine into the fray and vowed to purge BARRY GOLDWATER from political life after 1958. But nevertheless—he's still around.

Speaking in this vein, Senator CARL T. CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska, had this to say when opening a new Goldwater headquarters in Pittsburgh, Pa., recently:

"Let us be practical," CURTIS told his receptive audience. "If we are to win, we must get votes from Democrats. In spite of the soothsaying propagandists—some of whom are in sheep's clothing—we cannot take any votes away from the New Frontier wing of the Democratic Party.

ALL LOCKED UP

"The bosses, along with the ADA and the other leftwing groups, have that segment of their party locked up tight. But if we are true to our basic GOP principles, we can get the votes of constitutional and conservative-minded Democrats.

"I define a conservative as one who wants to conserve the forces of progress. The vast majority of Republicans, and a large segment of the Democrats, are in this category. A campaign that will unite these groups will make victory possible. Senator GOLDWATER will conduct such a campaign."

The astute Nebraska Senator made it plain that the GOP must offer the electorate a clear choice—none of tweedle dee or tweedle dum. He indicated in forceful terms that there must be an alternative to the New Frontier program of creeping socialism, debts, and centralization of authority in Washington over every phase of human activity. Received an ovation.

MR. AMERICA

It was CURTIS' contention that GOLDWATER has caught the imagination and gained the loyalty of millions of young voters in the United States today. He called him "America's most popular individual" on the campus.

"In the election this fall," the Senator told his Pittsburgh audience, "we face an opposition that hasn't had a new idea since the thirties. The enlargement of government, centralization of power, pump priming, big spending, disregard for the letter and spirit of the Constitution, huge debts and deficits failed to solve our problems then—and will fail now."

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, January 13, 1964]

NEW OLD PROGRAMS
(By George Todt)

In his first trip to the plate, young Barry Goldwater, Jr., 25, scored a forensic home run with the Los Angeles County Young Republicans at the Ambassador Hotel recently. Sound fundamental thinking, same as papa.

The youngster carried himself like an old pro and his dad would have been proud of his kid if he had seen him in action. Received a tremendous ovation from the YR's—and deserved it, too.

An analysis of his address reveals some penetrating insights into the body politic of the American Republic today. Here are a few choice samples:

NEW BRIBES

"Every day brings us news of some new program created to bribe the voting public with their own money. The new programs are never new, they are merely new names for antiquated socialistic ideas.

"There are two great forces, or philosophies, at work in the body politic today. There are personalities and policies which seek to increase the area of individual liberty—and there are those seeking to decrease the sphere of personal freedom.

"The venomous poisons of Karl Marx have unleashed upon mankind the largest hate group in history—international communism. This is the hate-filled doctrine which seeks to turn class against class, country against country and man against God.

"A political party is a failure unless it sticks to principle rather than expediency. We are more certain of victory next November if we put forward our best possible candidate rather than our most expedient compromise.

"Offered an opportunity to choose between basic philosophies in November, the American voter will select, not a personality, but rather a set of straightforward common-sense principles.

NO COMPROMISE

"After 25 years of firsthand observation, I can say with absolute certainty that my father will never sacrifice the principles of individual freedom and justice simply to buy votes.

"One of the most vital aspects of the rising tide for conservatism in our country today is its youthful image. It is this youthful initiative, drive, desire, and tenacity which will turn the tide of socialism. * * * After all, as young men and women, we are the ones who will suffer most from socialism. It is we who have the most to lose from reactionary welfare state plans.

ASSAULT ON LIBERTY

"As we look around the world today, we see a concentrated assault upon individual liberty and personal freedom of action taking place almost everywhere. The haunting specter of international communism casts its shadow over the lives of untold millions.

"At the same time, we find a diminishing apprehension of the dangers of centralized government in our own country * * * we hear the constant complaint that socialism is inevitable.

"The simple truth," Goldwater explained to his attentive audience, "is that socialism has always failed throughout all history. Every socialistic experiment has proven this fact: the only thing inevitable about socialism is that inevitably it does not work."

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, Jan. 6, 1964]

FOREIGN AID GIMMICK
(By George Todt)

It may come as a startling surprise to those who imagined our foreign aid bureaucrats were down to their last pinchful of green stuff—what with Congress handing them only \$3 billion this time instead of the \$4.5 billion originally requested—but guess what?

The hard-pressed bureaucrats have suddenly "discovered" \$670 million in the till they must have forgotten about during negotiations with our boys on Capitol Hill. Praise and glory be, they have just "found" it.

WHY NOT BEFORE?

According to an Associated Press dispatch released shortly after passage of the controversial foreign aid bill recently:

"Officials of the Agency for International Development have found \$669,876,000 still available from previously voted funds that were never committed or that have been recovered from unfulfilled projects."

We may wonder why this choice tidbit of information was not made available to the House and Senate during deliberations on the AID bill.

Perhaps it would not hurt to write our elected representatives and ask them why such data has a habit of cropping up after—never before—the voting has taken place. Why not ask some penetrating questions next time around?

As a matter of fact, I was told once upon a time not long ago by a highly respected Congressman that the foreign aid pipeline has enough billions in it to keep the program going a couple of years even without annual appropriations.

CUP RUNS OVER

Before Congress invests another dollar into questionable areas of little or no return to the American people, we ought to have an effective accounting of AID funds—without hocus pocus or doubletalk. Just the facts, Ma'am.

And if the dear old Department of State is too snooty to furnish our elected representatives with the proper arithmetic—then the latter should return the favor by withholding all funds until the data is available.

Foreign aid is setting a less-than-happy pace with the U.S. taxpayer since he received the bad news in the closing days of the last congressional huddle that he must now underwrite credit for Soviet wheat.

The administration may find out this was a costly mistake when Joe Doakes realizes he is now in a position to cough up funds to pay for Ivan's free wheat from America—if the Red supplicant decides later to renege.

WHAT HAPPENED?

This is not the way the wheat deal was outlined originally to the public. It was then supposed to be a cash-on-the-line gold transaction. "Whad happened, Dad?"

A top leader in the close fight in the Senate to prevent questionable extension of credit to the U.S.S.R. through use of the Export-Import Bank was sturdy Senator KARL MUNDT of South Dakota. He rates a salute.

Let's realize that financing our enemies will not win the cold war.

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, Dec. 31, 1963]

LET'S DO IT NOW
(By George Todt)

After today another year will have gone its way and whereby have we gained from it? Are we better off than before? What is different for us now? In what kind of coin in the realm of time shall we be rewarded?

For almost 50 years I have sat before the swinging doors of a small listening post on the outskirts of the sands of time—and the time was always now. Yesterday had invariably gone, tomorrow simply never came.

All I have ever known was now and my basic philosophy is built primarily upon the ever-present 24 hours. Take care of today

and the tomorrows will take care of themselves. Don't live in the past or future—but the here and now.

BE PRACTICAL

It would be only too easy for the occasional weakminded reader to assume mistakenly I mean "Eat, drink, and be merry—for tomorrow you die."

Not so, as the overwhelming majority already know. The real idea is to be practical and keep our eyes observing the ground to avoid pitfalls—but constantly raising our sight to the stars for inspiration. Neat trick.

Today, the Republic of the United States is the fountainhead of power for the so-called "Western civilization." Is its flame a dying one, or will it maintain its fire for generations yet to come? Who knows?

But one thing must seem certain: if our way of life is to be protected and preserved, it is up to the present generation of Americans to accomplish the trying task in the days ahead of us. But are we equal to our destiny?

It would be most pleasant simply to say, "By all means, we can accomplish this work or any other—if we but set our minds to do so."

WE DID NOTHING

This is what everybody seems to expect. But I am not so sure we have it now. A few weeks ago the President of the United States was assassinated—in the arms of his beautiful wife—by a Red traitor.

I can understand the reasons why we may have restrained ourselves from going to a full-scale nuclear war with the Communist nations that spawned this evil travesty against human decency. But I fail to absorb our lack of indignation.

There are times when a people has every right to be angry. This was such a time in our history. Instead, we bleated like sheep or moonstruck cattle lowing in the field. And we apologized for our collective "guilt."

It was the most idiotic performance in American history and a sheer disgrace to the memory of a fine young American President who did not deserve to die at the hands of a murderous Communist assassin. We should have exploded.

I opposed John F. Kennedy on many issues of the day when he was alive, but he was my President and yours—and a man whom all of us would have done anything in our power to protect him from physical harm.

CHIPS ARE DOWN

So much so that I am certain many of his loyal opposition themselves, in addition to his closest party workers, would have volunteered gladly to take the Red bullet if it might have spared our Chief Executive.

There is no questioning the loyalty of the American people to their President—regardless of politics—when the chips are down.

Why did we permit neurotics to sell us their "self-incrimination" line?

PROPOSED TAX CREDIT FOR EDUCATION EXPENSES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have just received the following telegram from Mr. R. E. Lieuallen, the chancellor of the Oregon State System of Higher Education:

My consideration of the income tax credit proposal which will be before Congress leads me to express my views to you. I believe the proposal to be definitely not in the best interests of public higher education or of families and students in lower income categories. In serving all quali-

fied students, public higher education in America is facing unprecedented challenges, in which extensive help is needed to maintain education which is of comparable quality. Your concern in this matter is greatly appreciated.

This is not the only message along these lines that I received from school officials in the State of Oregon. But it expresses an opinion about the proposed tax credit for education expenses that I hold very strongly myself. Chancellor Lieuallen is quite right in pointing out that the amendment will make much more difficult the task of public education. Beyond that, I very much doubt that it will have a very beneficial effect upon parents, because it will result in an increase in tuitions that could wipe out much of the benefit to the taxpayer.

In short, this tax credit proposal is going to be of no value in helping to educate American youth. It is simply one more proposal for a tax break to one class of taxpayers. I am opposed to riddling the Internal Revenue Code any more than it is already riddled with special privileges. I shall oppose this amendment in every way I can if it is offered on the Senate floor.

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN PRESERVING FREEDOM

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, Willard M. Wilson, native Nebraskan from Phelps County and onetime member of the Nebraska State Senate, is a longtime, perceptive observer of the Nation's political and economic scene. He has written and spoken on subjects in this field from time to time in many forums.

He was a winner of a Freedoms Foundation Award in 1960 for one of his excellent, well-thought-out speeches.

Recently he addressed the Scottish Rite reunion at its annual banquet in Omaha upon the invitation of its program chairman, Mr. Einar Viren, a longtime friend of Mr. Wilson, on the title, "One—Multiplied by Thousands." In this address, Mr. Wilson, who is now secretary of the American Petroleum Institute, made analyses of governmental, as well as business and economic matters, in a way clearly in keeping with his wide experience in these fields.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

ONE—MULTIPLIED BY THOUSANDS

(Public address by Willard M. Wilson, secretary, American Petroleum Institute, New York, N.Y.)

Government is always in the news. Today's front page stories relate to the coming elections, while a year ago the headlines concerned the Communist Khrushchev, who was visiting in this country.

One story of a year ago which received worldwide coverage was when Khrushchev was challenged on his statement that the Communists would "bury us." When initially asked about it, he deftly qualified his remarks to make the statement palatable for local consumption. You will remember he said that he had been speaking figuratively—

they would outproduce us on the economic front.

Some people liked that answer. It was so consoling. They wouldn't have to worry, now that they knew what he intended.

But there was a sequel to that statement, which received practically no publicity. In June of this year Communist Khrushchev was visiting Rumania. At a public meeting there he referred to the fact that he had been questioned on this statement in the United States, and to the Rumanians he said the answer was: "Capitalism will dig its own grave."

What a difference there is in those two answers. The latest statement is undoubtedly the correct one. They intend, by their own words, to let us dig our own grave. How? It's the simplest thing in the world. Every freedom we lose is another spade of earth. When you dig a grave you only have to turn over one spadeful at a time.

Don't you think it's time to ask ourselves how many spadeful of earth we have turned over, or permitted to be turned over, in just the last generation? Shouldn't we also ask ourselves how many times we have silently stood at the graveside of one of our freedoms and consoled our grief by telling ourselves that, after all, there isn't much that one person can do about it.

You know as well as I do that there are endless examples of accomplishments of what one person can do. There isn't much point in listing them—I'm sure some of you would say "Let's be practical—one person can't do it."

We seem to have forgotten the simple lesson learned from parents when as children we complained that we could not do something—it was too hard. And a parent would say, "You can try, can't you?"

As adults we tell ourselves that there really isn't much one person can do about government—and yet, while we tell ourselves it cannot be done, there is an echo of the words of a wise father saying, "You can try, can't you?"

What can one person do? We do have the power of one—one multiplied by thousands who are willing to take a stand. That is what I want to talk about today.

We accept as a common truth that a child must learn to stand before it can walk, and it must walk before it learns to run. Can we not also accept the same common truth that each of us has a place in service toward government at some level—that we each must learn to participate—that we must have enough knowledge of government and of candidates to be able to wisely exercise our rights as citizens.

Take a lesson from history. Less than two centuries ago the issue was liberty with an emphasis on the rights of man, and then the torch of liberty was handed from one man to another and from father to son. It was taught by example.

Today the issue seems to be a race for space with an emphasis on science. And in the teaching of science we find it necessary to delegate to experts that which we are unable to teach. No one disputes the value of science nor the fact that experts must teach it. But what about the science of government—that spark of liberty which was handed from father to son. Can we justify delegating to others the teaching of something which is learned primarily by example?

Let us never forget that the real difference between Communist Russia and the United States is not in the field of pure science—not in the race for space—but rather in a philosophy of government. The only really lasting difference between these two countries is the issue of freedom—and if

we lose our liberty it won't make much difference whether we win the race for space. If we win that scientific race, and destroy our philosophy of government, they will have won. We will have dug our own grave.

Usually when a speaker approaches the subject of government, he tells you what needs to be done and why it needs to be done. On rare occasions, he tells you how. I would like to discuss with you today—not theory—but rather the practical aspects of what you can do and how you can do it.

First of all, you have to determine what role you expect government to play. If we are going to ask government to do those things for industry which industry can do for itself; then recognize that someone is going to have to pay for it—and it is not someone else. If we expect government at each level to receive donations or services from the next higher level of government, then face up to it—it is going to cost.

There is no such thing as a free lunch.

Do not blame high taxes and excessive regulation on government unless you are willing to recognize the truth of Theodore Roosevelt's statement when he said, "The government is us, we are the government, you and I." Add to this the words of Woodrow Wilson, who said, "Freedom exists only where the people take care of government."

Now then, whose fault is it if government does things we do not like. That is something we would rather not talk about, is it not? We would rather talk about our rights—and our freedoms.

There is nothing wrong about talking of freedom, but let us remember—freedom does not consist of the "gimmies." Each freedom—each right—has a corollary duty—and to discuss one without the other is sheer folly.

Freedom is not a one-way road. It carries with it responsibility. Freedom is not a license to do what we want, when we want, without regard to our fellow man. Rights cannot be claimed unless duties are, at the same time, recognized.

Now I suppose you think that the next thing I am going to tell you is that you should talk to your legislator about your problems. How right you are. One thing sure—legislators cannot obtain their facts by looking into a crystal ball.

A legislator will do what he thinks the people want him to do. If he does not, they will elect someone who will. To do his job, he needs facts and he needs experts to furnish them. Sounds like theory? All right, then take just one everyday example.

Some of you in this room are producers. You know that 65 percent of all this country's total producing units are stripper or marginal wells, averaging only $3\frac{1}{2}$ barrels of oil a day, yet collectively they account for 21 percent of all domestic production. And you know that the profit on many of these wells is figured in pennies—not dollars. The slightest change in any number of laws or regulations can make a large number of these wells unprofitable and you will have to close them down.

And yet you might say, "Everybody knows that." It may come as a surprise, but very few people know that. In fact, there are too many in the oil industry who do not know it. Then how can you expect a legislator, or any person in Government, to have this information at hand in deciding a related issue, unless you tell him.

Some of you fellows here are service station operators or jobbers. You have problems.

Yet you may believe that since most people see your service stations and trucks almost every day, they must know something about your business. Don't believe it. You are the expert in your business, and it requires a lot more expert knowledge than

most people recognize. Of course you have problems, and we could spend all afternoon going over them, but it would only serve to illustrate the endless examples which can be given to prove that regardless of trade or industry, each person is an expert in his particular business or occupation and, as an expert, each person has information which others must have if they are to evaluate any proposal. And, more important, each person has a duty to communicate.

And this is as good a time as any to establish the place of a trade association in its work with government. Your membership in a trade association or a chamber of commerce does not relieve you of your individual responsibility. These organizations can, and do, keep you informed. They can, and do, assemble facts. But they are not your substitute. When they update Priscilla's advice to John Alden and say, "Speak for yourself, John"—you'd better do it. You're being called on as an expert.

But some people say, "I have never dealt with politicians or politics. How do I go about it?" Basically it's just commonsense. And here is how.

First of all, don't apologize. Your only reason for communicating is to give information so there may be a better understanding. You are not asking for a favor but rather, you are helping people in government do a better job.

Never under any circumstances lie to your legislator. What he needs is people he can trust all of the time. He has all the fair-weather friends he can handle.

Give him a pat on the back. You'll accomplish more than you will with a kick in the pants. The line of kickers is much too long already. Write him a letter and thank him for a job well done. There won't be many letters in that file in his office. By doing this you may encourage a good legislator to endure the beating it takes to run for office the next time—and you may help improve the legislator who isn't quite measuring up to the job in the way he should.

When your legislator is wrong, and sometimes he will be—first ask yourself this one question: "Did I help him reach a wrong decision by remaining silent—or by withholding information he needed? If I did, whose fault is that?"

Don't threaten him. He has been threatened by experts, and if he is one of those rare birds who will yield to a threat, there are others who will see him later and out-threaten you. Besides, he won't last long if he yields to threats.

Don't tell him you are a citizen or a taxpayer. He knows the woods are full of them. If that's your only qualification for writing, then you have no more information than any other constituent.

Do not under any circumstances let others tell you what to say. If you do not know enough about a bill to give your own opinion in your own words, then find out what it's all about before you go around handing out free advice based on ignorance. The informed constituent is a gem. And there are too few gems writing letters to legislators.

Don't turn your back on a good public servant because he does one thing you don't like. If you will be honest, you will have to admit that, with the benefit of 20/10 vision on hindsight, you haven't done so well sometimes on decisions you have made.

Learn to communicate. One good factual letter is worth its weight in gold. I once saw a Governor's veto overridden by one letter written to a legislator. Written by a young man barely old enough to vote—a young fellow who had none of this so-called political influence. The letter was written in pencil on an ordinary tablet of paper. But it was eloquently simple—it was factual, and

it showed how a law would apply to ordinary people. A Governor's veto was overridden. And I know—I was the legislator who received that letter.

There are other examples, and other "do's" and "don'ts"—and these and others apply not only to legislators, but to almost every elective and appointive office. It's principally commonsense.

Now, then, plans on what you can do after election may be fine—but we have the cart before the horse—these people are candidates before they are elected. Isn't that the place to start? It is—and it's the place where we really fall down.

Here again, however, commonsense applies. When a candidate is running for election, listen to his speeches. Read his material and that of his opponent. If you can talk to him, do so. And then make up your own mind on the man you believe will do the best job of making government a servant, rather than a master.

If you like a candidate, go to work for him with no expectation of personal benefit in any form. Work for him because you believe in those things for which he stands. Recognize that he probably has not seen his family for weeks, other than for a few minutes here and there. He's tired of traveling. He has talked until he is hoarse. He is spending money he should be saving for his children's education or his own retirement. The least you can do is to help a sincere man who really wants to serve.

On this platform today you are having the candidates from the two major parties, seeking election as Governor of the State of Illinois. One of these men will be your next Governor. Each of these men has worked and is working hard. Each of these men is convinced that he can do the better job in office, and each of these men wants you to know why. All they ask is that you listen and then vote as your conscience dictates. Is that asking too much?

As election day draws near, you will probably read in the papers that the political forecasters in Illinois have made estimates of what the total vote will be; and the forecasts will undoubtedly be conditioned on—of all things—the weather.

These candidates have traveled day and night for long distances in all kinds of weather. Isn't it ironic that the final result could depend on the weather? Not only in Illinois, but in every State.

Before we neglect to vote, shouldn't we put it in perspective by going back again in history and, in our mind's eye, visiting Washington at Valley Forge. To hear the wind and feel the bitter freezing of snow. To see for ourselves the inadequate food and clothing. How, then, with that stark picture in mind, could anyone say, "I'll vote on election day; that is, if the weather is not too bad."

Shades of Khrushchev. How many spades of earth have we turned over by neglecting to vote?

Elections are one thing—what about political and legislative issues? What do you do when someone asks you to take a position on a controversial issue?

If you're looking for an excuse you can find it. You might say, "I have a business. I just can't afford to be mixed up in it."

Spades of earth.

If you believe you can't afford to get mixed up in politics, then tell me—tell me how many unmarked graves are there in Germany—unmarked graves of those who at one time, when they had the power, could not afford to get mixed up in it?

And how many generations of hard-working people behind the Iron Curtain will continue to be blank numbers in a calculating machine of communism because their forefathers, when they had the power to take

a stand, said they didn't want to be mixed up in it.

Will the day come when, through neglect of our freedom to take a position, we will no longer have the power to do so? One thing is sure, the quickest way to lose our freedoms down the rathole of communism, is to do nothing.

When we fail to vote we're destroying more than one election. We are destroying our form of government which gives us the freedom to vote.

By remaining silent when we should speak, we are not only depriving ourselves of one of our basic freedoms; we are taking the first sure step toward the destruction of a form of government which assures us of the freedom of speech.

Failure to preserve our rights—through failure to use—is one of the most damning indictments which could be leveled against us. And we can take little consolation in pointing a finger at the other fellow, because he may be more guilty than we.

Nor can we afford to mince words about those in our own industry, or other industries, who do not have the courage to take a stand on fundamental issues. And I do not mean just those issues of primary interest to an industry—I mean issues essential to the preservation of our freedoms.

There is a place for diplomacy, but this is not the time or the place. This is a place to talk frankly and bluntly, so there can be no misunderstanding.

And I want to say just as bluntly as I can—that if the description fits any of you in this room today, then I am talking to you when I say:—If you intend to sit idly by, twiddling your thumbs and consoling yourself that no one man can change the picture, then I accuse you of active participation in the destruction of our freedoms because of selfishness, expediency, and complacency.

And I accuse you now.

Some of you feel that a speaker who talks this way is only asking to be unpopular. I'll let you in on a little secret. I am not running for a popularity contest.

If you are so concerned about being popular—if you are really too busy to take an interest in government—if you honestly feel that getting mixed up in politics is beneath your dignity, or may be bad for business—if that represents your opinion, then at least take the time to teach your children one thing. Teach them how to count in rubles—they'll need it with the kind of an inheritance you are leaving them.

Speaking of children, I am sure all of us in this room have known since childhood the story of the American Revolution, and how a comparatively few men, untrained, ill-equipped—believing in a cause—took a determined stand against what was then the most powerful nation in the world. And yet with that knowledge, and with that heritage, did you ever stop to think of how soft we have become when we shrug our shoulders and say, "You can't fight city hall."

Spades of earth! What would a soldier of the American Revolution say if he could talk to us?

If he could be on this platform today, would we hear something as the following—which might be titled:

"AN ECHO FROM VALLEY FORGE

"I gave you a birthright of freedom only in trust—and you are squandering it on a luxury labeled 'expediency.'

"I stood in snow without shoes to give you a right to vote—and you stay home on election day whenever the weather is bad.

"I left my family destitute so that you could have freedom of speech—and you remain silent because it might be bad for business.

"I orphaned my children to give you a government to serve you—and through neglect you permit it to become the master of your children."

If a soldier of the Revolutionary War could speak to us from this platform today, could he honestly say these things? Could other soldiers of later wars say them too?

We know they could.

And what then can we say, here today. How can we reply?

There is only one plea—that of guilty.

But we, here today—we can take this vow: This is the time—and this is the place—and we are the people who will take responsibility.

We know it is up to us. Each of us.

We each have the power of one, multiplied by thousands who are willing to take a stand.

And we take the stand that government is our business.

SURVEYS OF ELECTION TRENDS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it is unusual to call attention to the surveys which are undertaken with increasing repetitiveness as we move along in a national election year. The Detroit News poll of election trends has been one of those rare polls which most political observers of both political parties in Michigan have found to be useful, prepared without bias, and quite accurate over many years.

While I do not intend to make a practice of calling all the polls this year to the attention of my colleagues, this first Detroit News poll in the year 1964 has a message which I believe is especially important—important not in the sense of what the outcome of the November election may be, but important in showing a remarkable degree of support for the quality of presidential leadership President Johnson is giving our Nation.

From every segment of Michigan's diverse population, President Johnson is receiving a sizable vote of confidence in his program and his already proven ability to move into the world's most trying and challenging job.

It is for this reason I found special interest in the results, and would suggest my colleagues on both sides of the aisle consider these results as reflecting the support America is giving our President and the goals he urges us to achieve.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Detroit News poll printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Detroit News, Jan. 19, 1964]

JOHNSON LEADS NEWS POLL IN STATE

(By Richard W. Oudersluys)

President Johnson, a southerner, would sweep Michigan against any Republican challenger so far seriously discussed if the presidential election were held today.

The size of 'his lead' over any of the six Republicans tested against him in the first Detroit News Poll of 1964 is reminiscent of Franklin D. Roosevelt's landslide victory in the early days of the New Deal.

Governor Romney and Richard M. Nixon, the Republican nominee in 1960, topped the list of Republican entries and split honors on the basis of their showing against Johnson.

The figures: Johnson, 62.5 percent of the total vote to 20.1 percent for Romney; Johnson 65 percent, Nixon 20.7 percent.

The disparity between the sum of the percentages for contending entries and 100 percent is the present undecided vote.

The News poll also surprisingly disclosed that the two announced Republican presidential contenders in whom the party is showing so much interest run at the tag end of Michigan voter preferences as of now.

New York's Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller trailed the list of six entries in his showing against Mr. Johnson. Arizona's Senator BARRY GOLDWATER ran a poor fourth.

The figures: Johnson 69.5 percent, against 14.8 percent for Goldwater; Johnson 71.7 percent, Rockefeller 11.1 percent.

Henry Cabot Lodge, the Republican Party's 1960 vice presidential candidate in 1960, ran third, and Gov. William Scranton, of Pennsylvania, fifth.

The figures: Johnson 64.7 percent, Lodge 18.8 percent; Johnson 69.9 percent, Scranton 11.3 percent.

Political analysts have long speculated on how Mr. Johnson would run in a State where organized labor speaks strongly in his party. If Michigan can be assumed to be somewhat typical of such States, he presently would have no difficulty.

Organized labor's delegates at the 1960 convention opposed the nomination of Mr. Johnson, both for President and Vice President, until almost the end. Against his strongest opponent for the vote of semi-skilled and unskilled workers, Romney, Mr. Johnson would take 69.8 percent of the vote.

Farmers in the rural Michigan districts turned in substantial margins for Mr. Johnson. No doubt, this can be accounted for by the Texan's conservative reputation.

HOLDS NEGRO VOTE

Another revelation of the poll is Mr. Johnson's ability to hold the normal Democratic strength among Negro voters. His majorities against the six Republicans ranged from 75.5 percent, against Scranton and Goldwater, to 71.8 percent, against Nixon.

Surprisingly, the long Rockefeller family devotion to aiding Negroes is not reflected in Rockefeller's vote. He received 5.5 percent to Mr. Johnson's 73.6 percent.

Mr. Johnson's popularity shows across all voter classifications. In every category of the vote analyses, he shows wide majorities against each of his possible challengers.

GOLDWATER, who is said to have strong support among the young voters, does not run as well in the 21-29 age group as does Nixon. Nixon pitted against Mr. Johnson, took 16.6 percent of that category to 9.9 for Goldwater.

THEORY CHALLENGED

The poll challenges the theory that Goldwater would be strongly supported by businessmen. Goldwater would take 17.4 percent of that group to 70.4 for Mr. Johnson.

What effect formal announcement of their candidacies would have on the standings of Romney, Nixon, Lodge, and Scranton could only be determined by a poll after the announcements were made.

The political scene can change as the conventions and the November elections near. Mr. Johnson still has to establish a record. He still is riding the crest of the late President Kennedy's popularity. The Republican campaign has yet to develop.

Organization of local and State tickets by political parties also will tend to shift or solidify interest in top candidates for both parties.

Future Detroit News polls will report these and other trends and changes throughout this election year.

MICHIGAN POLL

How poll rates Johnson and 6 in GOP

[From the Detroit News, Jan. 19, 1964]

	Lyndon B. Johnson	Henry Cabot Lodge	Lyndon B. Johnson	Richard Nixon	Lyndon B. Johnson	Nelson Rockefeller	Lyndon B. Johnson	William Scranton	Lyndon B. Johnson	Barry Goldwater	Lyndon B. Johnson	George Romney
Total.....	64.7	18.8	65.0	20.7	71.7	11.1	69.9	11.3	69.5	14.8	62.5	20.1
Wayne.....	73.6	13.1	72.1	14.8	77.5	8.4	76.8	9.9	75.8	11.4	67.6	15.8
Outstate.....	60.2	21.6	61.4	23.8	68.8	12.4	66.4	12.1	66.3	16.5	59.9	22.2
Rural.....	51.5	28.1	51.9	32.2	63.7	15.2	58.5	14.1	56.3	22.2	51.5	29.2
Urban.....	68.6	16.0	68.8	17.4	74.1	9.9	73.2	10.5	73.3	12.6	65.7	17.4
Male.....	64.9	18.7	64.4	22.5	70.9	12.6	68.3	14.5	68.0	17.1	61.1	22.2
Female.....	64.6	18.8	65.6	19.0	72.6	9.5	71.6	8.1	71.1	12.3	64.0	17.9
Married.....	64.7	18.2	65.3	20.7	72.0	10.7	69.8	11.4	69.5	14.3	62.8	20.3
Single.....	65.5	22.8	62.5	21.3	69.8	14.0	70.6	11.0	69.1	18.4	60.3	18.4
American-born white.....	63.7	20.6	63.9	22.9	71.4	11.7	69.3	12.0	68.8	15.8	61.2	21.7
Negro.....	72.7	.9	71.8	1.8	73.6	5.5	75.5	1.8	75.5	1.8	74.6	2.7
Foreign born.....	71.4	19.0	73.8	16.7	76.2	9.6	71.4	19.1	71.4	21.4	64.2	26.2
Own home.....	64.6	20.1	64.2	22.9	72.0	11.6	69.7	12.2	69.5	15.5	61.7	22.0
Rent home.....	65.7	10.2	69.9	7.2	69.9	7.8	71.1	6.0	69.3	10.2	67.5	7.8
21 to 29 years.....	72.2	14.7	72.8	16.6	78.8	8.6	76.8	9.9	75.5	9.9	68.9	13.9
30 to 39 years.....	63.0	20.4	67.1	20.4	74.3	10.4	72.4	11.0	72.4	12.9	66.5	17.3
40 to 49 years.....	65.9	16.5	64.5	19.4	73.8	7.6	72.0	6.8	72.0	10.6	62.0	20.0
50 to 59 years.....	66.1	16.3	64.7	18.6	68.8	11.6	68.8	10.7	67.0	14.4	62.3	21.0
60 years and over.....	57.7	26.8	56.0	30.3	60.6	20.6	56.6	22.8	57.2	30.9	50.9	29.7
Professional and technical.....	61.2	29.1	58.2	31.1	73.8	11.6	67.0	17.5	69.9	15.5	59.2	28.2
Farmowners.....	49.0	27.9	49.0	30.9	58.3	15.7	54.4	14.7	52.4	22.1	48.5	29.4
Managers.....	63.5	20.9	62.6	22.6	73.9	9.6	70.4	13.9	70.4	17.4	59.1	26.1
Clerical workers.....	64.5	21.1	62.7	22.9	71.1	10.9	67.5	15.7	69.3	15.1	56.6	24.1
Skilled craftsmen and foremen.....	75.4	9.0	74.9	10.9	78.7	7.6	81.0	5.7	78.2	9.0	73.5	11.9
Semiskilled and unskilled workers.....	70.6	10.7	75.4	10.7	74.2	8.3	75.8	5.2	75.8	8.0	69.8	10.3
Farm labor.....	54.5	30.3	51.5	42.4	75.8	18.2	69.7	15.2	69.7	21.2	60.6	30.3
Retired.....	64.1	24.4	64.1	28.2	69.2	19.2	64.1	16.7	65.4	26.9	61.5	21.8
Unemployed.....	75.7	10.8	75.7	10.8	81.1	5.4	81.1	8.1	75.7	10.8	75.7	10.8

NOTE.—Voting percentages of the 6 races do not add to 100 percent because of the undecided vote.

OUTDOOR RECREATION—KEY TO A MORE ENJOYABLE LIFE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, Mr. Thomas L. Kimball, executive director of the National Wildlife Federation, recently spoke before the Michigan Bear Hunters Association at Lake City, Mich.

His presentation is an excellent review of the important conservation and wildlife issues now before both the National Government and the State of Michigan.

Mr. Kimball has some important things to say about outdoor recreation, river basin development, water pollution control, and the preservation of shorelines. I believe his remarks will be of wide interest and I therefore ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

OUTDOOR RECREATION—KEY TO A MORE ENJOYABLE LIFE

(Presentation by Thomas L. Kimball, executive director, National Wildlife Federation, before the convention of the Michigan Bear Hunters' Association, Inc., January 18, 1964, at Lake City, Mich.)

Outdoor recreation, in the broadest sense of the term, is America's favorite pastime. According to the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission report, about 90 percent of our adult population engages in one or more outdoor recreation pursuits in the course of a year. Most of these activities center around water, with about 45 percent of the adults participating in swimming, 40 percent in fishing, and 30 percent in boating. Skiing and horseback riding rank lowest among the 11 activities studied and were engaged in by less than 10 percent of the adults probably because they require so much more in terms of skill, energy, and money. It seems almost everyone desires to engage in more outdoor recreation activity than they currently enjoy, but are prevented by three major factors: lack of time, money, and facilities.

The analysis of outdoor recreation participation by socioeconomic groups pointed out that, when particular activities are compared, there are distinct regional preferences. Swimming and boating are especially popular in the northeast while hunting is distinctly less popular there than in other regions. Fishing is most popular in the South, skiing in the Northeast. Hunting, camping and hiking have far more adherents in the West than in any other portion of the country. Sociologists conclude that outdoor recreation plays an increasingly important social role in the life of the American people, with the inevitable result of increasing and intensified participation in most phases of outdoor recreation.

The desire to travel appears strong and widespread among persons from all walks of life. Nearly half of all American families take a vacation trip each year.

In addition, over a fifth of all families take weekend trips planned around outdoor recreation activities. Practically all families interviewed during the course of the ORRRC survey expressed a desire to travel and participate in some form of outdoor activity. The majority of vacationers, 64 percent to be exact, engage in specific outdoor recreation activities on their trips and many engage in two or more such experiences.

Informal living, which has been characterized by the great American middle class, has been identified by participation in outdoor recreation activity. Some 70 percent of the U.S. population are now classed as urban dwellers, but the great trend has been toward suburban housing developments and nonconventionality.

There is no evidence that living in the suburbs or having a large yard diminishes people's interest in outdoor recreation away from home. The relatively high frequency of outdoor recreation away from home in the West suggests that better facilities and improved opportunities in themselves lead to greater participation by people from all walks of life.

Nearly one-fifth of all American adults visited a Federal or State park or recreation area while away from home on one or several weekend vacation trips during the 12-month survey period. Water activities as

well as camping are engaged in more frequently on weekend park visits than on vacation trips. One in 6 American adults went camping during the survey year and 1 in 11 expressed a desire to do so in the future. The two major motivations for going camping seemed to be the need for a change from the formalities of year-round urban living and a compelling desire to return to nature and enjoy the out-of-doors.

America's economy continues to move ahead and it is becoming increasingly evident that personal incomes will continue to rise, benefiting a much larger segment of the populace. There is also little question that ever-increasing leisure time will accrue to the average American as a result of the industrial-technological revolution.

Probably the most significant conclusion reached by the President's Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission was the unqualified recommendation that the acquisition of land and water areas and other outdoor recreational facilities be accomplished now. This is urgent if the present quality of outdoor recreation opportunity is to be maintained and plans to meet future needs adequately developed. A review, then, of national conservation issues and programs is in order in an effort to visualize how effectively we are meeting the challenge.

During the last session of Congress, Public Law 88-29 was placed on the statute books. This has been described as the organic act for the new Federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The purpose of this act was described as a means to meet the Nation's present and future outdoor recreation needs.

H.R. 3846, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1963, was designed to provide the money—some \$200 million per year for at least 8 years—to implement the organic act and to assist State and local governments in the planning, land acquisition, and development of outdoor recreation resources. The fund would be created from three sources of revenue: receipts from the sale of Federal surplus real property, receipts from the existing 4 cents per gallon Federal tax on motorboat fuels, and revenues from a new system of recreation user fees charged on Federal recreation areas.

The bill has been reported favorably by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and is now awaiting its place on the House of Representatives' calendar. The first hurdle is the House Rules Committee. Considerable opposition to the measure is coming from commercial water users, forest industry groups, and certain recreationists who are reluctant to pay any user fee even for the privilege of using facilities developed at Government expense, even though a general entrance fee proposal has long been discarded as unacceptable. The old fallacy of expecting to get something for nothing, particularly if Uncle Sam pays for it, will probably either delay the bill or possibly eventually prevent its enactment.

It is estimated that \$200 million annually would be funneled into State and Federal outdoor recreation planning and development programs if the fund bill is enacted in its present form. Michigan's estimated share would be approximately \$3 million annually in Federal funds. It would do for outdoor recreation, in its broadest sense, what the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Acts have done for hunting and fishing. Without it, there is little hope for meeting present demands and no possibility of even talking about future needs.

Comprehensive river-basin planning for the development of our water resources is another important resource problem the Nation has been struggling with for many years. The Senate Select Committee on Water Resources recommended a water resources planning act contained in the provisions of S. 1111. This proposed legislation provides that planning for the conservation, development, and utilization of water resources be conducted on a comprehensive and coordinated basis with the cooperation of all affected Federal agencies, State, and local governments representing all resources concerned with water use including fish, wildlife, and recreation.

Although practically all of the more expensive water-control structures are constructed by Federal agencies, the States have been the principal opponents to this type of legislation for fear of abrogating some of the States rights over control of the water. Although most of the proposed bills maintain the status quo in the Federal versus States rights water question, opposition to the measure from the Federal construction agencies still exists. In the meantime, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation not only continue to do the planning of most river-basin developments, but frequently do not even present alternative suggestions for the Congress to consider and, more often than not, fail to give adequate recognition to all resource values in the planning effort.

Water pollution continues as a national disgrace. As of January 1, 1963, there were 5,831 communities serving 35,800,000 people which had no or inadequate sewage treatment facilities. There has been very little, if any, attempt to control industrial pollution which continues in direct proportion to our need to supply an ever-increasing citizenry with all of the basic needs, luxuries, and gadgetry of a people possessing the highest standard of living in the world.

S. 649 recently passed the Senate and is now being considered by the House Public Works Committee. In essence, the bill upgrades the Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control of the Public Health Service by creating an independent authority within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with improved authority to act in water pollution cases. Members of Congress, as well as most national conservation organizations, have not been at all satisfied with accomplishments of the U.S. Public Health Service in the water pollution abatement field. Medical doctors in the Federal service are primarily interested in research and

treatment of the many dread diseases with which mankind is currently afflicted. Public Health Service has done an outstanding job in this field of responsibility and receives unparalleled financial assistance and moral support and praise from Members of Congress and the public.

Contrariwise, the enforcement of water pollution laws has proved extremely difficult and as messy as the filth which is poured continuously and in ever-increasing quantities into our waterways. It costs cities and industries tremendous sums of money to adequately treat their effluents and far too many pull out all stops in their attempts to prevent being forced into an effective cleanup program.

It appears to most conservationists that the Public Health Service's attitude and policy has been to take no positive action to abate pollution where water, no matter how much filth it carries, can be filtered, chlorinated, and when used does not cause any epidemics or infectious diseases in the human population. Forgotten is the enforcement of water quality standards necessary to maintain aquatic organisms essential to fish life. Forgotten are odor and bacterial count standards preeminently required for water-oriented outdoor recreation activities such as boating, swimming, water skiing, picnicking, etc. In fact, medical doctors have proved to the satisfaction of a good many national conservation organizations that they do not have the interest nor the inclination to develop quality standards necessary to protect the entire spectrum of water users, particularly fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation; nor do they have the intestinal fortitude that it takes in the rough and tough enforcement actions necessary to clean up our water supply.

The great State of Michigan is now in the throes of State government reorganization and consolidation. There is the question of whether the Michigan Water Resources Commission should be placed in the department of health or the department of natural resources. As an outsider, with a definite interest in water pollution abatement problems, let me put in my two bits' worth. For the same reasons mentioned previously at the Federal level, your water resources commission should be a part of the conservation, or newly proposed natural resources department. To place the responsibility for the management of this vital and most precious resource in the health department is subordinating its importance to a myriad of public health problems not related to the critical problem of providing the State of Michigan clean water for a multiplicity of uses. Experience has shown that a water resource agency expecting to properly manage and conserve this fundamental resource must possess and maintain the following characteristics:

1. A good basic law containing complete authority to manage water resources. My definition of a good basic law does not include dividing water pollution abatement authority between the health department for municipal sewage and a water resources commission for the control of industrial pollution. They should be together in an independent agency.

2. An independent commission comprised of individuals who have proved by demonstrated interest and capability that they are dedicated to the concept of water clean enough for all legitimate uses.

3. A commission free from petty personal or partisan politics and not dominated by the polluters.

4. A definite, positive, aggressive pollution abatement program complete with effective enforcement procedures staffed by dedicated personnel who are not more concerned about retirement than clean waterways.

5. Sufficient public interest and support of a clean water program. No agency of

government can move any faster than public opinion will support.

Let's not have a type of commission that is fearful of moving into the large urban areas where municipal and industrial pollution is a problem. Let's not have a Detroit versus Lansing detente. Polluters are the only beneficiary to such a shortsighted policy. For example, there is really no legitimate reason why the people of Detroit should not be able to swim on the incomparable beaches of Sterling State Park. All that is needed is a demand by a majority of the Detroit residents that they want the city to effectively treat all sewage and for the large industries of Wayne County to eliminate their present contribution to water pollution.

One of the principal objectives of the National Wildlife Federation is to promote and support a comprehensive educational program for wildlife management based upon competent technical research information obtained by appropriately and adequately educated and trained scientists. No one can explain the complexities of the human mind that will accept without question the advice of a medical doctor, or a qualified lawyer, but cannot accept the advice of the professional wildlife biologist, equally as well trained and competent in his field of endeavor.

The proper management of our deer herds is a case in point. As with all living creatures, the development and maintenance of suitable environment plays the paramount role in preserving continuing stable populations. When the loggers clear cut thousands of acres of virgin timber in the Lake States, the new succulent growth of readily available forage of new trees and shrubs produced deer habitat par excellence. Deer populations increased to fantastic proportions. Wildlife experts are uniformly convinced that while season and bag limits, the buck law, effective law enforcement, and predator control all played a part in the deer population explosion, the primary credit for the increase must be given to an improved environment.

