sentative of your country at the time of the tragic death of President Kennedy. Only a short time later, Mrs. Johnson made a sad mission of mourning to attend the funeral of your beloved King Paul, whom we had been privileged to meet so happily on our visit to your land only 2 years ago.

Today I am confident that your visit and the talks that we shall have together will again affirm the close and cordial relations between Greece and the United States. With diligence and understanding, we shall seek to chart a course that will preserve the union and harmony of free nations, militantly opposed to Communist aggression.

We in America know that the people of Greece yield to no other people in the world in their devotion to freedom and independence, and in their desire to keep the peace won and maintained by such great sacrifice from freemen in our times.

Mr. Prime Minister, it is to that cause of peace that our efforts are dedicated today.

Prime Minister PAPANDREOU. Mr. President, I thank you for your kind welcome. I regard it as a great privilege that upon your friendly invitation I find myself in the Capital of the mighty American democracy, the great friend and ally of Greece, and before this famous mansion which has housed so many illustrious promoters of human achievement, of liberty and justice.

I am happy that I shall be given the opportunity to become personally acquainted with the present great leader of the United States, the champion of peace, as well as with members of his administration and of the Congress of the United States.

Your concern for the maintenance of peace and freedom is shared by the Greek nation and by myself. Greece has always tried for the promotion of peace. A people that has suffered as much as ours from the violence of war and the reverses of history can only long for peace, but no peace can be durable without justice, and no settlement of problems can be right and just if it is not based on democracy and freedom.

In the past there existed a distinction between the world of ideals and the world of politics, between a policy based on idealism and a policy based upon realism. Nowadays they have merged into one, and the policy is today the more positive the more it is consonance with ideas. This constitutes the glory of our times, the glory of the free world whom you are called upon by history to lead.

My country does not forget that the United States, through the doctrine which bears the name of one of your great predecessors, President Truman, has been instrumental in the defense of Greece against aggression, as well as in the rehabilitation of the country, exhausted and devastated by cruel years of war. Greece also feels proud to be represented in your great democracy by a number of citizens of Greek descent who constitute a living link between the two nations, and of our national cultural ties to the world of American civilization.

Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to bring to you and to the people of the United States the cordial salute of the people of Greece.

JOINT COMMUNIQUE OF PRIME MINISTER PAPANDREOU OF GREECE AND PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of the joint communique of June 25, 1964, of Prime Minister Papandreou and President Johnson with respect to the Cyprus situation.

The communique follows:

JOINT COMMUNIQUE OF PRIME MINISTER PAPANDREOU OF GREECE AND PRESIDENT JOHNSON

During the visit to Washington of the Prime Minister of Greece conversations were held between Mr. George A. Papandreou and the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and other officials of the U.S. Government.

The conversations, which were conducted in an atmosphere of friendship and warm cordiality, have contributed to the strengthening of the close ties between Greece and the United States.

The visit provided the opportunity to the Greek Prime Minister and the President of the United States to review various aspects of the international situation and to discuss subjects of mutual interest.

The President of the United States and the Greek Prime Minister had a sincere and useful exchange of views on the Cyprus situation. Both expressed full support of the efforts undertaken by the Security Council and the Secretary General of the United Nations for the establishment of peace in the island and for rapidly finding a permanent solution. The Greek Prime Minister explained in detail the Greek position on the problem. He emphasized that a permanent solution should be based upon the principles of democracy and justice. The two leaders reiterated their determination to make every effort to increase the understanding among allies.

The Greek Prime Minister expressed the deep appreciation for the generous support of the U.S. Government and people in the hard struggle of the Greek people for their freedom and welfare.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 6, 1964

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

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

Our Father, God: From the jubilation of the Nation's joyous remembrance of heroic bequests from the costly past, we come with bowed heads and grateful hearts, praying that grace may be ours to hallow the deeds of the yesterdays and to remember that not annual observances, but eternal vigilance, is the price of liberty, and that each generation must earn the right to keep it.

In all the national agitation that privileges guaranteed to all shall be open to all, may there be among all elements of our favored people a solemn acknowledgement of the rights which the state, whose very breath is freedom, requires for itself of every loyal citizen.

Give, we pray, to those who are anxiously claiming their birthright the realization that among the rights claimed by the Republic is the obligation of those who enjoy liberty to practice in all human relationships the Golden Rule, to give loyal obedience to the Nation's laws, to strive to increase the store of understanding and good will, and that each citizen worthy of freedom, jealous of the total strength of the commonwealth, shall have as his highest joy, not what he takes, but what he gives.

We ask it in the Name of the One who was the servant of all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 2, 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 July 3, 1964, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 71) to establish a National Commission on Food Marketing to study the food industry from the producer to the consumer.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 2. An act to establish water resources research centers, to promote a more adequate national program of water research, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2735. An act for the relief of Ligia Paulina Jimenez;

H.R. 2737. An act for the relief of Pedro Aguinaldo;

H.R. 5408. An act for the relief of Jackie Bergancia Smith;

H.R. 5478. An act authorizing a survey of the Frio River in the vicinity of Three Rivers, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes;

H.R. 5501. An act for the relief of Wieslawa Marianna Borczon;

H.R. 6385. An act for the relief of Wolfgang Seidl;

H.R. 6455. An act to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue

Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income);

H.R. 6473. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Loward D. Sparks;

H.R. 6923. An act authorizing a survey of Cedar Bayou, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes;

H.R. 8590. An act to incorporate the Aviation Hall of Fame;

H.R. 9094. An act to authorize the President to declare July 9, 1964, as Monocacy Battle Centennial in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Battle of the Monocacy;

H.R. 9234. An act to incorporate the Little League Baseball, Inc.;

H.R. 10407. An act for the relief of Keith Hills;

H.R. 10437. An act to incorporate the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements;

H.R. 10456. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administration operations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11004. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act;

H.R. 11235. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 11 million pounds of molybdenum from the national stockpile;

H.R. 11257. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of lead proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act;

H.J. Res. 475. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 7, 1966, as Pearl Harbor Day in commemoration of the attack on Pearl Harbor; and

H.J. Res. 950. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the compact between the State of Ohio and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania relating to Pymatuning Lake.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO MEET DURING SENATE SESSIONS FOR WEEK BEGINNING JULY 6

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Appropriations was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate for the week beginning July 6, 1964.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, 25 reports on overobligations of appropriations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON LOAN TO THE PLAINS ELECTRIC GENERATION & TRANSMISSION COOPERATIVE, INC., ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on a loan to the Plains Electric Generation & Transmission Cooperative, Inc., of Albuquerque, N. Mex., in the amount of $10,807,000, for the financing of certain transmission facilities (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON LOAN TO THE LEA COUNTY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., LOVINGTON, N. MEX.

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on a loan to the Lea County Electric Cooperative, Inc., of Lovington, N. Mex., in the amount of $6,020,000, for the financing of certain generation and transmission facilities (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON RELATIVE COST OF SHIPBUILDING IN THE VARIOUS COASTAL DISTRICTS OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the relative cost of shipbuilding in the various coastal districts of the United States, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON UNNECESSARY COSTS INCURRED IN HANDLING IMPORTED MERCHANDISE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in handling imported merchandise, Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON HIGH DEADLINE RATE OF AIR DEFENSE EQUIPMENT AND EXCESS SPARE PARTS AT AN OVERSEA LOCATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on high deadline rate of air defense equipment and excess spare parts at an oversea location due to supply support deficiencies, Department of the Army, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON OVERSTATEMENT OF REQUIREMENTS FOR AIRCRAFT ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overstatement of requirements for aircraft electronic systems resulting in improper procurement actions, Department of the Navy, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON AWARD OF YOUNG AMERICAN MEDALS FOR BRAVERY AND SERVICE

A letter from the Attorney General, reporting, pursuant to law, on the award of the Young American Medals for Bravery and Service, for 1962; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for medical and hospital care for senior citizens; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Michigan Democratic Spring State Convention, favoring the enactment of legislation to designate the recently enacted civil rights bill "The John F. Kennedy Civil Rights Act of 1964"; to the Commiteee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Philip C. Macfadden, of Represa, Calif., relating to his claim for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN EXISTING RULES RELATING TO THE DEDUCTIBILITY OF ACCRUED VACATION PAY—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1096)

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 10467) to continue for a temporary period certain existing rules relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 6, 1964, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers, to promote a more adequate national program of water research, and for other purposes.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TWO VERSIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL (H.R. 7152)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, who had much to do with the passage and also the preparation of the civil rights bill, has prepared a comparative analysis of the House version and the Senate version of H.R. 7152. I believe this analysis is highly informative.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent as a special request, that in printing this comparative analysis in the RECORD, it be set forth in parallel columns, in order to show in every case the differences in the sections and in the titles. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this be done.

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

The tabulation follows.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL, H.R. 7152, AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND BY THE SENATE
(Prepared at the request and under the supervision of WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, Representative to Congress, Fourth District, Ohio, June 29, 1964)

TITLE I—VOTING RIGHTS

House version	*Senate version*
1. No State or local government official shall in determining whether a person is qualified to vote in an election in which Federal officials are to be elected:	1. Same.
(a) Apply any standard, practice or procedure different from the standards, practices or procedures applied to other individuals within the same county, parish or similar political subdivision who have been found qualified to vote.	(a) Same.
(b) Utilize an immaterial error or omission committed by a person on any application or registration form as a basis for denying the person the right to vote.	(b) Same.
(c) Employ any literacy test (1) unless such test is administered to a person wholly in writing except where a person requests and State law authorizes a test other than in writing; and (2) unless a certified copy of the test and the answers given by the person are furnished to him within 25 days after a request is made for the test and the answers.	(c) Employ any literacy test (1) unless such test is administered to a person wholly in writing; and (2) unless a certified copy of the test and the answers given by the person are furnished to him within 25 days after a request is made for the test and the answers, except that the Attorney General may enter into agreements with State and local authorities that alternative testing procedures may be utilized by State and local authorities in the cases of persons who are blind or otherwise physically handicapped.
2. In a voting rights suit, instituted by the Attorney General where literacy becomes a relevant fact, there is created a rebuttable presumption that a person who has not been judged an incompetent and who has completed the sixth grade of school possesses sufficient literacy to vote in an election in which Federal officials are to be elected.	2. Same.
3. In a voting rights suit, the Attorney General or any defendant in the proceeding is authorized to request that a three-judge district court be convened to hear the suit.	3. In a voting rights suit, where the Attorney General requests a finding of a pattern or practice of discrimination, the Attorney General or any defendant in the proceeding is authorized to request that a three-judge district court be convened to hear the suit.

TITLE II—PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

1. All persons shall have access to the following places of public accommodation without regard to race, color, religion or national origin:	1. Same.
(a) hotels, motels, and similar places of lodging serving transient guests, except proprietor-operated dwellings having five rooms or less for rent.	(a) Same.
(b) eating establishments.	(b) Same.
(c) places of entertainment, such as theaters and sports arenas.	(c) Same.
(d) gasoline stations.	(d) Same.
(e) any other establishment which (1) is physically located within or houses one of the above places of public accommodation and (2) holds itself out as serving patrons of one of the above specified places of public accommodations.	(e) Same.
2. Bona fide private clubs or other establishments not open to the public are exempt from coverage, except where their facilities are made available to customers or patrons of one of the places of public accommodation specified above.	2. Private clubs or other establishments not in fact open to the public are exempt from coverage, except where their facilities are made available to customers or patrons of one of the places of public accommodations specified above.
3. In addition, all persons shall have access to any establishment (whether or not specified above) without regard to race, color, religion or national origin if such establishment is required by State or local law to discriminate.	(3) Same.
4. No person shall:	4.—
(a) withhold, deny or deprive, or attempt to withhold, deny or deprive any person of the right to have access to the above specified places of public accommodations.	(a) Same.
(b) Intimidate, threaten or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten or coerce any person with the purpose of interfering with the right to have access to the above specified places of public accommodation.	(b) Same.
(c) Punish or attempt to punish any person for exercising or attempting to exercise the right to have access to the above specified places of public accommodation.	(c) Same.
5. A civil action to enjoin a violation of this title may be instituted by a party aggrieved or by the Attorney General.	5. A civil action to enjoin a violation of this title may be instituted (1) by a party aggrieved or (2) by the Attorney General if he has reasonable cause to believe that any person or group of persons is engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance to any of the rights secured by this title, and that the pattern or practice is of such a nature and is intended to deny the full exercise of the rights secured by the title.
6. No such provision.	6. Where an action is instituted by a party aggrieved, the court may in its discretion permit the Attorney General, upon timely application to intervene in such action if the Attorney General certifies that the case is of general public importance.
7. No such provision.	7. Where an action is instituted by a party aggrieved, the court, upon receipt of an application, may appoint an attorney and waive fees and other court costs for the party aggrieved if the court believes that circumstances so warrant.
8. No such provision.	8. In a State or political subdivision thereof which has a law prohibiting an act or practice prohibited in this title and which establishes or authorizes a State or local authority to grant or seek relief from such act or practice or to institute criminal proceedings with respect thereto, a party aggrieved may not institute a civil action under this title before the expiration of 30 days after written notice of such act or practice has been given to the appropriate State or local authority. The court may stay proceedings of the party aggrieved under this title pending the termination of the State or local proceedings.
9. No such provision.	9. Where an action is instituted by a party aggrieved in a State or political subdivision thereof which has no State or local law prohibiting an act or practice prohibited in this title, the court may refer the matter to the Community Relations Service for up to 120 days in an effort to secure voluntary compliance.