As of 1964, a good many States are still enjoying the myriad benefits of a substantial deer population. How long such a desirable condition will remain will be directly proportional to the excellence and competence of deer management. Most States, and I include Michigan in this category, within the next decade must be satisfied with deer populations somewhat below even present levels. The problem again is one of habitat, principally the production of forage in sufficient available quantity to support current deer populations. Increasing herds usually consume more browse than is produced during the growing season. Succeeding years of overbrowsing reduce further the forage production capacity. The obvious problem to the professional wildlifer is to adjust the deer population to the sustained deer food production capacity of the environment. Balancing the number of deer with their food supply is invariably accomplished either by the reasoning and intelligence of man or by the relentless power of mother nature. An increased harvest of deer by sportsmen, usually requiring the taking of either sex, is one way. This choice provides infinitely more enjoyment and pleasure afield for the hunter, adds more protein to American tables, contributes more materially to the general economy, and, most importantly, provides a satisfactory, stable deer population producing a continuing harvestable crop.

The other choice is to take deer management away from the professional and leave it to the cruel and relentless law of mother nature. Lack of adequate winter food supplies inevitably results in malnutrition, disease and starvation, undernourished and

impoverished animals, smaller in size with ever-decreasing reproductive potentials.

Let me make a strong plea for public recognition of the value of scientific wildlife management and a recognition by sportsmen everywhere that the wildlife technician is a professional in the field of wildlife management and is due the same respect, recognition, and consideration of his services, conclusions, and recommendations as the doctor, lawyer, or other professional. This statement reminds me of the story of the space scientist who reported to a group of interested persons that from his space studies he had concluded that other planets may not be able to support life. Whereupon one of the struggling young scientists replied that "it's not exactly easy to support life on this one." Likewise it is not always easy to support scientific wildlife management.

Elk in Michigan need management by the commission and department technicians for the same reasons other wildlife must be managed to prosper. I was shocked to learn that the intelligent and knowledgeable people of Michigan have permitted \$3,264,005 of your game and fish money to be wasted in the payment of predatory animal bounties during the period from 1935 to 1961. This is not scientific management of a great renewable resource. At best, it is a sop to the financial doldrums of rural America, and, at worst, a complete waste of sportsmen's money at the expense of meeting today's wildlife problems and tomorrow's outdoor recreation challenges.

Michigan is a State blessed with a superabundance of valuable natural resources and an educational system nationally recognized for its capability in training technicians in this field. Your Michigan Department of Conservation enjoys an international reputation as one of the best in the complex business of natural resource management. Of special interest, therefore, was the report of the Special Citizens' Committee appointed by your Governor to review the operations and organization of your commission and department and to arrive at conclusions and recommendations designed to guide the executive and legislative branches of Michigan State government in their deliberations in reframing the constitution. Frankly, I was well pleased with most of the general recommendations, particularly that the name of the conservation commission be changed to the natural resources commission. The most important and significant part of the report contained a recommendation that the department's financial and policymaking authority and responsibility remain under a nonpartisan commission of unsalaried citizens appointed for staggered terms of office and with the power to appoint a director. The top authority in most game, fish or conservation departments in the United States is vested in citizens' commissions, groups of laymen who usually have other part-time or full-time employment and who are appointed to act in a fiduciary capacity. It is generally acknowledged that while the commission in meeting assembled with a quorum present possesses the ultimate policymaking authority, the most powerful individuals in such an organization are the career officials. Their training and experience, coupled with expert knowledge in the resource field and working full-time at their assignments, invariably enables them in most instances to prevail over the less well-informed laymen. In order to have continuity of planning, stability of personnel and program, as well as scientific management of public resources, such a policy development procedure is imperative if public resources are to be managed wisely in the public interest.

The other alternative is to entrust conservation policy determination to a single politically appointed administrator. The committee very judiciously rejected this approach, primarily on the basis that one indi-

vidual should not be entrusted with the custody of such a treasure house of valuable resources as Michigan possesses. A single administrator, no matter how well qualified, has his limitations. He has a specific type of personality; he is apt to have training and experience in only one or two fields which will dictate his primary interest. Political consideration will undoubtedly take precedence over capability in naming the administrator and, in the final analysis, Governors and their appointees are more apt to base policy decisions on how such a decision would influence election returns rather than on resource management needs in the overall public interest.

The trend during the past 30 years in the professional field has been toward specialization, and the conservative technician has been no exception. The staff of a modern conservation department is apt to have law enforcement officers, predator and bird control specialists, research technicians in a wide variety of fields, information, education and public relation specialists, foresters, fire control officers, outdoor recreation planners, and others too numerous to mention. Such an army of specialists tends to create problems, principally financial. Many departments are now finding it most difficult to obtain sufficient money to support specialists in quantity at all levels of department operation. As a consequence, interdivision rivalries have sprung up. Each division is fighting for a larger share of the budget, the decisionmaking process is slowed and it becomes increasingly difficult to develop long-range coordinated plans.

Our institutions of higher learning are now turning out resource managers better qualified and equipped to handle a multiplicity of conservation problems. The trend now is toward a multiple-purpose employee at the field level, capable of enforcing the law, controlling nuisance animals, fighting forest fires, aiding the researchers in gathering data, speaking authoritatively on conservation matters before service clubs, writing the newsletter and a myriad of other jobs a modern conservation department will be required to handle. Specialists at the regional and central headquarters can provide the necessary planning and assistance in policy recommendations, as well as filling in the gaps of a fieldman's knowledge, by a carefully planned and forcefully executed inservice training program.

In a democracy such as ours, public agencies move only as far and as fast as public opinion will allow. Many conservation battles have been lost by default because of public apathy. The organized citizens' groups such as yours and mine, well informed and united in purpose and action, are responsible for considerable progress in the conservation field. I am proud to say the NWF has in the Michigan United Conservation Clubs one of the most active, best organized, and effective State affiliates in the country. MUCC has given the National Wildlife Federation a most respected and capable national president, an outstanding and distinguished regional director, competent and effective affiliate representatives, officers and members. Unity in purpose and action is the formula for influencing conservation affairs for the common good.

This type of cooperation is exemplified by work on proposals to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. I know how hard the Michigan Bear Hunters' Association and MUCC have worked with the Michigan Conservation Commission and Senator HART and others on the important precedent relating to hunting and fishing. As you know, recreational hunting is not permitted in Federal Parks or Monuments. Many of us have worked hard to have hunting and fishing in the new national seashores and lakeshores. Through your efforts here in Michigan, coordinated with

those of national groups, we now have a provision in the Sleeping Bear bill which says that "hunting and fishing shall be permitted in accordance with State law." Exclusion of certain areas from hunting and fishing for reasons of public safety can be made "after consultation with the Michigan Department of Conservation." In short, we think this is an important victory and one in which everyone concerned can be congratulated.

The Michigan Bear Hunters' Association should be affiliated with MUCC, or if this is not possible, at least continue to work together in matters of mutual concern. A visitor once commented to Nells Bohr, the famous atomic scientist and Nobel Prize winner, "I'm surprised to see you have a horseshoe hanging over your door. Do you, a man dedicated to science, believe in that superstition?" "Of course not," smiled Bohr, "but I have been told that it is supposed to be lucky whether you believe it or not."

Whether you bear hunters believe it or not, it will be a lucky day for all of us when we stand united on the many conservation issues which confront your State and the Nation today.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE AREA

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on December 19, the Senate passed and sent to the House the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore bill, S. 792. It is my hope that the House Interior Committee will give it early consideration.

There has been a good deal of favorable comment in Michigan on the bill as passed by the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that editorials from Michigan Out-of-Doors, the official publication of the Michigan-United Conservation Clubs; the Ann Arbor News, and the Lansing State Journal be printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, as passed by the Senate, be printed in full in the RECORD.

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

[From Michigan Out-of-Doors, January 1964]

PERSEVERANCE

A bill providing for the establishment of a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore area in northwestern Michigan has been passed by the Senate, due largely to the dedicated perseverance of one man.

The struggle to preserve this uniquely beautiful area for all the people for all time is not yet over. The Senate proposal for an area of 47,600 acres faces rough going in the House of Representatives, which holds a proposal recommending a much smaller preserve.

But it is hoped that the holiday season was the brighter for Senator PHILIP HART for this breakthrough after his years of untiring work. Those who tend to quit when the going gets tough can gain inspiration from his performance.

The bill that passed the Senate, S. 792, was the fourth dunes bill Senator HART had submitted. He had rewritten, he had compromised. In Michigan and Washington, he patiently and graciously worked year after year to find reasonable solutions to honest differences.

The bill, obviously, is not perfect—nothing in this world is. No one faction received all it wanted. But the heart of successful government is the art of compromise, of achieving a workable alternative to differing points of view.

And we can no longer see justification for opposing the Sleeping Bear Dunes proposal of Senator HART.

We can see an excellent opportunity for Representative ROBERT P. GRIFFIN to enhance his own reputation by forsaking partisan politics and helping to guide through the House this compromise bill for a much-needed area.

Prime recreation areas, already scarce, are rapidly disappearing into private ownership, under the mills of industry and beneath the smothering concrete of our spreading highways. Existing parks are overcrowded now. If we do not make farsighted provision now, our children will not be able to enjoy the outdoors we love and revere.

The economic implications are tremendous. Tourism is today Michigan's second largest industry and growing. Our State can be viewed as a recreational triangle, funneling our citizens and people from States south of us northward—north straight to Canada on our superhighways.

What will keep these tourists in Michigan? Outstanding national lakeshore areas at Sleeping Bear Dunes and at Pictured Rocks in the Upper Peninsula, Senator HART points out, will attract these visitors as nothing else could.

The State owes a great debt of gratitude to Senator HART for his vision and perseverance. We wish him continued success in the new year.

[From the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News,
Dec. 21, 1963]

**FROM OUR POINT OF VIEW: DUNES BILL
COMPROMISE IS REASONABLE SOLUTION**

Senator ALAN BIBLE's optimism may prove to be premature, but it came as a welcome surprise anyway.

"I think we have eliminated most of the controversy from this project," he said when the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee approved a compromise plan for creating Sleeping Bear Dunes National Seashore. BIBLE, chairman of the subcommittee, correctly predicted that the Senate would pass the compromise before going home for Christmas.

The plan now before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Democrat, of Colorado, is chairman) is a compromise between the small park plan sponsored by Representative ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Republican, of Traverse City, and the large-acreage plan sponsored by Michigan's Senator PHILIP A. HART. Representative NEL STAEBLER, Democrat, of Ann Arbor, has in the House a bill identical to HART's. Understandably, HART, STAEBLER, and varied conservation groups, are more pleased than is GRIFFIN with the subcommittee's compromise.

HART has had two main goals in sponsoring the dunes bill, while GRIFFIN has had just one.

GRIFFIN's bill is designed to preserve part of the Lake Michigan shoreline without extending any coverage to inland areas. Along with many residents of Benzle and Leelanau Counties, he has rejected the argument that certain inland areas must be protected if a park along the shoreline is to have any lasting value.

Without some Federal protection to maintain existing land uses for some distance inland, the area bordering the park would be in danger of being taken over by billboards, roadside zoos, motels, and other such promotions. Township zoning ordinances alone simply could not protect local residents against this once the national seashore becomes a popular tourist attraction.

Fortunately, this was realized by BIBLE's subcommittee, to a degree. Its proposal calls for a winding drive along the ridges of the highlands around the inland lakes just west of the Sleeping Bear. This will preserve the best scenic overlooks, and accomplish the second main purpose of HART's bill. At least there will be no motels or billboards towering over the dunes.

Looking at a map of the compromise plan, it is easy to predict where roadside zoos and comparable "tourist bait" will appear: There is a 3-mile stretch of M-22 in northern Benzle County where only the west side of the road would be in the park. The compromise plan would carry the park at least a few hundred feet east of M-22 over most of its length, and it should be easy to eliminate this one weak point. The National Park Service is likely to insist on such a change before accepting the land.

The compromise bill, unlike HART's bill, does not cover lands occupied by private cottages around the inland lakes. This change undoubtedly was necessary to get any sort of bill out of committee. A misleading campaign conducted by certain opponents of the project and supported by some news media, has convinced some local residents the Federal Government wants to socialize their land. The truth about HART's bill is quite different. But having failed for 2 years to get the facts across, supporters of the dunes project had to conclude this could never be done. HART has accepted this compromise without quibbling.

Other Members of Congress should do the same. The Midwest is much in need of additional park facilities.

[From the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal,
Dec. 15, 1963]

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES BILL PASSAGE SEEN

Although the original proposal has been whittled down considerably, Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan, expresses himself as "very happy" with the compromise Sleeping Bear Dunes national seashore bill approved last week by the Senate Interior Committee.

The first measure was cosponsored by Michigan's other Democratic Senator, PATRICK McNAMARA. It proposed that 77,000 acres, including 1,587 cottages and other structures, be included in the national park along the Lake Michigan shore west of Traverse City.

The scaled-down version includes 42,000 acres of mainland property and the 5,000-acre South Manitou Island. Only 288 structures are now included.

Senator HART pointed out that the compromise bill provides for a 33-mile shoreline in the proposed park, about a mile more than he sought in his original bill. The mainland acreage is contained in a shoreline strip extending 1 or 2 miles inland.

The 30,000 acres deleted from Senator HART's original plan include Glen and Platte Lakes, where owners of summer cottages and year-round homes have formed the backbone of the opposition to the Sleeping Bear Dunes park project.

A leader of the Sleeping Bear Dunes Citizens Council regards the compromise bill as an improvement but he points out that it still permits condemnation of private property. He contends the Federal Government should not confiscate property for recreational purposes.

Senator HART has forecast passage of the compromise measure by the Senate before Christmas. There are indications, however, that the bill will not have an easy time in the House.

Having tasted a measure of victory, it is to be expected that the Sleeping Bear Dunes Citizens Council will continue its fight. The council's objection is to the principle of the Federal Government condemning private property for recreational purposes. In taking this tack, however, it appears the council members ignore the fact that the Government in times past has condemned private property to build the concrete highways to the dunes country. These highways make it possible for them to reach their summer cottages in shorter time and enjoy longer periods of recreation.

Actually, the condemnation of the 288 structures involved in the revised proposal is not as drastic as it is made to appear.

According to Senator ALAN BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, chairman of the Senate Interior Subcommittee, the Cape Cod formula, used on the Massachusetts seashore project, would be applied to acquire the property involved in the Sleeping Bear Dunes park proposal.

Under this formula, property may be held in private ownership so long as zoning regulations are adhered to, or the property may be sold to the Federal Government with private occupancy to continue for 25 years or for the owner's lifetime.

When the Cape Cod Seashore Park was proposed, similar opposition was encountered from owners of private property. The Cape Cod project involves about 25,000 acres of land, 50 miles of beaches and about 300 private structures.

The National Park Service is now engaged in acquiring the Cape Cod seashore properties that owners are willing to sell. According to Charles H. Foster, Massachusetts State commissioner of natural resources, there has been no complaint regarding the prices paid by the Government. In fact, some payments proved more than the owners expected.

In Massachusetts, there appears now to be a more general acceptance of the idea that public recreation areas must be expanded to meet the needs of a rapidly growing population.

Similarly, in Michigan, there is a need for additional public recreational areas. The natural tendency on the part of the people living in Detroit and other industrial cities is to hie northward to the open spaces. The proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes Park fits well into this recreational picture and it is to be hoped that the scaled-down project will ultimately win congressional approval.

S. 792—An Act To establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in order to stabilize and preserve for the benefit, inspiration, education, recreational use, and enjoyment of the public a significant portion of the diminishing shoreline of the United States and its related geographic and scientific features, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to take appropriate action, as herein provided, to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

(b) In preserving the lakeshore and stabilizing its development, substantial reliance shall be placed on cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments to apply sound principles of land use planning and zoning. In developing the lakeshore full recognition shall be given to protecting the private properties for the enjoyment of the owners.

Sec. 2. The area comprising that particular land and water described in section 12 of this Act and generally depicted in a map identified as NPS-101-SB which is on file in the office of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior, is hereby designated for establishment as the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

Sec. 3. As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of an acreage within the boundaries of the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore which in his opinion is efficiently administrable for the purposes of this Act, he shall establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

Sec. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Advisory Commission.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of ten members, each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary, as follows:

(1) Four members to be appointed from recommendations made by the counties in which the lakeshore is situated, two members to represent each such county;

(2) Four members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Michigan; and

(3) Two members to be designated by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall consult with the Commission with respect to matters relating to the development of the lakeshore and with respect to the provisions of sections 9, 12, and 13 of this Act.

(f) Any member of the Commission appointed under this Act shall be exempted, with respect to such appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), except as otherwise specified in subsection (g) of this section.

(g) The exemption granted by subsection (f) of this section shall not extend—

(1) to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service from any other source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment; or

(2) during the period of such appointment, and the further period of two years after the termination thereof, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against the Government involving any matter concerning which the appointee had any responsibility arising out of his appointment during the period of such appointment.

SEC. 5. In administering the lakeshore the Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction in accordance with the laws of Michigan. The Secretary, after consultation with the Michigan Department of Conservation, may designate zones and establish periods where and when no hunting shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment and issue regulations, consistent with this section, as he may determine necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

SEC. 6. (a) The administration, protection, and development of the lakeshore shall be exercised by the Secretary, subject to the provisions of this Act and of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, relating to the areas administered and supervised by the Secretary through the National Park Service; except that authority otherwise available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

(b) In the administration, protection, and development of the area, the Secretary shall prepare and implement a land and water use management plan, which shall include specific provision for—

(1) development of facilities to provide the benefits of public recreation;

(2) protection of scenic, scientific, and historic features contributing to public enjoyment; and

(3) such protection, management, and utilization of renewable natural resources as in the judgment of the Secretary is consist-

ent with, and will further the purpose of, public recreation and protection of scenic, scientific, and historic features contributing to public enjoyment.

(c) In developing the lakeshore the Secretary shall provide public use areas in such places and manner as he determines will not diminish the value or enjoyment for the owner or occupant of any improved property located thereon.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as prohibiting any governmental jurisdiction in the State of Michigan from assessing taxes upon any interest in real estate retained under the provisions of section 10 of this Act to the owner of such interest.

SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary is authorized, subject to the limitations, conditions, and restrictions imposed by this Act, to acquire the land, water, and other property, and improvements thereon, and any interests therein (including easements) comprising the area defined in section 12 of this Act by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or condemnation; except that such authority to acquire by condemnation shall be exercised only in the manner and to the extent specifically authorized in this Act.

(b) In exercising his authority to acquire property under this Act, the Secretary shall give immediate and careful consideration to any offer made by an individual owning property within the lakeshore to sell such property to the Secretary. In any case in which an individual owning property within the lakeshore submits evidence to the Secretary that the continued ownership by such individual of that property would result in hardship to him, the Secretary shall immediately consider such evidence and, if he determines on the basis of that evidence that a hardship would so result, he shall, within the one year following the submission of such evidence, subject to the availability of funds, purchase such property if offered for a price which does not exceed its fair market value.

(c) Any property or interests therein, owned by the State of Michigan, or any political subdivisions thereof, may be acquired only with the concurrence of such owner. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any property owned by the United States on the date of enactment of this Act located within such area may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for use by him in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(d) With respect to that property which the Secretary is authorized to acquire by condemnation under the terms of this Act, the Secretary shall initiate no condemnation proceedings until after he has made every reasonable effort to acquire such property by negotiation and purchase.

(e) In any case where the owner and the United States agree, the power of condemnation may, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, be used as a means of acquiring a clear and marketable title, free of any and all encumbrances.

(f) In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to non-Federal property located within the area designated for inclusion and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary within such area. Properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in value: *Provided*, That the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged. The Secretary shall report to the Congress on every exchange carried out under the authority of this Act within thirty days from its consummation, and each such report shall include a statement of the value

of the properties involved and of any case in which equalization payments are made or received.

SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary shall, at the request of any township or county in or adjacent to the lakeshore affected by this Act, assist and consult with the appropriate officers and employees of such township or county in establishing zoning bylaws for the purpose of this Act. Such assistance may include payments to the county or township for technical aid.

(b) No property within the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore shall be acquired by the Secretary by condemnation during the one-year period following the date of enactment of this Act. Thereafter the Secretary shall be prohibited from acquiring by condemnation any improved property so long as the affected county or township has in force and applicable thereto a duly adopted, valid zoning bylaw approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of this section and the use of improved property is in compliance therewith. In the event that the affected county or township does not have in effect and applicable to any improved property a duly adopted, valid zoning bylaw so approved, the Secretary shall be prohibited from acquiring such property by condemnation, if the owner thereof notifies the Secretary in writing of such owner's agreement to use his property in a manner consistent with the applicable standard set forth in subsection (d) of this section, and such prohibition against condemnation shall remain in effect for so long as such property is so used.

(c) If the Secretary determines that any such property referred to in subsection (b) of this section covered by any such bylaw is being used in a way which is not in substantial compliance with such bylaw, or that any such property referred to in subsection (b) with respect to which an agreement has been made is being used in a manner which is not substantially consistent with such applicable standards, he shall so notify the owner of any such property in writing. Such notice shall contain a detailed statement as to why the Secretary believes that such use is not in substantial compliance with such zoning bylaw or why such use is not substantially consistent with such applicable standards, as the case may be. Any such owner shall have sixty days following the receipt by him of that written notification within which to discontinue the use referred to in such notification. Discontinuance of such use within such sixty-day period shall have the effect of prohibiting the Secretary from acquiring such property by condemnation by reason of such use. In any case in which such use is not discontinued within such sixty-day period and condemnation proceedings are thereafter initiated by the Secretary, no condemnation shall be ordered in any such proceedings if the Secretary fails to demonstrate to the court by substantial evidence that such a use was not in substantial compliance with such bylaw or was not substantially consistent with such applicable standards.

(d) Any zoning bylaw or amendment thereto submitted to the Secretary for approval for the purposes of this Act shall be approved by him if such bylaw or amendment contains provisions which—

(1) contribute to the effect of prohibiting the commercial and industrial use (other than a use for a commercial purpose as authorized under section 13 of this Act) of all property within the boundaries of such area which is situated within the county or township adopting such bylaw or amendment;

(2) are consistent with the objectives and purposes of this Act so that, to the extent possible under Michigan law, the scenic and scientific values of the lakeshore area will be protected;

(3) are designed to preserve the lakeshore character of the area by appropriate restrictions upon the burning of cover, cutting of timber (except tracts managed for sustained yield), removal of sand or gravel, and dumping, storage, or piling of refuse and other unsightly objects or other uses which would detract from the natural or traditional lakeshore scene;

(4) provide that no construction, reconstruction, moving, alteration, or enlargement of any property, including improved property as defined in this Act, within the lakeshore area shall be permitted, if such construction, reconstruction, moving, alteration, or enlargement would afford less than a 50-foot setback from all streets measured at a right angle with the street line, and a 25-foot distance from the abutters' property lines. Any owner or zoning authority may request the Secretary of the Interior to determine whether a proposed move, alteration, construction, reconstruction, or enlargement of any such property would subject such property to acquisition by condemnation, and the Secretary, within sixty days of the receipt of such request, shall advise the owner or zoning authority in writing whether the intended use will subject the property to acquisition by condemnation; and

(5) have the effect of providing that the Secretary shall receive notice of any variance granted under and of exception made to the application of such bylaw or amendment.

(e) The approval of any bylaw or amendment pursuant to subsection (d) shall not be withdrawn or revoked by the Secretary for so long as such bylaw or amendment remains in effect as approved. Any such bylaw or amendment so approved shall not be retroactive in its application.

SEC. 10. (a) Any owner or owners of improved property situated within the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition to such acquisition, retain, for a term of not to exceed twenty-five years, or for a term ending at the death of such owner or owners, the right of use and occupancy of such property for any residential purpose which is not incompatible with the purposes of this Act or which does not impair the usefulness and attractiveness of the area designated for inclusion. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the value of the property on the date of such acquisition, less the value on such date of the right retained by the owner. Where any such owner retains a right of use and occupancy as herein provided, such right during its existence may be conveyed or leased for noncommercial residential purposes in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(b) Any deed or other instrument used to transfer title to property, with respect to which a right of use and occupancy is retained under this section, shall provide that such property shall not be used for any purpose which is incompatible with purposes of this Act, or which impairs the usefulness and attractiveness of such area and if it should be so used, the Secretary shall have authority to terminate such right. In the event the Secretary exercises his power of termination under this subsection he shall pay to the owner of the right terminated an amount equal to the value of that portion of such right which remained unexpired on the date of such termination.

SEC. 11. As used in this Act, the term "improved property" means a detached, one-family dwelling, construction of which was begun before December 31, 1962, together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, such land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the lands so designated. The amount of the

land so designated shall in every case be at least three acres in area, or all of such lesser acreage as may be held in the same ownership as the dwelling, and in making such designation the Secretary shall take into account the manner of noncommercial residential use in which the dwelling and land have customarily been enjoyed: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary may exclude from the land so designated any beach or waters on Lake Michigan, together with so much of the land so designated any beach or waters as the Secretary may deem necessary for public access thereto. If the Secretary makes such exclusion, an appropriate buffer zone shall be provided between any residence and the public access or beach.

SEC. 12. The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore shall consist of the following described areas together with adjacent waters:

SOUTH MANITOU ISLAND

(a) All of an island in Lake Michigan officially designated as South Manitou Island lying in townships 30 and 31 north, range 15 west, and adjacent waters for one-quarter mile offshore.

GOOD HARBOR—SLEEPING BEAR BAY AREA

(b) Beginning on the shore of Lake Michigan at the northern line of section 6, township 29 north, range 12 west, and continuing east along said line to the east line of said section and thence south along the said east boundary to the south boundary of said section, thence west along said boundary to the north-south quarter section line of section 7, township 29 north, range 12 west,

thence south along said quarter section line to the east-west quarter section line of said section, thence west along said quarter section line and east-west quarter section line of section 12, township 29 north, range 13 west to the north right-of-way of a public road following the north shore of Little Traverse Lake.

thence in a general westerly direction along said right-of-way to the north-south quarter-section line of the southwest quarter of section 10, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence south to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 22, township 29 north, range 13 west,

thence west along the north boundary of said section to the northwest corner of the section, thence south along the west boundary of said section to the east-west quarter-section line of the northeast quarter of section 21, township 29 north, range 13 west,

thence west to the west boundary of said section, thence north to the northeast corner of section 17, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence west to the northwest corner of section 18, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence south to the southeast corner of section 24, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence west along the south boundary of said section to the east right-of-way of county highway 675, thence continuing northwesterly along said right-of-way to the projected intersection of the west right-of-way of a north-south county road in the northwest quarter, southwest quarter of section 24,

thence southerly along the said right-of-way to the south line of section 24, thence west to the north-south quarter-section line of the southwest quarter of section 23, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence north to the east-west quarter-section line of said quarter section, thence east to the north-south quarter section line of said section,

thence north to the south boundary of section 14, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence east along said south boundary to the north-south quarter-section line of the southeast quarter of said section,

thence north to the east-west quarter-section line of the northeast quarter

of said section, thence west 660 feet, thence north to the north boundary of said section, thence west along said boundary to the shore of Lake Michigan,

thence offshore one-quarter mile perpendicular to the shore, thence along said shore in a general easterly direction at a distance of one-quarter mile perpendicular to the shore to a point one-quarter mile offshore perpendicular of the point of beginning, thence in a straight line to the point of beginning.

PLATTE BAY AREA

(c) Beginning on the shore of Lake Michigan at the northern line of section 6, township 29 north, range 12 west, and continuing east along said line to the east line of said section and thence south along the said east boundary to the south boundary of said section,

thence west along said boundary to the north-south quarter section line of section 7, township 29 north, range 12 west, thence south along said quarter section line to the east-west quarter section line of said section,

thence west along said quarter section line and east-west quarter section line of section 12, township 29 north, range 13 west to the north right-of-way of a public road following the north shore of Little Traverse Lake,

thence in a general westerly direction along said right-of-way to the north-south quarter-section line of the southwest quarter of section 10, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence south to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 22, township 29 north, range 13 west,

thence west along the north boundary of said section to the northwest corner of the section, thence south along the west boundary of said section to the east-west quarter-section line of the northeast quarter of section 21, township 29 north, range 13 west,

thence west to the west boundary of said section, thence north to the northeast corner of section 17, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence west to the northwest corner of section 18, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence south to the southeast corner of section 24, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence west along the south boundary of said section to the east right-of-way of county highway 675,

thence continuing northwesterly along said right-of-way to the projected intersection of the west right-of-way of a north-south county road in the northwest quarter southwest quarter of section 24,

thence southerly along the said right-of-way to the south line of section 24, thence west to the north-south quarter-section line of the southwest quarter of section 23, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence north to the east-west quarter-section line of said quarter section, thence east to the north-south quarter section line of said section,

thence north to the south boundary of section 14, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence east along said south boundary to the north-south quarter-section line of the southeast quarter of said section,

thence north to the east-west quarter-section line of the northeast quarter of said section, thence west 660 feet, thence north to the north boundary of said section, thence west along said boundary to the shore of Lake Michigan, then offshore one-quarter mile perpendicular to the shore,

thence along said shore in a general easterly direction at a distance of one-quarter mile perpendicular to the shore to a point one-quarter mile offshore perpendicular of the point of beginning, thence in a straight line to the point of beginning.

Beginning on the shore of Lake Michigan at a point 1,491 feet due east of the west boundary of section 21, township 29 north, range 14 west and running south to the

south boundary of said section, thence running east to north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northwest quarter section of section 27, township 29 north, range 14 west.

thence south to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of said quarter section, thence east to the west right-of-way of monument 22, thence south along said west right-of-way to the north line of section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west.

thence west along the north line of section 34 to a point which is 400 feet west of the northeast corner of Government lot 1, section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south 200 feet, thence west 430 feet, thence south 805 feet.

thence west 485 feet more or less to the west line of Government lot 1, thence south on the west line of Government lot 1 to the southwest corner of Government lot 1, thence east 144 feet more or less to a point 661.49 feet west of the northeast corner of Government lot 2, section 55, township 29 north, range 14 west.

thence south 8 degrees 45 minutes west 131.9 feet, thence north 81 degrees 02 minutes west 335.0 feet, thence south 8 degrees 45 minutes west 100 feet, thence south 30 degrees 37 minutes west 149 feet, thence south 89 degrees 38 minutes west 225.0 feet.

thence south 18 degrees 13 minutes west 235 feet, thence north 71 degrees 30 minutes west 45 feet, thence south 18 degrees 30 minutes west 450 feet.

thence south 71 degrees 30 minutes east 400 feet, thence south to the south line of Government lot 2, thence east on the south line of Government lot 2 to a point 418.35 feet east of Glen Lake on the south line of Government lot 2.

thence south 15 degrees 43 minutes west 100 feet, thence west 50 feet, thence south 2 degrees 59 minutes west 1,100.12 feet, thence west 43.1 feet, thence south 200 feet, thence west 50 feet, thence south 775 feet, thence west 225 feet, thence south 434 feet to the south line of section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west.

thence west along the south line of section 34 to the east line of section 4, thence south along said east line to the north right-of-way of Forest Glen Road.

thence northwesterly along the north right-of-way of said public road to the north line of section 32, thence west along the north line of section 32 to the shore of Glen Lake.

thence continuing northwesterly along the shore of Glen Lake from the intersection of the shore of Glen Lake with the south line of section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west, to a point of intersection of the shore of Glen Lake with the east line of Government lot 2.

thence north along the east line of Government lot 2 to the south sixteenth latitudinal line, thence west along the south sixteenth latitudinal line to its intersection with the west line of Government lot 2, section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south on the west line of Government lot 2 to the shore of Glen Lake.

thence westerly and southerly along the shore of Glen Lake to a point 664.77 feet east and 1,308.75 feet north of the southwest corner of Government lot 1, section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence north 89 degrees 39 minutes west 236.33 feet to the east right-of-way of Michigan Highway 109.

thence southerly along the east right-of-way to a stake on the east right-of-way of monument 109 located north 345.5 feet and north 89 degrees 12 minutes east 1,190 feet from the northwest corner of Government lot 1, section 31, township 29 north, range 14 west.

thence from stake on east right-of-way of monument 109 north 89 degrees 12 minutes east 229.5 feet, thence south 18 degrees 03 minutes west 400.0 feet.

thence south 89 degrees 12 minutes west, 1,242.0 feet to the west line of Government lot 1, section 31, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south along the west lines of Government lots 1, 2, and 3, section 31, to the southwest corner of Government lot 3.

thence east on south line of Government lot 3 to the west right-of-way of monument 109, thence southeasterly along the west right-of-way to its intersection with the north line of section 5, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence east along the north line of section 5 to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 5.

thence by a straight line in a southeasterly direction to the intersection of the east line of section 5, township 28 north, range 14 west, and the south right-of-way of a public road lying on the south line of Government lot 5.

thence east along south right-of-way of said public road to its intersection with Michigan Highway 22, thence east across monument 22 to the south right-of-way, thence northeasterly along monument 22 to a point 476.5 feet west and 1,519.0 feet north of the southeast corner of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 4.

thence south 400 feet, thence east 476.5 feet, thence north on the east line of the southeast quarter southwest quarter, section 4, to a point of intersection with the south sixteenth latitudinal line.

thence east on the south sixteenth latitudinal line to a point on the west boundary of a cemetery which point is north 89 degrees west 222.75 feet from the intersection of the south sixteenth latitudinal line with the east line of section 4.

thence south to the southwest corner of said cemetery, thence south 89 degrees east 222.75 feet to the west line of section 4, thence continuing east on the same bearing 33 feet more or less to east right-of-way of a public highway.

thence north to a point 554.2 feet south and 33 feet east of the meander corner at the north end of the west line of section 3, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence east 233.0 feet, thence north 374.14 feet to centerline of a public highway, thence south 69 degrees 55 minutes east 49.01 feet.

thence north 0 degree 47 minutes west 11.3 feet, thence east to north right-of-way of said public highway, thence southeasterly along north right-of-way of said highway to its intersection with the south right-of-way of a private road listed on the plot of McFarlane Woods numbered 2 as Beech Tree Road.

thence southeasterly along the south right-of-way of Beech Tree Road to the northeast corner of lot numbered 14 of McFarlane Woods numbered 2, thence north 37 degrees 24 minutes east to the shore of Glen Lake, thence southeasterly along the shore of Glen Lake to a point 1,850 feet due east of the west line of section 11.

thence south to the east-west quarter section line of section 14, thence west to the north-south quarter section line of section 18, thence south to the north line of section 19, thence west along north line of section 19 approximately 1,200 feet to a point north of northeast corner of Empire corporate line.

thence south approximately 1,300 feet to the northeast corner of Empire corporate line, thence west along said corporate line approximately 1,800 feet to the east shoreline of South Bar Lake, thence meandering in a general southwesterly direction along shoreline approximately 1,500 feet to a point.

thence south approximately 3,600 feet to a point along the corporate boundary line, thence east approximately 2,300 feet to the southeast corner of said corporate line, thence north to the north line of section 30, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence east to the north-south quarter-quarter sec-

tion line of the northeast quarter section of said section.

thence south to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of said section, thence east to the east line of said section, thence south to the southeast corner of said section, thence west to the north-south quarter section line of section 31, thence south to the north line of section 18, township 27 north, range 14 west.

thence east to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of said section, thence south to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of section 19.

thence west to a point 500 feet perpendicular to, in a general easterly direction, monument numbered 22 and continuing along 500 feet from monument numbered 22 in a general westerly direction to a point 1,500 feet west of the east line of section 31, township 27 north, range 15 west, thence north to the southerly right-of-way of monument numbered 22.

thence westerly along said right-of-way to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of section 36, township 27 north, range 16 west, thence south to the east-west quarter section line of said section, thence east to the shore of Long Lake, thence southeasterly along the shore to the east line of said section.

thence south to a point 1,000 feet south of the south line of said section, thence west to the west line of section 1, township 26 north, range 16 west, thence north to the shore of Lake Michigan, thence perpendicular to the shore one-quarter mile.

thence following along the shore at a perpendicular distance of one-quarter mile to a point one-quarter mile offshore perpendicular to the point of beginning, thence in a straight line to a point of beginning.

SCENIC PARKWAY

(d) In order to facilitate visitor travel, provide scenic overlooks for public enjoyment and interpretation of the national lakeshore and related features, and in order to enhance recreational opportunities, the Secretary is authorized to construct and administer as a part of the national lakeshore scenic roads of parkway standards generally located in accordance with the parkway zone designated on map numbered NPS-101-SB. Such scenic roads shall include necessary connections, bridges, and other structural utilities. Notwithstanding any prior provision of this Act, the Secretary may procure for this purpose land, or interest therein, by donation, purchase with appropriated or donated funds, or otherwise: *Provided*, That land and interests so procured shall not exceed one hundred and fifty acres per mile of scenic road, except that tracts may be procured in their entirety in order to avoid severances. Property so acquired in excess of the acreage limitation provided in this section may be exchanged by the Secretary for any land of approximately equal value authorized for acquisition by this Act.

Sec. 13. In any case, not otherwise provided for in this Act, the Secretary shall be prohibited from condemning any commercial property used for commercial purposes in existence on December 31, 1962, so long as the use thereof would further the purposes of this Act, and such use does not impair the usefulness and attractiveness of the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore. The following uses, among others, shall be considered to be uses compatible with the purposes of this Act: Commercial farms, orchards, motels, rental cottages, camps, craft and art studios, marinas, medical, legal, architectural, and other such professional offices, and tree farms.

Sec. 14. The Secretary shall furnish to any interested person requesting the same, a certificate indicating, with respect to any property which the Secretary has been prohibited

from acquiring by condemnation in accordance with provisions of this Act, that such authority is prohibited and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 15. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed \$4,750,000, as may be necessary for acquisition of properties under the provisions of this Act.

VACATION HOMES IN ADMINISTRATION HOUSING BILL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am delighted that the administration has incorporated in the new housing bill my suggestion that FHA insurance be extended to vacation homes.

This is something that I have been urging for almost a year. On February 26, 1963, at the suggestion of builders in northern Michigan, I asked the Acting Federal Housing Administrator to explore this matter, saying:

In many Michigan redevelopment areas, building is one of the chief business activities and anything that spurs it is in the public interest. Unfortunately, the lack of adequate financing has held back the construction of vacation homes in many of Michigan's northern counties, where the recreational potential is greatest. In coming years, there will be increasing interest and investment in seasonal homes. This will be a real asset to areas where the economy depends heavily on outdoor recreation. Private enterprise would be greatly encouraged by the availability of FHA insured mortgages, with all their proven advantages, for seasonal homes. It would be very stimulating for building activity.

Study by the Federal Housing Administration resulted in a decision that vacation homes would be eligible for FHA insurance but under eligibility standards which were unrealistic for the vacation home market. They required "adequate community facilities, utilities, schools, shopping, and other amenities which will attract year-round residents." The bill which is presented to the Congress today authorizes insurance on vacation homes if they are an acceptable risk, which is a more realistic approach to the market I had in mind.

This idea met with very favorable response in Michigan when I proposed it last year, and I am most gratified that it is included in the administration bill. I am hopeful it will pass this year. Every State with vacation and recreation potential stands to benefit from the economic stimulus this proposal would provide.

THE PROBLEMS OF BANKING

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, a recent address by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senator ROBERTSON, before the Wisconsin Bankers Association was the subject of editorial comment in the January 23d edition of the American Banker. The knowledgeable views of the Senator from Virginia on the need for new banking legislation are indeed most deserving of attention. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "Calm Voice From the Wings" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CALM VOICE FROM THE WINGS

As the latest episode in the continuing series of the Patman-Martin confrontation takes place on Capitol Hill, with all the high righteousness on both sides reaching new peaks, because of the loftier position now occupied by Mr. PATMAN, it is good to hear a voice of calm on the problems of banking, coming from the wings, uttered by another old trooper of comparable billing.

Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, views the scene in broader perspective than the narrow focus of the question and answer of a hearing can permit. He raises questions of the urgency of banking legislation in the realistic order of priorities which political action—and even industry need—impose. And in these lights, he finds the chance of anything really getting done in the near future dim indeed.

Senator ROBERTSON made clear these rather calm views, in a speech given this week to the convention of the Wisconsin Bankers Association. His own hesitancy to initiate action on the legislative stage, he declared quite frankly, is strengthened by the fact that there is relatively little evidence of any pressing need to do so.

The financial institutions, and all the people connected with them, appear to be getting along very well, he said. He failed to see any severe shortage of funds looming for investment in Government bonds, business loans, mortgages, or personal financing. "With most financial institutions thriving and with their customers on the whole supplied with adequate credit, the need for substantial changes in the organization of our financial institutions does not appear great.

"The long-established rules of a game should not be changed unless and until the need for change has been proved," Senator ROBERTSON declared.

He acknowledged that the Washington air is full of proposals for change in the rules of the banking game, changes to answer complaints about the supervisory and regulatory procedures, personalities, or policies.

He admitted that the present arrangements "clearly do not provide efficiency or clearcut lines of authority."

And he conceded dryly that "there is room for the expression of many points of view.

"As we all know," Senator ROBERTSON commented, "these different points of view can be expressed quite vigorously, quite forcefully, and sometimes with complete disregard for what used to be considered the bureaucratic amenities." He pointed out that these loud lapses from the good manners of the past are being cited in support of their positions by the advocates of change in the present system.

Senator ROBERTSON then made an important philosophical point, which has tended to be obscured in the vigor of the debates over how best to change the system. "We must not overemphasize the importance of efficiency and unanimity," he said. "These must be achieved within a framework of freedom, individual initiative, and competition."

The problem, he declared, is to "preserve a reasonable balance between the two."

Turning again to the realities of the Congress, Senator ROBERTSON then placed the problems of banking relatively low on the list of things likely to be done, specifically, well below the major proposals of the tax cut and the civil rights bill—and therefore, for all practical purposes, off the action list for this session.

There is an inevitable tendency for enthusiasts to equate vigor of debate and intensity of feeling with prospects for action.

Senator ROBERTSON, by making his veteran's perspective known to all, has provided an extremely valuable service to banking, if not as dramatic a performance as some others.

APPRAISAL OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S BEGINNING

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, 2 months have passed since Lyndon B. Johnson succeeded to the Presidency. Many judgments have already been made as to his conduct in performance of that highest office and many more assessments will be made before he departs. One of the most accurate judgments of these 2 months, in my opinion, is that of Max Ascoli writing in the current issue of the Reporter magazine. I certainly concur with Mr. Ascoli's appraisal of the President as a "good, strong, able man." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

A GOOD BEGINNING (By Max Ascoli)

There is a quality of novelty in the first few weeks of a Presidency, a queer mixture of ritualism and adventure that testifies at the same time to the constantly renewed power of the institution and to its plasticity when it becomes embodied in a new Chief Executive. Each time, it is like a new drama that has been played approximately according to the same rules ever since the Nation was founded. The tenure of office and the ways of accession to office are rigidly defined, but no one can foresee the use that a man is going to make of that enormous amount of power under the law.

Yet in our times there is something entirely new and we are forcibly reminded of this whenever the curtain rises at the opening of a new Presidential drama. Just as the whole Nation was unforgettably involved in the tragic end of John F. Kennedy's Presidency, so the whole Nation participated in the accession of Lyndon B. Johnson to power. In fact, a much larger audience than the American people was present on both occasions.

A great deal of what we can know about a new President comes from the studied impression he seeks to give us, from the mannerisms of his delivery of a manuscript to which, as we are duly informed, many many people have contributed and for which he has made himself solely responsible. The most important thing we know about President Johnson so far cannot yet be substantiated by analytical reasoning: in whatever he has said, in the way he has said it, in all the public postures in which he has exposed himself, he has brought us the sense of a good, strong, able man. He has given us powerful hints of what he wants to achieve. The time for a more articulate judgment will certainly come. So far, we are happy to register a feeling of confident expectation.

In his state of the Union message, he has shown, in our opinion, a sense of the concrete, a respect for pragmatic reality, blissfully unaccompanied by any attempt at reformulating a pragmatic philosophy. He has evidenced a desire to reconcile the conflicting interests of a plurality of economic and social groups without regaling us with any exaltation of pluralism. In general, we largely prefer politicians who are good at politics and theorists who are good at theorizing, and we have a very limited degree of patience for those who fall between the two stools.

As a politician, he identified the needs of still too large a section of the Nation in

terms of hospitals and schools and houses. He may have taken some chances with economics, but here too, much as we respect some of his critics, we are inclined to reserve judgment and to find no fault with the President's notion of frugality, for we are convinced that the wealth and the resources of our Nation are great indeed but limited. Moreover, as believers in liberty we have no sympathy for the notion that the aims of liberalism can be pursued only by ever increasing Federal intervention and Federal spending.

Our confidence in President Johnson is sustained by the knowledge of the political skill he exhibited before reaching the highest office. More than once, he proved his capacity to outgrow the sectional interests and outlook with which he had been identified. He became a man of national stature even before reaching the Presidency, and this makes us believe that it is insulting to him to assume that, as President, he is going to give priority to domestic over international affairs. True, in his state of the Union message, the formulation of his diplomatic aims was little more than a footnote, lacking that sense of the concrete that characterized his politician's approach to domestic affairs.

But we fall to be disturbed by his particular emphasis on national affairs in his first major address to Congress, for we are convinced President Johnson knows well that the major forces affecting the destiny of the American people lie far beyond our borders. Some of these forces are not exactly aimed at our well-being. The President has announced his intention to conduct what is called a vigorous peace offensive that will bring him to face to face with the major threats to peace. Some queer mannerisms have been noticeable lately in the diplomatic verbiage of our policymakers, and recently that excellent man Secretary Rusk, in a speech delivered by one of his subordinates, even saw fit to appeal to "our Soviet friends." This must have surprised the Russians, as certainly it surprised many of us. In his speech to Congress the President even used the phrase "a world made safe for diversity," thereby, we hope, making it unnecessary to repeat it on future occasions.

An international political order, largely diverse from the one our Nation strives for, is relentlessly pursued by an opponent who wants nothing less as his condition of peace than our cooperation in a status quo where he will be in charge of the status and we will guarantee the quo.

The more vigorous the peace offensive, the better will the President recognize the opponent and act accordingly. If we were pessimistic we would say we can rely on Khrushchev. But we are optimistic, and we rely on Johnson.

THE BIPARTISAN FOOD FOR PEACE PROGRAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the magnificent successes of our Government policy in recent years has been the food for peace program. This program has made successful use of our food abundance to help the needy throughout the world. It combines enlightened self-interest with a most practical humanitarianism.

One of the pillars of strength of food for peace has been its broad bipartisan support. A fine example of this kind of support came in the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator of South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] on September 30 before a meeting of the American Food for Peace Council held in Washington. From the outset, Senator MUNDT has

been a consistent advocate of the food for peace concept.

Many of my colleagues may not have had the chance to read the Senator's recent remarks concerning food for peace and therefore I am asking unanimous consent to insert them in the RECORD at this time.

As we all know, much of the food for peace program under Public Law 480 comes up for extension this year and we will all be giving increasing thought to this matter. I think it is important that we have comments such as those of our colleague from South Dakota as we begin to turn our attention to extending Public Law 480.

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

THE GENESIS AND GROWTH OF A BIPARTISAN CHILD OF CONGRESS

(Address by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, delivered before the National Conference, American Food for Peace Council, September 30, 1963, at the U.S. State Department, Washington, D.C.)

I appreciate addressing a group dedicated to the preservation, promotion and expansion of the program which was born in a bipartisan atmosphere and which has consistently received bipartisan support. I am sure we were all thrilled at the manner in which this food for peace program has helped Japan after the devastation of the war, and how it has gone on and expanded to reflect the biblical admonition of "being bread cast upon the water," so that now they are a great purchaser of American agricultural products and one of the great customers of the United States generally. What is true of Japan is true also of other areas of the world where our abundance of food, in the early days of reconstruction from the war, helped to heal the wounds and feed the bodies, reestablish and rehabilitate the economies of areas which have gone on to purchase substantial amounts of the products we were able to supply without charge as a consequence of the passage of Public Law 480 and the development and the evolution of our food for peace program. Certainly this is all to the good.

I am especially glad to have a part on this program because it calls back to mind—almost as though it were yesterday—the inception of this food for peace program which is not quite on its 10th birthday. It is just the 10th anniversary of the year that the bill originally passed the Senate and it was not until the following year that the House followed suit, and it finally became known as Public Law 480. I am sure that none of us who toyed with the idea and wrote the initial legislation dreamed at that time of the vast ramifications which would flow from this act.

We knew some things rather vaguely: We knew we had an abundance of food; we knew it was something which should not be destroyed; we did not like the nostalgic memories of killing little pigs and of burning potatoes, and destroying eggs. We were groping for a way to make some use of something which was piling up astronomically in the United States. Starting from that point, and recognizing that this was a commodity in great need by many people in many areas, evolutionary processes set in, and in the slow way in which we move in this legislative forum of ours, we began to produce some results.

I recall a day in March 1953 when, along with CLINT ANDERSON of New Mexico—a great and good Democrat who still sits in the Senate—and Earl Clements, a Democratic Senator from Kentucky, and myself, introduced

the first piece of legislation in this general area. On that time and on that day I said on the floor of the Senate, "We hear much these days of the phrase 'trade not aid.' I shall address myself briefly to a suggestion that the phrase be revised somewhat as it is applied to problems of American agriculture, and that we consider using the phrase 'trade to aid.'" I recall vividly that afternoon Senator CLINT ANDERSON arose and in an inspired speech told of some of his experiences as Secretary of Agriculture, when he worked some barter agreements for American surplus food with the people of Spain, and when he talked about the potentialities of using these vast resources for the good of mankind and for the promotion and the preservation of peace and for healing the distressed and the disaster that was created by the war.

Before I yielded the floor that day, Senator JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, Senator SCHOEPEL, of Kansas, the late Senator CASE, from South Dakota, and the late Senator KEFAUVER, all arose and said, "We would like to become coauthors of the legislation." Out of that and under the leadership primarily of the late Senator Andrew Schoepel, this idea was brought before the Senate Committee of Agriculture. This program was born in the U.S. Senate. It was a legislative idea. It received the approval ultimately of the then Secretary of Agriculture and President Eisenhower, but it was born in the Senate and written primarily in the Senate Committee of Agriculture where every member on the committee joined ultimately in cosponsorship.

Senator HUMPHREY, commenting on the bill on the day of its final passage said this: "In this legislation I see an opportunity afforded to our Government to be as ingenious in the field of trade as we have been in the field of science and technology. I hope the means provided in the bill will be utilized."

The basic good sense in this concept was reflected again by a later measure also passed in 1953 by the Senate, which made provisions beyond the original concept of Public Law 480, that provided in the Mutual Security Act methods and procedures of making the food available in greater abundance. A series of payments in kind, or in block currency, were created by that legislation. It was provided that some of the block currency could be used by foreign countries if they wanted to pay for additional American food, or for loans to increase production of goods and services within their own countries, or for grants-in-aid to increase production for domestic needs in friendly countries, or for scholarships to bring the people of the world closer together under the concept originally written, I believe, by a great Japanese philosopher, that the man you do not like is the man you do not know.

And so our whole program of leadership exchanges evolved whereby we made our surplus foods available for whatever quid pro quo the country had and none at all if none were available. So that these supplies could in turn be utilized for the benefit of all mankind.

I happen to hold the belief that a surplus of food is a benefit of which a country should be proud, instead of some kind of a plague for which a country should be ashamed, and it is up to us to find ways to win friends with this food, it is up to us to use this food for the benefit of those who are associated with us in a great crusade for human liberty and human freedom and human tolerance. I am proud of our capacity to produce food enough, food in abundance, and proud of the farmers, who almost inevitably and always without adequate pay and compensation, have produced the foodstuffs and the fabrics so sore-

ly needed and so highly desired by so much of the world.

The fact that the Russians, with all their vaunted claims for Communist efficiency require a single farmworker to produce food for 6½ people, whereas we in this country find ourselves blessed with an agricultural economy where a single farmworker produces for 28½ people, is a tribute to the way of life which we hope to encourage and support and inspire.

And so this program has not only moved ahead by bipartisan support, it has had the able and the talented administration of three who have headed the program thus far in its short career, Donald Paarlberg, the first; my colleague George McGovern, the second; Dick Reuter, the third; each in his own way making a contribution to the expansion and to the development and to the fruitfulness of a program which means so much to us all and which you have been gathered here today to discuss and to dream dreams about and to make plans insofar as its future potentiality is concerned.

I submit, therefore, that the program has been a success in the first instance in helping to do that which it was partially designed to do, to utilize fruitfully some of the tremendous surpluses which were accumulating. And I shudder to think what the Department of Agriculture or the Congress would be doing if we still had in our bins all of the hundreds of millions of tons of foodstuffs and fabrics that we have made available to others as a consequence of this program.

It has been a success in the second instance because it has improved the diets of millions of Americans and of millions of foreigners living in poverty and in a substandard status in other areas of the world. It has kept us from having here in our country a complete explosion of surpluses which might have destroyed our agricultural programs in their entirety and consequently destroyed the capacity of agriculture to produce in the future as it has in the past. Our abundant food supply is the most potent weapon available for intelligent and constructive use among the developing nations of the cold war.

It was said by a great military man, Napoleon, that an army marches on its stomach. If that be true, and I suspect that it is, I think it is equally true that peace crusaders also march most effectively in areas where the stomachs are filled and where there is an absence of hunger, because communism thrives on unhappiness and hungry people are unhappy people and this provides them with the wherewithal to maintain the health to dream the dreams and accomplish the accomplishments that people all over the world desire for themselves and for their families.

And so we are here in the ninth year of a program still in its swaddling clothes. I dare to say that there are yet untapped a great many potentialities for this type of food-for-peace program. I dare to believe that there are many opportunities which have not yet been met and I salute you who are gathered here at this conference for taking the time to help come up with concepts and ideas along the line of a program which has now established itself at home and abroad.

Truly this is a people's program, a bipartisan program and an American program and I think we do well to honor it.

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES OF THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, in the 87th Congress, Public Law 87-626 was enacted, which authorized the Geo-

logical Survey of the Department of the Interior to extend its research activities to areas outside the national domain.

Under the act, such activities were to be reported to Congress. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of the Interior to the President pro tempore of the Senate containing this report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 22, 1964.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to section 2 of the act of September 5, 1962, to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Interior exercised through the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior to areas outside the national domain (Public Law 87-626), the following activities were undertaken by the Geological Survey during the reporting period July 1 to December 31, 1963, under this authority.

The Survey is investigating changes in vegetation as part of its water resources research in the Southwest and relating the changes to natural causes (such as climatic trends) and to man's activities. Dr. R. M. Turner, the botanist directing the study, is analyzing differences in plant cover that have developed over long periods by comparing present vegetation with that documented in photographs taken as much as 80 years ago. Dr. Turner has examined a series of sites in the Southwest and during part of October examined some localities in Mexico.

A Survey team made two series of reconnaissance measurements on the Amazon River in collaboration with the Brazilian Government, one series in July during high water and the other during late October or early November during low water. About a fortnight was spent each time in measuring water discharge, suspended sediments, streambed materials, dissolved solids in the water, and such other characteristics as temperature gradient and oxygen content. These onetime samplings of the Amazon permit (1) closer appraisals of the salts and sediments moving from the continents into the oceans (the Amazon discharge probably amounts to more than 10 percent of all river discharge) and (2) testing a theory on how river channels behave, which was developed for rivers in North America, by measuring the channel of a river that far exceeds anything in North America.

Sincerely yours,
STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV OF STANDING RULES RELATIVE TO COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the con-

sideration of Calendar No. 485, Senate Resolution 111.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 111) amending rule XXV of the Standing Rules relative to meetings of committees while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is the intention of the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] to make the opening statement on the pending resolution this evening, and that will be all on it today. This matter has been cleared with the distinguished minority leader. Of course, the resolution will be taken up for further consideration tomorrow.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on September 19, 1963, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration recommended the adoption of Senate Resolution 111, a measure designed to expedite the business of the Senate.

The resolution, which I introduced for myself and Senators MONRONEY, ANDERSON, MCGEE, and PASTORE, originally was unanimously recommended by an ad hoc committee of the Senate Democratic conference. The committee was named last January by the senior Senator from Montana, chairman of the conference, to find ways to speed the workings of the Senate. Today, 1 year later, the urgency of such a resolution is underlined by the fact we have just completed the longest peacetime congressional session in history. Another long session would pose a particular difficulty in this presidential election year.

The measure would amend rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate so as to render inapplicable to the Senate that provision of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which provides that no standing committee of the Senate shall sit, without special leave, while the Senate is in session. In lieu of this provision, it would require special leave of the Senate only in those instances when a standing committee desires to sit after the conclusion of the morning hour, or after the Senate has proceeded to the consideration of unfinished business. The proposed amendment, if approved, would free the time normally devoted to the morning hour for the work of the standing committees, thus expediting the business of the Senate.

My purpose now, Mr. President, is to urge the Senate to adopt this rule change. As the possibility grows that yearlong congressional sessions will become the rule rather than the exception, the need for finding more time for committee work is obvious. The trouble with the present rule, which makes it virtually impossible, without securing unanimous consent, for standing committees to meet while the Senate is in session, is that committee business is cut short, without good cause, and the reporting of bills is often delayed.

Senators are aware that the morning hour serves a useful purpose, but it is hardly a purpose which requires the attendance of Senators who do not have morning business to pursue, so long as no legislative business is taken up. Indeed, as the senior Senator from Oklahoma said in his statement before the Committee on Rules and Administration:

The morning hour is for the discussion of extraneous subjects not necessarily related to the pending legislative program.

Some considerations, to be sure, may justify a conditional prohibition against allowing committees to sit while legislative business is being transacted on the Senate floor. But we who urge the adoption of this amendment do not believe these considerations are applicable to the morning hour; we urge that they be removed.

Moreover, in recommending the adoption of the proposed amendment, the Committee on Rules and Administration reported that:

In the opinion of the committee, the routine and often relatively unimportant business of the Senate handled during this period would not suffer due to the absence of Members engaged in committee affairs. On the contrary, it is believed that the interests of the Senate could better be served by granting the committees this additional time for the consideration and processing of legislation. This modification of the rules would expedite the business of committees, and enable them much sooner to report measures to the Senate for floor action.

There is little question that the modification of this rule would produce immediate benefits. More time would be available for committee work. Committees attempting to conclude hearings would often be enabled to finish with out-of-town witnesses, and avoid having to continue another day, thus speeding the flow of work to the Senate calendar. Further, the removal of an extraneous and bothersome restriction would encourage the attendance of Senators in the Senate while its substantive work is underway.

With national elections looming this year, Senators must at this time consider proposals to expedite the business of the Senate, or face the depressing prospect of a lame-duck session after the November election. If the 1st session of the 88th Congress is any indication of things to come—and I think that it most definitely is—this is a very real possibility. Thus, following on our adoption of a germaneness rule last week, I urge the adoption of this very moderate resolution—as a second step in the reform which is called for—to make more efficient the internal workings of the Senate.

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

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

ASSISTANCE TO BRITAIN IN CYPRUS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to extend my congratulations and compliments to the Attorney General of the United States for the extraordinary work he did in the field of American diplomatic negotiations in behalf of our Government in Indonesia and in discussions with the British. I believe the entire country feels a debt of gratitude toward him.

I noted in today's press an article which discusses briefly the British position in respect to Cyprus. The headline of the article is "Britain Asks U.S. Troops for Cyprus."

I ask unanimous consent that the brief article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

BOBBY WINDS UP VISIT: BRITAIN ASKS U.S. TROOPS FOR CYPRUS

LONDON, January 27.—Attorney General Robert Kennedy, assured of British support for his Far Eastern peace efforts, wound up his visit to Britain today with a final round of talks with Prime Minister Sir Alec Douglas-Home.

The talks were apparently ranging beyond the issue of Malaysia, the British-backed federation in southeast Asia whose existence is threatened by Indonesia.

In negotiations last week, Mr. Kennedy won Indonesian agreement to a cease-fire and got Malaysia and the Philippines to agree to a summit conference with Indonesia.

Informed sources said Britain has asked the United States through Mr. Kennedy, to send troops to Cyprus to help the 2,000-man British force on the island keep peace.

The sources said Mr. Kennedy could give no firm answer to the request.

Britain, its troop reserves stretched thin by the crisis in East Africa, was said to be appealing to other NATO powers, also for help on Cyprus.

NATO enters the picture because Greece and Turkey, both NATO members, are involved in the Cyprus dispute.

Mr. MORSE. The article reads, in part:

Britain, its troop reserves stretched thin by the crisis in east Africa, was said to be appealing to other NATO powers, also, for help on Cyprus.

Mr. President, I would be inclined to give consideration to the British request for assistance on Cyprus if Great Britain were in South Vietnam, or if Great Britain were living up to her commitments on the NATO line, or if Great Britain were living up to her obligations in respect to many of the things that the American people have a right to expect from her in regard to the NATO alliance.

However, when I realize that it is American boys, not British, who are dying in South Vietnam, and when I realize that there are more American soldiers on the NATO line than there are soldiers from France, Great Britain, and Canada combined, I pause to reflect a bit when I read a newspaper article such as this and to ask myself the question, as I think many Americans are asking the question, What is the limit that Great Britain has

the right to expect, or France has the right to expect, or any other alleged ally has the right to expect concerning the American contributions of manpower and money in the so-called trouble spots of the world?

Therefore, it is well to refresh the recollection of the British that they have not been carrying their share of the burden for some time in connection with the protection of freedom around the world, and have been perfectly willing to have the United States assume an ever-increasing share of that burden. Where are the British in Turkey? How much of a contribution have the British been willing to make in protecting Turkey and Greece?

I do not intend to forget their record when I read articles such as this, containing additional requests on the part of Great Britain for the United States to assume an ever-increasing burden, because in some places in the world Great Britain ought to have primary responsibility, and I believe Cyprus is one of them.

Whenever an alliance can be formed with our so-called NATO allies—and we do not have one at present; we have an alliance in name only, with Uncle Sam footing most of the bill—in which they will assume their fair share of the burden, I will be more disposed to listen to such a suggestion from the British as is contained in the article, that we ought to help them with manpower in Cyprus.

What I have said applies pretty much to the British Commonwealth, for the nations of the British Commonwealth have, for some years, fallen far short of carrying their fair, equitable burden in respect to meeting the crises that have developed in the trouble spots of the world.

I repeat, as I believe is well known in the Senate, that I shall not look with favor upon any proposal by my Government that the United States pour more millions of American dollars into those areas of the world and provide American manpower if our allies are not willing to do their share—and Great Britain's records in respect to doing her fair share is a sorry one.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 28, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 27, 1964:

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

William Rummel, of Illinois, to be Comptroller of Customs with headquarters at Chicago, Ill.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 27, 1964:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Cyrus Roberts Vance, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Stephen Alles, of the District of Columbia, to be Secretary of the Army.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Donald F. Hornig, of New Jersey, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology.

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

The Army National Guard of the United States officer named herein for promotion as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be brigadier general

Col. Charles Lutcher Southward, [XXXXXXX], Infantry.

U.S. AIR FORCE

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Harold C. Donnelly [XXXX] Regular Air Force, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code.

U.S. NAVY

Having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, the following-named officers for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving:

To be vice admirals

Rear Adm. John B. Colwell, U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. Reynold D. Hogle, U.S. Navy.

Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, U.S. Navy, to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Maclyn Abbott to be major, and ending Carolyn Reinbold to be major, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 16, 1964; and

The nominations beginning Max L. Abram to be first lieutenant, and ending Roberta K. Eyer to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 16, 1964.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 27, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Timothy 2: 3: *Thou therefore endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ.*

O Thou God of all grace, may we daily be conscious of Thy pervading presence and sustaining power as we encounter bewildering problems and difficult tasks.

Show us how we may mobilize every moral and spiritual resource in behalf of a nobler civilization and the common good of humanity.

Grant that when responsibilities are far beyond our own finite wisdom and the fallibility of human judgment, may we find our minds illumined with a new insight unto the abundance of Thy grace.

We pray that in the areas of human relationship, we may have a clearer understanding of mankind's needs and a joyous conviction that we are serving our generation worthily and faithfully.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 23, 1964, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on January 22, 1964, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7406. An act to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1959. An act to authorize the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of Government employees assigned to duty in Alaska, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3368. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey by quitclaim deed a parcel of land to the Lexington Park Volunteer Fire Department, Inc.; and

H.R. 4801. An act to amend subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding certification of facts based upon transferred records.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 855. An act to provide for more effective utilization of certain Federal loans or grants by encouraging better coordinated local review of State and local applications for such loans or grants;

S. 1833. An act to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household equipment and furniture, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 1928. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to sell a part of the former Cheli Air Force Station to Chanslor-Western Oil & Development Co. by negotiation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 298) entitled "An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. DOMINICK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 24, 1964.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy for the year 1964: Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ, of Maryland; Hon. ALTON LENNON, of North Carolina; and Hon. MILTON W. GLENN, of New Jersey. As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

THE LATE MRS. JOHN TABER

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to bring some distressing news to the older Members of the House. Mrs. John Taber, the wife of our former beloved colleague, died this morning at about 6:30 in the hospital at Auburn, N.Y. I talked with John Taber as late as last Thursday and he then thought that she was better and expected her to come home this weekend; but she took a turn for the worse.

I thought the Members who were friends of his would like to know about this; we all extend our deepest sympathy to John. Gertrude Taber, when they were here in Washington, was active in the Women's Congressional Club, having been president some years ago. As we who knew her know, she was a charming and popular personality in the social life of Washington. We will all miss her.

NASA REPORT 1963—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 207)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on

Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 206(b) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, I transmit herewith a report for the calendar year 1963, on this Nation's aeronautics and space activities.

The year 1963 was a period of constructive development of our increasing space competence. It was also a period of searching evaluation of the national space program—an evaluation which resulted in broad acceptance of the policy of our attaining and maintaining space leadership, with due regard for our national security.

Our space program, in both its civilian and military aspects, is peaceful in purpose and practice. Moreover, it combines such objective with a policy of international cooperation based upon a mutuality of participation and benefits as well as the wide dissemination of knowledge.

Space progress is essential if this Nation is to lead in technology and in the furthering of world peace. Such progress requires the use of substantial resources, which must be employed efficiently and effectively in order that we obtain the maximum benefits with a minimum of waste.

In summary form, the accompanying report depicts the contributions of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the national space program during 1963.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 27, 1964.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 206)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Our Nation stands today at the threshold of the greatest period of growth in its history.

By 1970, we shall have to build at least 2 million new homes a year to keep up with the growth of our population. We will need many new classrooms, uncounted miles of new streets and utility lines, and an unprecedented volume of water and sewerage facilities. We will need stores and churches and libraries, distribution systems for goods, transportation systems for people and communication systems for ideas.

Above all, we will need more land, new housing and orderly community development. For most of this population growth will be concentrated in the fringe areas around existing metropolitan communities.

I. HOUSING

Fortunately, the old pressures on our housing supply arising from depression and war-caused shortages have largely

been overcome. But new pressures will develop as the number of new families rises rapidly in the late sixties. And great numbers of our families have yet to secure the true goal of every parent: Not merely housing but adequate housing.

Now is the time to direct the productive capacity of our homebuilding industry to the great needs of the neglected segments of our population—this is necessary in its own right and vital to the continued strength of the industry.

Satisfaction with the 1,600,000 new housing starts in 1963 cannot obscure the fact that too many minorities, too many families of low income, too many elderly, too many rural families, and too many military families have not shared in the housing improvement which those units represent.

Unless we act and act now, the promises of the national housing policy will remain empty slogans to large numbers in these groups.

A. HOUSING FOR MINORITIES

Over a year ago, President Kennedy issued an Executive order designed to assure opportunities for equal access to federally assisted housing. Already a half million dwelling units are—or soon will be—subject to that order. This administration will continue and strengthen its efforts to translate the pledge of that order into meaningful practice. The program proposed in this message will broaden the range of housing choices open and realistically available to those whom discrimination has too long restricted.

B. HOUSING FOR LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

For over a quarter of a century, the low-rent public housing program has been the primary source of additional decent housing for families of low income. Over 1,500 communities—350 of them since 1961—have recognized the need for supplementing private efforts by creating housing authorities to build and operate public housing with Federal assistance.

The 100,000 units of federally aided public housing authorized by the Housing Act of 1961 are now all committed. But still more communities and more families need such housing.

To continue this program for those who have no other effective opportunity for better housing, I recommend the authorization of 50,000 additional public housing units for each of the next 4 years.

Most of these units should continue to be new construction to provide a net expansion in the volume of housing available to low-income families. However, we have at this time a real opportunity to make low-rent housing available more quickly and at lower cost in many cities by acquiring units from the existing stock of private housing and rehabilitating them, where necessary, for the use of low-income families. I recommend amendments to the Public Housing Act to facilitate acquisition of existing housing units within the proposed 50,000 units per year.

In other cases, leasing of standard units by local public housing authorities for use in the low-rent program is a fea-

sible and economic approach. I recommend, in addition, that the authority for expanding low-rent housing include authorization for local housing authorities to lease 40,000 housing units over the next 4 years.

We have much more to learn before the housing needs of our low-income population can be adequately met. The small demonstration program provided for this purpose in the Housing Act of 1961 has permitted a number of promising experiments to get underway. I recommend an additional \$5 million be authorized to continue this program for at least 1 more year. During this period, attention can be given to special housing needs, such as those of our physically handicapped, as well as to means of helping low-income persons obtain adequate housing.

C. HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

I believe it especially unfortunate that many of those who do not have or cannot secure decent housing are elderly. Special attention to the needs of this group at all income levels should continue.

The expansion and improvement of public housing programs that I am recommending will be used extensively for lower income elderly. Federal insurance of loans will continue to encourage the construction of specially designed housing for elderly with adequate incomes. However, the existing authority for funds to finance the program of low-interest direct Federal loans which serves the moderate-income elderly will soon be exhausted. I recommend that the low-interest direct Federal loan program for the elderly be extended and additional funds appropriated to permit loans of \$100 million during the coming fiscal year.

At present, the successful program of moderate-income housing provided through loan insurance at below-market interest rates enacted in 1961 is limited to family tenants. In many cases, admission of single elderly persons to such housing would be highly desirable. I recommend that single elderly persons be made eligible for housing financed by federally insured below-market interest loans.

D. RURAL HOUSING

The living conditions of our rural families—including the nearly one-third of our elderly who live on farms or in small towns—likewise deserve and need special consideration.

More than a million rural families still live in homes of such poor condition that they actually endanger the health and safety of the occupants; 3 million rural families live in homes that need major repairs; a third of our rural homes do not have complete sanitary facilities—nearly two-thirds of rural homes are without adequate heating.

The rural housing programs of the Department of Agriculture, initiated in 1949 and strengthened in 1961 and 1962, have made a good start on meeting the problems represented by these statistics, but the 20,000 rural families helped last year represent only a small fraction of the job to be done. Primary reliance on direct Federal loans for this purpose is,

however, neither necessary nor—in the volume required—realistic.

I recommend extension of the expiring authorization in title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to insure loans on rental housing for the rural elderly. Further, in order to accelerate the basic rural housing loan program, I urge that the Congress enact an insured rural housing loan program along the lines of that proposed by the administration in the first session of this Congress.

I further recommend early action on legislation along the lines of S. 981 to assist with the housing problems of domestic farm laborers—problems which are particularly acute for our 350,000 migrant farmworkers.

E. MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

The military man, in keeping with his profession, expects to endure—and frequently does endure—personal hardships during his career. We do not have the right to expect the same from his family. While the Defense Department properly relies primarily upon the private community to supply the major portion of its needs for decent and economical housing, an annual construction program to house the families of military personnel is required in those communities where the severest chronic shortages exist. Accordingly, I have recommended in the military construction program authorizations and appropriations for 12,500 additional units for fiscal 1965 to meet the most critical needs.

F. IMPROVEMENTS IN OTHER HOUSING PROGRAMS

Apart from the housing needs of the special groups already discussed, the partnership between private industry and Government—exemplified by Federal guarantees and insurance of private housing credit—has made possible good housing and widespread homeownership for millions of our citizens.

I intend to encourage—through legislative proposals, where necessary—even more effective cooperation between Government and industry for the joint benefit of homeowners, tenants and the industry itself. To this end, I am proposing a number of modifications in the statutes governing our self-supporting mortgage insurance and marketing programs which will improve their efficiency and usefulness. Among these will be the following proposals:

(1) To provide relief in those isolated cases in which, despite the care exercised by builders and the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration, substantial defects develop in new construction they have approved, I recommend that authority be provided for the FHA and the VA to finance the correction of substantial deficiencies.

(2) To make certain that no legislative barriers exist to discourage or prevent mortgage lenders and the Federal Housing Administration from cooperating to help delinquent mortgagors in deserving cases, I recommend that FHA's claim and forbearance authorities be amended to encourage the temporary withholding of foreclosures against homeowners who default on their mort-

gages due to circumstances beyond their control.

(3) To expand our concerted effort to substitute private credit for Federal loans, I recommend provision of legislative authority for the pooling of mortgages held by the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and the sale of participations in such pools.

II. URBAN RENEWAL

The Federal program of urban renewal is today our principal instrument for restoring the hope and renewing the vitality of older cities and wornout neighborhoods.

The Federal assistance which provides local leaders and governments with incentives and the tools for revitalizing their communities has proven its worth in eliminating housing blight; in contributing to restoration of the economic base of our communities; and in helping reshape our central areas into effective nerve centers for our cities.

The Housing Act of 1961 doubted the previous urban renewal authorization to a total of \$4 billion. By the middle of this year, all of that increase will have been committed. I recommend that an additional \$1.4 billion of urban renewal funds be approved for a 2-year period.

Despite existing programs assisting families and persons displaced by urban renewal projects, the human cost of relocation remains a serious and difficult problem.

The vast majority of those displaced by urban renewal and public housing have relocated in better and standard housing, but some have not. For most, the cost of improved housing has been an unsought burden. For some, the inconvenience of displacement has meant only another slum dwelling and the likelihood of repeating this experience.

To assist further those families and persons least able to bear the burden of displacement, I recommend:

A. That an additional annual subsidy of up to \$120 per unit be available for local public housing authorities where needed to provide access to such housing for displaced with extremely low incomes.

B. That low- and moderate-income families displaced by urban renewal receive 2-year supplemental relocation payments equal to the difference between rentals on standard housing in their communities and 20 percent of their gross incomes.

C. That low-income single persons displaced by urban renewal or other public action be made eligible for public housing.

Similarly, small businessmen—especially those in leased premises—often incur economic loss and hardship as a result of displacement by urban renewal or public housing which is not offset by current compensation practices and moving expense reimbursements. To provide more adequately for these firms, I recommend authority for a separation payment of up to \$2,500 for small establishments.

At the time of the 1960 census, 7 million nonfarm dwellings were found to be deteriorating, including 2½ million oc-

cupied by their owners. Rehabilitation and preservation of existing housing wherever possible is a key element in the urban renewal process today. Elderly homeowners in urban renewal areas with low, fixed incomes are at a particular disadvantage in trying to meet the increased housing payments required by rehabilitation. To assist them, I recommend a program of Federal insurance and purchase of low-interest loans, with a deferral of amortization of principal, for home rehabilitation by elderly homeowners in urban renewal programs.

III. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The great expansion of our urban areas over the last two decades has too frequently been carried out in a sprawling, space-consuming, unplanned, and uneconomic way. All levels of government are spending vast sums to accommodate this tremendous urban growth with highways, sewer and water facilities, schools, hospitals, and other community facilities. Rural communities and small towns face similar pressures. If the taxpayer's dollar is to be wisely used and our communities are to be desirable places in which to live, we must assure ourselves that future growth takes place in a more orderly fashion.

I recommend that the urban planning assistance program and the open-space program administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency be extended.

Although the planning requirements of these and various other Federal programs—such as the Federal-aid highway program—also emphasize orderly growth and development, much more can and should be done.

The pioneering efforts of progressive and imaginative private developers in planning totally new and complete communities indicate some of the exciting possibilities for orderly growth. In the tradition of the long-established partnership between private industry and Government in housing and community development, the Federal Government should encourage and facilitate these new and desirable approaches.

Such a partnership can help achieve the orderly accommodation of a significant part of our forthcoming urban growth by means of entirely new communities, complete with all public services, all the industry and commerce needed to provide jobs, and sufficient housing and cultural and recreational facilities for moderate- and low-income families as well as for the well-to-do. To realize such new community development, and to encourage the participation of private initiative on the greatest possible scale, I propose a program of grants and loans to States and local governments for the planning and provision of necessary public facilities and of loan insurance for private developers constructing such facilities.

Many existing communities face problems of expansion as well. Even though they may foresee enormous development ahead, they often lack the resources to build sewer and water systems and other facilities with adequate growth capacity. Building in such capacity in advance could result in tremendous savings and prevent costly duplication or premature

replacement of inadequate facilities. I, therefore, recommend a program of public facility loans with deferred amortization to enable communities to plan and build ahead of growth.

Early acquisition of land for right-of-way and other public improvements is frequently sound public business. Many communities which are prepared to exercise foresight in acquiring land—and to save private owners from uncertainty and hardship—lack the financial capacity to do so. Such advance acquisition—which would assure location of such facilities in accordance with planned development—could also result in substantial savings, inasmuch as the increases in land prices that occur as development proceeds would be avoided. I, therefore, recommend that public facility loans, with deferral of amortization as required, be made available for advance land purchase or option by States and local governmental jurisdictions.

To encourage better planned new development on a neighborhood scale, and to preserve and increase the supply of improved land for homebuilding, I recommend Federal insurance of loans to private developers for acquisition and improvement of land for planned subdivisions.

It is essential that all of these programs be based on the existence of effective planning arrangements in the community or region. For planned subdivisions, there should be, in addition, assurance that the neighborhood itself is carefully conceived to maintain its residential integrity and will result in efficient land use.

In our great metropolitan areas, and in our rural communities as well, the difficult problems of growth and development require understanding and cooperation at all governmental levels. The Federal Government can assist and encourage, but, in the last analysis, the success or failure of programs of community development depends on those most directly involved.

IV. URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

Efficient transportation systems are essential to our urban communities. Each local system should be tailored to its particular needs—existing and prospective—and the proper mixture of good highways and mass transit facilities should be developed to permit safe, efficient movement of people and goods in our metropolitan centers.

A matching grant mass transit program along the lines proposed by the administration was approved by the Senate last year (S. 6) and reported favorably to the House by its Committee on Banking and Currency (H.R. 3881). I urge early enactment of the mass transit program as basic to the development and redevelopment of our Nation's cities.

V. TRAINING NEEDS

The sound administration of local governments and the success of our federally supported programs of community development depend heavily on the competence of State and local public service staffs—on their ability, their imagination, and, especially, their training. Throughout the range of local functions—from traffic control to tax admin-

istration, from recreation to renewal—their efforts will influence greatly the quality of community living.

The substantial Federal investment in local community efforts justifies a deep Federal interest in the quality of local government employees and the expenditure of funds to help attract able people to local public service and help them develop the skills and perspective they need.

To this end, I recommend a program of grants to \$25 million a year in matching grants to States for the establishment of urban public service training and research programs.

VI. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

If we are to deal successfully with the complex problems of our urban and suburban communities, we need governmental machinery designed for the 1960's, not the 1940's. The Housing and Home Finance Agency, established 17 years ago primarily to administer housing programs, has seen its responsibilities enlarged progressively by the Congress during the intervening years to include the broader aspects of community development as well. The Agency now administers such major community development programs as urban renewal, urban planning, public facilities planning and loans, open space, and mass transit. These basic changes in the Agency's role and mission are not adequately reflected in the Agency's current organization and status which remain much the same as they were in 1947. Action to convert the Housing and Home Finance Agency into an executive department is long overdue.

The size and breadth of the Federal programs now administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the significance of those programs clearly merit departmental status. A new Secretary of Housing and Community Development would be in a position both to present effectively the Nation's housing and community development needs in the highest councils of government and to direct, organize, and manage more efficiently the important and closely interrelated housing and community development programs now administered or proposed for the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

I recommend that the Congress establish a Department of Housing and Community Development.

CONCLUSION

The dramatic increase in our Nation's population projected for the coming decades—over 300 million by the year 2000—and the increasing concentration of our population around urban centers will create increased housing needs and intensified problems of community development which must be anticipated and acted upon immediately.

How we respond to these challenges will have a lasting impact on the character of our cities and rural communities. Whether we achieve our goal of a decent home in a decent neighborhood for every American family rests, in large measure, on the actions we take now.

The substantive programs I have proposed in this special message will speed

our solutions to today's problems and the predictable needs of tomorrow. I earnestly urge the Congress to give the attached draft bills the attention they merit.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 27, 1964.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 298, to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, insist on the amendments of the House thereto, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PATMAN, RAINS, MULTER, BARRETT, KILBURN, WIDNALL, and HARVEY of Michigan.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR JANUARY 28

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], that tomorrow afternoon after the House has finished its consideration of the Davis-Bacon Act legislation, the gentleman from Rhode Island intends to ask for unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 875, the 1964 supplemental appropriations legislation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the Senate amendment, recede from disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and concur therein with an amendment.

Members will recall that the Senate amendment to this legislation added to it \$216 million for payments to school districts in fiscal 1964 under the federally impacted areas program.

The new amendment would appropriate an additional \$31.2 million for fiscal 1964 for the student loan program of the National Defense Act, and would also appropriate an additional \$595,000 for fiscal 1964 for the Mexican farm labor program.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to assure the gentleman from Oklahoma that this amendment which will be submitted tomorrow as an amendment to the Senate amendment has the complete and unanimous endorsement of our subcommittee. These are emergency items included in the supplemental request of President Johnson that was sent to the Congress last week. They are of an emergency nature and should be acted upon as soon as possible.

The student loan money is necessary for the second semester in hundreds of the colleges and universities throughout the United States. A complete list is contained in our hearings which are at the Printing Office and will be available to Members the first thing tomorrow morning.

The funds for schools in federally impacted areas is necessary because many of these school districts are at a point where they have exhausted completely their borrowing authority and, if these funds are not appropriated soon, they will not be able to even pay their teachers.

The Mexican farm labor money of \$595,000 is mostly in the compliance area, and is necessary if the Department of Labor is to be sure that the health standards, housing, and other requirements of the law and the agreement with Mexico are met? There should be no objection on the part of anyone to this particular appropriation to see that these minimums standard are met in all areas of the United States where this labor is used. These compliance people have been given their notices and will be discharged on February 7 if we do not appropriate these funds.

It is my hope that we can pass this amendment unanimously tomorrow. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding to me.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

GEORGIA MEDAL FOR DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVICE TO HON. CARL VINSON

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, Associated Industries of Georgia, an organization of industrial establishments and businessmen in the State of Georgia each year gives an annual award for distinguished public service. The award is designated as the Georgia Medal for Distinguished Public Service.

Last week on January 22 in Atlanta, Ga., one of our colleagues in the House, the Honorable CARL VINSON of the Sixth District of Georgia, was the recipient of this award from the Associated Industries of Georgia. The presentation address was delivered by Dr. Rufus Carrollton Harris, one of the foremost educators of the United States and presently president of Mercer University, Macon, Ga.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the presentation address of Dr. Harris and the acceptance speech of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], be included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

READING THE VINSON VANE

(By Rufus Carrollton Harris)

(Presentation address Georgia Medal for Distinguished Public Service, Associated Industries of Georgia, January 22, 1964, Atlanta, Ga.)

A short while ago, in one of the world's oldest cities, I observed the statue of a Greek philosopher cherished in the classical period of Athenian history. The base of the statue bore this quotation: "It is fit that the immortal gods should judge the errors of men; it remains for mortal beings to honor their noble endeavor." Our purpose here tonight is to honor the noble endeavor of a distinguished Georgian. It is difficult to determine if this occasion has more meaning for the notable citizen to whom the Georgia Medal for Distinguished Service is awarded, than for those who assemble here to acknowledge the significant fulfillment of a great man's dream of life.

The man chosen to receive this evening the Georgia Medal for Distinguished Service, the highest award presented by citizens of this State, has spent almost a lifetime in the public service. It would be difficult for anyone to undertake an adequate citation of his range of work and achievement. It is appropriate, however, that we should reminisce for a moment. It was in 1883 that our honoree was born on a farm a few miles from his present home at Milledgeville, Ga. He received his secondary education in Milledgeville, and at the age of 16 he enrolled at Mercer University. Even before graduation from the law school in 1902, he began a legal career. From this I derive a pardonable satisfaction, for it was at Mercer University, I believe, that the initial steps were formed of a career destined to become as purposeful and as illustrious in the processes of government and legislation, as the exciting history of our country affords.

After the law school, he returned to Milledgeville to practice law, and in 1906 was elected solicitor for Baldwin County. But there were wider horizons ahead. In 1909 he became a representative in the Georgia General Assembly, and in the last 2 years he was named speaker pro tempore. He left the legislature to become Baldwin County court judge, and thus for a short while Milledgeville claimed her native son to administer public justice. In 1914 there existed an unexpired term in Congress from the 10th District. This was the turning point in his life. He received the Democratic nomination, and on November 3, 1914, took the oath as Congressman in the 63d Congress. He has been there continuously, including the present one, the 88th. This record of continued service is unequalled in our history. Twenty-four times he has been reelected to this post. The Nation is saddened by his announced retirement. Although an inadequate knowledge of the facts exists, and no unfairness is intended by asking more of him who has given so much, yet there are countless Georgians who carry in their hearts a lingering hope that he may carry on. Three years ago when President Lyndon Johnson presented the annual Law Day address at Mercer, he stated to me what he has said publicly: "Certainly everyone would agree that Representative VINSON is one of the great legislators of our time."