TITLE II—PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS—continued

House version	*Senate version*
10. In a place where State or local laws or regulations forbid an act or practice prohibited by this title, the Attorney General shall, before instituting a civil action, refer the complaint to appropriate State or local officials and afford them a reasonable time to act unless the Attorney General certifies with the court that the delay caused by the referral (1) would adversely affect the interests of the United States or (2) would prove ineffective.	10. Deleted.
11. In a place where State or local law does not forbid an act or practice prohibited by this title, the Attorney General may, before instituting a civil action, utilize the services of any Federal, State, or local agency or instrumentality which may be available in an effort to secure voluntary compliance.	11. Deleted.
12. In an action commenced pursuant to this title, the court, in its discretion, may allow the prevailing party, other than the United States, reasonable attorney's fees as part of the costs.	12. Same.
13. No such provision.	13. In an action instituted by the Attorney General pursuant to this title, the Attorney General may request that a three-judge district court be convened to hear such action. The request must be accompanied with a certificate that, in the opinion of the Attorney General, the case is of general public importance.
14. In cases of criminal contempt arising under this title, a defendant shall be entitled to a trial de novo with the right to a jury trial if the defendant has been fined more than $300 or sentenced to jail for more than 45 days in the initial contempt proceeding.	14. See general criminal contempt provision in title XI, section 1101.

TITLE III—DESEGREGATION OF PUBLIC FACILITIES

1. The Attorney General is authorized, upon receipt of a signed complaint, to institute a civil action to enjoin discrimination or segregation in public facilities (other than public schools) which are owned, operated or managed by or on behalf of a State or local government, provided that the Attorney General certifies that the signer of the complaint is unable to maintain his own suit because of financial inability or fear of economic or physical reprisal.	1. Same.
2. The Attorney General is authorized to intervene in a civil action, instituted by an individual, where such individual claims a denial of equal protection of the laws.	2. Provision transferred to title IX, section 902.
3. In any action or proceeding brought under this title, the United States shall be liable for costs, including reasonable attorney's fees, if it loses the action or proceeding.	3. Same.

TITLE IV—DESEGREGATION OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

1. The Commissioner of Education is authorized to:	1.—
(a) Conduct a survey concerning the lack of equal educational opportunities in public educational institutions because of race, color, religion, or national origin.	(a) Same.
(b) Render technical assistance to a school board or other State and local governmental units, upon request of the applicant, in order to assist in the desegregation of public schools.	
(c) Arrange with institutions of higher learning for the establishment and financing of special training institutes to improve the ability of school personnel to deal effectively with educational problems occasioned by desegregation; and to pay stipends to school personnel to attend such institutes.	(c) Same.
(d) Make grants to school boards, upon request, to provide school personnel with inservice training and to permit the school boards to employ specialists in order to deal with desegregation problems.	
2. The Attorney General is authorized, upon receipt of a signed complaint, to institute a civil action to desegregate a public school, provided that he certifies that the complainant is unable to maintain his own suit because of financial inability or fear of economic or physical reprisal.	2. The same except that the Attorney General must notify the school board of the complaint and give it a reasonable time to correct the conditions alleged in the complaint before he institutes legal action.
3. The Commissioner of Education and the Attorney General are prohibited from taking any action under this title to overcome "racial imbalance."	3. Same.
4 No such provision.	4. Nothing in this title shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of students from one school to another or from one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance, or otherwise enlarge the existing power of a court to insure compliance with constitutional standards.

TITLE V—CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

1. The Commission's life is extended until January 31, 1968.	1. Same.
2. The Commission is authorized to serve as a national clearinghouse for information in respect to equal protection of the laws.	2. The Commission is authorized to serve as a national clearinghouse for information in respect to denials of equal protection of the laws.
3. The Commission is authorized to investigate cases of vote fraud.	3. Same.
4. The Commission, its advisory committees, or any personnel under its supervision or control are prohibited from investigating membership practices or internal operations of any fraternal organization, any college or university, fraternity or sorority, any private club, or any religious organization.	4. Same.
5. The Commission is granted rulemaking authority.	5. Same.
6. Provisions in House version were not as detailed in this regard.	6. The procedures of the Commission were amended to afford greater protection to the rights of individuals who may be required to appear before the Commission. Among the amendments were those to assure sufficient advance notice of the time and subject matter of a hearing; the right of counsel, accompanying a witness, to examine the witness and to present objections on the record; and to afford a witness, who may be subject to defamation, degradation or incrimination (through the Commission's receipt of other evidence or testimony) the opportunity to refute such evidence or testimony in executive session, including the right to have other witnesses called.

TITLE VI—NONDISCRIMINATION IN FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS

House version	*Senate version*
1. No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.	1. Same.
2. Federal departments and agencies empowered to extend financial assistance by way of grant, contract, or loan shall terminate, refuse to grant, or refuse to continue financial assistance to a recipient of such assistance if the recipient, on grounds of race, color, or national origin, excludes from participation, denies the benefits, or subjects to discrimination any individual under any such program or activity of financial assistance.	2. Same.
3. No action may be taken under this title with respect to contracts of insurance or guaranty (as, for example, may arise in Federal housing programs).	3. Same.
4. Federal departments and agencies administering financial assistance programs or activities are granted rulemaking authority to carry out their duties under this title, but such rules must be approved by the President.	4. Same.
5. Assistance may be withheld or discontinued under this title only after a hearing has been held and there has been an express finding of a failure to comply with the provisions of the title.	5. Same.
6. Assistance may not be withheld or discontinued under this title until it has been determined that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means.	6. Same.
7. Assistance may not be withheld or discontinued under this title until 30 days after a written report has been filed with the appropriate legislative committees of the House and Senate which disclose the circumstances and grounds for withholding or discontinuing the assistance.	7. Same.
8. No such provision.	8. Termination or refusal to grant or continue financial assistance shall be limited to the particular political entity, or part thereof, or other recipient, and such action shall be limited in its effect to the particular program, or part thereof, in which such noncompliance has been so found.
9. A person aggrieved (including a State or political subdivision thereof) is authorized to obtain judicial review of the action taken by a Federal department or agency either according to judicial review authority contained in the statute authorizing financial assistance or pursuant to the authority contained in the Administrative Procedure Act.	9. Same.
10. No such provision.	10. Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize action under this title by any department or agency with respect to any employment practice of any employer, employment agency, or labor organization except where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is to provide employment.
11. No such provision.	11. Nothing in this title shall add to or detract from any existing authority with respect to any program or activity under which Federal financial assistance is extended by way of a contract of insurance or guaranty.

TITLE VII—EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

1. Employers having 25 or more employees, labor organizations having 25 or more members, and commercial employment agencies are prohibited from discriminating against any individual in any phase of employment or union membership (including advertisement for employment) on the ground of race, color, religion, sex or national origin. (During the first year after the effective date of the act, only employers and labor organizations having 100 or more employees or members, respectively, shall be covered; during the second year only 75 or more employees, or members, respectively; and during the third year only 50 or more employees or members, respectively.) Excluded from coverage are: (1) The United States, a corporation wholly owned by the Government of the United States, or a State or political subdivision thereof; (2) a bona fide private membership club (other than a labor organization). The U.S. Employment Service is covered, however, as well as the system of State and local employment services receiving Federal assistance.	1. Same except that an employer will only be covered if he has 25 or more employees for each working day in each of 20 or more calendar weeks in a current or preceding calendar year. In addition, a labor organization is covered if it operates a hiring hall, while Indian tribes are excluded from coverage. But, it is provided that it shall be the policy of the United States to insure equal employment opportunities for Federal employees without discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin and the President shall utilize his existing authority to effectuate this policy.
2. Discrimination is also prohibited in apprenticeship or other training or retraining programs, including on-the-job training, by employers, labor organizations or joint labor-management committees.	2. Same.
3. Exemptions or limitations. (a) The title shall not apply to the employment of aliens outside any State or employment by a religious corporation, association or society of individuals of a particular religion to perform work connected with the carrying on of religious activities.	3.— (a) Same. In addition, the title shall not apply to an educational institution with respect to the employment of individuals to perform work connected with the educational activities of such institution.
(b) It shall not be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to advertise or employ employees of a particular religion, sex or national origin where such is a bona fide occupational qualification reasonably necessary to the normal operation of a particular business.	(b) Same. In addition, labor organizations, employment agencies, and joint labor-management committees controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining programs are granted the same exemption.
(c) It shall not be an unlawful employment practice for an institution of learning to hire or employ employees of a particular religion if such institution is owned, supported, controlled or managed by a particular religion or a particular religious organization, or if the curriculum of such institution is directed toward the "propagation" of a particular religion.	(c) Same.
(d) It shall not be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to refuse to employ any person who holds atheistic practices and beliefs.	(d) Deleted.
(e) The title shall not apply to any employment practice of an employer, labor organization, employment agency or joint labor-management committee with respect to an individual who is a member of the Communist Party or other subversive organization.	(e) Same.

TITLE VII—EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY—continued

House version	*Senate version*
(f) No such provision.	(f) It shall not be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to refuse to hire or to discharge an individual; or for a labor organization or employment agency to fail or refuse to refer an individual for employment if the position to be filled requires a Government security clearance and the individual has not obtained such clearance.
(g) No such provision.	(g) It shall not be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to apply different standards of compensation, or different terms, conditions or privileges of employment, pursuant to a bona fide seniority or merit system, to employees who work in different locations, provided that such differences are not the result of an intention to discriminate because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.
3. (h) No such provision.	3. (h) It shall not be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to give and act upon the results of any professionally developed ability test—provided that such test, its administration or action upon the results is not designed, intended, or used to discriminate because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.
(i) No such provision.	(i) It shall not be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to differentiate upon the basis of sex in determining the amount of wages or compensation paid to or to be paid to employees of the employer if the differentiation is authorized by the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.
(j) No such provision.	(j) The title shall not apply to any business or enterprise on or near an Indian reservation with respect to any publicly announced employment practice of such business or enterprise under which preferential treatment is given to an Indian living on or near a reservation.
(k) No such provision.	(k) The title shall not be interpreted to require any employer, employment agency, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee to grant preferential treatment to any individual or to any group because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin on account of an imbalance which may exist with respect to the total number or percentage of persons of any race, color, religion, sex, or national origin employed by an employer, referred or classified for employment by an employment agency or labor organization, or admitted to or employed in any apprenticeship or other training program, in comparison with the total number or percentage of persons of such race, color, religion, sex, or national origin in any community, State, section, or other area, or in the available work force in any community, State, section or other area.
4. To carry out the objective of the title, there is created an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission composed of five members, not more than three of whom shall be the same political party.	4. Same.
5. The Commission shall have authority to:	5.—
(a) Cooperate with and utilize the services of regional, State, local and other agencies, public and private, and individuals.	(a) Same, except that cooperation may only be extended upon request.
(b) Furnish persons subject to this title technical assistance, upon request, to further their compliance with the title.	(b) Same.
(c) Where employees of an employer refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in carrying out the provisions of the title, to assist an employer, upon his request, to effectuate such cooperation through conciliation or other remedial action.	(c) Same, except that assistance may also be extended to labor organizations.
(d) Make technical studies to effectuate the purposes and policies of the title.	(d) Same.
(e) Cooperate with other departments and agencies in carrying out educational and promotional activities.	(e) Same.
(f) No such provision.	(f) Refer matters to the Attorney General with recommendations for intervention in a civil action brought by an aggrieved party, or for the institution of a civil action by the Attorney General, and to advise, consult, and assist the Attorney General on such matters.
6. A charge may be filed with the Commission by or on behalf of an aggrieved person, or by a member of the Commission where he has reasonable cause to believe that a violation of the title has occurred. The Commission shall furnish the accused with a copy of the charge and shall conduct an investigation.	6. Same, except that a charge may not be filed on behalf of an aggrieved person, and that the charge may not be made public by the Commission.
7. If two or more members of the Commission determine, after an investigation, that reasonable cause exists to believe that the charge is true, the Commission shall endeavor to end the unlawful employment practice through conference, conciliation and persuasion, and, if appropriate, to obtain from the respondent a written agreement describing particular practices which the respondent agrees to refrain from committing.	7. If the Commission determines, after an investigation, that reasonable cause exists to believe that the charge is true, the Commission shall endeavor to end the unlawful employment practice through conference, conciliation and persuasion. Nothing said or done during such endeavors shall be made public by the Commission without the written consent of the parties. (The authority to investigate and attempt conciliation is dependent upon requirements set out in paragraph 8 below.)
8. If voluntary methods fail: The Commission may institute a civil action within 90 days in a U.S. district court, unless it has determined that the public interest would not be served by bringing the action. If the Commission fails to institute a civil action within 90 days, the party aggrieved may bring an action in a U.S. district court, if one member of the Commission gives permission in writing. No action may be based on an unlawful employment practice occurring more than 6 months prior to the filing of the charge.	8.— Where an unlawful employment practice occurs in a State, or political subdivision thereof, which has a State or local law prohibiting the unlawful practice and providing for legal redress, a party aggrieved may not file a complaint with the Commission before the expiration of 60 days after proceedings have been commenced under State or local law, unless such proceedings have been earlier terminated. (The period of abeyance shall be 120 days during the first year after enactment of a State or local law.) Where such State or local law exists and where a charge is filed by a member of the Commission, the Commission shall take no action for at least 60 days after referral of the charge to the appropriate agency of a State or political subdivision. (Referral shall be made for at least 120 days during the first year after enactment of a State or local law.) A charge must be filed with the Commission within 90 days after it occurs, except that where a party aggrieved has first filed the charge with a State or political subdivision thereof, the charge must be filed with the Commission within 210 days or within 30

TITLE VII—EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY—continued

House version	*Senate version*
	8 (continued).— days after receiving notice that the State or local agency has terminated the proceedings, whichever is earlier. If within 30 days after the Commission investigates a charge (whether the Commission receives the charge directly because there is no State or local law or whether it receives the charge after initial reference to a State or political subdivision thereof) the Commission has been unable to obtain voluntary compliance, it shall notify the aggrieved party. Within 30 days thereafter the aggrieved party may bring a civil action against the respondent named in the charge in a U.S. district court. Upon application, the court may appoint an attorney to represent the party aggrieved if the court believes it necessary. Upon timely application, the court may, in its discretion, permit the Attorney General to intervene in the civil action if he certifies that the case is of general public importance. Upon request, the court may, in its discretion, stay proceedings for up to 60 days pending the termination of State or local proceedings (when they occur) or the efforts of the Commission to obtain voluntary compliance. Irrespective of the above provisions, whenever the Attorney General has reasonable cause to believe that a person or group of persons is engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance to the full enjoyments of the rights secured by this title, the Attorney General may bring a civil action in a U.S. district court. The Attorney General may request the convening of a three-judge district court to hear the case if he certifies that it is of general public importance. In any case in which an employer, employment agency or labor organization fails to comply with an order of the court issued in a civil action brought by the party aggrieved, the Commission may commence proceedings to compel compliance with such order.
9. An action may be brought either in the judicial district in which the unlawful employment practice occurred or in which the accused has his principal office.	9. An action may be brought in the judicial district in which the unlawful employment practice occurred; in the judicial district in which relevant employment records are maintained and administered; or in the judicial district in which the plaintiff would have worked except for the alleged unlawful practice, but, if the respondent is not found within such district, the action may be brought within the judicial district in which respondent has his principal office.
10. If the court finds that the accused has engaged in or is engaging in an unlawful employment practice, the court may enjoin the accused from continuing such practice and may order the accused to take affirmative action, including the reinstatement of hiring of employees with or without back pay.	10. If the court finds that the accused has intentionally engaged in or is intentionally engaging in an unlawful employment practice, the court may enjoin the accused from continuing such practice and may order such affirmative action as may be appropriate, including the reinstatement or hiring of employees with or without back pay (payable by the employer, employment agency, or labor organization, as the case may be).
11. No order of court shall require the admission or reinstatement of an individual to a labor organization or the hiring, reinstatement, promotion of an individual by an employer if the labor organization or employer took action for any reason other than discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.	11. Same, except "sex" was included. (This had been unintentionally omitted in House bill.) Also, court action in this regard was prohibited where an individual opposed, made a charge, testified, assisted, or participated in an investigation, hearing or proceeding of an unlawful employment practice of an employer, employment agency, or labor organization.
12. In a case filed in court, where the pleadings present issues of fact, the court may appoint a master to hear the facts, issue a report, and recommend an order.	12. Deleted.
13. In any court action or proceeding under this title, the Commission shall be liable for costs if it loses the case.	13. In any court action or proceeding under this title, the court, in its discretion, may allow the prevailing party, other than the Commission or the United States, reasonable attorney's fees and costs.
14. Where a State or local agency has been established to end discrimination in employment and the Commission determines that such agency is effectively taking action, it shall seek written agreements with such agency under which the Commission and persons aggrieved shall refrain from bringing civil actions in the State.	14. Same.
15. The Commission may, with the consent and cooperation of State and local agencies charged with the administration of State fair employment practices laws, utilize the services of the State and local agencies, and reimburse them for their services, in aiding the Commission in carrying out its duties.	15. Same.
16. Every employer, employment agency, labor organization, and joint labor-management committee, subject to this title, shall make and keep such records and make such reports as the Commission may prescribe by regulation, after a public hearing. If any such requirement might result in undue hardship, the party affected may apply to the Commission or bring an action in a U.S. district court for an exemption or other appropriate relief.	16. Same, except that the provisions shall not apply with respect to matters occurring in any State or political subdivision thereof which has a fair employment law, to which the employer, employment agency, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee is subject, except that the Commission may require such notations on records which these parties are required to keep (under the State or local law) as are necessary because of differences in coverage or methods of enforcement between the State or local law and the provisions of this title. Moreover, where an employer is required to file reports relating to his employment practices with any Federal agency or committee pursuant to Executive Order 10925 or other Executive orders, prescribing fair employment practices for Government contractors and subcontractors, the Commission shall not require the employer to file additional reports.
17. The Commission is extended subpena power.	17. Same, although the manner on enforcing the subpena power is altered in form, but not in substance.
18. The Commission is granted investigatory authority, at reasonable times, to have access to, for the purpose of examination, and the right to copy any evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against that relates to any matter under investigation or in question.	18. The Commission is granted investigatory authority, at reasonable times, to have access to, for the purpose of examination, and the right to copy any evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against that relates to an unlawful employment practice covered by this title and is relevant to the charge under investigation.
19. State or local fair employment laws shall not be preempted or superceded by the enactment of this title.	19. Same.
20. The Commission is granted the authority to issue procedural regulations in conformity with the standards and limitations of the Administrative Procedure Act.	20. Same.

TITLE VII—EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY—continued

House version	*Senate version*
21. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $2,500,000 for the administration of this title by the Commission during the first year after its enactment, and not to exceed $10 million for such purposes during the second year after such date.	21. Deleted. (See general authorization provision in sec. 1105 or title XI.)
22. The Secretary of Labor is directed to conduct a special study and make recommendations for legislation concerning discrimination in employment because of age.	22. Same.
23. The title shall become effective immediately, but no proceeding may be commenced under the title until 1 year after the date of enactment.	23. Same.
24. The President shall convene one or more conferences for the purpose of enabling interested persons and groups to become familiar with the rights and obligations provided in the title and for the making of plans for the fair and effective administration of the title. Those invited to participate in the conferences shall be (1) members of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, (2) members of the Civil Rights Commission, (3) representatives of State and local fair employment agencies, (4) representatives of private agencies engaged in furthering equal employment opportunity, and (5) representatives of employers, labor organizations, and employment agencies subject to the title.	24. Same.
TITLE VIII—REGISTRATION AND VOTING STATISTICS	
1. The Bureau of the Census is directed to compile registration and voting statistics in such geographic areas as may be recommended by the Civil Rights Commission.	1. Same.
2. The compilation shall, to the extent recommended by the Civil Rights Commission, include a count of persons of voting age by race, color, and national origin, and a determination of the extent to which such persons are registered to vote, and have voted in any statewide primary or general election in which Members of the U.S. House of Representatives are nominated and elected since February 1, 1960. Such compilation shall be made in the 19th decennial census (1970), and at such other times as Congress may prescribe.	2. Same.
3. No such provision.	3. In any compilation made by the Bureau of the Census, pursuant to this title, no person shall be compelled to disclose his race, color or national origin, or be questioned about his political party affiliation, how he voted, or the reasons therefore, nor shall any penalty be imposed for his failure or refusal to make such disclosure. Every person interrogated with respect to such information shall be fully advised of his rights to fail or refuse to furnish such information.
TITLE IX—PROCEDURE AFTER REMOVAL IN CIVIL RIGHTS CASES	
1. A defendant, who has sought removal of a State court suit to a Federal district court on the ground that he would be denied his civil rights in the State court, may appeal to the Federal court of appeals an order of the Federal district court sending the case back to the State court.	1. Same.
2. Provision transferred from section 302 of title III.	2. The Attorney General is authorized upon timely application to intervene in a civil action, instituted by an individual, where such individual claims a denial of equal protection of the laws if the Attorney General certifies that the case is of general public importance.
TITLE X—ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE	
1. There is established in the Department of Commerce a Community Relations Service which shall be headed by a Director, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate for a 4-year term.	1. Same.
2. The Director is authorized to appoint six additional personnel and to procure the services of additional experts and consultants on a per diem basis.	2. Limitation on the number of personnel the Director may appoint is deleted.
3. It shall be the function of the Service to provide assistance to communities and persons therein in resolving disputes, disagreements, or difficulties relating to discriminatory practices based on race, color, or national origin which impair the rights of persons in such communities under the U.S. Constitution or which affect or may affect interstate commerce.	3. Same.
4. The Service may offer its services on its own motion or at the request of State or local officials or other interested persons.	4. Same.
5. The Service shall, whenever possible, seek and utilize the cooperation of appropriate State or local agencies.	5. Same, except that the State or local agencies may be either public or private.
6. The Service shall hold confidential any information acquired in the regular performance of its duties upon the understanding that it would be so held.	6. Same. In addition, the activities of all officers and employees of the Service in providing conciliation assistance shall be conducted in confidence and without publicity. A violation of such confidence shall constitute a misdemeanor.
TITLE XI—MISCELLANEOUS	
1. No such provision.	1. In any proceeding for criminal contempt arising under title 2 through 7 of this act, the accused, upon demand, shall be entitled to a trial by jury. Upon conviction, the accused shall not be fined more than $1,000 or imprisoned for more than 6 months.
2. No such provision.	2. An acquittal or conviction in a prosecution for a specific crime under laws of the United States shall bar a proceeding for criminal contempt, which is based upon the same act or omission and which arises under the provisions of the act. Similarly, acquittal or conviction in a criminal contempt proceeding shall bar a prosecution for a specific crime under the laws of the United States based upon the same act or omission.
3. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an intent on the part of Congress to preempt and thereby invalidate a State law on the same subject unless such State law, or part thereof, is inconsistent to and contrary in intent with the purposes and provisions of this act.	3. Same.
4. Existing legal rights of the United States are in no way denied or impaired by the enactment of this act.	4. Same.
5. Such sums of money are appropriated as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.	5. Same.

S. 935, TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE MENTALLY ILL IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, a few days ago this body fashioned the first link in what I hope will soon be a long and strong chain of constitutional protections for a sorely neglected group in our society. I refer to the unanimous consent of the Senate in passing Senate bill 935, to protect the constitutional rights of the mentally ill of the District of Columbia. Because of the significance of this measure, not only to the fields of law and medicine, but also to the immediate preservation of individual rights which may be jeopardized by delay, I hope the House accords prompt and favorable consideration to S. 935.

This bill is the result of a 3-year study by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, during which we had the advice and assistance of those in the fields of law, medicine, and psychiatry who have felt keenly the problems of the mentally ill, and have diligently sought solutions to them. Tribute should be paid especially to Judge Alexander Holtzoff, of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia; Dr. Winfred Overholser, former Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, and Dr. Dale Cameron, the present Superintendent; Colman B. Stein, president of the District of Columbia Association for Mental Health; Dr. Zigmond M. Lebensohn; Richard Arens; Dr. V. Terrell Davis, of the National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors; Mrs. Gladys Harrison; Hyman Smollar; Hugh J. McGee; Charles B. Murray; Charles Halleck; Dr. Jack Ewalt, of the American Psychiatric Association; Dr. Francis J. Braceland; Judge John Biggs, Jr., of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit; Dr. Manfred Guttmacher, chief medical officer of the Supreme Bench in Baltimore; Judge Shephen S. Chandler, U.S. District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma; Dr. Thomas S. Szasz; Dr. Morton Birnbaum; and many others.

A highly qualified and capable staff was the driving force behind the study. In addition to the present staff members, we appreciate particularly the dedicated services of Mrs. Elyce Zenoff Ferster, Mrs. Linda Rosenberg Sher, and the late Curtis Johnson, all former members of the subcommittee staff. The able assistance of Robert Louthian, of the Legislative Counsel's Office, was invaluable.

The Senate can be proud of this bill. As a leading psychiatrist told me recently, it is one of the finest bills in this field ever presented to a legislative body. I am proud to have taken part in the efforts which produced it.

Although it applies only to the District of Columbia, I think this bill may well serve as a model for revision of State laws relating to the mentally ill. During the subcommittee hearings in 1961, representatives of the medical, psychiatric and legal professions described for us the difficulties of working under laws and procedures which they called archaic and cumbersome. Our investigation pointed up the fact that while the problems are acute in many States, the District of Columbia has some of the least desirable procedures in the United States for protecting the legal and medical rights of the mentally ill patient.

On the basis of the recommendations then made to the subcommittee, a measure was drafted to meet the most urgent needs of the District. I introduced it in the 87th Congress as S. 3261, and again this year as S. 935. The bill constitutes a much needed revision of the various District laws which have been enacted and amended in piecemeal fashion for over half a century.

Let me summarize the important changes it makes. First, it protects the personal and civil rights of patients, by separating judicial findings of the need for hospitalization from a finding of incompetency. This means that Congress for the first time recognizes that mental illness does not necessarily mean that one lacks the ability to exercise his rights.

Much of the concern over the rights of individuals who are hospitalized stops short at the door of the hospital. What happens to the patient inside is often a closed book, since he may be so shorn of his rights that his story never reaches the outside world. Deprived of communication privileges, of visitation rights, of the power to protest against physical restraints, of the capacity to seek release, and more important, sometimes of his moral right to medical treatment, the mentally ill patient may become nothing more than a statistic.

S. 935 gives a remedy for this in the District, by providing a "bill of rights" for patients after they enter a hospital, as well as before. Furthermore, again for the first time, Congress is according legislative recognition to the moral right to medical treatment for the mentally ill patient whom society sends to a hospital.

The subcommittee has heard witnesses testify to the shocking fact that institutionalized patients often receive only custodial care, and may go for months without seeing a doctor. As yet there is no legal precedent for enforcing the right of a patient to treatment. The argument is valid, however, that to deprive a person of liberty on the ground that he is in need of treatment, and then to deny him that treatment, is tantamount to a denial of due process. Hampered as the medical and psychiatric professions are by inadequate facilities, apathetic legislatures, low appropriations, and a low ratio of doctors to patients, the concept of a right to treatment is still essentially a moral issue. Yet, S. 935 is the first Federal step toward its achievement. It provides that any person hospitalized by court order shall be entitled to an examination of his condition periodically. He is entitled to have a physician of his choice participate; and if the patient is indigent, the Department of Public Health will pay for the doctor. Provision is made for review of these medical reports, and for release of the patient if the patient is no longer mentally ill to the extent that he is likely to injure himself or others if not hospitalized. Dr. Morton Birnbaum, who contributed to the subcommittee study, recently told a session of the American Medical Association that recognition of this right would improve the ratio of patients to doctors in State institutions, and would prevent such institutions from becoming dumping grounds for those who are simply elderly and infirm or otherwise inadequately prepared to cope with life outside.