He has been chairman of a standing committee of Congress for more than 30 years, a record unequalled in the history of the House of Representatives. He served for 16 years on the House Naval Affairs Committee, which was merged into the Armed Services Committee after World War II. With the exception of a brief period when he was the ranking minority member, he has served as chairman of the Armed Services Committee. This service brought him nationwide prominence. The Democratic whip, the Honorable

HALE BOGGS, states admiringly that his colleagues refer to our guest affectionately and respectfully as "the Admiral." The fact that he is one of the Nation's superior military experts is consoling to most of the Nation in these times when world disaster is so ominous. The effective development, direction and expanded use of American seapower—a power not well enough comprehended in our history—did not simply happen. Back of it was more than one great man, but primarily it was made possible by the unique position and determination of our honoree. Before he was born, of course, the American Navy had shaped the lives of many of his predecessors. But we may assert confidently that the American Navy has woven its way into and through his life as ceaselessly as a mighty river cuts through the heart of a continent.

It is the quality of a life measured by its contributions to the moral structure of its society which inspires occasions such as this. The life of Mr. VINSON has been characterized by such service, and by devotion to his family and friends. His integrity as a man has earned the respect of his associates, but his personal loyalties have earned for him the love of people. The educator chooses to relate the processes of education to the lives of men. He asserts that purpose and character in a society come chiefly from its exceptional citizens who somehow acquire exceptional understanding and motivation. I profess the end of education as commitment—the commitment of people to compassionate moral and social responsibility. This has been made manifest in the life of Mr. VINSON. He is a man of many skills. The exceptional man must have the capacity for many. If skill were all he needed, he would do quite well for himself. But he has more. He has perspective and dwells in a sense of community with those who stir him by parallel forms of exceptional endeavor. This too is necessary, because the dream of an easy mechanical character of social progress has been shattered by the experiences of this generation. Our honoree knows there is no single, simple nor easy way to secure America's advancement. There is need for abundant exceptional service.

How well the exceptional man shall fare in the immediate future in our area depends not so much upon him as upon the area. In the right environment he will be esteemed; in the wrong environment he will be derided. The burden rests not with him, for he has no alternative but to maintain steadfastness. The burden rests rather upon all of us. In a society where regimentation of any kind is imposed, the person who allows himself to be pressured into the narrow confines of any category may appear to prosper. But in a society which is free to take shape and change according to its needs, wills, and vision, he will not do so. There only the sensitive and exceptional man will actually prosper. It would be well for us if that kind of person may walk the earth in dignity, for in order to advance we must have such people. We are beginning, I think, to strive earnestly for them, and in this complex world we must have more than a small coterie of them.

The future progress of our area cannot be turned on and off like a faucet. I believe Mr. VINSON knows that Georgia can pay no greater tribute to him and to his work than to provide opportunity for men like him in the future. That, I believe, is the basic aim of our distinguished Governor's broad educational program. Southern young people with restless curiosity, impelled to learn sometimes because they cannot help it, must be afforded the opportunity to reach unprecedented levels. They are the ones who will develop our social patterns and advance the human and commercial relations of the area. Their desire, like that of Mr. VINSON, will be to acquire the means and ways to public usefulness and personal meaning.

Deep in the heart of Georgians is generous recognition of the magnificent example of public usefulness, integrity, and commitment which our honoree's life and work have manifested. Prouder of his State but no less prouder of his country, he has been chosen to receive the Georgia Medal for Distinguished Public Service. Ladies and gentlemen, I present this medal and the Honorable CARL VINSON.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, the following is the acceptance speech of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. Chairman, Governor Sanders, distinguished members of the Associated Industries of Georgia, distinguished members of the Georgia General Assembly, distinguished public officials, ladies and gentlemen, with complete candor, I can say that no honor, no award, no citation, no distinction, no medal, in fact, no recognition I have ever received can equal, in my heart and in my mind, that which you bestow upon me here tonight.

I accept this very high honor in humility, and with a deep sense of humility.

To the end of my days I will prize this beautiful medal and this magnificent scroll. But above all, I will cherish forever the memory of this occasion.

When I think of the many distinguished, outstanding Georgians who are far more qualified than I for this great honor, I am sure you will appreciate even more the humbleness, and the humility I feel on this occasion.

At no time in my public life have I had a privilege comparable to that which I enjoy tonight, standing in this banquet hall, surrounded by hundreds of dedicated, highly motivated, loyal, outstanding Georgians who have done so much to place Georgia in the main stream of events in this vigorous Nation of ours.

If I have made any contributions to the people of this Nation and to the people of the State of Georgia, it is due to the fact that the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Georgia have given me this very rare opportunity to serve them.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the honor you pay me tonight is in reality an honor to all the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Georgia.

An award of this significance can only have true meaning if it is based upon accomplishment, and the true measure of accomplishment is the success that is achieved; and any success I have achieved must be attributed to the men and women who have helped make that success possible.

Many years ago, I had the good fortune of being assigned to the old Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. Later, I became chairman of that committee.

After the Armed Services Committee was formed, I became chairman of that committee in the 81st Congress.

As a result, I have been intimately associated with national security matters.

As it turned out, national security, since 1939, has been one of the most important single items of concern to the American people.

There was a time, during the 1920's and 1930's when appeasement, conciliation, and hiding our heads in the shifting sands of international affairs was a part of our way of life.

Perhaps it was some instinct that I inherited from my pioneering ancestors that made me skeptical during those deceptively peaceful days, of the wisdom of remaining isolated from world affairs.

So in the 1930's I became vitally concerned with the Nation's lack of seapower.

No man who serves in the Congress of the United States can accomplish anything independently and by himself. And I shall always be proud of the Congress that authorized the construction of a two-ocean

Navy—a Navy that was completed in time to win the great naval engagements of World War II and bring about our final victory.

I also sat in the Congress listening to the anguished cries of Americans everywhere to bring our boys home.

These cries became an avalanche, and the greatest Army and Navy the world has ever seen, melted before our very eyes.

The Communists were quick to take advantage of this situation.

Fortunately, we then initiated the Greek-Turkish loan and the Marshall plan, and through American leadership, Europe was restored, and we entered into the NATO agreement, the SEATO agreement, and many other agreements for mutual defense.

I preached the doctrine then of maintaining a defense capable of deterring aggression, a force that remained stable in its size, its flexibility, and its versatility.

But in spite of my earnest pleadings, I must say that we were not prepared in June of 1950 when South Korea was invaded by the Communists.

We had adopted a military policy of going from a peak to a valley—and we paid the consequences.

Since that time, however, I have had the satisfaction of watching our Armed Forces approach a more stable composition.

And if I were asked to choose the one most important ingredient in our defense posture, I would say that it is the stability of our Armed Forces today that constitutes our greatest defense against aggression.

We have, of course, made fantastic strides in our ability to wage the war for peace, and I would like to think that that is exactly what we are doing—waging a war for peace.

Every shot that is not fired, every missile that is not unleashed, every bayonet that remains in its scabbard, every service hospital bed that does not contain a combat casualty, every round of ammunition that is not fired in anger is a victory in the war for peace.

But without these missiles, without these bayonets, without this ammunition, without all of the tools of warfare, and without the men and women with the ability to use these tools, none of us, I am confident, would be sitting here tonight approaching, as we are, the most prosperous period in all the history of mankind.

We have been blessed over the years with men of great vision and wisdom, and we have been blessed with outstanding leaders.

No one can read the state of the Union message delivered by President Johnson on January 8 and not be impressed with his enthusiasm, his confidence, his vision of a bigger, greater, and more prosperous America, and the clear indication that he proposes to lead our Nation to even greater heights.

And he is going to accomplish what he seeks, because business and industrial leaders, such as yourselves, will recognize in him a man who understands the problems of business, who believes in the free enterprise system, who will get a dollar's worth of value for a dollar expended, who intends to live within our means, who recognizes that a strong expanding economy is a vital part of our national security, and who will ask the Federal Government to do only that which the people cannot do for themselves.

This Nation is moving forward at a rate unparalleled in the history of all civilization.

Technological advances mean better things for all Americans, but these technological advances also present many complex problems.

The Federal Government, the State of Georgia, the local communities, and men and women—such as yourselves—working together must, and will, find the solutions to these many problems.

As life becomes easier, as more people enjoy more benefits, means of obtaining an

adequate livelihood for everyone willing to work, must be found.

This is the paradox that we face in the years ahead.

As we all enjoy more of the benefits of an expanding and improving civilization, we must make it possible for more Americans to obtain the wherewithal to purchase these benefits.

I have every confidence that America will respond to this challenge, just as the Federal Government will respond to this challenge, and just as the State of Georgia will respond to this challenge.

The State of Georgia is one of the great States of the Union. We are a part, and a vital part, of America.

There is no longer room in America for any form of parochialism or sectionalism. The problems of Los Angeles, Denver, Syracuse, and Boston are the problems of Atlanta, Augusta, Macon, and Milledgeville.

For example, those who are unemployed in Macon, are problems for the people of Wyoming and Montana, just as they are problems for the people of Georgia. The illiterates and the physically handicapped in Michigan are problems of all Americans, not just those who live in Michigan.

The problems that we face are problems we must solve and problems that will be solved. And they will be solved because we have dedicated outstanding men and women in every State of the Union.

But if I may be excused, Mr. Chairman, for being parochial on this one occasion, no State in the Nation can equal the accomplishment, the dedication, and the ability of those who constitute the business, the industrial, the professional, and the government leaders of the State of Georgia.

But in saying this, I also recognize the problems that face the State of Georgia.

Governor Sanders, I was most impressed with the magnificent message you delivered to the citizens of Georgia on Tuesday, January 7. You faced the issues squarely, and you presented the proposed solutions.

Education is certainly one of our greatest challenges, and we must exert every effort to overcome this deficiency.

Our form of democracy is beyond doubt the greatest system ever devised to regulate the activities of mankind.

We are the greatest nation on this earth, militarily, economically, and spiritually.

But we did not achieve this status by resisting change; we did not achieve this status by turning our backs on progress; nor did we achieve this status by being afraid to venture into new fields of endeavor.

Our form of democracy is the best known form of government.

But that does not mean that our form of democracy cannot be improved.

During the long period that I have served in the House of Representatives, I have been guided by one paramount principle—and that principle is my firm belief that nothing stands still. We either move forward, or we fall backward. There is no such thing as maintaining the status quo.

The greatness of this Nation, and the greatness of Georgia, can be attributed to the fact that God-fearing men and women with firm convictions and strong religious beliefs, men and women such as yourselves, have constantly sought to improve every form of our business, social, and industrial life.

As a nation, we have achieved advances in technology. We have made tremendous progress in bringing to the American people everywhere the better things in life.

Practically all the progress we have made in these fields of endeavor can be attributed to the fact that our educational system has improved.

In fact, the progress of America and the improvement in our educational system go hand in glove. But that educational sys-

tem, not only here in Georgia, but in every State of the Union, must be further improved.

And, above all, we must never forget that our form of government is based upon a fine balance between the initiative of our citizens, the wisdom of our free enterprise system, and the willingness of the people to turn to government only for those things that they cannot do for themselves.

Those projects that are closest to the people, but require financial assistance, must always remain at the local government level.

We must constantly oppose any effort to take from the States and the local governments those responsibilities that are government in nature, but can be best performed by those who are closest to the problems.

We must constantly guard against the tendency to seek solutions to our problems by centralizing the power of decision in the hands of the Federal Government.

As I approach the threshold of a half-century of service to the public, I am proud of the tremendous changes that have taken place here in the State of Georgia.

Not too many years ago, many of the younger citizens of Georgia were seeking opportunities outside the State of Georgia.

Many of them went to other States of the Union seeking employment.

But we are fast approaching an improved situation which augers well for the entire State of Georgia.

There are new opportunities here today, and there will be even greater opportunities in the years ahead, for native-born Georgians to enjoy all the benefits of our form of government and our way of life without having to leave this great State, upon whom nature has bestowed so many bounties.

This is a tribute to the associated industries of Georgia, to the farsightedness of our public officials, to the cooperation between the State of Georgia and the Federal Government, to the increasing awareness of the need for higher educational attainment, and to the recognition on the part of industry and business all over America that there are opportunities unlimited here in Georgia.

But these opportunities must be expanded to an even greater rate, for our population is growing, and we must not only keep pace with this growth, but create opportunities faster than our growth rate.

We must constantly strive to demonstrate to the rest of the Nation that, here in Georgia, we can, and will, present not only business opportunities, but we will make available skilled craftsmen who will make the free enterprise system flourish to an even greater degree.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be a Georgian. I am especially proud tonight, surrounded as I am, by some of the noblest Georgians of them all.

But I must temper my pride tonight with the knowledge that you have honored me far beyond anything I deserve.

Tonight, my star has reached its zenith. But tonight, I am the humblest Georgian of them all.

COMMITTEE OF MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, on the front page of the Washington Post for Saturday, January 25, there was a story stating that:

The House Merchant Marine Committee yesterday approved Senate-passed legislation to bar action by the Justice Department to collect fines totaling hundreds of millions of dollars from port authorities.

The story goes on to say that:

The Justice Department has 10 cases pending in an effort to recover penalties totaling about \$12 million from port authorities who had failed to file agreements between port owners and users with the Federal Maritime Commission.

The story is quite brief, and possibly through its brevity might leave the impression that the Congress is attempting to forgive wrongdoing by various port authorities while the Justice Department is attempting to collect millions of dollars worth of fines which are due the Government. This impression is not in any way justified by the facts.

The Shipping Act of 1916 provides in section 15 that every person subject to that act shall file with the Federal Maritime Commission a copy of every agreement fixing or regulating transportation rates or fares or otherwise having a restrictive or discriminatory effect on transportation. Until very recently leases of terminal facilities were not believed by anyone to be within the scope of section 15, and consequently agreements of this type were not filed with the Commission. However, in a recent case the Commission reversed the position it and its predecessors had taken in prior years and held that certain types of leases of terminal facilities needed to be filed with the agency under section 15, subject to fines or penalties for failure to file at as much as \$1,000 per day. This new interpretation was confirmed by the Federal court. As the result many parties to terminal leases who did not file them with the Commission in the belief that they were not subject to section 15, find themselves subject to heavy penalties for failure to obtain Commission approval. The effect of the Commission's new interpretation and the court decision was to cause great confusion and doubt throughout the ports of the country.

As brought out in our full hearings in the matter, the Commission reviewed the situation and concluded that while it would be desirable to have certain types of leases which are still in effect filed with and approved by the Commission, it also would be desirable to remove the doubts which have arisen as the result of the new interpretations of the law by legislation which would forgive innocent technical violations which have occurred in the past. Adm. John Harlee, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, testified:

It is the Commission's position that, while a sound regulatory purpose is served in requiring that terminal leases which in any

fashion limit or control competition be first submitted to the agency for approval, the needs of justice are not served by exacting penalties for past behavior under what amounts to a new or different construction of the law.

The Department of Justice reported favorably on the bill and concurred in the position taken by the Federal Maritime Commission in their testimony during the hearings held before the committee last week. The reports of the Federal Maritime Commission and the Department of Justice were approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

I felt, Mr. Speaker, that this statement was necessary to correct the erroneous impression which the news story may have left.

The newspaper article referred to is as follows:

HOUSE UNIT ACTS TO BAR SUITS

The House Merchant Marine Committee yesterday approved Senate-passed legislation to bar action by the Justice Department to collect fines totaling hundreds of millions of dollars from port authorities.

The Justice Department has 10 cases pending in an effort to recover penalties totaling about \$12 million from port authorities who had failed to file agreements between port owners and users with the Federal Maritime Commission.

The bill would declare a moratorium on the pending suits and port authorities would be given 90 days in which to file the agreements. Filing of the agreements is required under law which port authorities generally believed was no longer in effect.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate tomorrow, January 28.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPE, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Europe, of the Committee on Foreign Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate tomorrow, January 28.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

SOMEBODY HAD BETTER TELL THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE THE FACTS OF LIFE

Mr. WHITTEN. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the sad things in history is that people are so very forgetful, that no generation seems to have remembered the lessons of the past. It has been said that each depression usually happens because folks forget the cause of the last one and do not know it; and that most wars come about because people forget what happened before. With those thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the following statement:

Mr. Speaker, I note from the press that Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman are having a real contest over the position the United States should take in 1964's worldwide tariff negotiations, particularly with the European Common Market.

Secretary Freeman insists American negotiations must not agree to any compromise that would curtail overseas markets for agricultural products.

Secretary of State Rusk feels just as strongly that it is vital for this Nation to win a "political victory" in the trade negotiations, even if the cost is a tightened agricultural market.

AGRICULTURE, FOUNDATION OF OUR HIGH STANDARD OF LIVING

Mr. Speaker, I have served on the Appropriations Committee, handling defense, public works, and all the rest. I have served as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture for many years. Mr. Speaker, somebody had better tell the Secretary of State some of the facts of life—not only that meat, bread, and potatoes are necessities of life for all Americans, but that American agriculture, the 8 percent of our people on the farm, makes it possible for the other 92 percent to maintain our high standard of living.

Somebody had better tell the Secretary of State it is this 8 percent in agriculture which enables this Nation to spend over 60 percent of its governmental income on national defense and related matters without reducing our standard of living.

Somebody had better tell Secretary Rusk that American agriculture is by far the greatest market American labor and industry have—\$28 billion spent annually producing a crop and \$15 billion spent annually for things other Americans buy.

Somebody should tell the Secretary 16 million people have jobs storing, transporting, processing, and selling agricultural products.

Somebody had better tell the Secretary that American agriculture historically has had to export about 30 percent of its production to remain economically healthy and to maintain this domestic market for labor and industry.

We know of our gold and balance-of-payments problems. It is agriculture which is our best earner of dollars abroad. We cannot afford to give up these dollars.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, somebody had better remind Secretary of State Rusk that it is his Department of State which promoted the spending of billions of dollars abroad making competitors out of our customers, and is responsible for our

shortsighted policy of holding U.S. products off world markets, all to gain what has proved to be empty political victories; that after all it was his Department which promoted the European Common Market which he now would help to squeeze U.S. agriculture out.

Somebody had better tell the Secretary of State that the drop in purchasing power of American agriculture set off the depression of the thirties, and that if the Secretary, the President, and the 92 percent of Americans dependent upon this 8 percent are not careful it could happen again.

BALANCE NEEDED BETWEEN THE SEGMENTS OF OUR ECONOMY

I know President Johnson knows that U.S. farm programs were set up to maintain a balance between agriculture, industry, and labor, by maintaining farm income and purchasing power; that in order for farm laws to work, surpluses must be kept off domestic markets; and that to permit increase in imports of cattle, meat products, cotton, or any other commodities above normal and to the point of having surplus supplies on the domestic market not only fails to carry out the intent of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, decreases farm income and purchasing power, but adds greatly to the costs to our Government.

Mr. Speaker, if you were to compare the total cost of all farm programs with the increased costs of labor because of laws and the markup of industry above costs, all passed on to the consumer as part of the retail price, you would find agriculture's share small indeed.

Someone ought to point out that the investment per worker required of the farmer is twice that of industry; his return on his investment is less than half that of industry; and his risks perhaps four times that of industry. His return for his labor is less than half that other Americans receive.

Mr. Speaker, compare the United States, where only 8 percent of our people are on farms, thus freeing 92 percent to provide goods or services, with Russia, where about 50 percent are on the farms to produce food and fiber—leaving only 50 percent of their population to provide goods and services, including defense.

In a nutshell, there is the major explanation for the vast difference between our standard of living and that of our chief opponent, Russia.

Mr. Speaker, I hope President Johnson, with his fine record of support of agriculture while in Congress, his knowledge gained in his boyhood days during the depression, will make a farm speech—not to the farmers, but to the 92 percent who are so dependent upon farmers for their unbelievably high standard of living and well-being. I trust he intends to do so. Certainly, such a special message is badly needed, for only the President can get the attention of the press, television, and radio on this subject.

THE DISGRACE OF FRENCH RECOGNITION OF CHINA

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a sorry day for freedom. Our once-proud ally, France, has recognized the goddess, criminal government of aggressor Red China as a lawful government.

What price honor? What an insult to the United States. What an insult to free governments everywhere. What a colossal disgrace to the graves of those men and women who have fought and died for freedom and for France, including Frenchmen, by the tens of thousands.

Is it to be anything for money nowadays? Even international honor? Recognition of a Communist government committed to destroy France, committed to destroy those still strong enough to save France if there is another world war, is an incomprehensible act for a freedom hero like Charles de Gaulle. The establishment of a Communist embassy in France will be a headquarters for espionage, subversion, and if need be sabotage. The pattern will be the same in France as it has been in every Communist embassy around the world. Recognition for trade will only make Communists stronger. It will earn money for France, yes—but it will be worthless once communism is strong enough to take over by force.

Mr. Speaker, what have we left? Where is courage in the West? Where is the pride of Western peoples in principle? Where is the moral fibre of western allies once devoted to our common cause of freedom and justice, once willing to die rather than to see a Fascist tyranny trample over Europe?

Communist tyranny is no less great a danger than was Adolf Hitler. It is every bit as much a danger to the Jewish peoples of the world as was Hitler, Auschwitz, Dachau, and all the infamous horrors of genocide.

Is everything to be lost for us by an official Washington these days that is lost in the shambles of the influence peddling shown in the Bobby Baker disclosures, shambles that I might say do not yet seem to have touched the bottom of the well. A good many important people in important places in the Nation's Capital are uneasy in this knowledge. I wonder if the lack of outrage in official Washington at this incomprehensible French weakening of allied unity in some measure is due to abandonment of devotion to good government for having yielded to personal economic pressures?

How many prominent Americans in the Government of the United States, of whatever branch, have a price for honor? Is this infecting America's capacity to retaliate? Does this destroy our will to resist the Communist aggressor? Does this cause Americans who fancy themselves leaders to feel that, well, maybe it would be better to be Red than dead?

Mr. Speaker, this is a shameful mess, from Foggy Bottom to the White House to Capitol Hill.

The American people deserve better.

The armed services, who are asked to be ready to die for us, are beginning to wonder whether it is worth it for what they see in Washington.

So are the American people—and so is the world.

THE LINDSAY BILL TO REGULATE FIREARM SHIPMENTS

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, recently an article in the Christian Science Monitor related how a 13-year-old San Francisco boy, with his parents' consent, ordered by mail for \$9.95 what he thought was a model of a Soviet bazooka.

According to the article, the boy wanted the model bazooka to add to his "realistic toy" collection. He was sure, from the way the picture in the advertisement looked, that this model would be just like the real thing.

The "model" finally arrived in a 4-foot crate with a \$22.60 freight bill. It was, indeed, the real thing.

Josephine Ripley, who wrote this article as one of a series for the Monitor, commented how this illustrated the ease and legality with which guns may be purchased today by teenagers or anyone else. Ironically, her series was written just a month before our country was shocked and numbed by the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. He was killed by bullets from a mail-order rifle.

Today, I am introducing legislation aimed at protecting our citizens and officials from needless gun death at the hands of irresponsible individuals. My bill is designed to hit at the heart of the problem—it would regulate the interstate shipment of firearms, the gun mail-order business. I will explain the terms of the Lindsay bill later in these remarks.

There is no dearth of incidents just as ludicrous as the one concerning the San Francisco youth and the Soviet bazooka. Another lad with a mail-order bazooka took it out in the countryside and began shooting transformers off utility posts.

A Pittsburgh police inspector told of finding a gunman firing shots on a main thoroughfare in the city. The gunman told the inspector he was only firing at rodents behind a display advertising board. The man had purchased the gun by mail order after he had seen it advertised in a printed periodical. The inspector said the man, prior to this incident, had been under investigation for armed robbery but was released because of lack of evidence.

There is no dearth, either, of incidents where mail-order or illegally-purchased guns have been used to rob and murder.

In California, a 33-year-old man was shot to death by his wife. She told police she had bought the murder weapon, a .25-caliber revolver, from a mail-order house.

In Virginia, a 17-year-old boy walked into a gun shop, police said, told a salesman he was 23, gave a fictitious name and address, paid out \$65 in cash and walked out with the weapon of his choice. Later, police charged, the weapon was used in a murder.

In Oregon, a 22-year-old escapee from a mental hospital bought a .38-caliber automatic pistol for \$49.50 in a pawnshop. A few days later he used it to shoot and kill a traveling businessman.

Some mail-order houses, in their efforts to bolster their business, have carried amazing magazine advertisements:

Submachinegun for Father's Day? A limited quantity of brandnew, hard-to-get U.S.-made machine guns now available, complete with magazine.

Looks like a ballpoint pen, writes like a ballpoint pen. But cleverly built into the other end is a .22-caliber pistol.

A 7.92 machine rifle: The Fuhrer himself ordered these machine rifles for the Wehrmacht in the last days of World War II. Only because they appeared so late in the war did they not completely annihilate the invading Allied forces.

Many weapons advertised in this way are incredibly easy to obtain. The only requirement: be able to sign your name, lick a postage stamp, and pay the cash.

James V. Bennett, Director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons, has said:

Anyone can buy a gun in this country, almost anywhere. All that one needs is the price.

He cites case after case in which men with prison records, or mental defectives, have had no trouble buying a gun at a "moment's notice."

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, said recently:

Those who claim that the availability of firearms is not a factor in murders in this country are not facing reality.

In 1962, the FBI reported, 54 percent of the victims in 7,261 murders were killed with guns. And, Mr. Hoover said:

A review of the motives for murder suggests that a readily accessible gun enables the perpetrator to kill on impulse.

Yet with this situation facing the Nation, laws concerning firearms are in this kind of shape:

In 41 States and the District of Columbia, there are no license requirements for the purchase of firearms.

Only 21 States and the District of Columbia require dealers to be licensed before selling handguns at retail.

Only seven States require a permit to purchase a gun.

Only in New York State is a license required to carry a handgun.

Only in Hawaii must guns be registered, and only in South Carolina is it against the law to sell a handgun.

As the New York Times pointed out recently in an editorial:

It is, unfortunately, easy to have a rifle shipped from Chicago to a Dallas box number, under an assumed name.

With this situation confronting us, I feel stronger Federal legislation aimed at controlling the sale and reckless use of firearms is necessary. The Lindsay bill introduced today is designed to regulate the interstate shipment of firearms.

My measure would prohibit mail-order shipments of firearms, sight unseen, to individuals, either through the mails or by railway express or other common carrier. My bill, however, would permit such shipments between manufacturers and dealers provided they are properly licensed.

The Lindsay bill would also increase the license fees for manufacturers to \$50, for dealers to \$10, and for pawnbrokers to \$50. Licensed manufacturers and dealers would be required to keep permanent records of production supply and shipment and other means of disposal for firearms.

As it now stands, pistols and revolvers are exempted from the controls of the National Firearms Act. The Federal law does establish license requirements for firearms dealers. And it does prohibit shipment of guns to known criminals or persons under indictment.

But, as Mr. Bennett has pointed out, the Government has to prove that a dealer knew or had cause to believe that a person was not lawfully eligible to receive a gun in interstate shipment—and this is a very difficult thing to prove. As of last year, no convictions had ever been made under this provision of the Federal statute.

At present, Federal statutes prohibit post office "mailing" of hand guns—revolvers and pistols. But hand guns may be shipped by Railway Express and other common carriers. Rifles and shotguns may be shipped through the U.S. mails. In short, Federal law does not restrict interstate "shipments" of firearms on the basis of "mail orders."

State laws, in a few cases, have strict regulations on licensing and purchasing. But where one State may have a strong law, the State next to it probably has a weak one, and it is but a few miles travel across the line for an individual who wants to take advantage of the weaker provision.

As I pointed out, mail-order shipments to individuals other than licensed dealers or manufacturers would be stopped. Dealers could ship only to other dealers. This would eliminate the impulsive purchase by mail of a dangerous weapon by any individual who can write his name and put up the money.

My measure would also prevent an unlicensed individual from receiving firearms shipped from overseas. This provision, coupled with the interstate commerce regulation, and with stricter licensing procedures, will hit hard at the very thing that contributed to the assassination of our President. Lee Harvey Oswald bought an Italian-made rifle from a Chicago mail-order house, according to the FBI. That rifle was probably shipped, disassembled, from overseas, originally.

It was estimated by Senator THOMAS J. DONN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, that as many as 7 million cheap, foreign-made guns may have come into this country during the past 5 years.

I am proposing higher license fees for dealers and manufacturers because I believe this can help rid our Nation of

fly-by-night gun dealers. At present, almost anyone can become a dealer by filling out a form and paying \$1.

The Lindsay bill also restricts dealer licenses to persons over 21. There is no age limitation under present Federal law.

Opponents of firearms legislation have argued that stricter provisions would trespass the second amendment to the Constitution, which states that "the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed." I say that our right to "keep and bear arms" does not mean that you or I have a right to walk down the street with a bundle of hand grenades tied to our waist, or to enter a streetcar with a loaded shotgun, or to obtain a high-power rifle with a telescopic sight by mail-order.

Certainly in framing gun-control laws we must think carefully about the constitutional aspects of the question. Surely, there is no reason why we should prevent responsible adults or even minors from possessing licensed firearms—for self-protection, hunting, target-shooting, or gun collections. But it should also be apparent that the unrestricted traffic in death weapons must be stopped.

In 1787, when the second amendment was written, the rifle was the principal weapon of national defense, and it made good sense for every adult male to be able to use one.

Today, the national security no longer depends on the citizen's weapon, nor does the citizen himself. And, most significant, the population is now densely packed into urban areas, and it is diverse and mobile. In our changed and complicated society, guns have become more dangerous, and they demand more careful use. The Constitution is interpreted in the light of the times; protection today means the reasonable regulation of firearms—not the absence of any regulation.

And even the most ardent gun collector or avid sportsman must admit that there is neither sense nor safety in the present state of this Nation's laws. Responsible sportsmen and gun owners find their sport or hobby degraded by the greedy practices of irresponsible gun sellers and the murderous practices of irresponsible gun buyers. I cannot see how it helps bona fide hunters, gun lovers and even the dealers and manufacturers to have a national sport become a national scandal.

The Lindsay bill is modeled basically on the Dodd bill in the Senate except that the Dodd bill would allow interstate gun shipments to individuals who can provide affidavits to the manufacturer or dealer with their gun order. I doubt that this provision in the Dodd bill sufficiently plugs the loopholes in the gun laws, and further, I believe it might be difficult to enforce.

I have written an article which appears this week in the Saturday Evening Post in which I call for Federal firearms legislation, and in addition, for uniform State laws on the subject and an education program on the part of magazines and television. In the article, I called attention to the plethora of magazine advertisements promoting the shipment of guns to would-be "gun slingers."

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Lindsay bill is a workable solution to the problem of free wheeling gun sales and irresponsible possession of these lethal weapons in our country. We need to plug the loopholes and bolster up our firearms law, and provide uniform regulations for all the States.

The public recognizes this need. In a recent Gallup poll, a clear majority of the voters favored stricter firearms control.

We are not treading on constitutional rights here. We are simply attempting to keep guns out of the hands of juvenile delinquents, and fanatics, and criminals. We must not sell these weapons that are capable of inflicting death to individuals whom we know are quite capable of using them for crime and murder. Our citizens deserve this protection.

I urge my fellow Members of Congress to consider this legislation carefully, especially in light of our need for stronger legislation. I believe this measure is the answer.

OUR PROBLEMS IN PANAMA

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] 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 Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, all of us have been concerned with the complex nature of the problem in Panama. There are a number of aspects to this problem and today I would like to call two editorials from newspapers in my district to the attention of my colleagues.

The Standard Times of New Bedford, Mass., has written on January 22, 1964, "We 'Reap' in Panama" and maintains that our current problems stem from previous errors in our foreign policy where we have too strongly advocated independence for youthful and undeveloped nations.

"Lesson of Panama" appeared on January 23, 1964, in the Old Colony Memorial of Plymouth, Mass. It recommends that our diplomatic service ought to send foreign service personnel who would recognize the need to live more compatibly with the people of the country to which they are assigned. As the editorial says the number of U.S. dependents in foreign countries should be reduced. Following are those two editorials which provide valuable background for understanding the Panama situation:

WE "REAP" IN PANAMA

Referring to the Panama crisis, nationally-known Columnist William S. White wrote, "Some unpleasantly buzzardlike chickens are coming home to roost."

The New York Times veteran political writer Arthur Krock phrased it differently, but said the same thing: "The bloody anti-American riots in the Panama Canal Zone are logical consequences of the paradox of U.S. foreign policies."

If there are Americans who do not understand what Messrs. White and Krock are saying, consider these items of modern history:

In recent years, the United States has encouraged the formation of new nations long before they were capable of self-government.

It has accepted or abetted military aggression undertaken in the name of "anticolonialism," as in Goa and West New Guinea.

In the United Nations, the United States has fallen in line with the most extreme anticolonialists.

In December 1960, our U.N. delegation abstained, but with an expression of "deep regret," from supporting an irresponsible demand for "immediate steps to transfer all powers to the peoples of these (Angolan) territories, without any conditions or reservations."

But the United States did convict Portugal of "repressive measures" in Angola without waiting for a finding from a U.N. mission dispatched there to evaluate the charges.

By June 1962, the United States had assumed a far more extravagant "anticolonial" position and supported a resolution with respect to the terrorist activities against Portugal in Angola that provided virtually the same things as did the 1960 version. This marked a major shift of Washington policy on issues of "colonialism."

One other action is noteworthy.

As Mr. White noted, "To its lasting shame, the U.S. Government under Republican President Eisenhower, but with no effective protest from the Democrats (in 1956) joined with the Soviet Union in branding as 'aggression' the effort of the British, French and Israelis to strike the throttling hands of Nasser Egypt from the Suez Canal."

Thus we established a United States-United Nations definition of "aggression" and set a historic precedent that invites international theft, as long as the property-grabber can claim to be acting under the sacred banner of "anticolonialism."

Washington has followed this paradoxical course in order to attract favorable "world opinion" and to avert a "confrontation" of major East-West power that could trigger nuclear war, to employ its own favorite excuses and pet phrases.

Now, our "anticolonial" position, aimed at wooing the Asians, Africans and Soviets, has backfired.

When, in the interests of national security and the defense of the Western Hemisphere, we had to use force to protect our alien sovereignty of the Panama Canal Zone, we reaped the bitter harvest of our own shortsighted policies.

We were promptly accused by "world opinion" of "aggression" and "colonialism." Our own bold speeches on these subjects were quoted to us in support of the charges against us.

Our errors in judgment have produced a tragic sequel.

LESSON OF PANAMA

From a purely objective standpoint it is absurd that the Panamanians should feel so hatefully toward us. In final analysis we Americans are not really responsible for their low estate. They are the product of their own history and geography. If there were no canal, Panama would sink out of sight and become an entirely irredeemable jungle slum.

However, we cannot expect Panamanians to admit they are a second-rate people doomed to a second-rate situation. Indeed, it is only natural that they should seek to put the blame for their shortcomings on what they regard as the arrogant, self-satisfied intruders in their midst.

They see the neat tile-roofed homes, the well-tended grounds, the smooth streets of the Canal Zone and hunger to have such things themselves. They long for permanence, comfort and all the nice things of life. And of course it never occurs to them that all these pleasant things are paid in good measure out of taxes generated by the

energies and skills of 180 million American people, working with a purposefulness unknown in Panama.

To them the American presence in Panama is a chronic provocation, a thorn in their side. This is a fact of life which we Americans too little take into account in our dealings with foreigners all over the world. No matter where we go, more often than not we end up by being disliked. It happens everywhere, from Zanzibar to Panama, from Vietnam to Spain.

The ideal would be to have all forms of foreign service marked by simple living and no favors asked. In sum, American power abroad should be masked. There should be no wives and families tagging along, ordering servants about, getting special deals at commissaries created for their self-indulgent benefit.

But it seems to be generally believed that unless the military and the State Department provides a soft, cumshaw situation it will be impossible to recruit "the kind of men we want." Our contention is, this kind of man, who must be bought, over the long run cannot hope to prevail in competition with other, harder political philosophies. Therefore, it is all a great waste of money.

If all wives and children of Canal Zone employees were shipped home, with a corresponding reduction in semicolonial felicities, much of the trouble would vanish overnight. Panamanians would not be any better off. But we would have one less headache. And so it goes in comparable outpost situations throughout the world.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORT RESTRICTIONS IMPOSE COSTLY PENALTY ON NEW ENGLAND

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] 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 Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, New England is suffering from the administration's policy of refusing to relax residual oil import restrictions despite a shortage of residual fuel oil in the United States. Power costs in New England are highest in the Nation; and although the administration has proposed the vast Passamaquoddy electric project as an answer, it has ignored the immediate obvious relief available for the Northeast: allowing more residual oil to enter the United States.

This artificial fuel shortage increases costs to 50 million consumers on the east coast. In my State, the preventing of private enterprise from operating in the fuel industry is costing a New Hampshire Electric Co. more than \$300,000 a year.

For the RECORD I am including my December 20, 1963, letter to Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, his January 20, reply, and my reply to him of January 24, 1964:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 20, 1963.
HON. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On Monday, December 9, President Johnson restored to you the responsibilities and role of being the chief agency for petroleum policy matters for the

Federal Government. After your talk with the President that date, you stated "we will have a heavier responsibility than in the past on oil matters, referring especially to all import controls." As a Member of Congress who has been fighting aggressively for relief for my State, as well as all of New England, on this subject of restrictions on residual fuel oil imports, I am most happy to see that we now have one central source that we can go to. I commend President Johnson for making this decision since it will eliminate the confusion of the past that resulted in divided authority and responsibility on oil imports between the White House and your Department.

As you are well aware, in view of the statements that you and your senior aids made at the time of the announcement of the Passamaquoddy project, New England power costs are the highest in the Nation. The findings of the Federal Power Commission studies in the past have always confirmed the fact that New England power costs are the highest in the Nation and, further, that the prime factor creating these high power costs was, and is, the high cost of fuel. The restrictions on residual fuel oil imports that have been kept in effect for the past several years, have been a major source that has contributed to the burden that the New England consumer has had to shoulder in the form of high fuel costs which, in turn, have created the highest power costs in the Nation.

In spite of the facts that I and my colleagues from New England have made known to you in the past, that the coal industry's problems are caused by factors other than residual fuel oil competition, these controls have been kept in force for apparent political reasons. I want to stress again the causes of the coal industry's problems—namely, automation, which now requires only 170,000 miners to do the work of 400,000 miners 10 years ago in order to produce the same volume of coal, conversions from coal to diesel fuel oil by the railroads, and by household consumers from coal to No. 2 fuel oil. None of these products has any direct connection with residual fuel oil. Another factor that has contributed to the coal industry's problems is the fact that the coal mine owners have looked to the taxpayer to finance their research and development in both technological as well as marketing research. An example of the latter is the fact that the coal industry last year spent less than \$20 million on research and development as against over \$400 million by the oil industry.

Please do not misunderstand me, I am not unsympathetic to the problems of coal regions. In fact, I think it is the responsibility of both the coal mine owners as well as the Federal and State Governments to do everything in their combined power to assist in retraining programs, relocation programs, as well as efforts to attract diversified industries into the depressed areas. Another potential outlet for coal, and one virtually untapped because of the failure of the coal mine owners to aggressively develop foreign markets, is the potential for U.S. coal exports. Here again the coal industry had the taxpayer pay approximately \$100,000 for a detailed study by Robert Nathan Associates, "The Foreign Market Potential for U.S. Coal."

I endorse this program 100 percent and urge its implementation to the end that U.S. coal, which, because of its automation can compete with any coal produced in the free world, gets its fair share of foreign markets. Because, in this manner, not only will we help the coal regions, but we will make a very considerable contribution to our serious balance-of-payments program.

Speaking for my own State, residual fuel oil imports have placed an undue burden on every resident of the State, as well as on our industrial machine. At the start of the century, New England was the heart of our industrial empire and now it is far down the line, and one of the main causes of this slip-

page has been the high cost of power and the high cost of fuel. In the case of the Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, I am informed by President Schiller that his utility is paying a premium of at least \$300,000 per year due to residual import controls. If we had the traditional free enterprise market economy in residual fuel oil in New Hampshire, President Schiller could effect savings to his customers in his residual fuel oil costs that would, on the basis of present price levels, result in a saving of at least \$300,000 per annum.

There is no rhyme nor reason for the continuation of the present restrictions on residual fuel oil. They are not helping the coal industry; they are causing the cost of living for the 50-million-odd consumers on the east coast to be higher due to increased fuel costs; they are denying the consumer his traditional right of freedom of choice of supplier; they are hurting friends and customers abroad such as Venezuela; they are compromising our position in our trade affairs because we will have to set aside \$750 million of import trade when Governor Herter and his trade negotiating team meet in GATT conferences next year; and, finally, these imports are of no impact on our domestic oil industries, as witness the fact that at the annual meeting of the Industrial Petroleum Association of America in Dallas last November, this reputable and responsible organization excluded residual fuel oil imports from its resolution on the overall subject of oil imports.

Mr. Secretary, the evidence is such that you can by no stretch of the imagination justify the continuation of these import restrictions which are causing such hardship to the consumer in New England. At least, if you will not lift these controls, then reform the governing regulations so that the factor of end-use control is eliminated and freedom of choice of supplier by the consumer is returned to the marketplace.

Although I have stressed my own State of New Hampshire and the New England region in this letter, as you know, this is a matter of direct concern to all eastern seaboard States. I noticed with interest that Senator JAVITS and Senator KEATING have joined in the battle to remove the infamous residual oil quotas, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 19, pages 25005-25007.

Yours very truly,
JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1964.
HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CLEVELAND: Your interest regarding oil imports, specifically residual fuel oil imports, as expressed in your letter of December 20, 1963, is appreciated.

In early 1959, the President's Special Cabinet Committee To Investigate Crude Oil Imports recommended to the President that imports of crude oil and its derivatives, including residual fuel oil, should be controlled in the interests of the national security. These recommendations were adopted by the President and incorporated in Presidential Proclamation 3279 which sets forth the terms of the mandatory oil import control program. The control program, as you know, is designed to assure the maintenance of a healthy domestic petroleum industry capable of exploring for and developing petroleum reserves essential to the national security.

At the outset, it was recognized that control of oil imports would entail moderate additional costs to the U.S. economy. These costs were weighed against the benefits that flow to the economy from a healthy domestic oil industry and were found fully justified.

Were the program or many of its elements abandoned, we might expect to see some immediate price reductions. The long-term costs to the economy of this abandonment might, however, prove to be very substantial. The moderate immediate additional costs attributable to the program are necessary to the maintenance of an industry that is perhaps the most essential of all to our national security. When the national security contribution of the residual fuel oil program is measured in the broader terms of the overall petroleum import control system, it is apparent that in order to maintain the integrity of the control program it is necessary to retain controls on all of the principal derivatives of crude oil, including residual fuel oil.

Taken alone, almost any product of petroleum could probably be determined to present no particular problem from the standpoint of national security, and the argument could be made that controls on such product could be eliminated without danger to the Nation. From the standpoint of the total petroleum position of the United States, however, the logical extension of this argument could and would lead to piecemeal dismemberment of a program which is almost universally recognized as being essential to the national interest.