One of the most significant features of the bill is the emphasis it places on voluntary admission procedures. Over 200 patients are admitted voluntarily to St. Elizabeths Hospital each year, but present District law gives the Superintendent discretion to refuse anyone who applies for admission. By requiring him to admit all voluntary applicants who are shown by examination to need hospitalization, the bill gives voluntary patients the same status as those hospitalized through court order.

Many times, the subcommittee was told, cumbersome, legalistic procedures which might prove embarrassing and distressing to the patient and his relatives, will prevent early treatment of a patient. By easing the way for voluntary admissions, this bill will encourage early treatment. Nonjudicial procedures established by the bill allow admission of a patient who, for one reason or another, lacks the capacity to apply for hospitalization, but who does not object to being hospitalized if someone else applies on his behalf. At the same time, the patient's rights are protected by a requirement of a signed statement by him at the time of admission and a stipulation that he must be immediately released upon written request.

Another important change is made in the law of the District by the provision for emergency hospitalization. Many of the complaints received by the subcommittee often arose from a disregard of the procedural rights of individuals who were hospitalized on an emergency basis by officials who had little or no guidance from a statute, and who often construed broad grants of power to suit their own convenience. S. 935 sets a specific statutory standard for such hospitalization, by requiring a belief that the person is mentally ill and likely to injure himself or others if not detained immediately.

Mr. President, these are some of the major problems the bill will meet. It deserves the support of all who would see justice done, not only for those whose cause is championed by heavily financed organizations with political power, but also for those who have few champions and whose voice is weak. This, to my mind, is the true measure of our democracy.

SMITHFIELD, N.C.: FINALIST IN NATIONAL COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, one of the strengths of our form of government is the capacity of Americans to unite in community action, to work together for common goals. Since it is a tradition which has marked North Carolina society from earliest colonial times to the present, I have always felt that the people of my State are among the world's

most skillful in the art of self-government. Therefore, I take pride in sharing with all Senators the latest example in North Carolina's long history of local self-government—an example of such proportions that it has received well-deserved national recognition.

I refer to the cooperation of the citizens of Smithfield, N.C., in creating and carrying through the Smithfield plan for improving and beautifying their town. As a result of their efforts, Smithfield was recently chosen from among 9,976 entries as 1 of the 10 outstanding communities in the United States, for an award in the national community improvement program contest sponsored by the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the Sears Foundation. It already had been accorded first place in a competition with 300 other communities in North Carolina.

Credit for this outstanding honor goes, of course, to all of the citizens of Smithfield who participated so enthusiastically in the improvement program. Principally, however, it is due the Woman's Club and the Junior Woman's Club of Smithfield. In addition to their efforts in making the plan a success, it was their work in compiling a monumental scrapbook describing the history and progress of the renovation projects which focused national attention on Smithfield.

Features of the community plan, which was begun in 1961, included a million-dollar modernization of the downtown area, a residential cleanup campaign, a picnic area, an airstrip, and revision of town ordinances.

In the general federation's report "Won Among Many," Mrs. Virginia Stitzenberger, director of the community improvement program, has described the background of this community effort:

The word "plan" has a special meaning in Smithfield, N.C. (population 6,117), where citizens developed the Smithfield plan to combat economic inroads made by nearby shopping centers.

In 1957, when the Smithfield Woman's Club and the Smithfield Junior Woman's Club entered the community improvement program, they tried to persuade the chamber of commerce to help organize a community council to study the town's problems. The chamber declined. Practicing the art of gentle persuasion, clubwomen succeeded in recruiting some support which included the local press.

Broader citizen interest awakened when 25 leading businessmen chartered a bus and toured 800 miles inspecting communities that had solved similar problems. Returning with ideas and enthusiasm, they launched the Smithfield plan.

With emphasis on beautification as well as utility, businessmen cooperated in a million dollar effort to modernize the downtown district. A residential cleanup campaign went hand in hand with downtown redevelopment. All major organizations extended cooperation. Among them were the jaycees who developed parks. Kiwanis headed a dollars-for-scholars program which provided funds for students of all races. The senior woman's club, under the title of "Know Your Government," campaigned for court reforms, urged voter registration, and kept the women of the community informed about government action. The junior woman's club organized a community council, a coordinating body which insures continuing community improvement in Smithfield. Through these and other efforts, the town became revitalized. New industry, impressed by town morale, settled in Smithfield.

Further testimony to the success of the plan is the fact that community leaders have been invited to towns and cities as far north as New York and as far south as Florida to tell their inspiring story.

To the story of Smithfield's success, I would only add that I am proud to represent such people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several newspaper articles and editorials reporting the story of Smithfield's successful effort to meet the problems of change in a growing economy.

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

[From the Smithfield (N.C.) Herald, Apr. 10, 1964]

COULD BE NO. 1 COMMUNITY IN UNITED STATES: SMITHFIELD ONE OF 10 NATIONAL WINNERS IN IMPROVEMENT CONTEST

Smithfield, riding its widely acclaimed "plan," has moved into the finals of a national community improvement contest. It is in the running for a $10,000 top prize and the distinction of being the No. 1 community in the Nation.

Mrs. Denton F. Lee, president of the Smithfield Woman's Club, and Mrs. Stratton R. Story, president of the Smithfield Junior Woman's Club, have been notified that Smithfield is one of 10 national winners in the 1962–64 community improvement program contest cosponsored by the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the Sears Foundation.

Smithfield was selected as one of 10 national finalists after being declared winner of the North Carolina division of the contest.

The community will receive a $300 cash award as State winner.

It is assured of at least another $1,000 in cash as one of 10 national winners.

Mrs. Story and Mrs. Lee said they were informed that a judging team will visit Smithfield on April 27 to take a firsthand look at Smithfield's community improvements, mainly the accomplishments of the Smithfield plan.

The top community in the contest will receive $10,000; second place will win $5,000; third place, $3,000.

The presidents of the Smithfield clubs affiliated with the general federation were notified of Smithfield's success by Mrs. Virginia Stitzenberger, director of the community improvement program, who maintains headquarters in Washington, D.C. In a telephone conversation, Mrs. Stitzenberger said full information about the winners was being mailed to the successful communities.

Smithfield took top honors in North Carolina in competition with more than 300 communities that submitted reports on their improvements prior to a March 1 deadline.

Smithfield submitted a 4-pound scrapbook compiled by members of the woman's club and junior woman's club.

The scrapbook featured the Smithfield plan, with emphasis on downtown renovation projects. Information concerning all projects in the plan, their history, and their progress was included in the scrapbook. Newspaper clippings were used along with before-and-after pictures illustrating improvements. The report emphasized the wide citizen participation in improvement projects.

The theme of the Smithfield scrapbook was "Smithfield, the Town on the Move."

A scrapbook committee spent some 400 hours preparing the report that brought to Smithfield the coveted national distinction.

Members of the scrapbook committee Mrs. Denton F. Lee, Mrs. William Barnes, Mrs. Murray Bonder, and Mrs. Joe Teague, representing the woman's club; Mrs. Stratton R. Story, Mrs. C. Harold Creech, Mrs. Donald Carson, and Mrs. Von Rhoades, representing the junior woman's club.

The presidents of the Smithfield clubs received congratulations Friday morning from Mrs. James M. Harper, Jr., of Southport, president of the North Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs. She praised Smithfield for the community's achievement in winning first place in the State contest and for its selection as a national finalist.

[From the Smithfield (N.C.) Herald, Apr. 14, 1964]

BASKING IN SUN SHOULD REFRESH US FOR NEW EFFORTS

How does it feel to be a resident of a town selected as one of 10 finalists competing for a $10,000 first prize in a national community improvement contest? Great.

Smithfieldians are proud of the accomplishments of the Smithfield plan. And Smithfieldians are encouraged to work harder for community improvement when outsiders see merit in things we are doing and point to Smithfield as a community which sets an example of citizen cooperation worthy of emulation. Surely we want to measure up to the reputation we have acquired beyond the borders of our town. We desire to be a worthy example.

Contests are means of establishing standards. Contests also engender enthusiasm among competitors—and no worthwhile community improvements are attained without the propulsion that comes from community enthusiasm.

The women of Smithfield—especially the members of the woman's club and the junior woman's club—have an abundance of enthusiasm as well as ability to get things done. They have been prime participants in development of the Smithfield plan from the start. Their enthusiasm has rubbed off on the men—and Smithfield men are doing more for their town than they would be doing if the women weren't around to do some prodding.

The women, led by Mrs. Denton Lee and Mrs. Stratton Story and a hard-working group of associates, spent hundreds of hours assembling information about Smithfield and its community improvement program. The women, entering Smithfield in a national contest sponsored jointly by the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the Sears-Roebuck Foundation, submitted a 4-pound scrapbook to contest judges. The scrapbook tells a story of citizen cooperation which was thrilling even before we received the announcement that Smithfield was State winner in the contest and one of 10 national finalists.

It's nice to be the No. 1 community in North Carolina. It's nice to be one of 10 national winners. It will be a great deal nicer if Smithfield wins that $10,000 prize.

But the truly important thing that matters is that Smithfieldians are doing worthwhile things to make Smithfield a more attractive community in the eyes of those of us who have lived here a long time and also in the eyes of the newcomers who are heartily welcomed to share our community life. The life we live here is more important than the honors we win, and the contest sponsors will say that this is so.

Even the thrill of being a State and national winner in a meaningful contest does not overshadow the thrill of knowing what has happened in Smithfield, not simply in the past 2 years but in the past decade or so.

Some men of vision were disturbed 10 years ago by the great change taking place in agriculture and its effect upon the economy of Smithfield and Johnston County. Mechanized agriculture expanded, and the

expansion was accompanied by a steady exodus from the farms. Fewer hands were needed on the farms as the machines came in. Our men of vision were disturbed by the threat of declining population and accompanying community decay, but not discouraged. Local imagination and initiative set in motion a period of industrial development unprecedented in the history of this area. Within a few years, four major industries were established in the Smithfield-Selma area, providing from 1,000 to 1,200 new jobs. Old industries expanded. Some new small industries cropped up here and there. People living on farms found profitable employment in industry.

Industrial development prompted Smithfieldians to take a more careful look at their community. What they saw was not altogether pleasing. More and more our people acknowledged that the old town needed more modern facilities in several areas of community life. There was resolve, especially, to give the downtown area a facelifting. We wanted the community—its shopping area and indeed, all its aspects—to keep pace with industrial development. There was increasing awareness that the old town was inadequate for the new day.

A group of Smithfield business and civic leaders chartered a bus and spent 4 days in parts of four States hunting for improvement ideas. The group came home with more enthusiasm than the tour planners had thought possible. Things began to happen. The Smithfield plan unfolded, under the direction of the Smithfield Chamber of Commerce, with excellent cooperation from many civic groups and individuals—and from town government.

Smithfield has much yet to be accomplished. And this we must remember even as we bask in the sun of favorable publicity and a spreading good reputation that is enhanced by victory in a national contest. This is not to say that we shouldn't enjoy the basking. It is only to suggest that the basking is meant to refresh us—for that second, and third, or fourth effort. The job is not yet finished.

[From the Raleigh (N.C.) Times, Apr. 25, 1964]

WOMEN'S CLUBS COMPETING FOR $10,000 AWARD: SMITHFIELD PLAN RECEIVES NATIONAL RECOGNITION

(By Carol Colvard)

The Smithfield women's clubs have brought the town's community improvement efforts to the attention of the entire Nation and the town is now in competition with nine out-of-State communities for a $10,000 award.

The Smithfield women's club and the Smithfield junior women's club together submitted a 4-pound scrapbook depicting the community cooperation in the Smithfield plan to the community improvement program sponsored by the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the Sears-Roebuck Foundation.

Smithfield was in competition with more than 300 communities on the North Carolina level and more than 9,000 at the national level. As one of the 10 national finalists, the town is in the running for a $10,000 prize. Four other prizes will be awarded in order of place and the five communities not placing will receive honorable mentions of $1,000 each.

All prize money must be spent on the community as a whole.

Mrs. E. L. Rankin, of Raleigh, State chairman of the contest, noted that Smithfield is the second consecutive North Carolina community to place in the national finals.

The Mooresville women's club's and junior women's club's joint entry on their community placed in the 1960–62 contest.

JUDGES

Judges for the national contest will arrive at the Raleigh-Durham airport on Monday and will be met by Mrs. James M. Harper, Jr., president of the North Carolina Federations of Woman's Clubs, by Mrs. Rankin and by members of the Smithfield clubs and officials of the town.

Judges who will decide the final position of the local club after a 3-hour visit Monday are Mrs. Mildred White Wells, Lookout Mountain, Tenn., former editor of the general federation magazine, the Clubwoman, and a former director of the community improvement program; Robert C. Child, Carbondale, Ill., assistant director, community development service, Southern Illinois University; and A. B. Hamilton, College Park, Md., assistant dean of agriculture, University of Maryland.

A feature of the visit will be the presentation of a special community improvement record book to the Smithfield clubwomen in recognition of their outstanding work in behalf of the community. It will be accepted by Mrs. Denton F. Lee, president of the Smithfield Woman's Club.

Results of the judging will be announced June 10 at the General Federation of Women's Clubs national convention in Atlantic City. Awards to the winners will be made at a later date.

THE SMITHFIELD PLAN

The Smithfield plan was touched off in 1961 by Thomas J. Lassiter, editor of the Smithfield Herald. It was picked up by the chamber of commerce and the town board, which drew in other trade, social, and service groups.

The women's part of the plan was explained by Mrs. Lee who described the effort of the junior woman's club in inaugurating a steering committee of representatives from each civic organization. This group evolved into the community council.

The chamber of commerce, town board and the community council literally changed the face of the town. Sidewalk canopies and refurbished store fronts appeared.

Each of 25 organizations took an individual project. The juniors already had the community council, and the woman's club decided on citizenship. The women attended many of the planning meetings and governmental meetings, and took an active part in the decisions about the town's new look.

Mrs. Frank E. Barnes, a member of the woman's club and president of the Smithfield Garden Club, worked with her clubwomen and with the Smithfield council of garden clubs to landscape the areas around the courthouse, the nurses' home, the ballpark, and the entrances to the town.

The men, in addition to their work through their businesses, also worked through their civic organizations on such projects as improvement of the parks.

A TOWN WORKING TOGETHER

"The whole town was working together," Mrs. Lee emphasized.

She and Mrs. Stratton Story, president of the junior woman's club, summarized the Smithfield efforts:

"Smithfield suffered from the same blight as that of many other small towns because local citizens preferred to shop in nearby cities. With the cooperation of the local press, interest was sparked in a bus trip to take leading citizens on an 800-mile tour of communities that had solved problems similar to ours.

"When our people returned to Smithfield and toured their own town for comparison, they knew something had to be done. A community-development program known as the Smithfield plan was born, with the result that businessmen and the chamber of commerce cooperated in a million-dollar effort to modernize the downtown district. Emphasis was on beautification as well as utility.

"When downtown redevelopment was well on the way, citizens focused on other improvements—a residential cleanup campaign, a picnic area, an airstrip, and revision of town ordinances."

After word of the Smithfield plan had spread, local community leaders were invited to tell the Smithfield story in cities and towns as far south as Florida and as far north as New York.

In January Governor Sanford and about 200 town officials and businessmen from eastern North Carolina spent several hours in Smithfield looking over the town improvement, which over 50 delegations have come to study.

Governor Sanford praised the new and moving spirit of cooperation that set the Smithfield plan in motion. He will be there again Monday to attend the tea given at the Woman's club for the judges.

PRESERVATION OF THE PLAN

Representatives from the General Federation of Woman's Clubs, including Mrs. Dexter Otis Arnold, GFWC president, and the Sears-Roebuck Foundation will accompany the judges.

The plan will be presented to the group as soon as they arrive from Raleigh, by Harold Creech, chamber of commerce manager, and Joe Grimes; the men are cochairmen of the Smithfield plan steering committee. Lassiter will review the economic conditions that gave rise to the plan and the needs for further community development.

Other Monday afternoon events include a walking and bus tour of the town and a question and answer period conducted by Mrs. Story to clarify information about the improvements.

Special displays of projects not easily accessible, such as Bentonville restoration and Harper House, are being prepared by club members.

[From the Smithfield (N.C.) Herald, June 12, 1964]

SMITHFIELD AT ATLANTIC CITY: IN LIMELIGHT, BUT NOT AS NO. 1

Smithfield received national recognition at Atlantic City, N.J., this week, even though Smithfield did not win one of the top three prizes awarded in the community improvement program of the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the Sears-Roebuck Foundation.

As 1 of 10 national finalists in the improvement contest, Smithfield was in the limelight at the 73d annual convention of the general federation.

Smithfield's entry in the contest, which featured the Smithfield plan, was sponsored by the Smithfield Woman's Club and the Smithfield Junior Woman's Club.

Mrs. Denton Lee, president of the senior club, appearing in behalf of both Smithfield clubs, received recognition, symbolic of Smithfield's success, from Mrs. Dexter Otis Arnold, president of the general federation, and James T. Griffin, president of the Sears-Roebuck Foundation.

Mrs. Arnold also presented Mrs. Lee with a miniature Statue of Liberty, symbolizing the significant role of community improvement in "Strengthening the Arm of Liberty," theme of Mrs. Arnold's general federation administration in the past 2 years.

A check for $1,000, to be used for further community improvement under rules of the program, will be presented to the Smithfield clubs in a local ceremony on a date yet to be announced.

The top prize in the national contest—$10,000—was awarded to Leavenworth, Wash., for sparking an organization which brought together a divided community to solve grave economic and educational problems.

The second prize—$5,000—went to Grafton, W. Va., for leading a survival program which lured new industry to "the town that refused to die."

Indianapolis, Ind., won a $3,000 third prize for leading an anticrime crusade and a program which brought hundreds of dropouts back to school.

The $1,000 prizewinners, in addition to Smithfield, were Windsor, Calif.; Elmhurst, Ill.; Camden, Maine; East Concord, N.H.; Pawhuska, Okla.; and Balmorhea, Tex.

[From the Smithfield (N.C.) Herald, June 12, 1964]

SMITHFIELD DID NOT "LOSE" THE NATIONAL CONTEST

The news from Atlantic City, on the outcome of the community improvement contest sponsored by the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the Sears-Roebuck Foundation, was not what we in Smithfield had hoped it would be. But let no one say Smithfield "lost" the contest.

We didn't become the No. 1 community in the Nation.

But—we finished among the top 10 communities in the Nation. And that is no ordinary achievement, when you consider that almost 10,000 U.S. communities were entered in the competition.

We were judged to be the No. 1 community in North Carolina. And that's a pretty good ranking, when you consider the spirit of North Carolina communities. We live in an improvement-minded State.

The news release which came from Atlantic City to the Smithfield Herald was appropriately worded. The lead sentence did not say "Smithfield lost the national community improvement contest." The lead sentence declared that the Smithfield Woman's Club and the Smithfield Junior Woman's Club "were honored" Wednesday night at the General Federation's 73d annual convention for Smithfield's being among the national finalists.

We in Smithfield should be proud of the community spirit that produced "the Smithfield plan," proud of the women's clubs for the role they have played in development of that community spirit, proud of Smithfield's national ranking in the General Federation's improvement program. But let our pride not become something to rest upon. Let it be something to build upon.

It is time to take a fresh look at "the Smithfield plan." What projects have been completed? What projects yet unfulfilled need pushing? Does the plan have any deadwood that ought to be removed? What new projects should be added?

The honors we have won and the favorable reputation we have received as a result of the Smithfield plan give us delight. But more valuable than national honor or favorable reputation is the actual accomplishment of worthwhile community improvements through the coordinated efforts of civic organizations and community minded individuals.

Let's keep the Smithfield plan alive and kicking—and growing.

ALBERT COATES HONORED BY NORTH CAROLINA BAR

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in 1935, Roscoe Pound, then dean of the Harvard Law School, wrote:

I doubt whether anything which has taken place in connection with American government in the present century is as significant as the movement for planned, intelligent, official, and administrative cooperation which began some years ago in North Carolina, and has now taken on enduring form in the Institute of Government.

North Carolina's Institute of Government was established to study government at every level from the township to the State, including the best methods for cooperation with the Federal Government. The knowledge thus gained by its highly trained staff is made available to public officials through schools, publications, legislative journals, guidebooks, reference services, and special reports done for the Governor on any requested problem.

The institute is a product of the unrelenting dedication, tenacity, and plain hard work of one man: Albert Coates. It is impossible for the citizens of North Carolina to thank him enough for the contributions he has made to good government in our State.

Last week, Albert Coates received the North Carolina Bar Association's fourth annual John J. Parker Award given for distinguished service in the field of jurisprudence,

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Institute of Government Founder Honored by Bar," published in the June 20, 1964, edition of the Raleigh News & Observer, be printed in the RECORD.

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

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT FOUNDER HONORED BY BAR

MYRTLE BEACH, S.C.—Albert Coates, founder of the Institute of Government at Chapel Hill, was honored Friday night by the North Carolina Bar Association.

Coates, who retired in 1952, received the association's fourth annual John J. Parker Award given for distinguished service in the field of jurisprudence.

Beverly C. Moore, of Greensboro, chairman of the awards committee, made the presentation at a banquet session of the association convention.

Coates started the Institute of Government about 1929, using his own classroom and offices at the University of North Carolina.

At the time of his retirement, the institute had its own building, 24 assistant directors and other personnel carrying on a program of training, teaching, and research work on public law and government for cities, counties, and the State.

New York Attorney James B. Donovan, who was scheduled to speak Friday night, could not attend due to illness.

Earlier, in a panel discussion, three superior court judges and three attorneys agreed there is a need for reducing the time required for selecting a jury. They also cited a need for improvement in the quality of prospective jurors brought into the courtroom.

The panel also heard a report that many North Carolina judges expect to begin permitting trial attorneys to make opening statements to the jury before beginning trial of a case.

Participating on the panel, discussing trial practices, were Judges Leo Carr, of Burlington, Walter J. Bone, of Nashville, and Henry A. McKinnon, of Lumberton. The attorneys of the panel were David M. Britt, of Lumberton, James L. Newsom, of Durham, and Robert D. Rouse, of Farmville.

At a meeting of the young lawyers division, F. Gordon Battle, of Chapel Hill, was elected chairman.

The convention will end Saturday with the election of officers.

INDEPENDENCE DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLLAND

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President last Saturday, July 4, 1964, I had the honor to deliver an address at the Independence Day celebration put on by the civic and public bodies at my hometown, Bartow, Fla.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my speech printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR SPESSARD L. HOLLAND JULY 4, 1964, PEACE RIVER PARK, BARTOW, FLA.

Today we celebrate the 188th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. We have come a long, long way since that distant day when thirteen small and weak Colonies solemnly declared their independence from Great Britain. Meanwhile, the history of our Nation has become the world's greatest success story.

Our forefathers succeeded in the Revolutionary War in which—with great help from France—they won by armed force and superb courage the freedom which they had declared in 1776.

They succeeded in the long effort to establish a permanent national organization which culminated in the adoption of the Federal Constitution and the beginning of our new National Government in March 1789.

They succeeded in retaining our independence in the War of 1812 with the mother country.

Temporarily divided, they lived painfully but courageously through the terrible Civil War of the 1860's and the tragic era of Reconstruction which followed.

Again united, they succeeded in building an ever more powerful nation. They successfully served the cause of freedom in the Spanish-American War and the two great World Wars, where the sons of the North and of the South served together, shoulder to shoulder.

Through the devoted fighting of millions of men and the dedicated service of millions of men and women, earlier Americans have succeeded in preserving and strengthening our country. What a debt of gratitude we Americans of this day owe to all Americans who have served our country so valiantly during these 188 years—a period of three average lifetimes.

We are enriched today by the fact that we have among us 22 million veterans who have served in the uniforms of our Armed Forces and who now still serve their Nation, working in hundreds of peaceful pursuits. They know something about what it means to fight to preserve freedom for ourselves and for others who also want to be free.

We have become not only the strongest force for freedom in the world, but also the mightiest power from every standpoint that the world has yet seen.

Our population has exploded from a little over 3 million in the beginning to 190 million now.

Our vast territory, extending from Florida to Alaska and from Maine to Hawaii, embraces in the 50 States the richest combination of material resources to be found anywhere in the world.

Our agricultural capacity is the marvel of the world, producing food for our people to enjoy the highest standard of living of all the nations as well as an abundance to go to poorly fed millions elsewhere.

Our industrial capacity is far the greatest that the world has ever seen, built as it is

upon the principle of free enterprise and a responsible and highly skilled labor force.

Our financial strength has made us the most powerful force for additional development, both at home and on a worldwide basis.

Our inventive and scientific genius has kept us in the forefront of this modern and fast-moving world.

Surely this vast complex of human and material resources which is now the United States of America must make every American proud of his citizenship, proud that he can call himself an American. And surely we must realize at the same time that more than human genius has been required to make such a success of our great American adventure. I hope that every American tempers his pride with the feeling of humility and thanksgiving that comes with knowledge of the fact that a greater force than our own has played a necessary part in the development of this great Nation.

There are those who think that recent decisions of our Supreme Court can take us away from the close reliance upon the Divine Creator which this Nation has always recognized. I think that they will feel differently if they come to the Senate or the House of Representatives and note that each day the session begins with prayer. They need to go to a presidential inauguration and to see how every new President, and for that matter the whole Nation, becomes a suppliant for divine guidance through the prayerful intercession of devout religious leaders of many diverse faiths. They will be helped by remembering that in all of the Armed Forces the kindly services of chaplains are regarded as vitally necessary. They should recall that in all of the great fundamental documents of our Nation—the Declaration of Independence—the Constitution—the constitutions of our various States—and many official mottos, creeds, songs, and symbols our dependence upon the Great Creator is recognized over and over again.

If they could see at one glance the tens of thousands of church spires which dot the vast expanse of this country throughout its length and breadth and could look at one time into the faces of the millions of worshipers who gather there weekly they would realize that the religious bent of this great Nation has not been lost but that instead it remains a vital and permanent part of the soul of America. You can no more take the religion out of America than you can take the warmth away from the bright light of Florida sunshine.

And so, each of us on this Fourth of July can and should rejoice in the strength of our Nation, and in its high stature among the nations of the earth. Each of us should feel deep personal pride and gratitude to be one of its citizens.

But, along with these pleasurable feelings, we must remember our responsibilities as citizens to participate fully in sustaining the Nation in its efforts to solve the unprecedented problems which confront us, both in the field of foreign affairs and on the homefront. These problems, far too many to mention here, point up the positive need for active participation of every good citizen in the affairs of his government. We should keep ourselves informed to the fullest degree possible and then, on the basis of that information, we should perform the manifold duties of citizenship in such a way as to do our personal part in maintaining our hard-won freedom and preserving our high degree of individual opportunity and prosperity.

The fact which causes greatest concern at this critical moment is that there are too many divisions among us. Whether it be conservatives against liberals, Republicans against Democrats, capital against labor, country people against city dwellers, divisions on racial, religious, or regional lines, we frequently take them so seriously as to undermine our capacity to work together to advance our country's good. Almost every citizen is a patriot in time of war but pure patriotism in time of peace becomes a much more difficult matter because of these many divisions which exist among us and because of our preoccupation in our own selfish interests. What we must be thinking about much more seriously today in these difficult and confusing times, is the welfare of our beloved Nation as a whole.

And so, on this Independence Day I hope that all of us will think seriously on how we can best show by our daily constant interest in the affairs of our Nation, our State, our county, our community, that we recognize our personal responsibility as very great and our own influence as a force which must be continuously exerted if the Nation is to continue to advance and prosper as it should.