The Department in the past 3 years has made important progress in liberalizing the terms of entry into the residual fuel oil import program. You will recall that when the program was initiated, participation was limited to those firms having an importing history. In April 1961, after my initial detailed review of the program, eligibility was broadened to include all individuals and corporations in the business of selling residual fuel oil, who owned or controlled terminal facilities capable of receiving oceangoing vessels. In the revisions to the program, effective April 1, 1963, the proportion of oil available to this new class of eligibles was significantly increased.

These actions have had, and will continue to have, the effect of maintaining healthy competition within the industry. In this connection, I would be the first to admit that it is most difficult to maintain effective control of imports of residual fuel oil and at the same time engender within the industry the degree of competition which would exist in the absence of such controls. The Department has examined sympathetically numerous proposals which, according to their supporters, would have just this effect. We find on examination, however, that these proposals, while perhaps favoring one industry group over another, would not in fact increase competition within the industry, and would raise serious questions as to the equitable distribution of allocations.

We will continue to examine carefully and sympathetically, all proposals placed before the Department for improvement of this program, and we shall continue to work actively on our own to devise and incorporate further improvements. In the meantime, I wish to assure you that in the future, as in the past, the program will be so administered as to guarantee that sufficient supplies of residual fuel oil are made available to meet consumer requirements.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 24, 1964.

HON. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for your letter dated January 20. Since I feel that a number of your conclusions are open to discussion, I am offering herewith a critique of

your letter. My comments are in the sequence in which your letter was written.

With regard to the second paragraph of your letter, I agree with the basic premise, namely, that the control program is aimed at assuring a "healthy domestic petroleum industry capable of exploring for and developing petroleum reserves essential to the national security." Such a statement can only be made with regard to crude oil control program since the domestic industry is not producing sufficient residual fuel oil to satisfy domestic demand. In fact, each year production of residual fuel oil by domestic refineries has been decreased to the point that I understand there is a serious shortage of this product as the current license year draws to an end due to the fact that domestic production of this product during this license year has been far less than the estimates developed by the Bureau of Mines. I contend therefore that your statement can only apply to crude oil and when used in the context of a letter discussing residual fuel oil imports such a statement is of no significance.

Regarding your third paragraph, you state that "control of oil imports would entail moderate additional costs to the U.S. economy." "Were the program or any of its elements abandoned, we might expect to see some immediate price reductions." "The long-term costs to the economy of this abandonment might, however, prove to be very substantial." It would appear that you are making a case for import restrictions of residual fuel oil on the basis of a price support program which is in complete contradiction to the contention that this program is needed for national security reasons. I also want to draw attention to the fact that your statements are in complete disregard of the interests of the 50 million consumers on the east coast who want the benefits of a free competitive enterprise system and not to be placed in a position wherein our Government forces them to pay higher prices for their energy. In this same paragraph you state "When the national security contribution of the residual fuel oil program is measured in the broader terms of the overall petroleum import control system, it is apparent that in order to maintain the integrity of the control program it is necessary to retain controls on all of the principal derivatives of crude oil, including residual fuel oil." Your argument does not stand up in the light of my previous remarks and I further want to draw your attention to the Office of Emergency Planning memorandum on residual fuel oil dated February 13, 1963, which effectively exploded any fictitious arguments that national security was being imperiled by residual fuel oil imports.

Regarding your fourth paragraph, I contend that your argument will not stand up except in the case of crude oil imports, namely, that this program is "almost universally recognized as being essential to the national interest." Incidentally, and just for the record, my State is being penalized and being forced to subsidize the coal mine owners on residual fuel oil and the domestic oil industry on crude oil. It is a recognized fact that every barrel of crude oil imported is worth \$1.25 to the importers, most of whom cannot physically use this imported oil and therefore sell their imports for a windfall of \$1.25 a barrel, for which they incur no expenses or responsibilities. Here again the consumer in my State is paying an indirect subsidy in the form of higher priced gasoline and kerosene. The New England consumer is getting hit from all sides.

Regarding your fifth paragraph, you state that your Department, in the past 3 years, has liberalized the residual fuel oil import program. I agree with this statement, but it is misleading in the fact that the liberalization has only been a token one and has not given any relief to the consumer who is still tied to one supplier under your inequitous regulatory control system and

procedures. In this regard I would like to quote from a letter from Mr. Schiller, president of the Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, addressed to President Johnson under date of December 27 in reply to the President's appeal "to get a dollar's value for every dollar spent." I quote from Mr. Schiller's letter "Prices might be further reduced to these installations, as well as to the public in general if the anti-New England import restrictions on residual oil imports were removed or greatly liberalized. Because of our geographical location, we are in a very high cost fuel area."

Regarding your sixth paragraph, you then go on to take credit for the above liberalization actions, and "the effect of maintaining healthy competition within the industry." I contend there is no competition, when by government decree consumers are tied to one supplier and the independent suppliers are in turn handcuffed to a primary supplier. You then go on to mention that your Department has studied "numerous proposals" to "engender within the industry the degree of competition which would exist in the absence of such controls." It seems to me that there is only one solution, and that is to revise the regulations to the end that consumers have returned to them a traditional right, namely, that of freedom of choice of suppliers.

Regarding your final paragraph, I sincerely hope that you "will continue to examine carefully and sympathetically, all proposals placed before the Department for improvement of this program." I regret that I have to disagree with your contention that you have administered the program in such a manner as to "guarantee that sufficient supplies of residual fuel are made available to meet consumer requirements." The mere fact that the New Hampshire Electric Co. is being forced to pay in excess of \$300,000 a year more than it would pay for energy under a free enterprise economy, is positive proof, in my opinion, that an artificial shortage is being created as a result of your administration and continued refusal to give any relief to the 50 million consumers on the east coast.

In closing, this is a nonpartisan issue of vital importance to every consumer in my State. It is an issue that every Member in the House of Representatives, from every State that does not possess indigenous source of low-cost energy, should become interested in so that, finally, positive action is taken by the administration, and controls on residual fuel oil either eliminated or liberalized to serve the best interests of the 50 million Atlantic coast consumers.

Yours very truly,

JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
Member of Congress.

THE DAVIS-BACON FRINGE BENEFITS BILL

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 28, we are scheduled to consider the Davis-Bacon fringe benefits bill, H.R. 6041, a most important and greatly needed bill. The bill would update the Davis-Bacon Act by requiring consideration of fringe benefits as part of the prevailing wage determination on Federal construction contracts. Since 1931, when the Davis-Bacon Act was enacted to prevent the

depressing of local labor conditions by federally contracted construction, health and welfare benefits have become a major factor in the total wage package. To ignore this is to defeat the principle of the Davis-Bacon Act, a principle which is as valid today as it was in 1931.

This bill which we will consider tomorrow has received substantial support from the construction industry, both from contractor associations and labor organizations. I have received many letters urging that this bill be passed immediately as reported by the Committee on Education and Labor. As sponsor of the legislation and as chairman of the subcommittee which conducted the hearings on the bill, I am very pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues four particularly incisive and articulate letters requesting prompt passage of H.R. 6041 without amendment.

NATIONAL ELECTRICAL
CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1964.

The Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT,
Chairman, General Subcommittee on Labor,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: By way of introduction, the National Electrical Contractors Association is the recognized representative of the electrical contracting industry, which includes more than 15,000 small business concerns primarily engaged in the business of making on-the-site electrical installations. On the average, they individually employ fewer than 10 workmen. These concerns are located in every community of the United States and are engaged in building projects which range from small homes to such complex installations as atomic energy plants and missile complexes.

The association and its members understand that the bill (H.R. 6041) to amend the Davis-Bacon Act so as to include fringe benefits in the determination of prevailing wages is scheduled for House consideration on January 9, 1964.

In March of 1963, we presented testimony in support of legislation designed to include fringe benefits in prevailing wages. The association has also supported similar legislation introduced in previous sessions of Congress. This letter reaffirms our previous position and it is also a specific endorsement of H.R. 6041.

We are convinced that this bill further effectuates the original legislative intent of Congress in passing the Davis-Bacon Act—protection of prevailing living standards of local building tradesmen from the depressing effects of imported cheap labor on Government construction. Additionally, we believe this bill is a substantial benefit to the public as it further assures a quality construction job by strengthening competitive competence between construction contractors performing or seeking to perform construction work for the Federal Government. It is interesting to note that legislation similar to H.R. 6041 has already been enacted in a significant number of States which have prevailing wage laws.

Objection to H.R. 6041 and other similar bills has been made by some organizations. Although many of these organizations support the amendment, they first want to obtain a revision and modification of the current Davis-Bacon procedures. In particular, such organizations have requested some form of review of either prevailing wage determinations or enforcement cases.

After many months of careful study and review of the act's administration, the Secretary of Labor, on January 4, 1964, issued an

extensive revision changing and improving Davis-Bacon Act and procedures. We are of the firm opinion that this revision satisfies any prior reasonable and realistic complaints concerning former Davis-Bacon procedures. The new regulations establish a Wage Appeals Board to provide for administrative review of both prevailing wage determinations and enforcement cases. This Board is to be composed of competent and experienced public members. This provision for review is both reasonable and workable.

Other changes resulting from the revision include extending the period of effectiveness of prevailing wage determinations from 90 to 120 days from their issuance. The period during which no changes in the wage determinations may be made was increased from 5 to 10 days prior to the opening of bids. Changes concerning payroll deductions and debarment provisions were also included in the revision.

We understand that your subcommittee has definitely scheduled hearings this year for the purpose of reviewing the general administration of the Davis-Bacon Act. We do not believe the hearings are necessary in view of the issuance of the January 4 regulations. However, we are interested in such hearings as we believe that those organizations which may still demand further reorganization and revision or repeal of the act will have ample opportunity to state their views. We will not agree with their opinions but it is proper that they be given that opportunity.

In view of the issuance of the revised Davis-Bacon procedures and the forthcoming hearings, this association can perceive no valid or reasonable basis for opposing the enactment of H.R. 6041. In truth, this association was impressed with the administration of the act prior to the issuance of the new procedures in view of the fact that the Department issued last year 50,000 wage determinations containing approximately 5 million individual wage minimums.

The National Electrical Contractors Association and its members sincerely believe that all Members of the House of Representatives should and can vote for the prompt enactment of H.R. 6041 on January 9, 1964.

We are sending an identical letter to Representative AYRES, the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT L. HIGGINS,
Assistant Executive Vice President.

PAINTING & DECORATING
CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA,
Chicago, Ill., January 8, 1964.

Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In a few days you will be called upon to vote on H.R. 6041 which is known as the Davis-Bacon fringe bill.

The Painting & Decorating Contractors of America as a national association of some 8,000 active painting contractors from every section of the Nation are, by resolution unanimously adopted at convention, in favor of this legislation and solicit your support.

When first enacted in 1931, there was some question as to whether painting and decorating was covered by the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act. This association sponsored legislation to amend the act to specifically "include painting and decorating" as it now reads. Here is a rare example where a trade association of small businessmen petitioned the Congress to be included in regulatory legislation. It was felt in 1931 that this was good. We have lived with the act for 32 years and found it workable. We now join with other associations of the construction industry and ask your support in having fringe benefits included in all determinations. And, in addition, we oppose any provisions for court review. In

our opinion, the law has not been inflationary, but has established a fair and competitive basis for bidding; has been well administered by the Labor Department and has prevented discrimination. H.R. 6041 deserves your complete support.

Sincerely,

ED. S. TORRENCE,
Secretary.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND
CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C., January 3, 1964.

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: H.R. 6041, a bill to include fringe benefits in prevailing wage determinations under the Davis-Bacon Act, is expected to be on the floor of the House of Representatives early in January. The AFL-CIO strongly supports this legislation, and I urge you to vote for H.R. 6041 without irrelevant or crippling amendments.

In 1931, when the Davis-Bacon law was enacted by Congress, fringe benefits such as health, welfare, insurance and pension plans scarcely existed. There are now in the construction industry more than 5,000 health, welfare and pension funds covering more than 70 percent of the building and construction trades workers and financed primarily by employer contributions. Today these fringe benefits are as much a part of the wage structure as the cash wage payment itself.

An employer who does not pay these fringe benefits clearly has an unfair advantage in bidding on Federal construction contracts over a contractor who does provide such benefits for his workers. Updating the Davis-Bacon Act by including such fringe benefits in the prevailing wage determinations made by the Secretary of Labor is essential to protect local wage rates and local community living standards.

I urge you again to vote for H.R. 6041.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MEANY,
President.

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION
TRADES DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., January 4, 1964.

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am again writing on behalf of the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO, in support of H.R. 6041, a bill to include fringe benefits in wage predeterminations issued under the Davis-Bacon Act. The Department is composed of 18 national and international unions, representing over 3½ million building and construction tradesmen throughout the country.

H.R. 6041 was favorably reported by the House Education and Labor Committee by a voice vote. The House Rules Committee granted a rule on December 10, 1963. We expect this measure to be scheduled for consideration by the House of Representatives shortly after the Congress reconvenes on January 6, 1964.

This bill (H.R. 6041) would place all construction contractors on equal competitive terms. It would eliminate any unfair advantage hitherto enjoyed on federally financed construction by contractors who do not pay fringe benefits to employees. It does not interfere with the prevailing wage rates paid in a community but requires outside contractors from other States to pay the minimum prevailing wage rate in a community and thereby protects local contractors from unfair competition.

Unfortunately, the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage requirement no longer reflects the existing wage patterns which now include fringe benefits to an increasing extent. The

act in its present form allows unfair competition by contractors who are not required to include fringe benefit costs in paying prevailing wages.

The evils which the Davis-Bacon Act was designed to correct occur when contractors bring low-paid construction workers from outside the local community to build Federal projects. The low wages of these workers from outside the local area undercut wage rates and undercut living standards for building and construction workers and their families in the local community.

The Davis-Bacon Act is designed to prevent such undercutting of community wage standards and community living standards by requiring contractors to pay workers on federally aided projects at least as much as the prevailing wage rates in the local community. Thus, the act is aimed at stopping unfair competition by contractors who underbid local contractors who hire workers in their locality and pay wage rates—including fringe benefits—on Federal projects.

You will note in the committee Report No. 308, that not one member of the committee opposed the merits of this bill with respect to including fringe benefits in determining the prevailing wage in the community. In fact, only 8 of the 31 members filed supplementary views. In the supplementary views of five of these members, it states in part:

"The cost of fringe benefits should be included when the prevailing wage rate is computed under provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act. When the act was passed in 1931, fringe benefits were for the most part unknown. At that time, a worker received a flat amount, usually so much per hour, and this constituted his whole wage. Today, that is not the case. The so-called fringe benefits are an important part of a worker's wage often being given today in lieu of increases in actual cash wages. Therefore, we believe the present law should be amended to permit the inclusion of fringe benefits when the prevailing wage is determined."

Other parts of the supplementary report relate to administrative changes which have nothing to do with the merits of this legislation.

The Department feels very strongly that this change is long overdue. We respectfully urge your support for enactment of this much-needed legislation.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

C. J. HAGGERTY,
President.

THE DAVIS-BACON BILL

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, two of our distinguished colleagues have distributed a letter on the subject of the Davis-Bacon bill which will be before the House on Tuesday, January 28. Because of the great importance of this bill to update the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act, I feel that it is imperative that I elaborate a little on this matter.

First, the letter makes it clear that the rule granted by the Rules Committee does not permit the offering of an

amendment to sections of the bill other than section 1, the prevailing wage section. Such a rule is justified fully by the facts. Hearings and executive sessions of the Committee on Education and Labor dealt with only one specific, concrete proposal. No other proposal was submitted to the committee nor was any other amendment considered. The bill which we shall consider shortly, H.R. 6041, amends one, specific, limited, distinct section of the Davis-Bacon Act. To seek to amend other sections of an act on the floor of the House is so obviously unwise as to have given rise to a much respected rule of the House—rule XVI, clause 7.

However, not satisfied that the drafting of legislation on the floor is injudicious, our two colleagues have stated that an effort will be made to vote down the previous question and modify the rule. This is a clear attempt to defeat the pending bill. It must be recognized as such an attempt and opposed vigorously by those who support passage of H.R. 6041.

Consideration of a highly complex judicial review section on the floor of the House will be impossible. It is a matter which deserves attention, but not on the floor. Recognizing this fact the General Subcommittee on Labor has commenced hearings on judicial review and other amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act. However, the subject is a complicated one with much difference of opinion. Several amendments will be considered by the subcommittee in a deliberate, but not dilatory, manner. This is the traditional and respected manner in which to proceed, not by the precipitate drafting of legislation on the floor. I strongly urge my colleague to vote affirmatively on the previous question on the rule, House Resolution 582.

For the interest of my colleagues I am including the letter referred to in my remarks.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 8, 1964.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: As you know, H.R. 6041, a bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to include so-called fringe benefits in the determination of prevailing wages, is scheduled for floor action on Thursday, January 9, 1964.

Without entering into a discussion of the merits of the pending bill, we wish to point out that after participating in more than 3 months of hearings, we are alarmed at the numerous serious abuses that mark almost every aspect of the administration of the Davis-Bacon Act. This is the only wage-fixing law on the books under which the administrator's word is final, and under which no recourse can be had to the courts of the land. Such a situation cries out for correction.

Unfortunately, the rule granted by the Rules Committee does not permit the offering of an amendment making this act subject to judicial review. In view of this fact a strong effort will be made on the floor to vote down the previous question and modify the rule, so that this vital amendment may be offered. If the administration of the act is not reformed prior to the passage of the pending bill, it is doubtful that the House will have the opportunity to vote on real reform this year.

We would appreciate your support in the effort to bring the Davis-Bacon Act into har-

mony with the basic administrative system of America.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. GOODELL,
DAVE MARTIN.

A BILL TO REPEAL SECTION 3 OF THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would repeal section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act and reenact this section as a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violation of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act. Actually the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936 itself amends section 2 of the Clayton Act; however, over the years there has been considerable disagreement over the point whether or not section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act should be considered a part of the Clayton Act. This disagreement has been accentuated by recent court cases specifically involving section 3.

Section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act in its present form prohibits three kinds of trade practices: First, participation by any person in any transaction "which discriminates to his knowledge against competitors of the purchaser"; second, geographical price discriminations; and, third, selling "at unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor." In addition, this section provides for criminal sanctions for violation of its provisions. Violation of any of these provisions is punishable by fines of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or both. No specific provision for civil proceedings was included.

Since the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act in 1936, the critics of section 3 of the act have contended over the years that it is first, unconstitutional; and, second, not truly a part of the Clayton Act, because they believe that its enforcement does not fall under the jurisdiction of the Sherman and Clayton antitrust laws. Those questioning the constitutionality of section 3 claimed, for example, in a recent case before the Supreme Court—*United States v. National Dairy Products Corporation*, 372 U.S. 29—that one of its statutory provisions, sale of goods at "unreasonably low prices, is so vague and indefinite as to violate the due process requirement of the 5th amendment and an indictment based on this provision is violative of the 6th amendment in that it does not adequately apprise them of the charges." After reviewing the lower court decision which ruled that this particular provision was unconstitutional, based on the reasoning given above, the Supreme Court on February 18, 1963, reversed the

decision and sent the case back for trial on the facts. In rendering its decision, the Court concluded:

Section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, making it a crime to sell goods at "unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor," is not unconstitutionally vague or indefinite as applied to sales made below cost without a legitimate commercial objective and with specific intent to destroy competition.

Although the constitutional issue surrounding section 3 has been resolved, its usefulness as a means of combating harmful pricing practices has been virtually nullified as a result of decisions on two companion cases, *Nashville Milk Co. v. Carnation Co.* (355 U.S. 373) and *Safeway Stores, Inc., v. Vance* (355 U.S. 389), handed down by the Supreme Court on January 20, 1958. In short, the Court ruled that a private party claiming injury from a competitor could not seek injunctive relief or treble damages under sections 4 and 16 of the Clayton Act as a result of violation of any of the provisions included in section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act. Therefore, in other words, violation of any provisions of this section can only be prosecuted as a criminal offense. The Supreme Court based its decisions on the fact that according to the definition of "antitrust laws" as contained in section 1 of the Clayton Act, section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act should not be considered as an antitrust law. The Court stated that "the Robinson-Patman Act shows on its face value that section 3 does not amend the Clayton Act, but stands on its own footing and carries its own sanctions, which are penal in nature."

Immediately following the Supreme Court decision, steps were taken by certain Members of both the House and Senate to enact legislation which would in no uncertain terms make section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act a part of the Clayton Act so that violations of this section would be subject to either criminal proceedings or civil remedies, such as treble-damage actions and suits for injunctive relief. Attempts to enact such legislation unfortunately have been unsuccessful to date. However, in the light of the recent Supreme Court decision reaffirming the constitutionality of section 3 and with greater efforts on the part of proponents of such legislation, it is my hope that we will be successful in getting my bill, or a similar version, enacted into law during the current session of Congress. It has always been my belief that private enforcement of antitrust laws through civil proceedings is by far the most effective way to prevent firms from resorting to harmful pricing practices in order to reduce competition in the marketplace. Section 3 has remained virtually unused since its enactment because the Justice Department has found it impossible to obtain criminal convictions for violation of the provisions of this particular section. It has been reported that, since 1936, the Justice Department has filed only two criminal cases which charged violation of section 3; however, both cases were dropped because of insufficient evidence.

Thus, until we enact legislation which would clearly provide for such enforcement, it is evident that the competitive process in our free enterprise economy will continue to be adversely affected by firms which seek consciously to injure their competitors by various forms of price discrimination, especially cut-throat pricing.

WE CANNOT AFFORD TO EXPORT JOBS

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, last week I referred to the most recent example in which our Government is encouraging the export of jobs to other nations.

Specifically I discussed plans of the Consolidated Edison Co., of New York, to import electrical energy from Canada. At that time I mentioned that the Secretary of the Interior had given encouragement to this plan, despite the fact that American workers could have been used to supply this additional power.

The president of the United Mine Workers of America, Mr. W. A. Boyle, strongly protested Secretary Udall's support of the Consolidated Edison Co. decision. His letter of January 21 follows:

JANUARY 21, 1964.

HON. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The United Mine Workers of America is unalterably opposed to the importation of electrical energy from Canada. We view the importation of such energy as a direct and immediate threat to the American coal miners and as detrimental to their present and future job security.

For many years the United Mine Workers of America has protested the exportation of American jobs by an unwise and destructive foreign trade policy. This is true in the case of imported residual fuel oil and natural gas and it is equally applicable to the proposed use by the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York of vast quantities of hydroelectric power produced in Canada.

The energy needs of this Nation can best be filled by the fuels resources of the United States. Our coal industry has the reserves, the men, and the technology to supply Consolidated Edison or any other utility with ample low-cost fuel produced in America, which will provide jobs and economic security for American workers and their families. The coal industry has made tremendous strides in productive technology in recent years and great advances have been made in the transportation of coal. In fact, the entire economic basis for the proposed Consolidated Edison purchase is the extra high voltage transmission, an innovation which has been hailed as a great advance in the competitive struggle in which the coal industry is engaged.

If Consolidated Edison is willing to carry electricity 1,100 miles from a foreign country, it can carry American coal "by wire" through mine-mouth generating a similar distance. There are available to the utility some of the richest coal seams in this Nation which would provide more than abundant fuel to meet the demands of their customers.

We are all aware of the need to eliminate poverty in America. The President has declared a major aim of this administration is to do all necessary to eradicate this blot on our national honor. We feel—and we are sure you concur—the best way to do this is to provide useful work for these millions of Americans who desire it.

Mine-mouth generation would do much to alleviate the depressed conditions of the Appalachian area and further would allow many dormant coal areas in the western part of the United States to be utilized. This has long been the position of the United Mine Workers and we urge you to carefully consider it. The technical feasibility of high voltage transmission is a major breakthrough but it should be applied to utilize the resources of our Nation rather than foreign resources.

We therefore urge you to reconsider your support for the Consolidated Edison Co.'s project and others of a similar nature and concentrate instead on using the technical advances in energy for the benefit of our own natural resources and for the achievement of full employment in the coal mining areas of this country.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. BOYLE.

STAB IN THE BACK OF AMERICAN VETERANS BY ED NEILAN, WILMINGTON BANKER AND PRESIDENT OF THE U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to do with selecting Pulitzer prize-winning editorial writers. If I did, my vote would go to the Scripps-Howard writer of the Indianapolis Times, who wrote on January 7 an editorial entitled "Watching the Mud Go By." I shall not read the entire piece. But there are sections of it that you will enjoy sharing with me. It begins:

If Edwin P. Neilan, Delaware banker and president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, is ever out of work, he needn't worry. He can hire on as consulting mudslinger. * * * When he was through his speech for the local chamber last night, you couldn't see the targets for the mud. * * * He talked about "political pigs who have pushed their snouts into the public trough and are gorging themselves on human misery." He did not say who they are except that they "mask themselves as humanitarians and civic improvers."

The editorial writer asked:

Whether this means that all people who work for humanitarian and civic improvement are political pigs? Or just some of them? The Congressmen who passed urban renewal and public housing legislation, the officials who carry it out, local officials who cooperate with it, private people who call for it? Neilan didn't say. * * * He purported to prove that urban renewal and public housing have gone to wealthier rather than poorer areas. He didn't say what he meant

by an area, but later on he made clear he meant a State. He can't tell the difference between densely packed New Jersey and underpopulated Wyoming.

He called programs in New York City and Newark vote buying. He didn't say how this works. * * * Neilan's technique—

Continues the editorial—

is like hunting a crook in a crowd with a machine gun, like killing weeds by plowing the garden under, like discarding the baby instead of the diapers.

The editorial wound up by saying:

Indianapolis has wretched slums and nasty floods and 5,000 families getting evicted by highways and sky-high property taxes.

I want you gentlemen here in Congress to heed the last line of this magnificent editorial. It sums up the cynicism of the Scrooge of Wilmington.

Neilan doesn't seem to give a damn—

The editorial concluded.

No, the gentleman does not give a hoot about anything except the big bankers' bonus. That is, millions of Federal money on deposit that can be rented out to the public at the "going commercial rates." Mr. Neilan's Bank of Wilmington had \$8,100,000 of Government funds on deposit on October 15, 1963, and according to his own admission considerably more than this on an average during the year, and this money comes to the bank free for nothing.

Oh, I know when I called this to the attention of the Congress not long ago, the banker from the duchy of Du Pont almost immediately got out a statement which said that in 1963 "the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia paid the Treasury \$48,852,000 which it earned on the required reserve deposits made by member banks." Now Neilan had the temerity to state what every banker who is a banker knows to be a deliberate falsehood. He said that this \$48 plus million belongs to the member banks and this includes his Bank of Wilmington. He said that the fact that this \$48 plus million is turned over to the Treasury means that his bank and other commercial banks in the Philadelphia Reserve district, are "subsidizing the U.S. Treasury."

Despite the statement of the Wilmington gentleman, the truth is, and every banker in the country knows this—that the \$48 million plus was not earned on the required reserves of member banks but on Government securities which the Federal Reserve Bank in Philadelphia acquires by a flick of the pen thereby using its power to create money.

It is impossible to believe that a man who is a bank president and who is also president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce cannot understand such basic fundamentals of banking and the Federal Reserve System. It must be concluded that Neilan is deliberately attempting to deceive his fellow members of the chamber of commerce, Congress, and the people. He certainly is not going to fool bankers. If there is any question about my own statement, let me quote from the December 1962 Monthly Review of the Richmond Federal Reserve Bank:

The heart of the matter is that according to the principles under which central banks

operate their earning power is not increased by the deposits which commercial banks carry with them, regardless of the way in which those deposits are created. Rather, the great profitability of central banks is due to the fact that they exercise the sovereign power of governments to create money.

Now we are coming to the hard core of our business for today, namely, the shoddy, despicable treatment afforded the American veteran by Ed Neilan, banker head of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. We all know that the Scrooge of Wilmington is against almost everything. He is against the Congress, against public servants anywhere, against the American Government, against laws designed to see that the Government serves all the people. He is against chamber of commerce businessmen who seek useful projects in their communities if any Federal moneys are called for to help pay the way. He is really against people. He does not like people. The largest segment of the American people yet insulted by Ed Neilan is composed of American veterans. These are the men who came to the support of our Government at times of its greatest trials—World War I, World War II, and the Korean war.

When Neilan attacked these men in a sneering, contemptible piece in the Saturday Evening Post last November, he stabbed in the back the finest manhood of America.

I received a great deal of mail from prominent veterans concerning Neilan's stab-in-the-back article. From Earl A. Graske, Ohio American Legion:

No citizen of our Nation has the right to spread lies and untruths as Edwin Neilan has done. * * * Neilan's slur against all veterans in his story in the Saturday Evening Post is an insult to any man who has served his country.

From John E. Erickson, national legislative director, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc.:

Neilan's tirade was so completely devoid of facts that it has not been difficult for veteran leaders to point out the distortions and untruths in his article which has aroused a terrific tide of resentment among veterans, their friends and supporters. * * * In nearly every appearance that he has made, his ill-founded statements have returned to haunt him. In Indianapolis, Ind., Minneapolis, Minn.; Cleveland, Ohio; and Bay City, Tex., and even in his own State of Delaware his audiences have been astonished and amazed at the inaccuracies and misstatements that have been sprinkled most liberally throughout his addresses. * * * He puts his foot in the mouth at every conceivable opportunity.

Waldron E. Leonard, Director of the Department of Veterans' Affairs of the government of the District of Columbia, sent me a copy of a letter he wrote Neilan after Neilan's attack against the veterans in the national magazine. Let me read you the letter:

Mr. NEILAN. I have been a member of an affiliated organization of the chamber of commerce for approximately 20 years, which annual dues are about five times that of any veterans' organization. I have been acquainted personally with two past national presidents of the chamber of commerce, who were very fine and distinguished gentlemen.

I was somewhat shocked to read the article attributed to you in the Saturday Evening

Post. In my estimation you have done a great disservice to many thousands of veterans, who like myself pay large fees to belong to the chamber of commerce. You insulted these veterans, in my opinion, through your desperation for public attention or publicity. You insulted veterans' organizations that have cooperated and worked with the chamber of commerce throughout the United States in civic and welfare programs.

There was an article that kept going through my mind when reading your insults entitled "Let's Say 'No' to the Veterans." It is as follows, which you might find a little more interesting and I presume the research is factual:

"DID YOU KNOW

"In 1923 a very important meeting was held at the Edgewater Beach Hotel in Chicago. Attending this meeting were eight of the world's most successful financiers. Those present were the president of the largest independent steel company; the president of the largest gas company; the greatest wheat speculator; the president of the New York Stock Exchange; a member of the President's Cabinet; the greatest 'bear' in Wall Street; head of the world's greatest monopoly; president of the Bank of International Settlements.

"Certainly we must admit that here was gathered a group of the world's most successful men. At least, men who had found the secret of 'making money.'

"A check was made 25 years later; let's see where these men are:

"The president of the largest independent steel company, Charles Schwab, died a bankrupt and lived on borrowed money for 5 years before his death.

"The president of the largest gas company, Howard Hopson, is now insane.

"The greatest wheat speculator, Arthur Cutten, died abroad, insolvent.

"The president of the New York Stock Exchange, Richard Whitney, was recently released from Sing Sing Penitentiary.

"The member of the President's Cabinet, Albert Fall, was pardoned from prison so he could die at home.

"The greatest 'bear' in Wall Street, Jesse Livermore, died a suicide.

"The head of the greatest monopoly, Ivar Krueger, died a suicide.

"The president of the Bank of International Settlement, Leon Fraser, died a suicide."

All these men learned well the art of making money, but not one of them learned how to live. So let's live and let live.

Happy new year.

Sincerely yours,

WALDRON E. LEONARD.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Ed Neilan got the message. While he may today be enjoying life in a great master bedroom, I wish to remind him that in the architecture of the American system it is only a few short steps from the master bedroom to the doghouse.

For the benefit of the Scrooge of Wilmington and those like him who are opposed to veterans receiving their just due, I would like to review quickly a little history as it concerns veterans and bankers and veterans benefits and interest rates. Those who have opposed veterans receiving their just due always take the position that those like myself who want justice rendered the American veteran are wild-eyed radicals, demagogues. We want to throw away the Government's money in unearned bonuses, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. To these critics I would like to borrow a quote from the mayor of Cleveland,

which he used concerning some hocus from the mouth of Ed Neilan. Quote, horsefeathers, unquote.

World War I was up to that time the greatest war in all history. Young men gladly served for the small compensation that they received. The private got "\$30 a day 1 day a month." But after his allotment, insurance, laundry bills, incidentals were deducted and he had made a payment on a war bond—if he were able to pay on one—the amount he had left was usually raked off in his hat on pay day in the form of small change.

However, the men did not complain; they were told that those who were furnishing the money would only receive a low interest rate in comparison to their low wages.

Most of the financing of the war was done through the sale of bonds since the amount of taxes raised was wholly insufficient.

The men were also told about the great and generous Government of the United States of America never forgetting those who came to its aid in times of trouble. The traditional policy of the Government was often quoted by civilian leaders, military leaders, and others to the effect that when the country is at war and needs the young men to defend and save it, the Government has an obligation later on when these young men become aged and they need the Government that they helped to save—the Government would then come to their aid and comfort and support as a traditional policy.

World War II was the greatest war in every respect up to and since the time it occurred. A military man, citizen, soldier, and sailor received more pay than those who served in World War I. Even so it was recognized that they were inadequately compensated for their services. They were not paid the going rate for work or services of those who stayed home. During World War II, military officers reminded the men that though their pay was low, the people who furnished the money were buying bonds at a very low rate of interest. They were told that World War II would certainly not bring a rash of Daddy Warbucks, new multimillionaires. Everybody was supposed to make a sacrifice—the men by not receiving full and adequate pay; the people, corporations and institutions with money were also making a sacrifice by investing in bonds that provided a low rate of interest.

Immediately after World War II, the United States had a large national debt, aggregating between \$250 and \$300 billion—principally from the two major wars. Promises that had been made to those entering the military during these wars were not entirely forgotten, but as time went on they became only a dim memory. The result has been over the years that terrific fights were made against veterans' benefits and every effort made to hold down the cost even though much of the cost required was entirely justified. On the other hand, the bondholders put on a tremendous campaign to get their interest rate raised on this debt. The result was that in 1946, a year after World War II ended, there were veterans' benefits on the budget for

\$4.4 billion and interest payments on the national debt of \$4.7 billion. In 1963, veterans' benefits were \$5.3 billion, the interest payments on the national debt \$10.7 billion. For fiscal 1965 it is estimated veterans' benefits will be \$5.1 billion and for interest on the national debt, \$11.1 billion.

In compliance with my request, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress prepared a table for me, giving significant information along this line. It is as follows:

Administrative budget expenditures for veterans' benefits and interest on the national debt for fiscal years 1944-64, also national debt at end of fiscal year

[Amounts in millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Veterans' benefits	Interest payments	National debt
1944	745	2,609	201,003
1945	2,095	3,617	258,682
1946	4,415	4,722	269,422
1947	7,381	4,958	258,286
1948	6,653	5,211	252,292
1949	6,725	5,339	252,770
1950	6,646	5,750	257,357
1951	5,342	5,613	255,222
1952	4,863	5,859	259,105
1953	4,368	6,504	266,071
1954	4,341	6,382	271,260
1955	4,522	6,370	274,374
1956	4,810	6,787	272,751
1957	4,870	7,244	270,527
1958	5,184	7,607	276,343
1959	5,287	7,593	284,706
1960	5,266	9,180	286,331
1961	5,414	8,957	288,971
1962	5,403	9,120	298,201
1963	5,186	9,980	305,860
1964 ¹	5,362	10,701	311,800

¹ 1964 data are estimates from the Budget of the United States for fiscal year 1965.

Source: Bureau of the Budget of the United States and Department of the Treasury of the United States. Submitted Jan 23, 1964.

The average interest on the national debt is now much lower than it will be when the long-term 2 and 2½ percent bonds are refinanced at the now going rate which is much more than 4 percent. Then our annual interest burden will be much more than \$12 billion.

It should be stated that most of our national debt was incurred during the Second World War. At that time the Bank of Wilmington, which Ed Neilan now heads, and other commercial banks bought a large part of the bonds that were offered by the Government to pay on the cost of the war. These banks were privileged to buy these bonds on the Government's credit without even a reserve and receive the interest on them as though they had actually paid their own money for the bonds. Even after the war was over and at the present time, Ed Neilan's bank and other commercial banks invest in Government bonds by creating the money on the books of the bank to buy them. Today they own about \$70 billion worth of bonds acquired in this manner.

The Federal Reserve banks could have bought these bonds without interest cost to the taxpayers by the issuance of non-interest-bearing bonds for that purpose—or by permitting the interest to be paid and returned to the Treasury like it is done today, through the Federal Reserve banks. In other words, the Government is not dependent upon the commercial banks to purchase U.S. Government bonds. The Government,

through Congress, could easily provide for any bonds that the Government needs to sell to be purchased by the Federal Reserve banks. In that way the people and the taxpayers would get the credit by not having to pay interest, or getting the interest returned and not giving it entirely to the commercial banks that created the money. The bonds should be sold to the "Fed" after all the money possible is raised in taxes and after all the bonds can be sold to individuals and corporations having actual money to invest.

The Federal Reserve banks now own \$33 billion in Government bonds which they bought with created money on the Government's credit upon which over a billion a year is paid in taxes by the taxpayers, millions of whom are veterans. The Federal Reserve System spends all this money that it wants to spend—usually about \$200 million a year—and returns the remainder to the Treasury.

It is difficult to understand how a banker like Ed Neilan would be so hard set against the veterans and insist that the people say "no" to the veterans, but with a straight face, at the same time ask the Congress and the people to pay a fabulous bonus each year to the bankers.

Although the figures used are not exactly comparable, they nevertheless tell the story that after the wars were over the men who fought the wars received low pay and those who bought the bonds received low interest; yet, the campaigns commenced to pay the veterans, their widows, dependents, and other necessary expenses, just as little as possible. It looks like the same campaigners against the veterans were campaigning at the same time for higher and higher interest rates for those who furnished the money, even though much of it was the Government's money that they themselves were receiving interest on.

So now we realize in this year 1964 the annual interest on the Government obligations—most of which was used to fight the two wars—is twice as much as the Government appropriates for all veterans of all wars for all purposes, including compensation, pensions, hospitalization, and for every other purpose.

All of this is information that Ed Neilan left out of his Saturday Evening Post article. His omission is part of his technique of distortion. The information I have presented is what the Ed Neilans of America do not want the public to know about or talk about or think about.

[News release, the American Legion, Washington, D.C., Dec. 5, 1963]

NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DANIEL F. FOLEY, STRIKES BACK AT ANTI-VETERAN ARTICLE IN THE SATURDAY EVENING POST, OF NOVEMBER 30, BY PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, EDWIN P. NEILAN

American Legion National Commander Daniel F. Foley today termed an article, appearing in the November 30 issue of the Saturday Evening Post and authored by the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, a "blatant and outrageous" attack on veterans and veterans' organizations and a "shocking and unwarranted" indictment of the

Congress and of the Veterans' Administration. "This will do nothing to improve the public image of either the Post or the Chamber of Commerce," Commander Foley stated. The leader of the world's largest veterans' organization said the American people have a right to expect of the Nation's major magazines fair and responsible reporting. "This article," he declared, "is a gross contribution to confusion. It is loaded with inaccuracies and inconsistencies."

The article, entitled "Let's Say 'No' To the Veterans," contends that veterans are the "worst offenders" among groups receiving from the Congress what its author calls handouts and Federal giveaways. It refers to the veterans' benefits program as a "scandal" and implies that any veterans' legislation passed by Congress is "loosely written." Congressmen, says the article, "are demonstrably unable to resist" the lobbyists.

To thwart "pressure groups," the chamber's president recommends abolishment of the House Veterans' Committee. "If we were to pursue this kind of logic," Commander Foley noted, "one also would have to recommend the abolishment of the constitutionally guaranteed right of petition, and perhaps the American system of representative government. We doubt if the leading spokesman for the business lobby would seriously propose that the Banking and Currency Committees of the Congress be dissolved."

The chamber's president also charges the Veterans' Administration with "loose" administration of veterans' legislation and with inefficient management of its hospitals. He would discontinue the VA hospital system and he questions the Agency's justification for remaining in control of other benefit programs.

The American Legion took particular exception to the Post article's claim that the VA routinely permits veterans to perjure themselves so as to secure free medical care. The Legion's leader stated that "this reckless accusation establishes without doubt the chamber president's complete ignorance of the extreme lengths to which the VA goes to insure that its hospital beds will be used only by those having entitlement on the basis of either service connection or need." The commander said repeated surveys have demonstrated that abuse of the veterans' hospital treatment privilege is negligible. The findings, he pointed out, consistently have shown that "less than one-half of 1 percent of the cases might be subject to question," and he emphasized that this record is remarkably low in comparison with other public programs of like nature. The Legion spokesman added that his organization has given the VA every cooperation in continuing efforts to eliminate abuse of the non-service-connected medical program.

The Post article, in the Legion's opinion, adds up to an unfair—and unsubstantiated—condemnation of all veterans' programs, even though its writer gives lip-service to the "sensible principle that benefits should be paid only for service-connected disabilities, for unemployability and for need." Commander Foley observed that the Legion has consistently supported this principle and, in fact, participated in establishing it as part of today's law. The chamber's president, however, selected out for particular abuse a general pension bill that is backed by an organization representing less than 10 percent of those in veterans' organizations, but he neglected to make clear the pension policy of the American Legion.

The Legion commander said "anyone even casually acquainted with our organization's long-standing position knows that we stand for a showing of need in non-service-connected benefit programs. The American Legion is," continued Mr. Foley, "the foremost spokesman among veterans' groups for retention of a reasonable test of need in the veterans' disability and death pension programs. Within the framework of existing

law, we seek moderate liberalizations in keeping with rising living costs, and such other modifications as will serve to perpetuate the dignified and gracious manner in which the Nation traditionally has care for its war veterans and their survivors."

The Wabasha, Minn., lawyer identified four major fallacies in the Post article which he said served to discredit any claim its author might make to expertise in the field of veterans' affairs. These, together with the Legion's comment, are:

1. The Post article asks, "If low-income veterans of World War I should be helped, why shouldn't low-income, elderly nonveterans?" The Washington office of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is well-staffed with experts in all forms of Government programs. It is inconceivable that its president would be unaware of the public assistance program under which well over 2 million older citizens, regardless of veteran status, receive a monthly payment consisting largely of Federal funds. The amount paid in such cases is, on the average, approximately the same as the average pension paid by the VA to a war veteran.

2. The Post article says "85 percent of the VA patients have non-service disabilities." The quoted figure must have been grabbed out of the air for it bears no ascertainable relationship to official Government statistics. It is possible, of course, that all VA patients have some non-service-connected disability. The fact is, however, that somewhat over 40 percent of all veterans occupying a VA hospital bed have service-connected disabilities of a compensable degree. Of the remaining non-service-connected group, over 57 percent are under treatment for chronic, long-term disabilities such as tuberculosis and neuropsychiatric conditions. These patients would be a charge on the public whether in a VA or a non-VA hospital.

3. The Post article claims "there are generally more empty beds than patients in VA hospitals, if only because most of the patients are ambulatory." The reference to "ambulatory" patients renders this statement senseless. Under this definition, all beds in any hospital would be "empty" on any given day that all of its patients could stand up and walk. The fact is the VA's record on utilization of beds is much better than non-VA hospitals. The bed occupancy rate for VA hospitals is 90 percent, compared to 75 percent for non-Federal hospitals.

4. The Post article states: "Our veteran population is aging, but not decreasing." This would be a good trick, if possible. The fact is the Nation's war veteran population has been on the decline since March 1958.

The chamber's president, a Delaware banker, favors dismemberment of the VA and letting the general social security system provide for the needs of veterans. Commander Foley called attention to the fact that the writer of the Post article failed to provide the details as to how this would be accomplished. "Furthermore," said Legion head, "the business-lobby's representative did not tell us how much money, if any, would be saved. The needy—veteran or not—are cared for in our society for the most part through public programs. It is fundamental to the Legion's philosophy, however, that war veterans in need are a Federal responsibility and the VA is the agency for discharging that responsibility; and our philosophy in this regard is founded on the Nation's historic policy of providing special benefits for its war veterans and their survivors."

Representing the 2,600,000 veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean war who are members of the American Legion, Commander Foley said: "Thousands of Legionnaires also are members of some local chamber of commerce. They will have more than a passing interest in their national president's views as expressed in the Post

article. We have found over the years that whenever a local installation of a Federal agency is threatened with transfer, dissolution or curtailment, the local chamber of commerce takes an active part in efforts to retain the status quo. Legion posts and chamber units often have joined forces to justify continued full operation of a given VA medical facility."

Commander Foley stated in conclusion that the Post article presents nothing new. "It's the same old charges from the same old source. No amount of fallacious reasoning will dissuade the American public from its policy of caring for the Nation's war veterans and their survivors through special programs designed to provide for their just and reasonable needs. Neither will foundationless attacks against the VA's fine record; nor will such a base purpose be served by impugning the integrity and judgment of Congressmen."

"As national commander, I pledge to all needy war veterans, and to the widows and orphans of those who served, that the American Legion will continue its efforts in their behalf, that the VA's hospital system shall be maintained intact, and that we will fight with our full strength and resources any and all attempts to dismember the VA or otherwise weaken its ability to carry out its important mission."

"We make no apology for our position on veterans' benefits, just as we need not apologize for the American Legion's great and continuing programs of community service; its child welfare work; its sponsorship of youth projects emphasizing American ideals of fair play, tolerance, civic responsibility, and constitutional government; its unselfish service to veterans and their dependents; its support for a national defense establishment second to none; its insistence upon the maintenance of American principles of justice, freedom, and democracy."

"Finally," said Commander Foley, "in view of the attitude expressed by the writer of the Post article, perhaps it is also his view that veterans' groups, including the American Legion, should cease their keen interest and participation in countless community projects and endeavors all across America—many of which would not be realized without the support of such patriotic organizations."

NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE SERVICES,
VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I OF
THE U.S.A., INC.,

Washington, D.C., January 24, 1964.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: With each succeeding week it becomes more and more apparent that Edwin P. Neilan, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, is fast becoming the victim of his own utterances.

Starting last summer, Neilan, who is also president of a chain of banks in the State of Delaware, opened a vicious attack upon Members of Congress, terming them "confidence men," "bagmen," "patronage peddlers," "grave ladlers." He, in plain words, accused Members of Congress of squandering the public money in order to perpetuate themselves in office and virtually stated that all of them were open to various means of bribery in order to hold their elected positions.

This blast, of course, did nothing to ingratiate the chamber head with Members of Congress and since that time he has authored an article in the Saturday Evening Post, "Let's Say No to Veterans." This tirade was so completely devoid of facts that it has not been difficult for veteran leaders to point out the distortions and untruths in his article which has aroused a terrific tide of resentment among veterans, their friends, and supporters.

As the president of the chamber of commerce, Neilan has been invited to address civic organizations in various cities. In nearly every appearance that he has made, his ill-founded statements have returned to haunt him. In Indianapolis, Ind.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Cleveland, Ohio; and Bay City, Tex., and even in his own State of Delaware his audiences have been astonished and amazed at the inaccuracies and misstatements that have been sprinkled most liberally throughout his addresses.

His charges against veterans and veteran benefits have been most ably answered by top veteran spokesmen. It would appear that Neilan's image as a spokesman for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has been considerably tarnished as he continues to play the contortionist and put his foot in the mouth at every conceivable opportunity.

While it seems popular to downgrade World War I service, we wonder how many, if any, of these critics have studied the history of the hastily built citizen army who were thrown against the most efficiently trained and experienced troops in the world. History shows that these farmers, mechanics, and just plain kids met and defeated the Feldgrau Legions who had 4 years of combat to their credit in every major encounter of World War I.

The record is filled with astonishments by our European Allies at the free-swinging and singing doughboys as they recklessly stormed the fortified positions of the enemy who had defied attack for so long a time. If Mr. Neilan had acquired a little mud on the seat of his "britches," perhaps he would not be so glib and careless in his evaluation of men who did the impossible. The adjectives he uses in reference to these doughboys should make even the most shameless blush.

While the chamber of commerce head is unalterably opposed to benefits for veterans, he has no such scruples when it comes to benefits for bankers, estimated insofar as Neilan's bank is concerned, as being approximately \$400,000 yearly. This subject has been amply covered by the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, a recognized authority on finance. It would appear that it is only a matter of a very brief time before Edwin P. Neilan will be thoroughly discredited by the people of this Nation.

The Veterans of World War I wish to commend the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, for his courageous stand before the House of Representatives in defense of the veterans of this country from the unwarranted and unjust attack upon those men and women who answered the call of their country in time of its greatest need. We wish to assure all of those Members of Congress who have courageously stood up to be counted in supporting the Veterans of World War I, whose average age is now 70 or better, and particularly in defense of the traditional treatment which has been a part of our Nation since its founding. These traditions have been established upon many a field of battle, from the earliest Colonial days through the French and Indian wars, the Revolution, Mexican War, the Civil War, Spanish-American War, World Wars I and II, and Korea. This tradition is epitomized in the statement made by President Hoover that military service in time of war is extraordinary service over and above the normal requirements of citizenship and, therefore, entitled to special consideration. The American fighting man has garnered strength and encouragement from these traditions together with a spirit of determination to defend and carry forward into perpetuity our American way of life and the true concept of our realization with those who have given so much and who will, in the future, give that which has to be given in its defense.

Again we want to say we are grateful, particularly to the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,

of Texas, for his consistent support and in defense of the fighting men of this Nation from the time he became a Member of Congress to the present. We consider all those who are supporting this concept and our World War I program as men of courage and men with a deep, sincere sense of loyalty to those who have fought and to the American tradition.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. ERICSON,
National Legislative Director.

MICHAEL J. DWYER,
National Research Consultant.

LEROY P. CHITTENDEN,
National Public Relations Director.

BOBBY BAKER INVESTIGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a problem of perjury has become a major issue in the Bobby Baker investigation by a committee of the other body. This is a grave matter that involves the credibility of key witnesses. It also involves the question of the integrity of the investigation itself.

Walter Jenkins has stated that he "was never present or a participant in any alleged conversations between Reynolds and Baker where the disposition of the commissions earned by Reynolds as agent for the Manhattan Life Insurance Co., was discussed."

According to the statement Jenkins swears is true, he "emphatically denies ever suggesting to Robert G. Baker or to Reynolds the LBJ Co. should get any sort of rebate from the commissions earned by Reynolds."

Jenkins should have been asked a good many more questions about this matter—by committee counsel L. P. McLendon and W. Ellis Meehan—relative to the \$1,200 in advertising time that Reynolds says he was pressured into buying on the LBJ Co. radio and television station. However, as inadequate as the questioning and statement by McLendon and Meehan were, the statement stands as a denial by Jenkins that he had been involved in any conversations with Reynolds about this kickback, rebate or whatever one wishes to call it.

Mr. Reynolds states that he disagrees with Jenkins' "statement that he [Jenkins] had no knowledge of any question of advertising time to be purchased from KTBC, which is a station owned by the LBJ Co."

Reynolds continued:

He [Jenkins] did have knowledge, and discussed it with me, sir. And he discussed it directly with the president of the Mid-Atlantic Stainless Steel Co., Mr. Albert G. Young.

Mr. Reynolds produced the checks for \$1,000 and \$208 to corroborate his statement on the payments to the LBJ Co. Those checks and other documents show that Mr. Reynolds did not want this advertising on an Austin, Tex., station and tried to sell part of it to Mr. Young.

In his testimony, Reynolds stated that he had "reconfirmed it with Mr. Young, that he dealt directly with Mr. Jenkins."

Young has also told reporters the same story. It is my understanding Mr. Young

has considerable documentation on this matter.

The testimony of Mr. Young is the testimony the Senate committee should be seeking if it really wants to find out who is telling the truth in this affair. Also, there is an obligation to call Mr. Jenkins to testify in person, and to be questioned on the details of this whole affair. Mr. Jenkins was an employee of the Senate when these matters transpired, and the fact that he is now the No. 1 assistant to President Johnson should not be a barrier to calling him for questioning under oath. Sherman Adams appeared and testified before a House committee on dealings with Bernard Goldfine and the vicuna coat gift. There is no reason why Walter Jenkins should not testify.

If perjury is to be permitted then the whole investigation will be a mockery, for the whole purpose of the investigation is to find the truth. There is an obligation to pursue every avenue and to call every witness to learn the truth.

It should be kept in mind that knowingly helping a perjurer to conceal his perjury constitutes another crime—subornation of perjury. All of those who take part in hiding perjury by refusing to call witnesses and subpoena documents are themselves involved in subornation of perjury.

This investigation was launched for the purpose of demonstrating to the public that the Congress could and would clean house. It was said that "the integrity" of the Congress was involved in the Bobby Baker affair.

The reputation of the Congress is harmed if perjury is hidden or condoned, and if high officials such as Mr. Jenkins are given favored treatment.

Mr. Reynolds states that he had a conversation with Jenkins in which Mr. Jenkins produced a letter from a Mr. Huff Baines, of Texas, who had indicated that he would buy advertising on the LBJ Co. station if he wrote the Lyndon Johnson insurance. Reynolds states he did not buy the advertising on a voluntary basis, but only after being called by Jenkins and told to buy it. Certainly Mr. Walter Jenkins should remember this, if it happened.

Apparently President Johnson intends to try to shut off all questioning on the subject of his dealings with Bobby Baker. I do not believe that the inadequate statements he made last week before running away from reporters should end it. In fact, his conduct and statements to this point raise more questions than they answer.

There was no word of criticism of Bobby Baker in the statement made by President Johnson, so we can probably assume that he still has the same warm admiration for Mr. Baker today that he had when they were gift-giving pals back in 1959. If we are wrong he should tell us.

The President explained the expensive stereo set as a gift from the Baker family, and indicated it was merely one of many gifts that passed back and forth between him and his bosom friend, Bobby Baker. I would like to hear more about these tokens of affection that were passing back and forth between the then

majority leader and Bobby Baker. It could be most pertinent. Up to this point there has been no demonstration of the Government relationships that gave Baker his power to land highly lucrative vending machine contracts in the aerospace and defense industries. He must have had powerful friends who were active and influential in defense and aerospace contract matters.

While the President has given some explanation of the stereo set, he has said absolutely nothing about that \$1,200 gift of cash money that Don Reynolds says he was pressured into contributing to the LBJ Co. radio and television firm. There is no doubt that Don Reynolds paid the money to the LBJ Co. station for he has the checks to prove it. There is little doubt that someone had to suggest this arrangement, for it is most unlikely that a Maryland insurance man would throw \$1,200 down the drain by advertising on a station 1,500 miles away in Texas.

If the LBJ Co. employees were shaking down this insurance man in this questionable way without his knowledge, the President should say so and publicly condemn them. If President Johnson knew about it, then he owes the public an explanation of this transaction.

His comments that he has said all he is going to say about the subject is unacceptable, and I do not think the public will regard this as the honest and forthright explanation we have a right to expect from men in high office.

The President's quips about "the miniature television set" will not suffice for an answer on either the stereo or the \$1,200 paid to the LBJ Co.

It must be remembered that according to the sworn testimony of Reynolds he received a telephone call from Bobby Baker who told him, in effect, that he had not done anything for Senator Johnson.

On the basis of this and other manipulations on the part of Bobby Baker an expensive stereo set was delivered by air freight to the residence of Senator Johnson. Incidentally, according to Reynolds, the actual delivery was made by a Government truck from Friendship Airport.

Neither should it be forgotten that the evidence shows that Baker did not pay for the stereo set for the Johnson family. It was paid for by Don Reynolds the insurance man, and it carried an invoice showing that it was billed to the same Don Reynolds.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. I want to congratulate the gentleman for a very fine statement, and I thank him for yielding.

I have some concern about the statement that was issued by the President. This, I think, is a very smelly situation and I doubt very much if it can be deodorized by stories or sharp remarks of a smart nature.

The President said they had exchanged gifts before. I have some of the reaction that the gentleman expresses because from all indications there was al-

most a father and son relationship between the then majority leader of the Senate and Bobby Baker. Certainly if a son were giving the father \$500 gifts, it would be natural that the father would want to know where that money was coming from. Apparently that was not a concern of Mr. Johnson.

The second thing about it is that he said Bobby Baker did not want anything. Now, that has two implications. One is, if a man came into your office and laid \$100,000 on the desk but did not want anything, it would be perfectly all right and ethical for you to accept it. That is one inference from his statement.

The other inference, which also concerns me, is the question about not wanting anything. I think that Bobby Baker wanted something that was dearest to his heart, and that was protection. When you say that Bobby Baker did not want anything you are begging the question because at that time Bobby Baker knew his operations and he wanted protection just like Billy Sol Estes wanted protection. I might say parenthetically that no report has been made on Sol yet, no investigation report. He was good at giving gifts around Washington but we have not had a report, as I understand it, from either the Department of Agriculture or from the Senate or House committees.

I am of the opinion that this thing is far more reaching than we have been led to believe so far. The public is not going to forget this any more than they have forgotten other cases in the past of similar instance in our history. I do not blame Mr. Johnson at all. He is in somewhat the same position as Macbeth's wife was in when she cried out "Out, out, damned spot, I say."

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. First let me thank the gentleman from California for his observations. Now I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I am interested in this from a technical point of view in addition to the remarks made by the gentleman, and I would like to associate myself and thank him for yielding and commend the gentleman for keeping this question before the public.

Like Macbeth's wife, it cannot be eliminated, and will not be eliminated between now and 10 months hence when we vote. The technical question is, Would the gentleman add to his recommendations that the subcommittee or the investigating body of the other body demand that it be shown whether or not the corporation, the LBJ enterprise, this monopolistic octopus of television in central Texas, reported taxwise to the revenue service whether or not they did claim credits for insurance? Or whether, according to the corporate law we all know, in fact, whether the recipient thereof did report this as due income, paying the premiums on his life in order to insulate, I believe that is the word that was used, and protect the enterprise from the sudden death of this key individual. Does the gentleman have any information on that?

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. He has made a very good suggestion, and I think it is most pertinent to the inquiry to ascertain such information. I received a letter this morning from an attorney in the Deep South. I am not going to disclose his name at this time. It reads in part, as follows:

The public is entitled to know more detail in regard to the payment of premiums for this insurance. As I understood Mr. Johnson, he stated that he owned stock in the TV company controlled by his wife, that when he had a serious heart attack, they became afraid that upon his death it might be necessary to sell his stock, so the company took out insurance on his life in order to purchase his stock in the corporation. In view of the fact that his family owns the balance of the stock, it would amount to a method of increasing their holdings to the extent of the value of his holdings without paying any income tax or estate tax on the payment from the insurance company.

It seems strange that Mr. Johnson would operate through Mr. Baker in obtaining life insurance. There are so many agents anxious to sell insurance, that his operating through Mr. Baker, on its face, indicates that in some manner the transaction was not on the level. The result of the transaction seems to be that Mr. Johnson and his family received a valuable stereo without having to pay any income tax on the money that bought it, and his family was placed in the position of obtaining a much larger equity in the TV corporation upon his death, without having to purchase it with funds upon which income or estate taxes had been paid.

So many poor people are being oppressed by outrageous taxes, that it makes the offense of those in high positions seeking to avoid taxes, much more despicable. The poor man for whom Mr. Johnson, with tears in his eyes, pleads, cannot get stereos as free gifts, without paying the taxes on the purchase money.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for this additional information. I submit further that it becomes a matter of theory to the public as to whom the insurance policy was assigned, whether to the corporation or the insured, and if so, was it or was it not revocable and what were the plans or options of settlement.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. It occurred to me that in order to get all the facts it will be necessary for the LBJ Co. to open their books for at least 10 years past for a complete investigation as to all the money that came in, whether it came in from a legitimate advertiser or whether the advertiser did not pay for it but the time was being paid for for somebody else, which is the case of the \$1,200. Mr. Reynolds did not use the time, it was assigned to another advertiser. We know that the \$1,200 went there. There is a suspicion as to other funds. The only way I know of that such a thing could be clarified is to have a complete audit from an independent agency or an independent body or committee of the House or Senate for at least 10 years to find out how much money went into that company in the manner of the Reynolds money. As long as Reynolds was the one

that put the money there, and he is in a position now to do much better than he was able to do in the Senate, we should know exactly how much money is involved. There should not be any possibility of people guessing as to what happened, because we have the facts in one case.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman and thank him for his observation. I would say to him that I would hope any committee or any audit of the books would also look into whether any Government contracts have gone to this station, how much if any Government money has been spent through this particular radio and television setup in Texas.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. I want to commend my colleague for his perseverance and for his bringing this matter to the attention of the House and the country. The danger in this kind of an exposure is that somewhere along the line the whole affair is likely to be swept under the rug. The American people are entitled to know the facts involving the entire Bobby Baker case and in my opinion, they are going to demand that the facts be brought into the open.

Reference was made a moment ago to the Billy Sol Estes case. The House should know and the country should know that as far as my knowledge extends, no report even as of this moment has been filed by the Committee on Government Operations on the Billy Sol Estes investigation. I for one want to know why such a report has never been furnished the House and the country. Over in the other body, and we are prohibited under the rules from mentioning people of the other body by name, a committee is presently investigating this Bobby Baker case. When things got hot in a certain phase of the investigation the chairman of the committee said, "We are not investigating Senators."

On another occasion when things got hot, he said, "We are not investigating tinware." Now regardless of whether it is Senators, tinware, or any other Government employee or Member of the Congress or anyone else who is involved in this mess, I think the American people want the facts laid out in the open so that they may know exactly what has been going on. I hope the gentleman from Iowa will continue his investigation so that the public may know the facts. If everything is in order—then well and good. But until there is a full disclosure, the American people are going to be suspicious and they are going to draw conclusions, perhaps unwarranted in some instances. Whether the American people get the whole story will depend on what the Johnson administration intends to do about it. They have the power to sweep the whole mess under the rug or they can bring the whole story into the open. All eyes will be on the White House from now on.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the observations of my colleague from Iowa. I would say to him as well

as to the other Members of the House that I think there will be some information, interesting information, made available today with respect to this alleged tinware—either today or within the next 24 hours.

I would suggest to the Members of the House, if they do not already have a copy that they obtain a copy of part I of the hearings of the Rules Committee in the other body. It makes interesting reading and it will be a valuable document to have at hand later on, as this sorry picture unfolds.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to my remarks and those of my colleagues who have spoken on this subject, I desire to submit for printing in the RECORD certain articles from leading newspapers.

The first is a timely editorial from the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star, of January 26, 1964, which reads as follows:

PERJURY IS THE ISSUE

In a frivolous response to a pertinent question, Chairman JORDAN, of the Senate Rules Committee, told a reporter: "We are not investigating tinware."

Of course not. No one thinks the subcommittee should. But unless Senator JORDAN and his colleagues are ready to forfeit public respect and confidence, they had better investigate the issue of perjury which has cropped up during the pussyfooting probe of the Bobby Baker mess.

Don B. Reynolds, the Silver Spring insurance man who paid for a hi-fi set given to Lyndon Johnson, told the Jordan committee that he had talked with Walter Jenkins about buying advertising time on the LBJ Co.'s Texas television station. Mr. Reynolds was testifying under oath. Mr. Jenkins is administrative assistant to Mr. Johnson. In a sworn statement, he denied any knowledge of the advertising matter. Thus, it seems probable that one of the two men committed perjury.

Mr. Reynolds has said that the TV time, which he agreed to buy in connection with a life insurance sale to Mr. Johnson, was of no value to him. So he made a deal under which it would be used by Albert G. Young, head of a Silver Spring firm which sells cooking utensils nationally. Mr. Young has told newsmen that he discussed this advertising transaction by phone with a man who said he was Mr. Jenkins. And the reporters naturally wanted to know whether Senator JORDAN intended to call Mr. Young as a witness. The tinware comment was the result.

Normally an investigating committee would try to get to the bottom of such a conflict of testimony. It would put Mr. Young on the stand and get his sworn story. It would follow through by examining the records of the TV company and interrogating the people there with whom Mr. Young must have dealt.

Apparently the Senate committee does not intend to do this. It is trying to clamp the lid on what could be a very explosive (though legitimate) aspect of its inquiry. If it does, it can expect a vote of "no confidence" from the American people. And this vote should come through loud and clear.

Another excellent editorial in the New York Times has this to say:

THE SENATE AND MR. BAKER

The conduct of the Senate investigation of the affairs of Robert G. Baker continues to perplex us. The committee's counsel, L. P. McLendon, was asked this week whether he intended to pursue further the contradictory testimony of Don B. Reynolds, an insurance man and Walter Jenkins, a White House aid. He replied:

"I don't attach any importance to this. You run into this sort of conflict of testimony all the time in an investigation of this sort."

Surely this is an astonishing attitude for Mr. McLendon to take when it is recalled that Mr. Reynolds testified he gave the President, then Senate majority leader, a valuable stereo set after writing a large life insurance policy for him, and then bought \$1,200 worth of advertising time from a television station owned by the Johnson family after a rival insurance salesman had threatened to do the same. The time was later allegedly sold to an advertiser for \$160.

Mr. Jenkins subsequently submitted an affidavit to the committee in which he asserted that the stereo set had been given to Senator Johnson by his protege, Mr. Baker, a point explicitly reiterated by President Johnson yesterday. Mr. Jenkins denied that he had ever talked to Mr. Reynolds about the TV advertising.

As Representative GROSS of Iowa told the House, the time has come to question Mr. Jenkins seriously about this manner. The committee should make every effort to establish the facts. Even if Mr. Johnson did believe the stereo set came from Mr. Baker why should he have accepted so valuable a present from a young protege with a large and growing family, whose plight led Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS to cut him in on a lucrative Florida land deal? As Mr. GROSS observes, the "war on poverty" seems to have started in Washington some time ago.

In the Des Moines Register and other newspapers the noted columnist, Mr. Richard Wilson, writes as follows:

SOME FEEL JOHNSON MUST DISAVOW BAKER (By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—President Johnson has adopted what amounts to a passive attitude toward the Baker inquiry. The theory behind this is that he is not in much real political danger and it is pointless to supply the opposition with new ammunition by undergoing critical questioning at a press conference.

The President rests on the explanation that there was nothing wrong in his relationship with Robert Baker, resigned secretary of the Democratic majority in the U.S. Senate. Baker expected nothing in return for a gift of a stereo set to the President when he was a Senator in 1959.

BROADER QUESTIONS

This is a professional-type political attitude and is probably sustainable. But in view of Mr. Johnson's fine beginning in the presidency some of his friends at the Capitol who wish him well will be disappointed and alarmed if he does not address himself to the basic problems raised by the Baker inquiry.

These problems are numerous, not the least of which is whether a U.S. Senator or Vice President, as in Mr. Johnson's case, should be involved in a radio-TV operation which owes its existence to a Federal license.

But there are broader questions. It has been proved politically unwise to ignore or brush under the rug small incidents which tend to arouse the always latent public suspicion that public officeholders are often on the make. President Truman made this mistake, and so did President Eisenhower. The pathway of good intentions has been blocked by freezers, vicuna coats, oriental rugs, and now—perhaps—by a stereophonic high-fidelity set.

NOTHING VENAL

This is why all through the Kennedy administration there was a poster prominently displayed at the entrance to public buildings in Washington proclaiming, in Kennedy prose, the absolute imperative for integrity in public office.

There was, of course, nothing venal in Mr. Johnson's having accepted a stereo set with a retail value of \$800 or \$900 which came his way, via Bobby Baker and his insurance agent, by virtue of \$200,000 insurance purchased on the then Senate majority leader's life.

This would not seem unusual in a world of private affairs which is keyed to rebates, kickbacks, and other practices prevalent in the "I can get it for you wholesale" set. Whether or not it was legal for an insurance agent to present the stereo set to Mr. Johnson, in the context of an insurance contract, has concerned some Senators.

THE PRESIDENT'S REAL PROBLEM

President Johnson's real problem, however, is that his acceptance of this gift ties him into Bobby Baker's world, and this is beneath the dignity of the Presidency of the United States. Some of his friends believe that he must act positively to separate himself from any such identification so that his administration cannot be marred by cynical implications.

As much as has been so far revealed of the amazing operations of the eager young man, who was Senator Johnson's lieutenant in operating the Senate, has left some of the old pros gasping. Former Vice President Nixon recently told a friend: "I used to see Bobby in the Senate and slap him on the back. I thought he was just a clerk or errand boy for Lyndon. But the guy was a millionaire."

It becomes increasingly apparent to some of his friends that the President must do what he has not wanted to do, disavow Baker. For, Baker was as the White House now states, a trusted friend of President Johnson.

LBJ STATION ADVERTISING

The other problems are less painful but essentially harder. The insurance agent who sold the LBJ Co. the \$200,000 policies on Senator Johnson's life was persuaded to pay for advertising to the tune of \$1,200 on the LBJ station in Austin, Tex., far from the agent's little office in a Washington suburb. The LBJ Co. was ostensibly controlled by Mrs. Johnson. The LBJ station was acquired by Johnson interests in the 1940's while Lyndon Johnson was a Member of the House of Representatives.

A television license was acquired when Senator Johnson was majority leader of the Senate. This radio-TV combination has prospered along with other Johnson ranch and business interests.

A few years ago a congressional investigator, Representative OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, found himself so embarrassed by a 25-percent interest in a radio station licensed by the Federal Government that he got rid of it although there was no reason in law for him to do so.

MORAL, ETHICAL LEADERSHIP

The problem here is whether or not a U.S. Congressman should be deeply involved in businesses which his actions in Washington might help or harm. It is an old question. President Johnson recognized that as President neither he nor his wife should be profiting from the radio-TV setup and they put it in trust during his incumbency. He had not thought this necessary as a Senator or as Vice President.

Lately some Senators and Congressmen have been making public their stockholdings. Others feel their business connections are private and will not conflict with the public interest.

A President has a broader responsibility, or at least President Kennedy thought so. This is to set a tone, and exercise moral and ethical leadership. Mr. Kennedy carried it to the point of donating his entire salary as President to charity.

RAYMOND F. FARRELL COMMISSIONER WITH A HEART

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the other day, President Lyndon B. Johnson said in a statement from the White House that the 1963 report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service is an example of government with a heart.

In my opinion, this was a special tribute to Mr. Raymond F. Farrell, whose outstanding qualifications caused me to strongly recommend his appointment as Commissioner to former President John F. Kennedy.

I have known Ray Farrell, who is from Rhode Island, for many years and have always been impressed by his strong sense of personal dignity as well as his concern for the rights of others. These qualities, plus a thorough understanding of the laws he administers, have enabled him to do a superior job as Commissioner.

A government with a heart is possible only where there is daily determination to function with compassion as well as efficiency. Ray Farrell, who has given almost his entire working life to the Federal career service, has shown that determination. I am happy today to add my commendations to those of President Johnson and the countless others who admire his work.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the report to the President from the Attorney General concerning accomplishments of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the statement of the President upon receiving it.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service is an example of government with a heart.

By applying existing immigration laws with humanity, we are demonstrating that compassion and efficient administration go hand in hand.

America's strength has risen from the diversity of its heritage. Its future has always rested on the hopes of our forebearers as they came to seek freedom and abundance.

We can take renewed faith in the eagerness of people throughout the world to become citizens—to share with us in the building of an even stronger country. We can express that faith by passing and implementing legislation already proposed to abolish the discriminatory national origins system. This bill will eliminate the waste of unused quotas. It will permit families to be reunited. I am hopeful of passage as early as possible.

The Attorney General's report makes it clear that the Immigration Service has done its job with understanding, ability, and energy. In executing the new legislation it will continue to perform in that manner.

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT FROM THE ATTORNEY GENERAL CONCERNING ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE, JANUARY 13, 1964

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am happy to report that the U.S. Immigration and Natu-

ralization Service made important progress during 1963 in eliminating time-consuming redtape for citizens and visitors, without diluting national security safeguards.

One of the Service's most satisfying accomplishments in the year was to make streamlined new procedures available to Americans who want to adopt alien orphans. Already, I am told, there has been a sharp reduction in the time required to adopt 1,500 of these orphans.

Raymond F. Farrell, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization also has reported to me that major gains in cutting redtape have been achieved in the inspection procedures for visitors from abroad. These improvements have been especially timely since they came during a year when an estimated 986,000 foreign tourists, a record number, visited the United States, compared with 851,506 in 1962 and 766,591 in 1961.

One of these improvements results from the adoption by several large ship lines of the Service's suggestion to use the simplified manifests long employed by the airlines. This change will ease the jam at inspection facilities, permitting inspection of all passengers on a first-come, first-serve basis.

Another travel aid instituted this year allows foreign passengers arriving and departing on cruise vessels to enter and clear U.S. ports as part of their tour without having to obtain nonimmigrant visas from U.S. consuls abroad.

I am also pleased to report to you that courtesy and cooperation along both sides of the thousands of miles of borders with Mexico and Canada during the year were unusually high all during the year.

As an example of this cooperation, the Mexican Federal Judicial Police worked with the Immigration Service to break up a major counterfeit ring in Mexico City which was producing bogus versions of the forms issued to aliens residing permanently in the United States.

Again this year, the Immigration Service continued its vigorous drive on organized crime and racketeering. Commissioner Farrell reports that 676 aliens were deported under criminal, immoral, or narcotics charges.

Among them was "Countess" Elizabeth Spedding, who had been convicted of violating the White Slave Traffic Act. She was deported to Canada following her release from confinement for illegal reentry.

Others deported during the renewed drive on criminals and racketeers included Giuseppe Crisalli, whose convictions include armed highway robbery, and Umberto Bauco, wanted by authorities in Italy for fraud and embezzling.

Also during the year, deportation proceedings were started against Hugo Rossi, a narcotics trafficker who was recently denaturalized.

Also in 1963, the Supreme Court upheld a denaturalization order against John "Bath-beach" Oddo, a racketeer loan shark who has been identified as a member of Cosa Nostra.

Other highlights of the 1963 activities of the Immigration and Naturalization Service are:

An alltime record number of 174 million aliens and citizens were admitted during the year, an increase of 1 million over the year before. This total, of course, includes many aliens and citizens who made frequent crossings of the land borders.

During the year, the United States population was increased by 314,000 aliens who entered as immigrants or as permanent residents. More than half came from Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Mexico.

Cubans fleeing Castro continued to arrive in the United States despite the termination of scheduled airline flights between the two countries in October 1962.

From then until last July, 6,076 refugees were brought to the United States by American Red Cross-sponsored vessels and aircraft, while others continued to arrive by small boat along the Florida coast. As of December 31, there were 154,703 political refugees in the United States from Cuba.

The Service continued to accept Chinese refugees from Hong Kong into the United States under President Kennedy's directive of May 23, 1962, to help alleviate overcrowding in that colony caused by the influx of persons fleeing from Communist China. Although no new applications have been accepted since January 1, 1963, 6,446 entered during the year, making a total of 9,200 who have arrived in this country.

All refugees, of course, are carefully screened before being permitted to enter this country.

During 1963, 73,250 aliens conceded deportability and were permitted to depart without formal proceedings. The 22 percent increase over 1962 was made up primarily of illegal entries from Mexico.

Fifty mentally ill aliens were returned to their native lands. Hospitalization of these aliens already had cost the United States \$340,000. Had they continued to remain in hospitals in the United States during their lifetime, the projected cost would have been \$3,850,000.

Subversive aliens deported during the year include: Gus Polites, long active Communist functionary in the Detroit area; Antonio Rodriguez Echazabal, former Cuban Ambassador to Haiti and Guatemala and alleged Communist agent.

Moy Cheung Seto, former propagandist for the Chinese Communist Party, who had procured documentation by fraud and was seeking entry to the United States, was excluded and deported. Stanislaw Byczkowski, former member of the United Polish Worker's Party and suspected espionage agent was also required to depart.

Eng Let Poy, a Chinese Communist who had falsely claimed U.S. citizenship, departed while under deportation proceedings. Deportation proceedings were initiated against Joseph Sherman, long active in Communist organizations in the Boston area.

Roger Tetreault, Pierre Schneider, and Mario Bachand, youthful members of the terrorist Quebec Liberation Front were expelled to Quebec. All three had fled Canada after being charged with involvement in large-scale bombings there which resulted in the death of one person and injury to others.

There were 4,053 investigations of possible fraudulent evasion of the immigration and nationality laws. Prosecutions were sought in all cases of individuals or rings seeking to profit from fraudulent practices. Among them were Richard A. Cody, a Los Angeles attorney, who arranged "sham" marriages between aliens and citizens for substantial fees. He was indicted together with three of the "grooms."

Salvatore Vavolizza, president of the Vavolizza Travel Service, Bronx, N.Y., two of his employees and the owner of another travel agency were indicted on 73 counts for conspiring to make false statements in applications for first preference visas. Elmer R. Castillo, a self-styled immigration consultant was indicted for furnishing fraudulent employment assurances to potential immigrants from Mexico.

There were 591 investigations in alien smuggling cases conducted by Service officers. George H. Stodder, Robert A. Clauss, and Efrain Rio-Gutierrez were indicted for illegally bringing 4 Mexican aliens into the United States and in furtherance of the violation transporting the aliens from the border to Wyoming by plane. They are awaiting trial.

Marvin Kenneth Wilson and Joe Frank Langston were charged with inducing 14

aliens to enter the United States illegally and with conspiring to convey them by plane from the Mexican border to Oregon. Wilson pleaded guilty and is serving a 1-year sentence. Langston is awaiting trial.

A. J. Kupper, Hoke McKim, and Roman Vidrio Virgen were indicted for having induced 8 Mexicans to enter the United States illegally and conspiring to convey them by plane from the border to Kaufman, Tex. They, too, await trial.

Service efforts to combat desertions by sailors resulted in the location of 1,930 deserters. One, a Greek crewman, who deserted ship was located in Chicago. He attempted to avoid arrest by being lowered from a third story window on a bed-sheet rope. His trial—and that of his accomplices for harboring and concealing him—is pending.

During 1963, illegal aliens found in this country by the border patrol increased by 23 percent to 43,174 from 35,096 from 1962.

In addition to aliens located by the border patrol, 12,795 aliens were found in urban areas by Immigration Service investigators who have the responsibility of seeking out aliens who have entered unlawfully or who have violated the conditions of their admissions.

In the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas, the marked increase in illegal entries during July, August, and September, almost paralleled exactly the sharp seasonal trend noted last year. In addition to the 23,558 aliens who entered illegally, 19,508 aliens who had violated nonimmigrant status were found. Most of these were working or seeking work on farms and ranches.

A moderate increase in the number of alien smugglers detected by the border patrol was noted—382, compared with 355 during 1962. There was a marked increase, however, in the number of smuggled aliens, from 635 last year to 821 during 1963.

There was an increase in the use of aircraft to smuggle aliens into the United States or to transport them after entry. In July, officers picked up 37 deportable aliens who were waiting for a plane to transport them from Deming, N. Mex., to Brooks, Oreg., where they had been promised work.

Reentry of deportable aliens is minimized by transporting them to the interior of Mexico nearer their homes rather than by releasing them at the border. Accordingly, 11,340 aliens were flown by chartered aircraft to Leon, Guanajuato, and 4,129 aliens were transported by train to Chihuahua.

Cooperation with other enforcement agencies continued to pay dividends. These agencies delivered 3,632 deportable aliens to patrol officers during the year and the border patrol was able to turn over to them 1,013 violators of various Federal, State, and local laws.

An officer at Wolf Point, Mont., arrested Sam Mannarino, Pittsburgh rackets figure, wanted for violation of the Federal income tax laws.

In routine operations, Oceanside officers solved a burglary (and recovered \$5,500 worth of men's clothing) by arresting three men fleeing the scene of a crime.

A Del Rio officer identified a deportable alien as a suspect, and as a result, 36 burglaries were cleared. El Paso officers arrested an alien wanted for murder in Canada.

Laredo officers arrested a man wanted in Dallas for murder after he attempted to evade inspection at a traffic checking point. In October, Del Rio officers arrested two smugglers and seized 100 pounds of marijuana concealed in their automobile.

In accordance with requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 3,236,684 aliens filed address report cards with the Service in 1963. This is an increase of 107,919 reports over last year. The States with the largest number of aliens reporting were: California, 710,419 or 22 percent; New

York, 600,468 or 18.5 percent; Texas, 241,001 or 7.4 percent.

Resident aliens comprise 89 percent of the aliens reporting. The largest numbers of resident aliens were of Mexican nationality (577,895), followed by Canada (339,659), the United Kingdom (247,811), Germany (247,805), Italy (228,766), and Poland (129,884). There were less than 100,000 in other nationalities. Most Mexican nationals live in California and Texas; Canadians in New York and California; British in New York and California; Germans in New York and California; Italians in New York and New Jersey; and Poles in New York and Illinois.

Another important function of the Immigration and Naturalization Service is the naturalization of resident aliens.

Among the 125,500 persons who became citizens through naturalization were approximately 8,000 Hungarians, who came to this country following the revolution of 1956. More than half of those naturalized were former nationals of Germany, Italy, United Kingdom, Canada, Mexico, and Hungary.

Another major area in the nationality field was the issuance of certificates of citizenship to 18,500 foreign-born persons who acquired U.S. citizenship through their naturalized parents. An additional 23,200 persons were issued other nationality documents.

The Service policy of expediting the naturalization of military personnel and their dependents was continued in 1963.

Ceremonies were held at many military stations at which children born abroad to Armed Forces personnel were issued certificates of citizenship, thus saving the servicemen and the Government time and expense.

Respectfully,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, 1964, I pointed out President Johnson's record on civil rights, which started out as that of a segregationist's. In view of the recent hearings held by my Committee on Ways and Means, on the King-Anderson bill which is compulsory health insurance, it is interesting to note the following letter written by Senator Lyndon B. Johnson on September 28, 1950, to Mrs. Thos. P. Caughlin, whose permission to use the letter has been given:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
April 28, 1950.

Mrs. THOS. P. CAUGHLIN,
Dallas, Tex.

MY DEAR FRIEND: Thank you for making available to me a copy of the resolution passed by your organization opposing any form of compulsory health insurance.

Ever since my election to Congress 13 years ago I have been in complete opposition to socialized medicine. I assure you that I shall always work against legislation which, in my judgment, would circumvent the right of our citizens to select physicians of their own choice.

If you will convey this information to your members, I shall be very grateful. Please tell them, too, that I hope I may continue

to share their views on legislation pending here.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

WHICH L.B.J. DO YOU BELIEVE?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL PLATFORM

Endorsed further centralization of power in the Federal Government.

Favored sit-in demonstrations.

Promised to close such tax loopholes as "depletion allowances."

Supported Federal aid for education.

Favored school desegregation.

Favored system of medical care for the aged as part of the social security system.

Supported legislation to repeal State right-to-work laws.

TEXAS DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

Denounced "Federal encroachment" and deplored the "growing and menacing concentration of power in Central Government."

Called for "enforcement of laws designed to protect private property * * * from physical occupation."

Called for retention of the "present oil and gas depletion allowances."

Opposed "the entry of the Federal Government in the general field of public education."

Pledged "to protect the decisions of the people of local school districts in the operation and control of their schools."

Deplored "socialistic proposals" and called for State rather than National action to deal with health problems of aged citizens. Supported the alternative Kerr-Mills approach to the problem.

Endorsed the Texas right-to-work law as "necessary to free enterprise system and the growth and prosperity of Texas."

To top it off, last Thursday evening, President Johnson issued a statement following the ratification of the 24th amendment to the Constitution by the South Dakota Legislature, an action which outlawed the poll tax as a requirement for voting in Federal elections, saying at that time:

As majority leader of the Senate, I personally urged the banishment of bars to voting. This triumph now of liberty over restriction is a proud moment for me.

What President Johnson failed to tell the American people was that between 1942 and 1960, while a Member of the House of Representatives and then of the Senate, he voted 12 times against legislation to outlaw the poll tax.

Is it no wonder that the question, in all fairness, can be asked: Which Lyndon B. Johnson are the American people supposed to believe? The President is the only one who can supply this answer.

CAN AMERICA SPEND ITSELF TO PROSPERITY OR BANKRUPTCY?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's housing and community development message is unbelievable. It is

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Lyndon B. Johnson, in the fall of 1960, ran both for the office of Vice President and for the office of Senator from Texas. He ran on two diametrically opposed platforms: The Democratic national platform adopted in Los Angeles and the platform adopted by the Democratic Party of Texas:

Denounced "Federal encroachment" and deplored the "growing and menacing concentration of power in Central Government."

Called for "enforcement of laws designed to protect private property * * * from physical occupation."

Called for retention of the "present oil and gas depletion allowances."

Opposed "the entry of the Federal Government in the general field of public education."

Pledged "to protect the decisions of the people of local school districts in the operation and control of their schools."

Deplored "socialistic proposals" and called for State rather than National action to deal with health problems of aged citizens. Supported the alternative Kerr-Mills approach to the problem.

Endorsed the Texas right-to-work law as "necessary to free enterprise system and the growth and prosperity of Texas."

socialism, not capitalism. It is government evaluation of problems followed by Federal prescription of aid, planning, regimentation, and control. Nowhere is there recognition or understanding of the spirit and deed of American individual initiative, local and community effort, State pride and States rights.

Specifically, first local city and community planning commission activities, working with private developers, builders, and investors are replaced by Federal open space land acquisition for later Government approved development. The President disapproves the so-called urban sprawl. Is not local development necessarily right since it pleases the local plan commission and private entrepreneurs and investors, all tailored to please the ultimate boss of development, the customer, the home buyer, the tenant? Where does Federal Government suddenly acquire Solomon-like wisdom, or our President, or Housing and Home Finance head Bob Weaver?

Second, public housing is to now be procured by Federal purchase by Mr. Robert Weaver of homes and apartments in each block and locality of the residential areas of our cities. The residential areas of every city will then become Government dominated. Is this the land of the free? The social rearrangement of our lives is actually what Mr. Weaver and President Johnson seem to want. Freedom of association, of choosing your neighbors is out the window. Perhaps public housing officials will promise to have Government employed yard men, painters, and plumbers keep up each public housing house equal to the neigh-

bor's efforts in maintaining their homes. Public housing tenants are wards of the Government and need not, do not keep up their properties and yards. As President Johnson puts it, the Housing and Home Finance Agency can both buy existing properties to lease them to public housing tenants at marked down rates or can act as simply a leasing agent between owner and tenant.