I am sure that most of us have thought many times today about the fact that the so-called civil rights bill which deals with the racial division among Americans, which has reached serious proportions, has just been signed by President Johnson, thus becoming the first major law in the field of civil rights to be enacted since the Reconstruction days of almost 100 years ago. The mention of this new law is not a pleasant subject. Everyone here knows that many of the contents of this law are as distasteful to your speaker as to any citizen who is here for this celebration. I vigorously opposed it on the floor of the Senate for 83 days. I deeply feel that coercive and compulsory legislation in such a field as this is wholly inappropriate to carry out the desired results. For we cannot, by coercion, make people like each other better or work and live together more cordially.

But the fact is that the civil rights bill has now passed the Congress in the regular way prescribed by our Constitution. It has passed by a large majority of both Houses, has been signed by the President, and has become a part of our law. In spite of our long and vigorous objections, a large majority of the Congress has passed it and it is clear that, at least as of this time, a large majority of the people of our country have approved it.

Some of this law is good and acceptable. Much of it in my opinion is bad and unconstitutional, unreasonable, unfair to the Southland or difficult, if not, impossible, of enforcement. We have the clear right to attempt by persuasion to repeal those portions which we do not approve. We have both the right and the duty to challenge in the courts those portions which we think are unconstitutional. But as law-abiding citizens we have no right to defy it and no choice but to obey this new and highly distasteful law. Several of its more controversial features have already been ruled upon by the courts such as the question of segregated public schools and the question of segregated use of public property. Other most objectionable features such as the so-called public accommodations title and the FEPC or equal employment practices title will be promptly subjected to vigorous court challenges.

I believe that the pendulum of our national philosophy has swung too far to the left—too far to the side of too great haste—too great coercion—too little persuasion, tolerance, and understanding. I believe that it will swing back, inevitably, and that the final standards which will determine the basis on which the two races will live together peaceably in our Nation must depend upon what both races find to be tolerable.

In the meantime, I hope we shall not resort to bitterness—much less to violence of any kind—and I hope we shall always recall that when good citizens do not obey the law they help to bring about a breakdown of government. This is a time for patience, restraint, self-control and tolerance. Somehow I feel that even in this difficult hour our Florida people, both white and colored, will respond in a very fine way to this challenge and that we shall have a minimum of difficulties in our good and lovely State.

This is a time for confidence in ourselves as well as confidence in our Nation. In my last remarks in the debate on the civil rights bill, shortly before the final vote in the Senate, I included a brief statement expressing my complete confidence in what would happen in the South after passage of the bill. I shall repeat that statement here and I hope that it will express the feelings of most of us. I said there on the Senate floor, and I quote:

"If I may speak for a moment about the area which I represent in part—the great Southland—which for the first three-quarters of a century of our Nation furnished so much of its leadership—I must say that we will not only survive this experience, but we will come through with flying colors, with continued development and prosperity, with continued biracial progress in many fields through conscientious and continuing efforts, and I believe without much of the disorder and lawlessness which has already reared its ugly head in other parts of the Nation and which I fear will vastly increase."

If there has ever been a time when we need to draw the utmost of inspiration from the events of that original Fourth of July when a small group of dedicated and courageous men in Philadelphia, representing that tiny string of Thirteen Colonies along the Atlantic seaboard, dared to sign the document by which they severed the bonds existing between those Colonies and the mother country, that time is right now. Sitting in Independence Hall, after many weeks of consideration of the supremely serious step which they were taking, they signed that document, our Declaration of Independence, which has been the forerunner of the many revolutions by which since that time men have claimed their freedom in countless places all around the world. They took that serious action with no illusions as to the danger which it might bring to themselves if the effort which they launched there should fail. They knew that their act would be regarded as treason by the mother country and that it could involve forfeiture of property and of life, itself.

But, as the concluding sentence of that historic declaration, just before their own signatures, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams and their heroic associates, appended this famous statement whose words shall never be forgotten by free men everywhere and particularly by all Americans: "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

It is upon their action that day and upon that foundation that our Nation has been built and has written in its history, as I have said earlier, the greatest success story of all times.

As we think of that day and that imperishable act, as we recall the ringing in old Philadelphia of the bells of liberty—whose sound has been heard round the world and will never cease to ring clearly in the ears of free men everywhere—perhaps we may better realize how resolutely we must meet the challenges of the hour which confront us and which must be solved in such a way as to allow our Nation to continue to be the shining star of freedom to which the eyes of free men everywhere are lifted

with hope and confidence. We must write new chapters to add to that American story—the greatest success story of all times.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

A TRIBUTE TO A GREAT AMERICAN: HUBERT HUMPHREY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a fine appraisal of our able and beloved majority whip, HUBERT HUMPHREY, appears in a series on vice-presidential candidates in the current issue of the New Republic.

It brings out what those who know HUBERT HUMPHREY have long appreciated—that with all his fervor and enthusiasm, dynamism and effective leadership, he is not only a most kindly but also basically a modest person. He is an unselfish individual who leans over backward in the matter of fairness and considerateness, and often prefers to yield the credit for his accomplishments to others and to ascribe successes in no small degree attributable to him most generously to those who have at times had a later, and perhaps a lesser, part in them.

As William V. Shannon's article points out, HUBERT HUMPHREY was the originator of such important legislation, for which he has received little recognition or credit. Shannon properly mentions, as among the great ideas which in large part were inspired by HUBERT HUMPHREY, the Peace Corps, the nuclear test ban treaty, and the drive for disarmament. These are major achievements, any one of which taken alone would cause HUBERT HUMPHREY's service in public life to be rated as outstanding and unforgettable. But there is much, much else besides. Few indeed are the worthwhile legislative measures enacted by the Congress during the last 15 years in the enactment of which he has not played a significant part. Few are the good and enduring causes to which he has not contributed his eloquent and meaningful support.

Those who observed his gallant and good-humored conduct throughout the long, gruelling civil rights battle, which his tenacious and dedicated leadership brought to a successful conclusion, appreciate his unique genius and the nobility of his conduct.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled: "Why HUMPHREY Gets Taken for Granted," written by William V. Shannon and published in the current issue of the New Republic, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WHY HUMPHREY GETS TAKEN FOR GRANTED

Men now campaign for the Vice-Presidency in much the same manner that candidates ran for President in the 19th century. They disclaim any active interest in the office and they make no canvass. But they write careful letters, make foreign tours, encourage their friends to organize in their behalf, give interviews to sympathetic journalists, receive delegations, and keep themselves in constant readiness.

HUBERT HUMPHREY jokes about this discreet jockeying: "Just look at what's happened. The President sent Bobby Kennedy to the Far East. He sent Sargent Shriver to deliver a message to the Pope. Adlai Stevenson got to escort Mrs. Johnson when she went to the theater in New York. So I asked the President, 'Who's going to enroll Lynda Bird in George Washington University? I'll volunteer'."

Although he tries to joke about it, this oblique and old-fashioned approach to office-seeking presents a serious problem for HUMPHREY. By nature, he finds coyness and pretense not only alien but almost impossible to practice—no matter what his keen mind tells him he should do. Moreover, this business of seeking the Vice-Presidency while seeming not to do so hits him on his weakest front—the matter of style. In more than 15 years in national politics, he has been an astonishing success in matters of substance but he has as often as not flunked questions of style. Perhaps no other major politician suffers so great a disparity between the high quality and broad range of his legislative and political accomplishments and the general public's misapprehension of him and his record.

The image is of a glib, clever, somewhat superficial, youngish politician who is long on talking but short on doing, facile with quick solutions but deficient in sober judgment and thoughtfulness. Set forth starkly in this way, this stereotype of HUMPHREY is self-evidently a grotesque misrepresentation. Yet elements of this caricature in one form or another have entered the public thinking about HUMPHREY and damaged him.

To trace this stereotype to its origins is to learn once again about the power of words in politics. HUMPHREY, who is interested in this as in most other aspects of the human comedy, used to point out during his long, running battle with former Agriculture Secretary Ezra Benson that the predominantly urban and Republican press put the farmers at an initial disadvantage in the very terms used to describe the controversy. For example, rival price support plans might have made different impressions if, instead of being described as "rigid" (a bad word) and "flexible" (a good word), they had been described as, respectively, "firm" and "soft." In HUMPHREY's own case, why not "articulate" instead of "garrulous"? Why not versatile and well informed instead of clever and facile? The basic reason is that when HUMPHREY, an aggressive, convinced, self-confident battler for social reform and a sophisticated foreign policy, entered the Senate in 1949, the tidal drift toward the conservatism of the 1950's was already underway. Despite Harry Truman's fluke victory in 1948, the liberal impulse was momentarily exhausted. HUMPHREY as a man with convictions that had a cutting edge, found himself out of harmony with the prevailing mood, fighting against the tide of opinion and events. It is no easy task for a public man to build a national career under such adverse circumstances. HUMPHREY almost inevitably became the victim of subtle disparagement. From earliest times, societies wishing to rest on the status quo have disposed of social critics by reducing them to figures of fun. (Swift wrote "Gulliver's Travels" as a savage indictment of his times and the world turned it into a fairy tale for children.) HUMPHREY, to his credit, during the difficult years of the 1950's committed none of the political mortal sins: cynicism, quietism, opportunism.

By an ironic turn, most liberals have rewarded HUMPHREY by taking him for granted. HUMPHREY, without bitterness but with wry awareness of the realities, takes note of this situation by referring to himself as "Old Available."

"The people and the organizations that believe in the things I do know they can count on my vote and that I'll speak to their banquets and help them raise money and so on. Nobody has to woo me. I'm old reliable, available HUBERT," he says.

Here we get to the heart of this matter of style. Familiarity, if it does not breed contempt, is at least fatal to a sense of awe. Voters, when they think of a Presidential-sized figure, want a certain emotional distance between him and themselves. They want a touch of mystery, a hint of unexplored depths and unused potential. A certain snobbishness is at work here. That note or aristocratic reserve that has been present in personalities otherwise so dissimilar as Franklin Roosevelt, Adlai Stevenson and John Kennedy has considerable appeal in our status-conscious democracy.

If there is one thing that HUBERT HUMPHREY is not, it is reserved. He has energy enough for two people. He is a warm, outgoing, optimistic extrovert. His is not the hardened bonhomie of the professional politician; he is genuinely friendly and open. "I've never met a man I did not like" is usually the attitude of a Rotarian conformist, but in HUMPHREY's case, his authentic good humor in no way diminishes his zeal. He is that rare man, the happy crusader. But this very quality makes many think him folksy and one dimensional. In this respect, he resembles Harry Truman. People think they know all there is to know about him. But do they?

CLIMAX OF A LONG FIGHT

Consider the issue of civil rights. HUMPHREY has not only been able floor leader these past months, shepherding the bill through the wastelands of southern filibuster and off-the-record negotiations with EVERETT DIRKSEN, but he also was responsible for shaping the present bill before it was ever introduced. In conferences with President Kennedy a year ago, he persuaded the late President to strengthen certain important provisions, notably the ban on discrimination in public accommodations. This was partly a matter of conviction, partly one of political tactics. Regarding the latter, he told Kennedy in one of their conferences: "Mr. President, no labor union ever walked into a bargaining session with management by first yielding on half of its demands."

The passage of this year's civil rights law climaxes the long fight HUBERT HUMPHREY began 16 years ago when, as a young senatorial candidate, he made his dramatic plea for a strong plank in the platform at Philadelphia in 1948. His plea persuaded the Democratic convention to substitute his language for a much milder draft backed by the Truman administration.

Medicare is one of the major pending items on the Johnson administration agenda. How many people realize that the very first bill HUMPHREY introduced in the Senate in January 1949 was one to provide hospital care for the aged under social security?

The struggle for a general Federal aid for schools has been going for a generation. HUMPHREY has worked tirelessly on numerous bills and tried different approaches, seeking the practical accommodations that would permit breakthroughs on a front where there is so much useless religious and ideological cannonading. Not many persons, even in the press gallery, could name the author of the National Defense Education Act. It was HUMPHREY who, in the first surge of excitement after the sputnik, conceived the idea of linking aid to education to the defense effort. The legislation was not ideal, as HUMPHREY is the first to admit, but it was the only education bill to make its way through the doldrums of the Eisenhower era.

HUMPHREY'S IDEA

The Peace Corps is now regarded as one of John F. Kennedy's monuments. Without taking any honor away from the late President or from Sargent Shriver, the almost-unknown fact is that the Corps was HUMPHREY's idea. He introduced the bill to establish it on June 15, 1960, 3 months before Mr. Kennedy first took it up in a campaign speech.

Everyone knows that HUMPHREY actively pushed for the nuclear test ban treaty and got the Senate to ratify it. But few realize the years of patient, dogged, painstakingly detailed work HUMPHREY has invested in problems of disarmament. He began studying them in the fall of 1955. Early the next year, the Senate passed his resolution to establish the Disarmament Subcommittee of which he became chairman. His first memorandum to the subcommittee staff said that he wanted to "stop talking in generalities and get to specifics, to go into the most important aspects of the field of disarmament in a responsible, practical way."

In the last half of 1956, he began writing a series of letters to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles asking just what the Government was doing in the field of disarmament, and urging politely that more be done. In early 1957, HUMPHREY put forward the idea, which was then novel, that if there was ever to be a test ban treaty, the United States would have to develop a way to detect Soviet explosions with pinpoint accuracy. He held the first congressional hearings on the dangers of nuclear fallout the same year.

As he grew in knowledge and mastery of the technical complexities of disarmament, HUMPHREY began bombarding the Senate, the administration, and the public with speeches, hearings, letters, and press releases. HUMPHREY is the Capital's only rival to Lyndon Johnson in the fantastic-energy department. For example, he rallied two-thirds of his Democratic colleagues to hear him make a major speech on disarmament in the Senate on February 4, 1958. He held the floor for more than 4 hours while 22 other Senators made statements supporting the main themes of his speech. (So many important Senate speeches go unnoticed that it is necessary to organize this kind of a demonstration in order to get public attention.) This effort put disarmament on the Nation's front pages and drew the largest favorable mail that HUMPHREY has received in his 16 years in the Senate. He kept it up. During Easter week, 1958, he took the floor every day to talk about a nuclear test ban.

In 1959, he kept the issue alive by getting the Senate to pass a resolution in favor of "an international agreement for the suspension of nuclear weapons tests." In 1960, he introduced a bill to create a National Peace Agency which in slightly revised form passed the following year and established the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. He held hearings, visited Geneva to sit in on the negotiations, and kept urging action until the treaty was finally signed in the summer of 1963. Men have won the Nobel Peace prize for less.

HUMPHREY is popular in the Senate and in his party. Although he has had his share of frustrations and disappointments, recriminations are not his style. After their bruising primary struggles, he and President Kennedy worked harmoniously together. When Lyndon Johnson was in the Senate and trying to build bridges to the northern and western liberals, he instinctively turned to HUMPHREY, a natural politician like himself. HUMPHREY has frequently stepped aside, to let other Senators share the credit or because he realistically concluded they could carry a bill to success better than he could. For example, he deferred to Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, as sponsor of the medicare bill because he decided that ANDERSON, a more conservative figure and a member of the Finance Committee that handles such legislation, would improve the bill's prospects. Similarly, HUMPHREY intended to introduce a resolution this year calling for a commission, similar to the Hoover Commission, to study the effects of automation, but he deferred to Senator HART, Democrat, of Michigan, who is running for reelection this year in a State where automation is a rising issue. HUMPHREY is always willing to help raise money or obtain favorable publicity for colleagues like FRANK MOSS, of Utah, and GALE MCGEE, of Wyoming, who face hard reelection fights.

If political conventions awarded nominations on the basis of gratitude or even recognition of proved ability, I would guess that HUMPHREY would win the nomination for Vice President by acclamation.

OUR WILDERNESS MUST NOT VANISH

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, an excellent article by one of Alaska's greatest nature enthusiasts, Justice William O. Douglas, appears in the current issue of the Ladies Home Journal.

It will particularly appeal to us Alaskans, who are happy to have in Alaska the greatest unspoiled wilderness left on the North American continent—perhaps, indeed, in the entire Western World. We Alaskans treasure that wilderness, which is our most priceless heritage, and will do everything in our power to see that it is not damaged, polluted or impaired, but is preserved in its pristine beauty, abundance and mystery.

At the same time, this determination need in no sense conflict with the purpose of developing our natural resources sanely, to harness our rivers, instead of letting them flow wastefully to the sea, utilizing their potential energy for the benefit of mankind, thereby making Alaska also a suitable habitat for the two-legged species—homo sapiens—whose habitat will not be viable for man unless it has an economy to sustain him.

With those objectives, not only will Alaska's wilderness not vanish in accordance with Justice Douglas's apprehensions, but people will be there to enjoy it.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled: "America's Vanishing Wilderness," written by Justice William O. Douglas, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AMERICA'S VANISHING WILDERNESS

(By William O. Douglas, Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court)

I envy those who first ventured into the vast wildness of this wonderful land of ours. I have often thought that man's most exciting journey would have been the first crossing of the Appalachians, or travel with Lewis and Clark, who, at the turn of last century, went up the Missouri from St. Louis and headed west over a trackless continent to the Pacific Ocean at Astoria, Oreg. Those would be more telling experiences than a trip into outer space, for they would be journeys into man's own domain.

The hardwood forests of the East with their flowering shrubs then, as now, were unequaled in the world for their variety of species and for colorations both spring and fall. The prairie grasses of the West stood 6 feet high; green rolling hills had blue-flecked mountains as a backdrop; pure, clear, free-flowing streams were unmarred by dams or sewage-disposal plants; the wilderness bowl was unbroken. The turf had been pounded by animals' hoofs for centuries on end, and still the land was not overgrazed. Dust storms, stirred up by man's contrivances, were yet to come. Forests stood in splendor—ponderosa pine, Douglas fir, Sequoias, Sitka spruce—some so large in girth that 20 men holding hands could not encircle one.

The sacking of the woodlands by predatory man was still decades away. At every height of land wilderness extended to the horizon, beckoning man onward, transforming meadow after meadow into homesites. The abundance of game and fish, the surplus of water, the supply of raw materials, the beauty, and serenity of the scene made America from the Appalachians on westward the land that man would rather possess than any in the world.

There are few places in America where those experiences can be duplicated today. America is so interlaced with highways that it is difficult, even in the Pacific Northwest, to get 10 miles from a road.

There are of course, roadless (wilderness) areas in the national forests. The Bob Marshall Wilderness in Montana is such a place. The national parks, in spite of their "development" as tourist attractions, still have large back country. But they are mostly alcoves—hardly large enough for the present population and woefully inadequate for three times the present number that, according to the Laurance Rockefeller report, will use them in the 21st century.

The one place in America where the immense expanse and solitude of the original wilderness can still be seen and felt is in Alaska. There the Brooks Range stands several hundred miles beyond road's end. The forests thin out into slender fingers of white spruce; the tundra rolls on and on like a prairie, to a distant horizon. One who watches from a height with binoculars will be rewarded before day is done by stirring sights—fast-stepping herds of caribou; a magnificent wolf in a graceful lope; an occasional grizzly bear dozing on a sunny hillside; Dall sheep high on the pinnacles; a wolverine slinking through willow lining a river bottom; golden eagles and many other kinds of birds. There is no habitation of man anywhere to be seen. This is untamed wilderness with no mark of civilization and none of its debris. The solitude is deep and immense. Some who see and feel the vastness of this wilderness get a sense of fulfillment; others have only fears; still others, an urge to "civilize" the wilderness and exploit it.

The question is, how long will Alaska stay untamed and wild?

Getting rid of the wilderness was part of the leveling of the frontier. The bulldozer became the symbol of our power. If our other experiences along the wilderness frontier are followed, Alaska's rivers will soon be harnessed by industry and her resources tapped by civilization.

Trees are important for their cellulose, and we need managed forests for lumber and other products.

Waterways are useful for disposition of sewage effluent, and for generation of electric power.

A mountain fastness may have to be invaded for an ore vital to our economy.

Valleys and grasslands must be developed to accommodate our steadily growing population.

But the planning for wilderness is as essential as planning for parks and shade trees in our urban centers. While we made some plans for wilderness, we did not start acting until this century was well underway; and our plans were woefully inadequate.

Conservationists who wanted to reserve large areas were opposed by special interests in logging, mining, and stockraising who even to this day often see nothing but dollar signs on our resources. The result was a series of compromises, reserving wilderness areas in national forests and in national parks that are inadequate today, let alone for the 21st century. Population has multiplied beyond expectations; automation has increased our leisure time; the workweek promises to get shorter; the machines will be slaves of the new society, with everyone having more time on his hands for development of his interests and talents. Sports stadiums, tennis courts, swimming pools, picnic grounds—the demand for these is increasing. Wilderness demand is also increasing—a longing for roadless sanctuaries where people can enjoy the primeval glories that once were America.

As we pile up in apartments and work in ant hill office buildings and have the roar of subways, autos, and trains in our ears day after day, we need wilderness for release from the tensions of life.

The wilderness is the only area—the ocean apart—where one can escape the noise, din, and smoke of civilization. A boy or girl should have the opportunity to grow up in the Daniel Boone, Thoreau, or Muir tradition—learning about survival in the woods, ridding the mind of fear, filling the heart with affection for all the mysteries of the forests, acquiring reverence, wonder, and awe for all the handiwork of the Creator. Here a person can come to an understanding basis with the earth and all its creatures.

Running fast-water rivers, or exploring chains of lakes by canoe, hiking ridges, scaling cliffs, traversing a glacier with the aid of ice axes, foraging for food in alpine basins—these are ways for building character; and they are vital in the American saga. Some will not want these adventures. But the opportunities should be left for those great-great-grandsons of ours who do turn their faces to the peaks rather than to the playgrounds.

If one looks down on a map of this continent and visualizes existing threats to our wilderness as fires, he will see blazes everywhere.

Our free-flowing rivers have been largely ruined by sewage and industrial waste. A river is a "treasure," Mr. Justice Holmes once said. But we have despoiled them. The pure, clear, free-flowing stream of the 18th century has not entirely disappeared; a few are left, such as the current in Missouri, the middle fork of the Salmon in Idaho and the Allagash in Maine. But sewage and industrial waste have seriously polluted most of them. The Potomac in the environs of Washington, D.C., where John Quincy Adams and his family liked to swim, is now a cesspool, giving off nauseating odors on hot, humid days. Towns up and down the Potomac have sewage-disposal plants, but none is large enough to handle the present volume of use; all were built to serve smaller communities than the years have produced. As a consequence, raw sewage enters the river. The same story is true across the land, many rivers being so polluted they have zero oxygen, which means that not even trash fish can survive.

Even though all raw sewage is kept from a waterway, the sewage effluent may in time kill the river as a recreational utility. The effluent contains some of the original contaminants as well as dissolved nutrients in the form of nitrogen and phosphorous compounds, which in turn tend to promote excessive algae growth and an eventual loss of dissolved oxygen. When the effluent comes in small quantities, life in the river may flourish. But the balance is a delicate one, and the effect of sewage effluent is cumulative. Detergents add to the problem. "Hard" detergents do not break down in sewage-disposal plants but emerge as foam on the water. They even enter percolating waters and artesian wells, and penetrate municipal water supplies. "Soft" detergents have been promised by the industry for 1965. Meanwhile the "hard" ones add to our water problem.

The processes for distillation of salt water and brackish water are adoptable to eliminate all contaminants and nutrients from sewage effluent, returning pure water to the river and pumping the residue to some distant point where it will not pollute drinking water. One or more of these plants would help to clear the Potomac.

Old attitudes are hard to change. But when Castro cut our sweet-water lines to the Guantánamo base, we put up a distillation plant to convert sea water to sweet water. The dollar cost vastly exceeded the cost of resuming relations with Castro. But the added cost was properly deemed irrelevant.

When it comes to the Potomac, the Corps of Engineers takes quite a different stance. They propose a huge dam at Seneca, Md., that will make a muddy, ugly waterhole out of many miles of the river, for the impoundment will fluctuate some 30 feet. And the chief purpose of the dam is to supply a head of water for flushing the river of sewage. The installation of a coal-fired distillation plant for sewage effluent would cost less than the dam, while the operating costs for water purification would probably be greater. Yet what price a pure, free-flowing Potomac? What price a stream with fast canoe waters, hundreds of swimming holes, picnic grounds washed by clean water? What price a river toward which the people turn their faces, not their backs?

Most of our rivers have been drafted into service of the country—if not for sewage effluent, then for power, industrial and municipal water needs, navigation and irrigation. While those uses are essential, there is another use long overlooked—recreation. Rivers offer that opportunity; and, when available, hundreds of thousands make use of the service. Today a joint study team named by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and Secretary of the Interior Udall, and headed by Edward C. Crafts, of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, is surveying the free-flowing rivers we have left in an effort to establish a system of "wild rivers" to be set aside and protected for all time in their natural state. These include the Allagash in Maine; the upper Hudson in New York; the North Branch of the Susquehanna in New York and Pennsylvania; the Clear Fork and New River, in Kentucky and Tennessee; the Savannah headwaters in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia; the Suwannee in Florida and Georgia; the Buffalo in Arkansas; the Current and Eleven Point in Missouri; and the St. Croix and Namekagon in Wisconsin and Minnesota.

Farther west are the Niobrara in Nebraska; the upper Missouri in Montana; the upper Rio Grande in New Mexico; the Green in Wyoming; the Klamath and the Middle Fork of the Feather in California; the Rogue in Oregon; the Skagit, and its Sauk and Suiattle tributaries, in Washington; three forks of the Flathead in Montana; the Salmon and the Selway Fork of the Clearwater in Idaho.

These are streams that should be guarded from all intrusions—including the building of dams—so that those who live here in the 21st century can enjoy float, canoe, or boat trips for a day or more without seeing too many other people. Visitors will be able to hike, fish, and camp alongside them and seldom know that civilization exists within a hundred miles, although in truth the nearest town or sawmill or farm may be barely out of sight over the bank.

Some of our lakes need as drastic a cleaning as the Potomac River. Lake Erie is one—a lake whose shores have been despoiled by Cleveland. Our seashores also need protection.

The Cape Cod Seashore National Park, established in 1961, has within its borders many private homes. It preserves the remaining underdeveloped acres in perpetuity, preventing uses which might make the area a slum come the 21st century. We must do the same in other areas.

The incomparable Indiana Dunes have been threatened with appropriation for industrial use. They must somehow be preserved for those whose playgrounds have now been mostly paved.

The Oregon Dunes are another pressing example; they, too, should be set aside as a national seashore before their character is lost in the developments that seem to come almost overnight.

At one time most of the beaches in California were in private ownership. The American people owned by the edge of the ocean, so to speak, but they had no access to it. The State of California several years ago started acquiring it by purchase or condemnation. By the end of 1963 about one-third of the shoreline was back in public ownership, but the price had jumped to $1,600 a foot or $133-plus an inch. (Some Lake Tahoe beach frontage sells for $2,000 a foot or $166 an inch.) Point Reyes in California was acquired as a National Seashore in 1962. As one travels the Pacific beaches north from San Diego to the Juan de Fuca Strait, he finds that most have been invaded by roads, billboards, hotdog stands, and other marks of "civilization."