Third, mass transportation must now be the Federal province, regardless of local or private action. This is now a part of the housing bill. If that is not enough, the Federal Government is asked by our President to set up training of those in local communities on how to run local communities. How did our Nation get where it is without such Federal aid? Can people be trusted to run their affairs locally? Apparently not. I contradict this outlook.

Nor do we need a new Federal Department of Housing and Community Development as the President requests. Nor do we need to extend urban renewal. The scandalous abuse of the law to date as seen in congressional investigation and GAO reports is proof enough that we must stop and evaluate, not plunge on into more chaos and corruption by Federal urban renewal laws.

By any test of Americanism that I know, moral or constitutional as viewed through our forefathers' eyes and our own sad Federal Government manipulations this message does not measure up. It certainly far exceeds my congressional oath to uphold and defend the Constitution or my first yardstick, "Is it a function of the Federal Government?" Secondly, when cost is considered, there is a bewildering duplicity of intent. The cost will be astronomic and escalating in nature. The open space purchase, new department and functions, the new loans, grants, research, training—there is almost no limit. How can we reconcile these extravagances with the loudly oft repeated claims of fiscal prudence, reduced debt and reduced spending? We can see as Senator BYRD observed that spending will soar in 1964 as over 1963 and even more in later years.

JOHN-A-DREAMS GLENN

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker—

Yet I, a dull and muddy-mettled rascal, peak like John-a-dreams, unpregnant of my cause, and can say nothing.—SHAKESPEARE.

Shakespeare's John-a-dreams is a name apparently coined to suit a dreaming character, so lost in his own thoughts that he is scarcely conscious of his surroundings. I think this aptly fits John Glenn's present state.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in the mind of the public that John Glenn was methodically brainwashed by the Kennedy's with an ego-tickling display of attention. Whether it was on waterskis or in the plush environs of Hyannis Port, John Glenn was persuaded to put his name on a ballot.

On that point, I wish to include an editorial from the January 22, 1964, issue of the Peoria Journal Star. Under unanimous consent, the editorial follows:

JOHN GLENN: JUST A BALLOT NAME?

Ohio politicians, drunk with their good fortune, are already whooping it up for John Glenn to be the next Vice President of the United States.

That eruption of cynical political greed and blind enthusiasm for a "name" on the ballot casts a shadow over the whole business of the space hero dumping the space program to enter politics.

John Glenn will bring to the political arena a famous name, a familiar face, an exceptional ability to speak appealingly to large groups, an unashamed religious faith, and an equally forthright patriotic pride. He is the image of the "All-American boy" come to maturity. A perfect hero.

The fact remains that Glenn's preparations for the actual job of making national policy and national decisions have been considerably less than his lifelong training for space.

There are others with much the same long, tedious, and demanding training and experience, but they are too few. His departure leaves a gap. Nobody can replace him in the space picture. Those years of training and of acquiring special knowledge, and the experiences of the space flights are washed out.

By no stretch of the imagination can this be considered the kind of training and preparation that is ideal for government service at the highest level. Its narrow and technical specialization is something of the opposite of training for high public office.

Yet, many men have gone to the U.S. Senate with fewer virtues and no better training than John Glenn. What he is doing is hardly uncommon. The temptation of senatorial office has snared many without the added pressure and aura of being urged to run by the Attorney General of the United States and brother to the late much-admired President.

But even from Washington there seems to be no subterfuge about the reason for urging Glenn to take up politics.

What has been said is that the party needs a shot in the arm in Ohio.

In other men we might think such crude and cynical political circumstances fairly normal and certainly commonplace.

But in John Glenn, the brave, unselfish, God-fearing, patriotic, squarefaced, and clear-eyed hero from space, it is inescapably disappointing. It is too earthbound. Too common. Too cheap. Too ordinary. And, maybe, too naive—to be used for partisan political advantage.

And to put our space effort, for which he is so brilliantly equipped, in second place.

To put the younger astronauts who must go into space without his help and preparation and experience to guide them in second place.

It is disconcerting. It is disappointing. We have already lost our shining example of the self-sacrificing "team player," the modest hero, the dedicated officer.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WELTNER, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. GROSS, for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include certain material.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STAFFORD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BOW.

Mr. REIFEL.

Mr. ALGER.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. EVINS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PICKLE.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 855. An act to provide for more effective utilization of certain Federal loans or grants by encouraging better coordinated local review of State and local applications for such loans or grants; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1833. An act to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household equipment and furniture, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1928. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to sell a part of the former Chell Air Force Station to Chancellor-Western Oil & Development Co., by negotiation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1959. An act to authorize the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of Government employees assigned to duty in Alaska, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3368. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey by quitclaim deed a parcel of land to the Lexington Park Volunteer Fire Department, Inc.; and

H.R. 4801. An act to amend subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding certification of facts based upon transferred records.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on January 23, 1964, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 779. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, relating to membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission, so as to authorize certain appropriations thereunder for the fiscal years 1965 and 1966.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 28, 1964, at 10 o'clock a.m.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

JANUARY 14, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Heimburger	General counsel	\$9,442.50
Francis M. LeMay	Staff consultant	9,442.50
Christine S. Gallagher	Clerk	9,442.50
Hyde H. Murray	Assistant clerk	8,615.04
George F. Missbeck	Printing editor	5,361.60
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	5,058.18
Betty M. Prezioso	do	5,058.18
Peggy Jean Lamm	do	4,711.50
Martha S. Hannah	do	4,711.50
Jane C. Wojcik	do	4,415.30

AGRICULTURE INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

Carolyn Becker	Staff assistant	1,829.00
Robert C. Bruce	Assistant counsel	4,870.38
Camille B. Packer	Clerk	1,046.04
William Allen Benson	do	409.63
Thomas J. Kraeft	do	169.63
Charles Gentry Hannah	do	245.78
Marjorie B. Johnson	Staff assistant	1,285.92

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$50,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 11,185.13
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963..... 12,152.59

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1963..... 23,337.72

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963..... 26,662.28

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Table with columns: Name of employee, Profession, Total gross salary during 6-month period. Lists employees like Kenneth Sprankle, Paul M. Wilson, Robert M. Moyer, etc.

Amount of expenditures previously reported... Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963... Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963...

CLARENCE CANNON, Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (INVESTIGATIONS STAFF)

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it.

Table with columns: Name of employee, Profession, Total gross salary during 6-month period. Lists Leonard M. Walters, Rowland C. Halstead, Leo E. Conroy, etc.

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Table with columns: Agency/Department, Name of employee, Profession, Total gross salary during 6-month period. Lists Agriculture, Bureau of the Budget, Commerce, Federal Bureau of Investigation, etc.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures... \$660,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported... Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963... Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963... Balance unexpended as of December 31, 1963...

CLARENCE CANNON, Chairman.

JANUARY 6, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946,

Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Table with columns: Name of employee, Profession, Total gross salary during 6-month period. Lists John R. Blandford, Robert W. Smart, Philip W. Kelleher, etc.

SUBCOMMITTEE FOR SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS (PURSUANT TO H. RES. 84 AND 146, 88TH CONG.)

Table with columns: Name of employee, Profession, Total gross salary during 6-month period. Lists John T. M. Reddan, Walton Woods, Phyllis Seymour, etc.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures... \$75,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported... Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963...

Total amount expended from Jan. 4 to Dec. 31, 1963... 55,917.14

Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1964... 19,082.86

CARL VINSON, Chairman.

JANUARY 24, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

STANDING COMMITTEE

Table with columns: Name of employee, Profession, Total gross salary during 6-month period. Lists Barriere, John E., Bean, Marguerite, Brown, Roger J., etc.

STANDING COMMITTEE—continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Moorhous, Margaret H.	Assistant clerk (as of Oct. 16).	\$1,750.92
Poston, Robert R.	General counsel (through Sept. 30).	4,721.25
Ruth, Elizabeth L.	Secretary (through Sept. 15).	2,085.02
Scott, Ira O.	Senior economist (as of Sept. 3 through Oct. 15).	2,255.70
Swanner, Regina.	Assistant clerk (as of Sept. 1).	2,801.48
Total		68,061.61

EMPLOYEES UNDER H. RES. 228, INVESTIGATING STAFF

Brunner, Karl.	Economist.	1,564.50
Culbertson, John M.	Professional staff member (from July 1 to 15).	786.87
Fasteau, Marc S.	Research assistant (as of Dec. 1).	541.46
Fulton, Wilbur D.	Minority professional staff member (from Sept. 1 through Oct. 31).	3,147.50
Goodman, Oscar R.	Senior economist (from Aug. 19 through Sept. 23).	1,836.04
Haase-Dubosc, Gerard.	Assistant clerk (from June 17 through Sept. 4).	711.27
Hale, Myron Q.	Organization specialist (July 1 through Sept. 7).	2,011.09
Hayden, Helen E.	Assistant clerk.	3,752.58
Hill, George C.	do.	4,101.99
Holstein, Charles B.	Professional staff member.	9,442.50
Hopkins, Raymond F.	Organization specialist (July 1 through Sept. 7).	670.58
Jackson, Linda.	Secretary (Sept. 1 through 30).	293.96
Jacobs, Donald P.	Senior economist (Aug. 6 through Sept. 6).	1,626.21
Jessup, Paul F.	Economist (Sept. 1 through Sept. 30).	708.50
Koepenick, Edward L. III.	Assistant clerk (as of Sept. 1).	1,527.99
Lerner, Eugene M.	Senior economist.	3,779.64
McLemore, Lawrence B.	Messenger (through Sept. 15).	1,168.52
Mansfield, Harvey C.	Professional staff member (through Aug. 31).	3,147.50
Mayer, Thomas.	Senior economist (through July 25).	1,311.46
Meiselman, David I.	Senior economist (through Aug. 31 and as of Oct. 1).	4,091.57
Meltzer, Allan H.	Economist.	1,672.92
Minesinger, Janet F.	Clerk-stenographer (through Sept. 30).	1,998.18
Moorhous, Margaret H.	Assistant clerk (Sept. 18, through Oct. 15).	653.67
Polakoff, Murray E.	Senior economist (Oct. 1 through Dec. 31).	2,358.45
Pomiecko, Constance M.	Assistant clerk (Oct. 1 through Nov. 8).	765.90
Roberts, Harriet L.	Staff assistant (as of Dec. 5).	570.99
Robinson, Donald L.	Professional staff member.	4,251.00
Sawhill, John C.	Senior economist (Oct. 1 through Dec. 31).	2,358.45
Schulkin, Peter.	Research assistant (as of Oct. 14).	581.22
Scott, Ira O.	Senior economist (through Sept. 2 and from Dec. 15).	4,091.75
Swanner, Regina.	Assistant clerk (through Aug. 31).	1,400.74
Vaughn, Donald G.	Assistant clerk (as of Aug. 27).	2,812.77
Walton, Jonathan R.	Research assistant (as of Oct. 17).	1,130.70
Weintraub, Robert E.	Senior economist (as of Oct. 1).	1,889.82
Young, Doris M.	Assistant clerk.	4,169.70
Total		76,927.99

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING (H. RES. 204 AND H. RES. 528)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Burns, Frances Y.	Secretary (through Oct. 31).	\$2,490.88
Burrows, Kenneth W.	Housing economist.	8,826.60
Cameron, Jean.	Research assistant.	4,711.50
Hamilton, Eleanor.	do.	3,795.90
Ireland, Casey.	Minority staff member.	7,500.90
McEwan, John J., Jr.	Deputy staff director.	9,442.50
Miles, Linda L.	Secretary (as of Dec. 7).	335.65
Perry, Grady, Jr.	Clerk.	6,584.16
Stark, John R.	Professional staff member.	9,295.18
Tucker, Margaret E.	Secretary.	4,608.54
Total		57,591.81

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Housing and Home Finance Agency:		
Diamond, Arnold H.	Senior economist.	8,578.11
Federal Trade Commission:		
Brod, Ernest.	Investigator (from June 5 through Sept. 30).	1,547.22
Drumm, John G.	do.	1,345.68
Fogarty, Joseph E.	Investigator (from June 5 through Oct. 11).	1,909.05
Manos, James.	do.	3,173.76
Stroud, Charles E.	do.	4,534.29
	Retirement contributions for above investigators.	813.16
Total		21,901.27

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$555,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	92,811.52
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31	175,643.02
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31	268,454.54
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963.	286,545.46

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Hayden S. Garber	Counsel.	\$8,615.04
Clayton D. Gasque	Staff director.	7,016.64
Leonard O. Hilder	Investigator.	6,358.50
Donald J. Tubridy	Minority clerk.	6,452.52
James T. Clark	Clerk.	9,442.50
Ellen M. Coxeter	Assistant clerk.	4,500.18
Jennie H. Owings	do.	3,736.32

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Patricia Ann Dempsey.	Assistant clerk (resigned effective Mar. 15, 1963).	\$1,605.42
Gertrude W. Johnson.	Clerk-typist (worked from June 1 to Dec. 1, 1963).	1,834.95
John G. Sims.	Assistant clerk (worked for month of August 1963).	263.11
Jean Quarles.	Assistant clerk (began work Mar. 1, 1963).	2,257.40
Total expended.		52,082.58

INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

Amount authorized	\$25,000.00
Amount expended	9,053.38
Balance available.	15,946.62

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford.	Staff administrator.	\$9,442.50
Roy J. Bullock.	Senior stax consultant.	9,334.38
Albert C. F. Westphal.	Staff consultant.	9,334.38
Franklin J. Schupp.	do.	9,249.72
Robert F. Brandt.	Investigator consultant.	9,099.30
Harry C. Cromer.	Staff consultant.	8,887.74
Phillip B. Billings.	Special assistant.	7,674.87
Marian A. Czarnecki.	Staff consultant.	8,563.38
Melvin O. Benson.	do.	8,253.06
June Nigh.	Senior staff assistant.	7,491.48
Helen C. Mattas.	Staff assistant.	6,424.32
Helen L. Hashaven.	do.	6,287.94
Mary Louise O'Brien.	do.	6,189.24
Mary Medsker.	do.	4,337.70
Doris B. McCracken.	do.	5,253.24
Jean E. Smith.	Staff assistant (commencing Oct. 5, 1963).	1,673.82
Robert J. Bowen.	Clerical assistant.	4,213.08

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$117,500.00
---	--------------

Amount of expenditures previously reported	40,335.22
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963.	46,063.73

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1963. 86,398.95

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963. 31,101.05

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Louise Maxienne Dargans	Chief clerk	\$9,442.50
Russell C. Derrickson	Staff director	9,442.50
Deborah P. Wolfe	Education chief	9,442.50
Odell Clark	Chief investigator	7,002.54
Richard T. Burress	Minority clerk (July 1 to July 31, 1963)	1,573.75
Charles W. Radcliffe	Minority counsel for education	7,002.54
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant	3,032.64
Louise M. Wright	do	4,548.96
Jeanne E. Thomson	do	4,548.96
Corrine A. Huff	Secretary	3,337.22
Philip Ray Rodgers	Minority clerk and counsel (effective Sept. 1, 1963)	6,295.00
Ernesto Galarza	Chief counsel for labor-management (effective Nov. 1, 1963)	3,147.50

Amount of expenditures previously reported... \$73,261.37
 Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963... 68,816.61

Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1963... 142,077.98

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Full committee staff:		
Aurora E. Harris	Secretary	\$2,924.68
Cleomine B. Lewis	Administrative assistant	3,254.16
H. Roy Partridge, Jr.	Assistant clerk (July 8 to Aug. 9, 1963)	231.83
Michael Schwartz	Assistant clerk (June 15 to Aug. 31, 1963)	801.20
Mary L. Shuler	Secretary	3,088.00
John Everett Warren	Assistant clerk	1,288.02
Ridgely Jones	Administrative assistant	1,200.30
Charles Greenleaf, Jr.	Assistant minority clerk (Aug. 15 to 31, 1963)	213.65

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Full committee staff—Continued		
Ernesto Galarza	Administrative assistant (Oct. 1 to 31, 1963)	\$620.91
Sandra L. Paxton	Secretary (effective Nov. 25, 1963)	650.83
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant	1,516.32
Beverly Pearson	Minority secretary	3,752.58
Total salaries, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963		19,542.48
Total other		3,192.38
Total expenses		22,734.84

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures... \$50,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported... 21,047.97
 Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963... 22,734.86
 Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1963... 43,782.83
 Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963... 6,217.17

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
General Subcommittee on Education, No. 1 (Representative CARL D. PERKINS, chairman):		
Hartwell D. Reed	Counsel	\$8,027.40
Freda Tuttle	Secretary	3,210.84
Earl McCoy Cornett	Assistant clerk	754.24
Total salaries, July 1 to Dec. 12, 1963		11,992.48
Total other		4.10
Total expenses		11,996.58

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures... \$25,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported... 11,381.08
 Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963... 11,996.58
 Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1963... 23,377.66
 Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963... 1,622.34

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
General Subcommittee on Labor, No. 2 (Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, chairman):		
J. H. Foreman	Counsel	\$4,998.12
Adrienne Fields	Clerk	3,993.65
Fern A. Burns	Assistant clerk	93.47
Total salaries, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963		9,085.24
Total other		2,377.58
Total expenses		11,462.77

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures... \$25,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported... 10,307.41
 Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963... 11,462.77

Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Feb. 31, 1963... 21,770.18

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963... 3,229.82

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Special Subcommittee on Education, No. 3 (Representative EDITH GREEN, chairman):		
William T. O'Hara	Counsel	\$4,237.75
Betty R. Pryor	Clerk	6,156.36
William Gaul	Counsel	839.42
Total salaries, July 1 to Dec. 12, 1963		11,233.53
Total other		34.20
Total expenses		11,267.73

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures... \$25,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported... 11,404.95
 Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963... 11,267.73

Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1963... 22,672.68

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963... 2,327.32

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Special Subcommittee on Labor, No. 4		
Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr. (chairman):		
Robert E. McCord	Clerk	\$7,981.98
Mary E. Corbin	Secretary	3,747.18
Lella W. Troup	Assistant clerk	303.89
Linda Johnson	do	200.92
Veronica Snowden	do	250.54
Mark Mazo	do	100.77
Total salaries, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963.		12,585.28
Total other		140.55
Total expenses		12,725.83

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$25,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported.....11,726.97
 Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963.....12,725.83
 Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1963.....24,452.80
 Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963.....547.20

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Select Subcommittee on Education No. 5 (Representative JOHN H. DENT, chairman):		
John C. Muntone	Counsel	\$6,001.20
Rosalind M. Black	Secretary	3,004.92
Barbara L. Rugito	do	1,503.24
Kassian A. Kovalcheck, Jr.	Assistant clerk	820.92
A. R. Kelley	do	1,503.24
Total salaries, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963.		12,833.52
Total other		1,668.50
Total expenses		14,502.07

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$25,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....\$6,833.52
 Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963.....14,502.07
 Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1963.....21,019.11
 Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963.....3,980.89

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Select Subcommittee on Labor No. 6 (Representative ELMER J. HOLLAND, chairman):		
Curtis C. Aller	Director	\$8,003.94
Olive M. Gibbons	Secretary	3,210.84
Anne Marie Southworth	Assistant clerk	1,145.23
Total salaries, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963.		12,360.01
Total other		187.70
Total expenses		12,547.71

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$25,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported.....4,171.98
 Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963.....12,547.71
 Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1963.....16,719.69
 Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963.....8,280.31

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON RESEARCH DATA PROCESSING AND INFORMATION RETRIEVAL CENTER NO. 7 (CHAIRMAN, REPRESENTATIVE ROMAN C. PUCINSKI)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Patricia A. Kuta	Clerk	\$2,169.44
Total salaries, Aug. 26 to Dec. 31, 1963 (no other expenses)		2,169.44

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$7,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported.....None
 Amount expended from Aug. 26 to Dec. 31, 1963.....2,169.44

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963.....4,830.56

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL NO. 8 (CHAIRMAN, REPRESENTATIVE DOMINICK V. DANIELS)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Gail S. Smith	Clerk (Oct. 22 to Dec. 16, 1963)	\$721.08
Emory W. Reisinger	Counsel	1,648.10
Total salaries, Oct. 16 to Dec. 31, 1963 (no other expenses)		2,369.18

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$5,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported.....None
 Amount expended from Oct. 16 to Dec. 31, 1963.....2,369.18

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963.....2,630.82

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 14, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Expenses, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963:		
Full committee		\$1,018.55
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee		35,500.68
Military Operations Subcommittee		39,060.56
Government Activities Subcommittee		25,288.43
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee		46,131.44
Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee		48,267.05
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee		49,322.31
Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee		22,849.04
Total		267,438.06

Salaries, full committee, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963:
 Christine Ray Davis, staff director.....9,442.50
 James A. Lanigan, general counsel.....9,442.50
 Miles Q. Romney, associate general counsel.....7,935.77
 Earle J. Wade, staff member.....6,734.58
 Dolores Fel'Dotto, staff member.....4,754.82
 Ann E. McLachlan, staff member.....4,700.64
 Patricia Maheux, staff member.....4,700.64
 Charlotte C. Bickett—staff member.....4,278.06
 Malcolm K. Edwards, minority professional staff member.....8,003.94
 John Phillip Carlson, minority counsel.....7,919.28

Expenses, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963:

Full committee: Travel, publications, telephone, stationery, supplies, etc., July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963, total \$1,018.55

Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman:
 Elmer W. Henderson, counsel..... 8,883.06
 Arthur Perlman, investigator..... 7,594.92
 Francis J. Schworer, staff member..... 5,350.74
 Sallie Lee Benditt, research assistant..... 4,754.82
 Veronica B. Johnson, clerk..... 4,278.06
 John L. Dodson, clerical staff (Nov. 1 to Dec. 31, 1963)..... 833.70
 Domingo E. Ulibarri, clerical staff (July 1, to Oct. 31, 1963)..... 1,385.88
 Irene D. Manning, clerk-stenographer (July 1 to Aug. 31, 1963)..... 1,426.02
 Expenses..... 993.48
Total..... 35,500.68

Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. CHESTER HOLIFIELD, chairman:
 Herbert Roback, staff administrator..... 9,442.50
 John Paul Ridgely, investigator..... 6,170.46
 Douglas G. Dahlin, staff consultant..... 3,009.60
 Robert J. McElroy, investigator..... 4,819.86
 Mollie Jo Hughes, clerk-stenographer..... 4,278.06
 Catherine L. Koerberlein, clerk-stenographer..... 4,278.06
 Expenses..... 7,062.02
Total..... 39,060.56

Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. JACK BROOKS, chairman:
 Ernest Cornish Baynard, staff administrator..... 7,402.14
 Daniel L. Power, investigator..... 4,283.52
 William David Allred, research assistant (Nov. 1 to Dec. 31, 1963)..... 1,400.74
 Roland J. Williams, investigator..... 4,001.76
 Irma Reel, clerk..... 4,066.80
 Lynne Higginbotham, clerk-stenographer..... 3,302.91
 Expenses..... 830.56
Total..... 25,288.43

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman:
 James R. Naughton, counsel..... 8,286.00
 Delphis C. Goldberg, professional staff member..... 8,286.00
 Herbert B. Warburton, minority counsel..... 7,919.28
 George O. Serini, investigator..... 6,424.32
 William Donald Gray, research analyst..... 5,878.74
 Eileen M. Anderson, clerk-stenographer..... 4,278.06
 Bebe B. Terry, clerk-stenographer..... 4,061.40
 Expenses..... 997.64
Total..... 46,131.44

Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee, Hon. ROBERT E. JONES, chairman:
 Phineas Indrity, counsel..... 8,615.04
 Sidney McClellan, professional staff member..... 7,331.64
 Daniel A. Kavanaugh, assistant counsel..... 5,140.41
 Maurice B. Tobin, assistant counsel..... 4,500.18
 George L. Miltstead, investigator..... 5,253.24
 Catherine L. Hartke, stenographer..... 4,278.06
 Josephine Scheiver, research analyst (Oct. 1 to Dec. 31, 1963)..... 1,748.97
 Francine Shacter, clerk-stenographer (Oct. 8 to Dec. 31, 1963)..... 1,612.94
 Susan Mann, clerk-typist (July 1 to Sept. 30, 1963)..... 1,250.55
 Expenses..... 8,536.02
Total..... 48,267.05

Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman:
 Samuel J. Archibald, staff administrator..... 8,615.04
 Vincent J. Augliere, chief adviser..... 8,253.06
 Jack Matteson, chief investigator..... 7,486.80
 David Gluck, assistant counsel..... 7,486.80
 Benny L. Kass, assistant counsel..... 4,273.55
 William E. Barnaby, Jr., research assistant..... 4,232.01
 Helen K. Beasley, stenographer..... 4,278.06
 Glenna G. Donat, secretary (Nov. 1 to Dec. 31, 1963)..... 1,001.64
 Marguerite A. Gleason, clerk-stenographer (July 1 to Oct. 20, 1963)..... 2,217.09
 Expenses..... 1,478.26
Total..... 49,322.31

Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL, chairman:
 M. Joseph Matan, staff administrator..... 7,886.40
 Charles Rothenberg, counsel..... 7,312.83
 Clara Katherine Armstrong, clerical staff..... 3,860.94
 Millicent Y. Myers, stenographer..... 3,627.99
 Expenses..... 160.88
Total..... 22,849.04

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... 600,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 241,457.68

Amount expended from Jan. 4 to June 30, 1963..... \$241,457.68
 Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963..... 267,438.06
 Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963..... 91,104.26

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Julian P. Langston.....	Chief clerk.....	\$9,442.50
Marjorie Savage.....	Assistant clerk.....	8,144.94
Mary F. Stolle.....	do.....	4,169.70

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$5,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 326.35
 Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963..... 459.07

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1963..... 785.42

Balance..... 4,214.58

OMAR BURLESON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Professional staff:		
Sidney L. McFarland.....	Professional staff director and engineering consultant.....	\$9,245.04
T. Richard Witmer.....	Counsel and consultant on national parks.....	8,915.94
John L. Taylor.....	Consultant on territorial and Indian affairs.....	8,915.94
Milton A. Pearl.....	Consultant on mining, minerals, and public lands.....	8,915.94
Clerical staff:		
Nancy J. Arnold.....	Chief clerk.....	7,975.68
Dixie S. Barton.....	Clerk.....	4,576.02
Patricia Ann Murray.....	do.....	4,576.02
Virginia E. Bedsole.....	do.....	4,364.76
Patricia B. Freeman.....	do.....	4,072.20
Susan A. Whitener.....	do.....	3,822.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$30,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... \$8,596.92
 Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1963..... 8,546.81

Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1963..... 17,143.73

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963..... 12,856.27

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
W. E. Williamson.....	Clerk.....	\$9,442.48
Kenneth J. Painter.....	First assistant clerk.....	7,334.66
Marcella Fencil.....	Assistant clerk.....	4,895.68
Glenn L. Johnson.....	Printing editor.....	6,640.55
Joanne C. Neuland.....	Clerical assistant.....	4,115.54
Mildred H. Lang.....	do.....	4,115.54
Mary Ryan.....	do.....	4,115.54
Roy P. Wilkinson.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,898.84
Elsie M. Karpovich.....	Clerical assistant.....	4,115.54
Marion M. Burson.....	Staff assistant (minority).....	8,342.40
Professional staff:		
Andrew Stevenson.....	Expert.....	9,442.48
Kurt Borchardt.....	Legal counsel.....	9,442.48
George W. Perry.....	Professional staff member.....	8,944.15
James M. Menger, Jr.....	do.....	8,944.15
Additional temporary employees under H. Res. 17, H. Res. 226, and H. Res. 521:		
Gladys Johnson.....	Clerical assistant.....	4,765.65
Kathleen Theresa Crowe.....	Clerical assistant (to Aug. 31).....	775.92
William T. Denman III.....	Staff assistant (Subcommittee on Transportation).....	6,001.19
Rosalie Ann Peterson.....	Minority clerical assistant.....	2,750.33
Carolyn Sue Browning.....	do.....	3,302.91
Lewis E. Berry, Jr.....	Minority counsel.....	9,442.48
Charles L. Honey, Jr.....	Staff assistant (from Aug. 1).....	4,502.45
Wallace L. Briscoe.....	Staff assistant.....	6,001.19
John A. Canfield.....	Staff assistant (Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance) (from Nov. 15).....	1,500.30
William B. Ellis, Jr.....	Messenger (to July 31).....	387.96

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles P. Howze, Jr.....	Chief counsel.....	9,386.06
Robert E. L. Richardson.....	Associate counsel (to Aug. 31).....	2,141.44
Herman Clay Beasley.....	Subcommittee chief clerk.....	7,759.44
Stuart C. Ross.....	Consultant.....	8,727.90
Zelig Robinson.....	Staff attorney.....	6,001.18
Elizabeth G. Paola.....	Clerical assistant.....	3,898.84
Catherine C. McLees.....	do.....	4,115.54
Mary E. Bainbridge.....	Stenographer-clerk.....	3,790.49
Dorothy Dimpel.....	Stenographer-clerk (from July 16).....	3,474.62

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$278,450.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 86,379.95

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963.....	\$90,654.40
Total amount expended from Jan. 4 to Dec. 31, 1963.....	177,034.35
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963.....	101,415.65

OREN HARRIS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bess E. Dick.....	Staff director.....	\$9,442.50
William R. Foley.....	General counsel.....	9,442.50
Walter M. Besterman.....	Legislative assistant.....	9,442.50
Murray Drabkin.....	Counsel.....	9,099.30
Stuart H. Johnson, Jr.....	do.....	9,099.30
Garner J. Cline.....	Assistant counsel.....	6,828.69
William H. Copenhaver.....	do.....	6,302.54
Carrie Lou Allen.....	Clerical staff.....	4,494.78
Anne J. Berger.....	do.....	6,264.48
Jane C. Caldwell.....	do.....	4,819.86
Frances F. Christy.....	do.....	5,568.42
Mary DeMatties.....	do.....	4,386.42
Velma Smedley.....	do.....	5,775.30

SALARIES PAID JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1963, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 36 AND H. RES. 100, 88TH CONG.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Appel, Leonard.....	Assistant counsel (through Aug. 31, 1963).....	\$2,652.30
Beland, Lorraine W.....	Clerical staff.....	4,083.06
Benn, Donald G.....	Assistant counsel.....	6,057.60
Burak, Gertrude C.....	Clerical staff.....	4,928.18
Cors, Allan D.....	Deputy associate counsel.....	4,668.12
Cuddy, Karen M.....	Clerical staff.....	3,319.14
Eisenberg, Roberta E.....	do.....	4,199.70
Haardt, Alma B.....	do.....	3,319.60
Hall, Patricia J.....	do.....	3,319.14
Hunter, Edwin K.....	Clerical staff (through Aug. 23, 1963).....	520.34
Hyman, Joseph.....	Counsel (through July 31, 1963).....	1,427.23
Jett, R. Frederick.....	Assistant counsel (through July 31, 1963).....	2,495.60
Kelemonick, Michael Lee, Charles R.....	Clerical staff.....	3,844.68
Levy, Joseph M.....	Messenger.....	2,544.42
McCabe, Mary Wass.....	Clerical staff (through July 31, 1963).....	535.19
McGrady, Florence.....	Clerical staff.....	3,627.96
Marcus, Philip.....	Associate counsel (through July 31, 1963).....	1,441.33
Meekins, Elizabeth G.....	Clerical staff.....	4,169.70
Moler, George P.....	Clerical staff (through Aug. 31, 1963).....	405.78
Rosenman, Louis.....	Associate counsel.....	7,439.76
Zelenko, Benjamin L.....	do.....	5,775.30

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$200,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	109,908.58

Amount expended from July 1 through Dec. 31, 1963.....	\$78,540.74
Total amount expended from Jan. 4 through Dec. 31, 1963.....	188,449.32
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963.....	11,550.68

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE TAXATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE, SALARIES PAID JULY 1, 1963, THROUGH DEC. 31, 1963, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 35 AND H. RES. 497, 88TH CONG.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ainsworth, Kenneth G.....	Economist (through Sept. 25, 1963).....	\$2,968.92
Breslow, Jerome W.....	Assistant counsel.....	4,671.77
Broussard, Gerald J.....	Clerical staff (as of Oct. 11, 1963).....	1,015.28
Faircloth, John W. F.....	Counsel (as of Nov 1, 1963).....	2,168.08
Fuller, David Otis, Jr.....	Clerical staff (July 15 to Aug. 31, 1963).....	614.25
Greess, Constance.....	Clerical staff (through July 7, 1963).....	145.30
James, Raymond K.....	Clerical staff (as of Oct. 14, 1963).....	1,540.39
Lane, Esther C.....	Clerical staff.....	3,319.14
McGrath, James P.....	Clerical staff (as of July 8, 1963).....	2,459.95
May, Julia M.....	Assistant counsel (through July 19, 1963).....	367.51
Melville, Robert F.....	Senior economist (through Nov. 26, 1963).....	6,406.67
Partridge, Anthony.....	Counsel.....	7,918.53
Pharr, Norman.....	Clerical staff.....	3,319.14
Rigler, Douglas V.....	Clerical staff (as of Oct. 15, 1963).....	1,520.38
Schoenek, Hilda C.....	Clerical staff (July 30 to Aug. 12, 1963).....	271.41
Sutherland, David A.....	Counsel.....	7,918.53
Wachs, Joel S.....	Clerical staff (through Sept. 6, 1963).....	881.32
Waggoner, Anne.....	Clerical staff (through Sept. 7, 1963).....	1,235.46
Zelfman, Jerome.....	Counsel.....	6,401.71

Funds authorized or appropriated for Committee expenditures.....	\$196,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	64,105.99
Amount expended from July 1 through Dec. 31, 1963.....	76,495.63
Total amount expended from Jan. 4 through Dec. 31, 1963.....	140,601.62
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963.....	55,398.38

FUNDS FOR PREPARATION OF UNITED STATES CODE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE, AND REVISION OF THE LAWS

A. Preparation of New Edition of United States Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1963.....	\$55,726.98
Expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963.....	41,302.36
Balance Dec. 31, 1963.....	14,424.62
B. Preparation of New Edition of District of Columbia Code:	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1963.....	22,877.05
Expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963.....	9,699.78
Balance Dec. 31, 1963.....	13,177.27
C. Revision of the Laws 1964:	
Legislative Appropriation Act, 1964.....	20,765.00
Expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963.....	9,442.50
Balance Dec. 31, 1963.....	11,322.50

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946,

Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Drewry.....	Chief counsel.....	\$9,442.50
Bernard J. Zincke.....	Counsel.....	8,803.14
Ned P. Everett.....	Assistant counsel.....	6,903.84
W. B. Winfield.....	Chief clerk.....	9,000.54
Frances P. Still.....	Assistant clerk.....	5,382.30
Ruth A. Brookshire.....	do.....	4,278.06
Edith W. Gordon.....	Secretary.....	4,278.06
Vera A. Barker.....	do.....	4,278.06
E. M. Tollefson.....	Minority clerk.....	5,144.88

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$37,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	8,813.71
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963.....	8,564.12
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1963.....	17,377.83
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963.....	20,122.17

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles E. Johnson.....	Staff director.....	\$9,442.50
George M. Moore.....	Counsel.....	9,442.50
B. Benton Bray.....	Professional staff member.....	8,709.09
John H. Martiny.....	Associate counsel.....	8,709.09
William A. Irvine.....	Staff member.....	8,427.02
Lillian H. Hanninen.....	Assistant clerk.....	5,775.30
John B. Price.....	do.....	4,819.83
Lucy K. Daley.....	do.....	4,819.83
Elsie E. Thornton.....	Secretary.....	4,711.48
Blanche M. Simons.....	do.....	4,332.25

Funds authorized on appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$62,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	24,201.15
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963.....	28,681.37
Total amount expended from Feb. 27 to Dec. 31, 1963.....	52,882.52
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963.....	9,617.48

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the

following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Richard J. Sullivan	Chief counsel	\$9,442.50
Joseph R. Brennan	Engineer-consultant	9,442.50
Clifton W. Enfield	Minority counsel	9,099.30
Stephen V. Feeley	Subcommittee clerk	6,734.58
Helen M. Dooley	Staff assistant	7,674.84
Helen A. Thompson	do	6,767.52
Dorothy A. Beam	do	5,779.62
S. Philip Cohen	Staff assistant (through July 31, 1963)	803.31
Florence C. Waters	Staff assistant (as of Aug. 1, 1963)	5,001.00
Ester M. Saunders	Clerical assistant (through Dec. 30, 1963)	3,525.06

STANDING COMMITTEE—SALARIES PAID, JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1963, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 236, 88TH CONG.

James L. Oberstar	Subcommittee clerk (through Nov. 15, 1963)	\$4,331.49
James R. Phippard	Subcommittee clerk (as of Nov. 16, 1963)	1,392.10
John A. O'Connor, Jr.	Subcommittee clerk	5,253.24
William B. Short, Jr.	do	5,253.24
Audrey G. Warren	do	5,253.24
Milton Well	Staff assistant	6,353.76
Paul R. S. Yates	Minority staff assistant	6,001.20
Eria S. Youmans	do	4,548.96
Agnes M. GaNun	Staff assistant (through Nov. 30, 1963)	3,185.80
Marina M. Gentilini	Staff assistant (as of Dec. 1, 1963)	579.38
Sterlyn B. Carroll	Clerical assistant	3,525.06
Flavil Q. Van Dyke, Jr.	Minority clerical assistant	3,519.60
Murray S. Pashkoff	Investigator	2,679.90
Dorothy Ann Carpenter	Research assistant (through Aug. 16, 1963)	600.40
Martin Baker	Research assistant (through Aug. 31, 1963)	600.58
John P. Brault	Research assistant (through Sept. 15, 1963)	750.58
Anne Thompson	Research assistant (through Sept. 6, 1963)	680.64

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$110,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	50,647.77
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963	54,933.66
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1963	105,581.43
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963	4,418.57

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM—SALARIES PAID, JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1963, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 236, 88TH CONG.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Walter R. May	Chief counsel	\$9,442.50
John P. Constandy	Assistant chief counsel	8,826.60
Robert L. May	Minority counsel	8,765.52
Salvatore D'Amico	Associate counsel	6,922.62
Patrick J. Cunningham	do	4,018.02
Robert G. Lawrence	Associate counsel (as of Oct. 14, 1963)	2,387.74

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM—SALARIES PAID, ETC.—CON.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George H. Martin	Administrative assistant	\$8,069.70
George M. Kopecky	Chief Investigator	8,408.22
John N. Dinsmore	Investigator	7,063.68
James P. Kelly	do	6,922.62
Sherman S. Willse	Investigator	6,922.62
George E. Burgess	Investigator (through July 31, 1963)	1,109.89
John P. O'Hara	Investigator	6,659.34
Richard A. Cordasco	Investigator (as of Sept. 16, 1963)	3,794.14
Carl J. Lorenz, Jr.	Investigator	6,001.20
Edward J. Gilhooly	do	4,018.02
Kathryn M. Keeney	Chief clerk	4,439.62
Mildred E. Rupert	Staff assistant	3,958.44
Dolores K. Dougherty	do	3,839.22
Agnes M. GaNum	Staff assistant (as of Dec. 1, 1963)	637.16
Sylvia H. Reppert	Minority staff assistant	3,600.90
Sara L. Vollett	Staff assistant	3,600.90
Shirley R. Knighten	do	2,934.54
Anna S. Rosch	do	2,522.76
Erwin Greenwald	Research assistant	4,283.52

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$340,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	169,617.90
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963	155,076.98
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1963	324,694.88
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963	15,305.12

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION—SALARIES PAID, JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1963, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 237, 88TH CONG.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ruth M. Heritage	Chief Clerk	\$7,016.64
Henry H. Krevor	Chief counsel	3,099.30
Robert J. Bolger	Minority counsel	8,765.52
Joe W. Ingram	Associate counsel	6,955.56
Roy Markon	do	6,532.44
Dorothy S. Martin	Secretary	4,825.26
Ruth Butterworth	Minority staff assistant	4,554.36
Meriam Buckley	Staff assistant	3,411.24
Florence C. Waters	Research assistant (through July 31, 1963)	713.92

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$125,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	56,585.34
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963	58,483.55
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1963	115,068.89
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963	9,931.11

1 Does not include outstanding obligations.
CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 21, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
 The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
T. M. Carruthers	Clerk, standing committee	\$7,204.68
Mary Spencer Forrest	Assistant clerk	5,253.24
D. E. Lukens	Minority clerk (July 1 to Sept. 30, 1963)	2,464.08
T. K. Leachman	Messenger (July 1 to Aug. 31, 1963)	992.62
Frank E. McCarthy	Minority clerk (Oct. 1 to Dec. 31, 1963)	2,626.62

HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
 The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles F. Ducander	Executive director and chief counsel	\$9,442.50
John A. Carstarphen, Jr.	Chief clerk and counsel	9,442.50
Philip B. Yeager	Counsel	9,442.50
Frank R. Hammill, Jr.	do	8,798.40
W. H. Boone	Technical consultant	8,923.78
Mary Ann Robert	Secretary	4,189.60
Emily Dodson	do	4,014.52
Carol F. Rodgers	do	3,916.90
June C. Stafford	do	3,669.50
Elizabeth M. Fleming	Secretary (from Sept. 23)	1,907.37
Patricia B. Harford	Secretary (to Oct. 1)	1,751.67

INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Richard P. Hines	Staff consultant	\$8,630.72
James E. Wilson	Technical consultant (from Oct. 16)	3,542.60
Peter A. Gerardi	Technical consultant (from Nov. 12)	2,314.50
Joseph M. Felton	Assistant staff consultant	4,160.70
Katherine V. Flanigan	Assistant clerk	4,928.16
Denis C. Quigley	Publications clerk	2,679.90
Virginia Robison	Secretary (from July 15)	3,230.86
Elizabeth Rothman	Clerical assistant (to Aug. 15)	665.48
Stephen Zorn	Assistant publications clerk (to Sept. 1)	868.02

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	47,689.15
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963	50,167.99
Total amount expended from Feb. 27 to Dec. 31, 1963	97,857.14
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963	52,142.86

GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

STANDING COMMITTEE

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Donald T. Appell	Chief Investigator	\$8,036.82
Helen M. Gittings	Research analyst (transferred from Investigating Committee)	2,464.08
Juliette P. Joray	Recording clerk	6,076.44
Francis J. McNamara	Director	8,897.16
Isabel B. Nagel	Secretary to counsel	4,169.70
Rosella A. Purdy	Secretary to general counsel	5,014.86
Frank S. Tavenner, Jr.	General counsel	9,442.50
Anne D. Turner	Chief of reference and files service	6,123.42
Lorraine M. Veley	Secretary to Investigators	3,953.04
Vera M. Watts	Clerk-stenographer (resigned Aug. 31, 1963)	1,223.66
William A. Wheeler	Investigator	7,580.82

INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

Arens, Margaret Ann.	Clerk-typist (resigned Sept. 4, 1963)	\$685.16
Louis S. Bedarfas	Information analyst (appointed Nov. 4, 1963)	951.56
Beatrice P. Baldwin	Clerk-typist	2,869.50
John R. Benedict	Research analyst	4,819.86
Frances Rosalyn Brown	Information analyst	2,880.30
Theresa J. Buglio	Clerk-typist	2,327.76
Gerard F. Burke	do	2,748.50
Daniel Butler	do	2,652.78
Kathleen Courie	Clerk-stenographer (resigned Aug. 14, 1963)	1,045.75
William R. Collins	Editor (appointed Aug. 12, 1963)	3,090.25
Annel Cunningham	Information analyst	4,232.95
Jean W. Curl	Clerk-stenographer	3,210.84
Florence B. Doyle	Clerk-typist (appointed Oct. 14, 1963)	899.82
Elizabeth L. Edinger	Editor	4,462.26
Rochelle J. Ellsweig	Clerk-typist	2,035.02
Ettorina Fantozzi	Clerk-typist (resigned Sept. 8, 1963)	839.30
Emily R. Francis	Information analyst	2,652.78
Metlie Gaffney	Clerk-typist (appointed Oct. 14, 1963)	899.82
Helen M. Gittings	Research analyst (transferred to Standing Committee Oct. 1, 1963)	2,464.08
Herbert Goldblatt	Clerk-typist (resigned Aug. 31, 1963)	642.34
Katherine R. Holton	Research clerk	2,977.86
Walter B. Huber	Consultant	7,674.84
Maura Patricia Kelly	Research analyst	3,425.71
Olive M. King	Editor (resigned Aug. 31, 1963)	1,588.56
Evelyn M. Kocsis	Secretary	3,878.96
William Margetich	Investigator	3,885.30
Carol E. McLaughlin	Clerk-typist	2,142.84
Esther L. Monts	Clerk-stenographer	3,042.84
David E. Muffley, Jr.	Clerk-typist	2,945.34
Jane S. Muller	Information analyst (resigned Oct. 15, 1963)	1,863.50
Alfred M. Nittle	Counsel	7,699.13
Alma T. Pfaff	Research clerk	2,888.66
Katharine Phillips	Switchboard operator	2,734.08
Josephine S. Randolph	Research clerk	3,339.02
Doris S. Rainbolt	Clerk-typist	2,355.47
Brenda R. Rogers	Clerk-stenographer (resigned Nov. 30, 1963)	2,454.45

INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE—continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Louis J. Russell	Investigator	\$6,264.48
Doris P. Shaw	Information analyst (resigned July 15, 1963)	240.93
Lela Mae Stiles	Information analyst	3,237.90
Pamela A. Stoddard	Clerk-typist (resigned Aug. 31, 1963)	642.34
Donald I. Sweany, Jr.	Research analyst	4,819.86
Patience S. Vaccaro	Clerk-stenographer	1,616.34
Mary Myers Valente	Secretary	4,809.00
Dorothy Vernor	Clerk-stenographer (appointed Dec. 9, 1963)	367.27
Stanley F. Walton	Clerk-typist (appointed Nov. 12, 1963)	613.02
Neil E. Wetterman	Investigator	5,296.56
Billie Wheeler	Clerk-stenographer	2,123.16
Judith Wheelus	Clerk-typist (Oct. 7 to Nov. 12, 1963)	875.49
John A. Yohe	Staff member (resigned July 31, 1963)	1,029.09
Raymond T. Collins	Investigator (resigned July 21, 1963)	625.52

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$360,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	152,134.90
Amount expended from July 1, 1963, to Jan. 1, 1964	155,428.84
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1963, to Jan. 1, 1964	307,563.74
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963	52,436.26

E. E. WILLIS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
Oliver E. Meadows	Staff director	\$9,442.50
Edwin B. Patterson	Counsel	9,442.50
John R. Holden	Professional staff member	7,952.22
Billy E. Kirby	Professional aid	6,922.62
George W. Fisher	Chief clerk	9,442.50
Helen A. Blondi	Assistant clerk	5,521.92
Carol A. Davis	Clerk-stenographer	3,480.48
George J. Turner	Assistant clerk	4,603.14
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer	4,603.14
Joanne Doyle	do	1,427.49
Elizabeth B. Baldwin	do	750.64
Investigative staff:		
Mildred E. Blackwell	do	2,977.86
Ben W. Crain	Clerk-messenger	249.22
Adin M. Downer	Staff member	7,190.58
Wilma Jean Johnson	Clerk-stenographer	3,953.04
Sally M. Orrison	do	754.95
Pamela C. Warren	do	1,091.33
Mead P. Miller	Clerk-messenger	775.92
Kay N. Small	Clerk-stenographer	992.62
Sharon L. Wright	do	363.25
Stafford Hutchinson	Clerk-messenger	387.96
Mark S. Connell	do	193.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$145,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	22,640.57
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963	31,573.71
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1963	54,214.28
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963	90,785.72

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Leo H. Irwin	Chief counsel (C)	\$9,442.50
William H. Quealy	Minority counsel (P)	9,442.50
John M. Martin, Jr.	Assistant chief counsel (P)	9,273.24
John P. Baker	Professional assistant (P)	7,524.42
Florence Burkett	Staff assistant (C)	3,882.60
Virginia Butler	do	5,031.12
William Byrd	do	2,571.54
Mary K. Daniel	do	3,254.16
William Goodrich	do	5,350.74
Martha Sue Huitt	do	3,600.90
Grace Kagan	do	5,031.12
Oscar E. Goss	Staff assistant (C) (Nov. 1 to 30, 1963)	886.38
June Kendall	Staff assistant (C)	5,408.10
Elizabeth Price	do	3,503.34
Dolores Rogers	do	3,151.20
Gloria Shaver	do	4,148.10
Eileen Sonnett	do	4,256.40
Susan Taylor	do	5,671.86
Irene Wade	do	4,689.78
David West	do	4,251.00
Hughlon Greene	Document clerk (C)	3,590.04
Walter Little	do	3,590.04

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$12,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	824.51
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963	1,669.69
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1963	2,494.20
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963	10,005.80

W. D. MILLS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1964.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles S. Beller	Counsel	\$8,144.94
Jane M. Deem	Administrative assistant	3,905.80
Myrtle Ruth Fouth	Clerk	4,061.40
Justim Gould	Counsel	8,144.94
Astrid E. Gram	Secretary	3,319.14
Angelina M. Griffin	do	2,411.44
Helen C. Hitz	do	3,747.18
Bryan H. Jacques	Staff director	9,367.26
Sylvia U. Keel	Secretary	3,747.18
Barbara Wright McConnell	do	4,565.22
Richard L. Mitchell	General counsel	9,367.26
Ralph Moody	Research assistant	1,500.88
Charles E. O'Connor	Counsel	7,753.19
Harry Olsner	Consultant	8,995.86
Gregg R. Potvin	Counsel	8,536.69
William M. Reddig	Research analyst	3,961.16
Audrey R. Smith	do	4,332.24
Penelope Walcott	Secretary	3,747.18
Ned L. Wernet	Research analyst	6,003.90
John J. Williams	Minority counsel	6,005.88
Temporary employees whose employment with the committee has expired:		
Linda Jackson	Secretary (terminated Aug. 31, 1963)	1,055.82
James J. Saxon, Jr.	Messenger (terminated July 31, 1963)	300.29

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$275,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	105,398.77
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1963	120,693.86
Total amount expended from Jan. 4 to Dec. 31, 1963	226,092.63
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963	48,907.37

JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1964.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT RESEARCH

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from September 11, 1963 (pursuant to H.R. 504), to December 31, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert L. Hopper	Staff director (as of Oct. 16, 1963)	\$3,916.75
Micah H. Naftalin	Deputy staff director and counsel (as of Oct. 1, 1963)	3,501.27
Stephen Parks Strickland	Chief clerk (as of Oct. 16, 1963)	2,334.18
Leo S. Tonkin	Associate counsel (as of Oct. 22, 1963)	2,333.80
Edward T. Fogo	Staff assistant (as of Oct. 16, 1963)	2,500.50
Annelle K. Murray	Staff assistant (as of Nov. 1, 1963)	1,500.06
Russell Saville	Staff assistant (as of Oct. 16, 1963)	1,875.08
William L. Sturdevant, Jr.	Staff assistant (Nov. 10 to Dec. 31, 1963)	1,984.05
Virginia L. Albert	Secretary (Oct. 17 to Nov. 1, 1963)	233.72
Frances H. Geddes	Secretary (as of Nov. 3, 1963)	1,128.85

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Mary Bell Osborne	Secretary (as of Oct. 16, 1963)	1,459.73
Helen C. Pigott	Secretary (as of Nov. 1, 1963)	1,167.78

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$553,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from Sept. 11 to Dec. 31, 1963	25,315.07
Total amount expended from Sept. 11 to Dec. 31, 1963	25,315.07
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1963	527,684.93

CARL ELLIOTT,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1580. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1581. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the 13th Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, 81st Congress, as amended, including a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, pursuant to Public Laws 874 and 815; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1582. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the 29th Annual Report of the Federal Communications Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1583. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report relating to the progress that has been made in carrying out the helium program, pursuant to Public Law 86-777; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1584. A letter from the Assistant General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a report by the Atomic Energy Commission relating to foreign excess property disposed of during fiscal year 1963, pursuant to section 404, 63 Stat. 398; 40 U.S.C. 514; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1585. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report relating to the disposal of excess property in foreign countries, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1586. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on unnecessary cost incurred in the procurement of AN/ARN 21C TACAN radio components through failure to accept option offer, Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1587. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, relative to the *Estate of Charles O. Fairbank by Charles Fairbank and Henry Fairbank, Trustees v. The United States* (Congressional No. 10-56), pursuant to House Resolution 488, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1588. 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 3 of the act of July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216, 217), and pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 382, 383); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1589. A letter from the Chairman, The Renegotiation Board, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend and extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1590. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the annual report relating to the 10 advisory committees assisting and serving the Welfare Administration during calendar year 1963, pursuant to the Social Security Act (as amended by Public Law 87-543); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 9745. A bill authorizing the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, to expend certain appropriated funds to maintain harbors and waterways at depths required for defense purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 9746. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 9747. A bill to permanently extend the special milk programs for the Armed Forces and veterans hospitals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9748. A bill to designate the lake created by the Dardanelle Dam in the State of Arkansas as Lake David D. Terry in honor of the late David D. Terry; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 9749. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to provide for Federal Reserve support of Government bonds when market yields equal or exceed 4½ percent; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 9750. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RAINS (by request):

H.R. 9751. A bill to help provide adequate dwelling accommodations for more families who have low or moderate incomes, who are elderly, or who are subjected to the special problems of displacement from their homes by Government action; to promote orderly community development and growth; and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 9752. A bill to preserve the jurisdiction of the Congress over construction of hydroelectric projects on the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 9753. A bill to amend section 110 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the preservation of total disability ratings under laws administered by the Veterans'

Administration where such ratings have been in force for 15 years or more; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9754. A bill to amend section 359 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that such section shall become effective as of the date of its enactment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 9755. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that bagpipes and related items used in bagpipe bands shall be admitted free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9756. A bill to revitalize the American gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 9757. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 9758. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9759. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to prevent the disqualification for pension purposes for certain veterans' widows who have remarried; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 9760. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for medical, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.J. Res. 897. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.J. Res. 898. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National Teenage Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.J. Res. 899. Joint resolution requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to expand current research into the quality and health factors of tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.J. Res. 900. Joint resolution requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to expand current research into the quality and health factors of tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.J. Res. 901. Joint resolution requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to expand current research into the quality and health factors of tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.J. Res. 902. Joint resolution requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to expand current research into the quality and health factors of tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.J. Res. 903. Joint resolution requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to expand current research into the quality and health factors of tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9766. A bill for the relief of Esperanza Corral-Marín; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 9767. A bill for the relief of Oranzo De Bellis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 9768. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Josip Gojanovic; 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:

659. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Forrest M. Newman, president, United Federation of Postal Clerks, Local No. 125, Minneapolis, Minn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to taking positive action to maintain the 40-hour week within the Post Office Department, and Federal Government agencies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

660. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to foreign aid assistance by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

661. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to install a modern electric voting machine-recorder for ye-a-and-nay vote tallies in the U.S. House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

662. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to have published for general distribution, a map showing the bounds of the States as they really are, minus all federally owned property; to the Committee on House Administration.

663. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to change the name of White Sands National Monument, near Alamogordo, N. Mex., to that of Atomic Bomb National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

664. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to the building of an interoceanic canal requiring atomic blasting; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

665. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to the appointment of presidential or vice-presidential electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

666. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to require the House Committee on the Judiciary to do a report involving a facet of Civil War legal and constitutional lore, for public distribution; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 9761. A bill for the relief of Stanley A. Luczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 9762. A bill to prevent denial of income tax exemption of the Plumbers Local Union 457 welfare fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 9763. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio T. Molo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 9764. A bill for the relief of Anne S. Henkel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 9765. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Battistina Gallo Iannuccilli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Diverted Acreage Plan for Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, recently the Department of Agriculture proposed a diverted acreage plan for cotton, and those of us from cotton-producing States are greatly concerned over the devastating effect of such a plan on the cotton industry. While I am sure my colleagues representing cotton-producing

areas know of this proposal and have expressed their opposition, I would like to again call attention to the effect of such a proposal by including in my remarks a letter which I have just written the Secretary of Agriculture.

The letter follows:

JANUARY 25, 1964.

HON. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: May I protest as strongly as I know how the proposed diverted acreage plan for cotton. From all information which has been submitted to me, this plan would have a devastating effect on the cotton producers of this country, especially those in Texas.

Since February 4 is the final release date in Texas under the release and reapportionment program, it is imperative that you instruct State ASCS offices to comply with the release and reapportionment law. Unless the Department of Agriculture makes clear its position immediately, Texas alone stands to lose at least \$100 million income and approximately 700,000 history acres in 1964.

For example, in a sample cotton district in Texas, which includes most of the 10 counties in my congressional district, approximately 46,000 acres were released for redistribution in 1963; and with the deadline only 2 weeks away only 6,400 acres have been released this year. In Williamson County, which is the largest cotton-producing county in my district, 17,000 acres were released from 549 farms last year, and this year only 2,771 acres have been released from 100 farms.

A diverted acreage program which you propose, with time allotted for acceptance, would kill the cotton industry in my district. It would destroy or greatly weaken the family farms. It is unfair to those farmers who have already released and to those farmers who have invested in soil fertilization and preparation during last fall only to be faced with the diverted acreage program in the past 30 days. The worst problem facing farmers is that they are left each year at the end of their turn rows wondering what is the next policy. This diverted acreage program is an example of late, last-minute inference of legislation and leaves our farmers confused. There is little or no chance to pass the diverted acreage program in this Congress, so the release and reapportionment program must be immediately stressed.

Therefore, it is extremely important that it be made clear that participation in the release and reapportionment program will not result in the loss of acreage history or the privilege to participate under the diverted acreage plan should it be enacted into law.

Sincerely yours,

J. J. PICKLE.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of January 25, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, Jan. 25, 1964)

KEY ISSUES IN 1964

Five key issues face Congress and the American people in 1964. The President and leaders of the Democratic Party have clearly drawn the line making these five key issues the basic differences between the two parties. They also spell out the most vital areas of concern to the people in both domestic and foreign policy.

Foreign policy

Foreign policy must take first place. The struggle in the world today is between capitalism and freedom as against communism and slavery. How we conduct ourselves as a nation, the kind of leadership we give the world, will mean the difference between victory and defeat in a war which is already in progress. Two legislative issues in foreign policy are paramount as the basis for a more effective overall foreign policy.

1. Aid to communism: This will come up again, as it does every year, in the Mutual Security bill. This question will be, should we aid and finance communism? We are doing so now in:

(a) The wheat deal demanded by the administration in the closing days of the last session. In the first sale alone we gave Russia a direct subsidy of \$25 million, plus a shipping subsidy of \$1 million. Actually, Russia will pay less for our wheat than the American housewife pays when buying bread at the corner grocery and we will help them finance the deal.

(b) We continue to make deals with Russia in spite of the fact they have broken 51 of 53 treaties and agreements and are even now fomenting revolution and violence and anti-Americanism everywhere in the world—Latin

America, Africa, Asia, and even among our so-called allies.

2. Aid to those helping the Communists. This is the second part of the two-part blueprint for national suicide. We continue to give aid to Communist countries—Poland and Yugoslavia—to neutrals and allies who help the Communists. On a crucial vote last year which would have denied U.S. aid to those countries shipping goods to Cuba the House split 162 to 162 and 1 vote decided against the self-interest of the United States (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 23, 1963).

Domestic

On the domestic front three issues will be decided within the next few weeks.

1. The tax bill was approved by the Senate Finance Committee and now goes to the Senate. Many of the reforms hammered out by the Ways and Means Committee and approved by the House have already been knocked out of the bill. Further attacks on the middle-income group, the overwhelming majority of taxpayers, will surely be made. My voting record has been entirely consistent—no real tax cut will be effective unless we cut Federal spending, balance the budget, and reduce the debt. A tax cut must be earned through fiscal discipline and responsibility. It cannot be done by merely juggling figures in a phony exercise in economy. To do less will cause Government-sponsored inflation, that is the devaluing of our money so that your dollar buys less. Inflation of the past has already caused a 50-percent decline in the purchasing power of our money.

Congressman CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, this week exposed the fallacy of the President's statements on the budget. CANNON said, in part: "Contrary to impressions, this budget is higher, not lower than the current year. It calls for higher, not lower, appropriations—the budget calls for new obligational authority. Contrary to impressions, this budget is above, not below the magic mark of \$100 billion. * * * This budget does not point to any lasting reversal of the upward trend of Federal spending. This budget sows the seeds of increased spending in the future. * * * The President urges supplemental obligational authority for the current fiscal year 1964 which * * * would in total more than cancel out the entire cut made in the last session."

2. Civil rights: The civil rights bill, with its public accommodations section, seriously threatens private property ownership. It discriminates against white to give special privilege to Negroes. It is being debated under the pressure of riots and the violence of last summer and the threat of increased violence and violation of the law if all the demands of its proponents are not met. My position has been consistent in this field—I believe in and have supported equality before the law for all our citizens. I have opposed the destruction of the right to own and manage private property and the freedom of association. The world struggle, and the New Deal-Fair Deal-New Frontier radicalism, directs its assault on the individual's right of property ownership.

3. Medicare: The Ways and Means Committee is now considering the new version of medicare—"hospital insurance for all persons over 65." Proponents, urged by the President to put the heat on Congress to pass the bill, ignore the facts:

(1) The actuarial imbalance of the program. Chairman MILLS of Ways and Means, has pointed out that in previous bills the increased tax asked was only one-half enough to meet the cost.

(2) It is not insurance, but a gratuity as the Supreme Court has ruled that social security cannot be insurance under the Constitution.

(3) The concept of this bill that many persons receive benefits who have never paid

into the fund, violates the original concept of the social security program that a person would draw benefits in relation to the amount paid in.

(4) The injustice to new workers now entering the labor force. The new worker will (a) pay in for 45 years before drawing partial benefits for hospital coverage while millions over 65, including the very wealthy, have paid in nothing; (b) he must pay for 45 years on other insurance to supplement his annuity when he reaches 65; (c) he must pay current insurance premiums for protection for himself and his family during his working years; (d) he must pick up the unfunded indebtedness of the social security program amounting to \$331 billion.

WILL SEEK YOUR OPINION

These are my views as your Representative, on the issues we face this year. Within a few days I will use all the available news media in Dallas County, to pose these questions to all the people of the Fifth District so that there may be a clear understanding of how you feel. Everyone is involved. You must make the choice on the kind of Nation and world we will have tomorrow. The choice will be made with or without you.

The Seeds of Our Surrender in Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the background of our present difficulties in Panama was discussed in a recent broadcast by Dean Clarence E. Manion, and I am happy to note that he paid appropriate tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] who have been so alert with regard to this issue.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the Manion statement, as follows:

THE SEEDS OF OUR SURRENDER IN PANAMA (By Dean Clarence E. Manion)

Those who have listened regularly to the radio and television program of the "Manion Forum" were not surprised at the recent violence and bloodshed in Panama. Consistently on these programs we have viewed Castro's conquest of Cuba in the perspective of Communist plans to conquer the world. Consequently, those who have listened to us knew long ago that the long index finger of the heavy Red hand impressed upon Cuba was pointed toward the Panama Canal.

For years, the best-informed man in Washington on the subject of Panama has been Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania. The Communist interest in the canal was explained and documented by Congressman FLOOD when he first discussed the subject over this microphone in June (12) of 1960. ("Manion Forum" broadcast No. 298.)

Congressman FLOOD recalled that in November of 1959, Panamanian mobs had attempted two invasions of the Canal Zone, which were repelled by Canal Zone police and U.S. troops. The purpose of the mob then—as now—was to plant the flag of Panama in the Canal Zone as a symbol of Panamanian sovereignty over that vital strip of American territory.

The Government of the United States was expected to issue a stern warning then against any such future violation of its es-

established treaty rights and responsibilities. Instead, said Congressman Flood, our Government "sent a diplomatic emissary to Panama to appease those stirring up the trouble."

"This emissary, with the approval of his superiors in the State Department, issued a public statement recognizing Panama as titular sovereign over the Canal Zone and, according to Panamanian sources, agreed that the flags of Panama might be displayed in the Canal Zone to show such sovereignty."

Shortly afterward the President (Eisenhower) publicly expressed the belief that Panama should be allowed to fly her flag in the Canal Zone to show her titular sovereignty. "These declarations," said Congressman Flood, "made without the consent either of the Congress or the treaty-making power, reflect a credulity and naivete on the part of U.S. officials that are simply unbelievable. The hoisting of the Panama flag would be the symbol of complete surrender and would be so hailed by Panama and universally so interpreted."

The fact that the whole House of Representatives shared Congressman Flood's views on this vital matter had been evidenced on February 2, 1960, when that body passed a resolution by a vote of 381 to 12 expressing the sense of Congress that no variation in the traditional interpretation of our 1903, 1936, and 1955 treaties with Panama should be made, except pursuant to the provisions of another treaty.

The flying of the Panamanian flag on the Canal Zone certainly was such a variation and it was the particular variation at which the House resolution was aimed. Nevertheless, on October 29, 1962, President Kennedy directed the formal display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone as evidence of Panama's "titular sovereignty" over the zone and over the canal.

When Congressman Flood was back on our program last June ("Manion Forum" broadcast No. 453), he had this to say about this formal flag raising: "This last action was taken by our Government despite the fact that on October 12, only 17 days, previously, the ceremonies for the dedication of the Thatcher Ferry Bridge at Balboa, attended by Under Secretary of State George W. Ball, and other notables was marred by Panamanian demonstrators who used Communist tactics and claimed Panamanian sovereignty over the bridge.

"With all of the foregoing," he continued, "we find evidence that Panamanian aspirations are aided by our own Department of State. The State Department's program has been one of aiding the piecemeal liquidation of our undeniable treaty rights in the Canal Zone."

Congressman Flood believes that the attitude of Congress, emphatically expressed by committee action and on the floor of the House, "demonstrates to the international infiltrators in the Department of State and their collaborators that these influences can never succeed in perpetrating their schemes with respect to the Panama Canal through normal procedure.

"They realize that they must bypass Congress by means of a new canal treaty, which they believe can be pushed through as was the 1955 treaty without adequate debate to continue the process of erosions that started with the 1936-39 treaty."

One of the provisions of any proposed new treaty with Panama will require the United States to accept jurisdiction of the World Court over controversies between Panama and this country. Panamanian agitators have always put this objective high up on their agenda of demands and, of course, the internationalists in our State Department will welcome it as an opening wedge to put us under the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court in all controversies with all nations.

ARBITRATION WOULD SET DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

The Panamanian controversy is not an international dispute that would be appropriate for settlement by international arbitration. On the contrary, it is a direct assault which challenges the basic right and duty of the United States to defend its property and its people against attack by anybody from inside or outside of this country.

We are in the Panama Canal Zone by virtue of the same kind of solemn treaty right that we exercise in Cuba at Guantanamo, or in the occupation of Florida, for that matter—which we acquired by treaty with Spain in 1819.

It is not merely our sovereignty in the Canal Zone that is under attack by Panamanians now, but our sovereignty and independence as a free nation that is under attack elsewhere, and anywhere, and upon any pretext by the agents of the advancing Communist conquest. Panamanian disturbances are symptoms merely of the violent Red revolution that the directors of our floundering diplomacy are trying so desperately to appease.

On January 11, 1964, Congressman Flood wired me as follows:

"Whatever investigations may reveal as to individuals concerned among Panamanian agitators who invaded American territory, the background of the plot is unmistakably the work of international communistic agents of the Castro type. Its ultimate purpose is wresting control of the Panama Canal from the United States.

"When faced with a most crucial situation, the commander of our Armed Forces on the isthmus acted with intelligence and restraint, using no more force than necessary to defend the Canal Zone against the force and violence of a mob invasion. * * * The Canal Zone territory was honorably acquired under treaty by international law.

"Its sovereign control was indispensable for the construction and operation of the canal which was the ideal of the entire Panamanian population. Our country has increased its annuity beyond that in the original treaty as a gesture of good will. Wages paid to Panamanians working in the zone are greater than those paid for comparable services in Panama. Canal Zone organizations supply the largest source of revenue for Panama.

"The Canal Zone is as definitely U.S. territory as Alaska, which was likewise acquired by treaty under international law. It would be as absurd to discuss surrendering the Canal Zone to Panama as to propose the return of the Louisiana Purchase territory to France, or Alaska to Russia."

The Congressman's diagnosis of the current Panama violence as the explosion of a Communist plot is borne out by the spontaneous reaction of Communist agents throughout the world. The Moscow radio was quick to accuse the U.S. Military Command in Panama of "repression, lying, and deceit." It called the American defense of its canal territory "a bloody act of repression" against Panamanians.

Havana headlines called it "a Yankee massacre in Panama" and Castro took off for Moscow for personal conferences with Khrushchev. (Chicago Tribune, Jan. 11.)

An on-the-spot report from Panama City reads, "The situation here is still made to order for the Communists. They have made the greatest gains that one can imagine. And it is fraught with serious danger for the present as well as the future. The Communists have put on a show for all of Latin America as well as for the world." (Jules Dubois, Chicago Tribune, Jan. 13.)

In Panama, as elsewhere, the Communists get their victories over this country at bargain prices—a shouting handful of agitators attacking our Embassy and other American territory provokes an incident which is

reverberated around the world through the Red chain of command until it becomes "a massacre of innocent people by brutal American imperialists."

CONGRESS AND THE PUBLIC CAN PRESERVE OUR RIGHTS

In our desperation to appease the unappeasable Communists, we submit our sovereign rights to international arbitration in which the agitators have everything to gain and we are destined only to lose another portion of our vested sovereign rights, and more and more of the international respect that we have surrendered to the Communists with servile continuity for 20 years.

Retired Army Gen. Robert E. Wood one of the builders of the Panama Canal and one who has maintained a continuously informed interest in the Canal Zone ever since, says that the United States "will be finished in Latin America if it permits arbitration of its treaty rights in the Canal Zone as the result of this rioting" (Chicago Tribune, Jan. 13), and indeed it certainly will.

It becomes more and more evident every day that our State Department is directing our foreign policy toward the complete surrender of our national sovereignty, not merely in the Panama Canal Zone but everywhere and for all purposes.

Millions of Americans—the overwhelming majority of our people who wish to preserve our proper sovereign power, prestige and national independence—must now turn quickly to Congress for protection against Internationalists who have infiltrated the directorate of our diplomacy and who appear deliberately to promote and ultimately to welcome disturbances such as the current one in Panama as an excuse for a further retreat from our rights as a sovereign nation.

There is now pending before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives a resolution introduced by Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri. That resolution would reassert our sovereignty in the canal, oppose the flying of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone, and positively reaffirm the Monroe Doctrine.

In his message to me of January 11, Congressman Flood says: "To protect the best interests of the United States of America, I urge the prompt adoption of the Cannon resolution." And so do I. And so should you, and so should every American who wishes his country and its Constitution to be respected, and protected here, and throughout the world. This is House Concurrent Resolution 105. Wire your Congressman to support that resolution now.

REPRINTED HERE ARE PROPHETIC EXCERPTS FROM CONGRESSMAN DANIEL J. FLOOD'S ADDRESS OVER THE MANION FORUM NETWORK JUNE 2, 1963

Wake up, America. Your house is on fire. Indeed, the very foundation of your house—the Panama Canal Zone—is smoldering and every so often is spurting forth flames. For it is the Panama Canal which is the key target of the world revolutionary movement in the Caribbean.

Thus far, we have not taken the measures required to put out this fire. Instead, we have floundered from crisis to crisis making concession after concession to Panama, and Panama, in return, has continued with larger and larger demands.

Warnings of what was to come have been given time after time in the Halls of Congress, but these warnings fell on deaf ears. But in each case, the things I warned of came to pass.

President Chiari's Secretary of Finance, Gilberto Arias, only this March was quoted as saying: "In the future, with God's help, we will achieve our objective; that the Panama Canal be the property of Panamanians, under full and absolute jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama, maintained by

Panamanians, operated by Panamanians, sanitized by Panamanians, and protected by Panamanians."

How can responsible officials of our Government knowingly collaborate with Panamanian radicals to surrender more of our authority to a country which, since 1955, when sanitation in the cities of Colon and Panama was returned to it, has not even succeeded in collecting its garbage? It is incomprehensible.

Here I must emphasize that the Republic of Panama grew out of the movement for the Panama Canal, and not the reverse. The only advantage that Panama can claim as regards the canal is its geographical location, which it never ceases to exploit in advancing its demands for increased benefits and sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

While in Panama last December, I visited the Canal Zone and found general alarm on the part of our citizens at the conduct of the Governor of the Canal Zone.

At a press conference held at the Tivoli Hotel, I learned about an address given by the Governor before the American Society of Civil Engineers, which includes Panamanian engineers among its membership.

Not only was his address the most disconcerting ever publicly uttered by a Governor, but he seems to have reveled in its flavor.

He reflected the philosophy of international socialist elements in and on the fringes of public affairs and advocated what amounts to a permanent state of social revolution, as well as belittling the constitutional foundations of our country and urged unconditional exercise by Federal agencies of power without regard to constitutional limitations.

He also condemned the past in our history without discriminating between what is great and that which is ephemeral, and failed to present our Constitution in its true light as the great contractual document under which the Thirteen Original States created three separate and independent agencies of Government with limited powers.

His conclusion was an illiberal assault upon those who differ with his views as having small minds bent on preserving the status quo and thus, in effect, as being domestic enemies as dangerous to the United States as foreign enemies.

This, my friends, was a deliberate administrative attack against the present diplomatic and juridical foundation of the Panama Canal enterprise and, as an attempted public intimidation of those standing up for the sovereign rights, power, and authority of the United States over it. Thus, this shocking address served to invite further aggressions against the sovereignty of the United States over the Canal Zone territory.

Problems in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1964

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech which was recently delivered by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable ANCHER NELSEN.

His speech is concerned with the problems facing the beef industry and the whole general area of agriculture. It is

important that we all become aware of the problems posed by foreign competition in agriculture because it directly or indirectly affects each one of us and it certainly has a telling effect on the national economy and prosperity of the American farmer. Mr. NELSEN speaks from personal experience and I am pleased to commend him for his discussion of this vital area of concern.

The address follows:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN ANCHER NELSEN ON JANUARY 21, 1964, BEFORE THE MINNESOTA STATE MEETING OF NATIONAL LIVESTOCK FEEDERS ASSOCIATION AT OLIVIA, MINN.

This was a most welcome invitation. It gave me the opportunity to come back to the farm this weekend and also gives me the opportunity to visit in Renville County—the county in which I was born.

For months we have heard much talk about the tremendous losses that cattle feeders have suffered and likewise we take note of the fact that farm parity of income, according to USDA analyses, is the lowest since 1939. For these reasons I think it very pertinent that farm folks get together and discuss the plight we are in with the hope that some resolution to the problem may be reached. We all realize that agriculture cannot remain in a slump without the entire economy of our country suffering by a recession and finally a depression.

Those of us who really operate farms find that we are constantly faced with tax increases, and cost of equipment rises while income declines. At the same time we have long been treated to the wild promises of smooth politicians who have practiced good politics but poor economics.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING NEEDED

Through the years I have watched with interest political trends and tactics, and looking back, we observe many things and among them the admonition of the philosopher who once said, "Let us look backward so that we may better be able to look forward."

Looking backward we are forced to admit that among many farm leaders in the past, one stands out as exemplary. This man has been sound; he has been courageous. And the man to whom I refer is U.S. Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, a Democrat and former Secretary of Agriculture.

Senator ANDERSON, way back in 1947 came to the conclusion that some long-range farm program was necessary. He felt that we needed a program that would establish some sort of a floor under agricultural prices, but such a program should not interfere with the functions of our systems above this floor. This would permit the normal processes of marketing, merchandising, and competition to work in the best interest of our country.

In 1948 both political parties endorsed the Anderson theory; but in 1949 the Brannan plan came into the picture and from that day on, a battle continued in the Congress of the United States: high supports versus low supports, and politicians trying to outpromise one another. As a result, there has been no uniformity of policy over a long enough period to prove anything, and in my judgment, the farmer has been the victim of mistakes that have been made through political motivation, and agriculture has suffered because of it.

In our farming operation at Hutchinson we are not in the cattle feeding business. My son and I have a dairy herd and have about 125 head of Holsteins on our farm, but we are concerned about cattle prices because, as you know, when you maintain a herd of milk cows there is a great turnover in animals that go off to slaughter. The problems of agriculture are all related,

whether you be a wheat farmer, a dairy farmer, or a cattle feeder.

Over a period of many years we have all worked with farm organizations to develop marketing facilities. We have struggled to keep our competitive marketing facilities going, and we have organized farm cooperatives in the hope that these competitive facilities in our free enterprise system could improve the position of the farmer.

We have worked with farm organizations in the hope that programs could be developed not with the idea of a subsidy from the taxpayer, but with the hope that farm income could be stabilized in the best interests of our country as well as the farmer. It is easy to understand why we are a bit discouraged at this point with parity at 77 percent, beef prices low, hog prices down, taxes up, family farms decreasing.

CAUSE FOR CONCERN

When circumstances like this develop, we immediately start looking for the cause. We all know that a big factor as far as livestock is concerned has been imports, which have been increasing rapidly in late years—and I intend to touch on that later. But first, I think we need to review the handling of farm programs by the Department of Agriculture where, in my judgment, a great contributing factor to the present circumstances rests.

Reviewing legislation and policy since I have been in Congress, I would like to point out that in 1960 when the first feed grain bill came to the committee for consideration, we found to our surprise that the high-support theory had been dropped, and instead, a support level of 74 percent of parity resulted from Department decision, with a provision in the bill allowing the Secretary to sell Commodity Credit surpluses substantially below support prices. The theory of the superplanners was that if Government prices were higher than market prices, the noncooperating farmer would be punished with low prices and would be driven into the program because of this price differential. Such an arrangement, of course, would tend to make support prices the ceiling price, and the story is well known that Commodity Credit dumped grain on the market in excessive amounts. For example, in the year 1962-63, October 1 to September 30, over 700 million bushels of corn were dumped. In the year 1961-62, 900 million bushels of corn were sold. In addition to that, in the 2-year period, 365 million hundredweights of grain sorghum was sold. All of this adds up to the equivalent of 2 billion bushels of corn. This was approximately equal to the total carry-over of corn in 1961.

In turn, this depressed the price of corn, which, of course, encouraged the producer to move into the livestock feeding program, having in mind the old statement that cheap feed means cheap livestock. As a result of this dumping of corn, Commodity Credit corn was available in the market at figures as low as 80 cents a bushel.

Listen, for example, to what one of our best known farm leaders has to say. M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, told its annual meeting last month:

"Since January 1961, the Federal Government has taken over a large part of the grain business. In that time it has sold the stupendous total of 3.5 billion bushels. That's between one-third and one-half of all the grain moving in commercial channels. This has been accomplished through a vast organization that has offices in almost every county, unlimited finances, giant central computers and arbitrary control over all the rules.

"Millions of dollars of income that should have sustained the private enterprise marketing system which is essential year in and year out to your marketing service, are build-

ing this vast Government machine. This must end. Either farmers must get out of the business of grain marketing, or the Government must get out."

The next serious error that I would like to mention was the fact that a large number of States were declared to be feed deficit areas and a preferred freight rate, not available to the cooperative elevators and the private grain trade was established, known as the section 22 freight rate provision.

Great amounts of feed grain moved into the South. This stimulated the poultry industry to vast proportions which, of course, becomes a competitive meat product.

We have recently heard much talk of the chicken war in the world market. I refer to the August 19 edition of the Farmers Union Herald, on page 9, where an article remarks that "chickens come home to roost." This article points out that the sale of Commodity Credit grain at bargain rates stimulated the Common Market countries into a realization of the competition they would have in their domestic market so they adjusted their import levies on feed grain.

Next, the southern broiler producers, who were favored with bargain freight rates and bargain grain, found they could compete in the European market with broilers because of their favored position, until these countries levied high tariffs that started the chicken war.

For many months last year we in this country were engaged in the "chicken war," as the countries of the European Common Market went about the business of deciding that they did not need much of our American-grown poultry. We were losing a great and growing market of substantial importance to some segments of American agriculture, and it was rapidly becoming an important factor in the future of our trade relations and our whole foreign trade. You will remember what happened—we reached a point where it became necessary to threaten retaliation if our American produce was to be cut off. So what did we do? We raised our tariff on French brandy as our big club to win concessions for our chickens.

Well, I don't believe you and I have missed our brandy much, but our poultry producers have missed a tremendously important market, especially as our European friends raised their poultry tariff again recently after we had already been forced into accepting a settlement which nobody could claim was very good for us.

I mention the chicken story for two reasons—one, I'm sure we haven't heard the last of it; and two, I wonder what our Yankee traders will offer to save the livestock industry from collapse—if we trade chickens for brandy, will we trade beef for kangaroo tails?

Is America so rich and so great that it can give endlessly in bad deals, by permitting a billion pounds of beef to be imported without stirring a bureaucratic muscle, by letting ourselves be traded out of position every time we meet with friend or foe?

You and I are deeply concerned about what's happening to our livestock industry,

an industry which has managed to feed us well without support prices or controls, an industry which represents \$23 out of every \$100 in sales of agricultural products, an industry whose declining income not only threatens it with disaster but has been the major factor in driving our farm parity income to its lowest level in 25 years.

FOREIGN TRADE AND TARIFF

Let's start, however, with the realization that we cannot and do not want to eliminate foreign trade, whether it be imports or exports. After all, this country ships some \$6 billion in farm products abroad each year, a big 25 percent of our export trade. We sell soybeans and poultry and wheat and cotton and a lot of other basic products of our farms to the peoples of the world, to their great gain and to the advantage of our own economy, and certainly we do not want to cut that vital business from our annual transactions. And we heard a great deal a couple of years ago, when we were debating the new trade agreements act, that new negotiations and new deals would open many doors to many new products and a vast expansion of our foreign trade.

But I well recall how many of us were concerned then, and expressed it over and over again, that our farmers would be left holding the sack when the trading began. And that's the way it is looking, I'm afraid, as we prepare for the spring round of negotiations which have been designated as the "Kennedy round." What is going to happen when these prosperous European countries build their tariff walls higher and decide they don't need our farm products? What will be our fate if the nations down under, which have found the United States to be their best market—having been cut off to some extent from their old channels of trade—persist in flooding us with beef and veal—and who protect their own agriculture 100 percent.

There is no comfort in the comment recently of Senator ARKEN, of Vermont, respected voice of agriculture and one of our most international-minded Senators, when he said, "American agriculture is being traded off for the benefit of our industries."

And there is no comfort in the attitude of our own Secretary of Agriculture who persisted in saying all last year that beef imports were having little or no effect on beef prices. This in spite of the fact that in 1963 our beef imports represented 11 percent of our own production, compared to less than 4 percent a scant 6 years ago. Obviously we can use some imports to match our needs, and perhaps 4 or 5 percent of production is fair enough, but one would have to be blind indeed to contend that letting a billion pounds of beef into the country in a year is having no effect on our own prices.

It is true, of course, that our own livestock population is gaining steadily, as we Americans are now eating twice as much beef per capita as we did a few years ago, and as prices have been attractive. But, as Senator ALLOTT, of Colorado, said in the Senate

the other day, "When the number of cattle has increased only 4 percent, it is hard to account for a 25 percent decrease in price."

And then bear this in mind, as Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, said recently: "Our trade representatives will go to the forthcoming negotiations armed with authority to reduce the present tariff on these meat products by 50 percent, or even to zero."

Well, we've tried—goodness knows, we've tried. We have had to fight the argument that most Australian beef becomes American hamburger, and therefore does not compete with our high quality cuts—silly argument, isn't it, especially when we remember that 30 percent of any fed beef carcass goes into hamburger, whether that beef has talked with an Australian or an American accent.

USDA APATHY

Months ago I pleaded with Secretary Freeman to do something about it. I quoted chapter and verse of the problem, and got no response. I tried again a month later, and got another burst of silence. So next, shortly before we quit to go home for Christmas, I wrote Chairman COOLEY, of the House Agriculture Committee. I told him of the inability to get action or even response from the Secretary; I reminded him of the sharp increase in imports and the sharp decline in prices; I reminded him of the tremendous importance of the livestock industry to the Nation and to the economy.

I can't pretend to guess what will come of it, but I am glad to report that 2 weeks ago one of Mr. COOLEY's subcommittees held the first of a series of hearings, finally delving into this whole subject. Several of your friends from the national organizations were present and took an active part in the discussions. It was my privilege to listen to them, and to join them in subsequent discussions.

So possibly we are on the way to some sort of action. Whether the Congress should insist on applying quotas to livestock imports as the surest way to put the brakes on is hard to predict as yet; I'm sure that if we wait for the slow motion of the Tariff Commission the livestock industry will be as dead as the carcasses you ship to market. But maybe some deals can be made—if our traders will do a better job than they have so far in Europe. Maybe we can get agreements to put voluntary limits on imports which would be adjustable to our needs; and maybe we could even make use of the fact that Australia and some other countries are glad to have quotas of our sugar production and could be talked into a settlement which would be good for everyone.

At any rate, it would seem now, at long last, that our combined efforts are beginning to show some results in the attention the Department of Agriculture is finally giving the problem. Just last week a considerable group of Members of Congress—both Representatives and Senators—met with Secretary Freeman and thrashed out a lot of angles of the problem. It is evident that it is now being taken seriously, and perhaps we can hope for sensible action.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 1964

The House met at 10 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Philippians 2: 5: *Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus.*

Eternal God, our Father, Thine is the wisdom that guides, the strength that

sustains, and the truth that reveals unto us the deep and satisfying meaning of life.

Grant that we may give unto our blessed Lord the obedience and the absolute right to possess and rule our minds and hearts.

May nothing ever divide or distract our devotion to Him but may we earnestly follow in His way and trust our souls to His keeping.

In these days of strain and stress may we give all that we have of faith and fortitude to establish His kingdom of righteousness and peace.

May the new social order and the better world, which we are striving for, be radiant and fragrant with His spirit and bring us unto oneness with Thy divine will.

To Thy name shall be all the glory and praise. Amen.