Individual homes and indeed whole communities cling to highlands above the beaches; shops and filling stations are everywhere. There are in that long stretch only some 30 miles of primitive beaches—primitive in the sense that no roads touch them, no structure is on them or overlooks them. These beaches lie between Cape Alava in Washington south to the Quillayute River near Lapush. The land east of those beaches was logged over some years ago and now is second growth, showing wind-blown Sitka spruce along the escarpment above the beaches. Red alder grows in varied stances closer to the high tide marks; they lean seaward to form an umbrella over corners of these beaches. At dawn, deer and their fawns can be seen on the ocean's edge, looking for seaweeds. Elk keep in the spruce higher up. But their tracks are also found where sweetwater streams pour through alder and bracken to the ocean. The howl of a coyote is common at night; the tracks of cougar are a reminder that one of our most skillful hunters is abroad; fresh tracks in the morning show that raccoons and skunks, who enjoy shellfish, have been abroad. Bright days are idyllic in this bit of heaven on earth; in the shade of alder one is carried far away in reveries as he listens to the soft murmur of the Pacific. On foggy mornings the headlands become distorted and ghostly.

When the storms mount and angry waves pound the shoreline, a sheltered retreat in the spruce makes one a witness to an inspiring primordial force that in a matter of seconds can move tons of earth and rock.

Though this stretch of the beach is in the Olympic National Park and though its value lies in its primitive nature, there are eager commercial interests who want to "improve" these beaches by bringing access roads down to them or along them. This proposal had some backing within the National Park Service in the late fifties. Seventy of us put on a 3-day protest hike down that 35-mile stretch of the beach. Opinion crystallized against the road. But in 1964 another hike will be held, as commercial interests working with the Bureau of Public Roads have

again proposed roads along and into these seashore sanctuaries.

The threat to the Everglades—perhaps our most nearly unique national park—is also continuous and immediate. That problem starts and ends with fresh water that keeps the saw grass green, the water holes filled, and so maintains all the life of the Everglades region, from the tiny mosquito-eating Gambusia fish to the alligators. More than that, fresh water pouring south holds back the salt water that always threatens to invade.

A reservoir system that releases water gradually is one secret of the maintenance of the Everglades as a river of grass teeming with life. The rock underlying the Everglades is another. Though called Miami limestone, its technical name is oölitic limestone, because it resembles partially fused fish eggs. Lumpy, permeable and soft, it is filled with holes, some small, some as big as one's fist, some as large as a washtub. These holes hook up into a vast underground waterway.

Its chief characteristic, important to the ecology of the Everglades, is that it lies only a few feet above sea level and has low rims on the east and west, giving it the shape of a spoon. The Everglades is, indeed, like fresh water in a spoon that is pressed down into a sea of salt water. The margin between fresh and salt is narrow. Once that low rim is broken, the salt water comes in. Man has tampered dangerously with this delicate balance.

The Everglades National Park, embracing 1,529,000 acres of land and water, was established in 1947, just in the nick of time. The race was on to restore the balance between fresh and salt water. The result was the creation of conservation areas north of the Everglades Park that fed into the southern part the necessary fresh water.

But the drainage continues today—this time under the aegis of an agency known as the central and southern Florida Flood Control District, 80 percent of whose costs are paid by the Federal Government. This drainage is not only for flood control but also for reclaiming lands, once flooded periodically, for agricultural purposes.

The flow of fresh water from the north has been so reduced that the ocean has taken over most of the coastal streams. It has driven the alligators, who enjoy only fresh water, way upstream. The otter, a freshwater animal, has also been driven far inland.

The growth of population and the expansion of industry to the east carry threats to the very existence of the Everglades. Drainage today is threatening water birds and waders. As sloughs and pools dry up or recede, competition for food increases and some birds disappear. Drainage is slowly changing the face of the Everglades. As the sweetwater level is lowered, exotics come in—willow, holly and wax myrtle. A casual visitor might not notice their invasion, but methodical studies show that the ecology of the Everglades is subtly changing.

As the Interior Department said in 1948 respecting the Everglades, "The question is not one of too much water but a guarantee that there shall not be to little."

The Everglades is a national property that more than a half million people visit a year—and the sanctuary is close to the hearts of people in all the States. We must make plans quickly to preserve the Everglades. Florida will need saline water conversion plants; the Government tells us they are now economically feasible when run by nuclear energy for the dual purpose of distillation and electric power. These conversion plants will be needed irrespective of their costs, for values are at stake that can never be measured in dollars—the preservation of sweetwater sanctuaries which make Florida unique among our 50 sovereign States.

Elsewhere in the Nation, the views of rivers, bays, rolling hills or ridges are being impaired by progress. Those views are often wilderness values in a sense. For though close views show intrusions and developments, distant ones give the effect of an untamed wilderness. These views have esthetic values greater than man can create on an easel or shape with his hands.

Those who know Mount Vernon know how restful to the eye the green hills and purling river are. They are part of the majesty of the historic monument. Mount Vernon would, of course, still have sentimental values even if it were surrounded by smokestacks and factories. But though there is legal power to despoil it in that way, there is a moral precept against it. Our values are not exclusively commercial; they are spiritual and esthetic as well. So the Potomac community was shocked when the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, an all-powerful Maryland agency, decided to locate a sewage disposal plant opposite Mount Vernon. An aroused public got that decision reversed—by persuasion. But threats of that kind will constantly recur, since our private and public agencies usually have commercial standards, not esthetic ones.

Farther up the Potomac, builders planned to erect high-rise apartments near the riverfront. These structures would have destroyed the serene, peaceful view of a river that makes up a part of the charm of the city. Those intrusions were finally stopped through acquisition by the Federal Government of scenic easements.

On a recent visit to California I was shocked to see the green, rolling hills that make up the coast range being marred by huge towers carrying powerlines. Why should not the power be transmitted by buried cable? It would cost more to do it that way. But what about the esthetic values? Are they not worth enough to be preserved at almost any cost? Ugliness is not an inevitable cost of modernity.

Planners are not always a boon and a blessing. Many of them value trees in terms of cellulose, ridges as powerline sites, valleys as sites for dams or highways. Yet enduring values are often realized only by keeping the trees, the ridges, and the valleys untouched.

As John Muir once wrote of our coast redwoods:

"Any fool can destroy trees. They cannot run away; and if they could, they would still be destroyed—chased and hunted down as long as fun or a dollar could be got out of their bark hides, branching horns or magnificent bole backbones. God has cared for these (Sequoias), saved them from drought, disease, avalanches and a thousand straining, leveling tempests and floods; but he cannot save them from fools—only Uncle Sam can do that."

Commercial interests unrestrained by biologists, botanists, ornithologists, artists and others, who see the spiritual values in the outdoors, can in time convert every acre of America into a money-making scheme.

Once Ohio had the finest stand of hardwoods that was to be found in the world. Today they are all gone, except perhaps for an occasional alcove. All the woods in Maine are filled with roads and crisscrossed by highways. The State has only a 20-mile corridor of wilderness left—Baxter State Park—and it was made out of cutover depleted land.

We have leveled the frontier so fast, we have reduced the wilderness at such a great rate, that we have precious few retreats left—apart from Alaska—and even the existing retreats will soon have to be rationed to hikers because the thin soils of our high country cannot take the pounding of an indefinite number of feet.

We have been going at the whole matter piecemeal, fighting rearguard actions, first at this point and then at another, winning a few battles, only to find that in other critical areas the road has pushed on another few miles until there are very few retreats left.

What we need is an overall plan—not one that lumps Florida and California together, or the Potomac Valley and Maine, but one that takes a whole region, such as the green hills of California or the Potomac Basin or Florida's Everglades, and drives as deeply into law as can be driven guarantees that precise areas will be kept as wilderness exhibits, now and forever. Grasslands where patridge can thrive even on the outskirts of a metropolitan area must be locked up in perpetuity. Zoning must be used to make not only the cities but also the countryside beautiful and inviting.

Plans to preserve these islands of beauty must be made by constitutional guarantee or otherwise.

Our coast redwoods (Sequoia sempervirens) will soon be museum pieces, though they once stretched in great numbers across this country, and from France to Japan. These trees are the tallest in the world, rising nearly 400 feet. They make a veritable cathedral of wilderness where all sounds are muted, where man stands humbly before the Creator. We started with nearly 2 million acres of these giants. For years they enticed but baffled the loggers, for their size presented difficult problems of felling and transportation. But these problems were solved.

A tree that took a thousand years to grow can now be felled in an hour or two. For years their timber was considered mediocre. But when man discovered that this timber was rotproof, termiteproof, easy to work, handsome and nonwarping, the trees were condemned to destruction. On the average, 15,000 acres are cut each year, the wood being in great demand. Some 50,000 acres have been set aside in State or national preserves. Apart from them, the remaining stands total 200,000 acres. At the present rate of cutting, the last of the unreserved coast redwoods will be gone in about 15 years. They may conceivably return in 1,000 years, the time it takes a tree to reach maturity—provided their growing sites are not taken over for highways, industrial plants or homes. If we are as reckless in dealing with them as we have been in cutting the trees, we will have only museum pieces left when the 21st century arrives.

Even the redwoods set aside are in danger. Torrential rains falling on adjacent cutover lands sometimes cause vast landslides. Some redwood preserves have lost substantial numbers of trees from the roaring torrents heading up on land astride the preserve. It is at last realized that as long as substantial parts of the watershed remain in private hands, the protection afforded by a preserve is illusory. The reckless methods of logging—with a loss of 6 pounds of soil for every square yard of land—makes regeneration of some redwood forests most problematical. Highways, destructive of redwoods, have been cut through the area "to open up new vistas to Californians and our millions of visitors from other States and nations."

The redwood groves are already too thin to stand the number of visitors who come to admire the trees.

"This wear and tear is becoming more serious all the time, as the popularity of the redwoods increases," Phillip Hyde and Francois Leydet report in their book, "The Last Redwoods." "Every year the campgrounds become more crowded. The qualities of silence and mystery and solitude of the redwoods' magic become increasingly impaired."

Theodore Roosevelt said more than 60 years ago:

"I feel most emphatically that we should not turn into shingles a tree which was old

when the first Egyptian conqueror penetrated to the valley of the Euphrates, which it has taken so many thousands of years to build up, and which can be put to better use. That, you may say, is not looking at the matter from the practical standpoint. There is nothing more practical in the end than the preservation of beauty, than the preservation of anything that appeals to the higher emotions of mankind."

Instead of preserving only museum pieces, why don't we stop cutting now, and leave more ample areas for camping and picnicking by the 300 million people who will shortly occupy the land?

There is hardly a householder who has not seen the devastation wreaked by the modern bulldozer in clearing land for roads, in the needless sacrifice of ancient trees and unique scenic views. Every State has examples of the needless pollution of rivers and lakes, of the spoilation of scenic views by powerlines, of the thoughtless sacrifice of esthetic values for commercial ones.

Some will want to drain the nearby swamp for a factory, when the swamp should be preserved for boys who like to catch frogs, for biology, zoology, and botany classes.

Some will want to open up a 40-acre tract near or in the town for homebuilding, when it should be preserved for leafy trials where young and old can commune with nature.

Some will want to run a road along the crest of the ridge for the scenic view it affords, when the whole mountain should be kept as a relic of the original American wilderness.

It will be proposed that a beach area be zoned for business, when recreational needs cry out for its preservation as a quiet alcove in a noisy, strident world.

All communities seem to be under the hammer of progress and improvement. Yet those terms are technology's excuse for wiping out some of our remaining natural grandeur and beauty.

In Oregon there are few primitive valleys left, roads having penetrated everywhere. The one remaining is the Minam River in eastern Oregon. Lumber companies want its timber. But the penetration by bulldozers and trucks will mark its demise as a primeval place of serenity and beauty. The same fate threatens most of the remaining roadless canyons in the State of Washington. Today the North Fork of the Rattlesnake, remote, distant and unknown, is doomed to the same fate. It has few friends to defend it. But left alone, it could in the 21st century become a hiking and camping ground for thousands who would explore its valleys and canyon walls.

These remote valleys belong not to the lumber companies and the few loggers and roadbuilders who will profit from their destruction, but to all the people. They belong to the apartment dwellers in New York, Illinois, and Pennsylvania as well as to the fishermen and hunters in the nearby cities. But the question of their sacrifice or preservation will be decided by distant bureaucrats.

We need committees of correspondence to coordinate the efforts of diverse groups to keep America beautiful and to preserve the few wilderness alcoves we have left. We used such committees in the days of our Revolution, and through them helped bolster the efforts of people everywhere in the common cause. Our common cause today is to preserve our country's natural beauty and keep our wilderness areas sacrosanct. The threats are everywhere; and the most serious ones are often made in unobstructive beginnings under the banner of progress. Local groups need national assistance; and that means joining hands in an overall effort to keep our land bright and shining.

We inherited the loveliest of all continents. We should bequeath it to our grandchildren as a land where the majority is disciplined to respect the values even of a minority. Those values are esthetic or spiritual, and they reflect the principle that beauty is an end in itself and that man will find relaxation, renewed strength and inspiration in the wildness of the earth.

We should leave behind a land where those yet unborn will have an opportunity to hear the calls of loons and come to know that they are more glorious than any whir of motors.

TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have watched with great interest the events surrounding the erection of a statue to the great Ukrainian poet, statesman, and humanitarian, Taras Shevchenko. The ground-breaking ceremony on September 21, 1963, and the unveiling of the finished work on June 28 of this year were most impressive and moving.

Recently, many Americans have discussed the poet's life and accomplishments. He is a national hero to all Ukrainian people wherever they may be. However, as we will begin Captive Nations Week on July 12 it is particularly fitting to speak about the poet and his meaning to all Americans.

The imposing statue which stands today in our Nation's Capital serves as a reminder to us all of the tyranny of the Soviets, for it recalls their efforts to suppress all observations of his birthday behind the Iron Curtain. They have repeatedly attempted to distort his message of freedom for all peoples under governments of their own choosing. They made an implicit recognition of the power of this poet's universal cry when they removed the cross which marked his grave. The Shevchenko statue is a constant reminder of the ruthlessness of the Soviets in their unending attempts to stamp out liberty—even the idea of liberty—in the oppressed nations of Eastern Europe.

The statue serves yet another function. It is a constant reminder to the American people of their obligations to fulfill Shevchenko's hopes for liberty for the Ukrainian people and all the peoples of the world. Shevchenko wrote:

Terrible to fall into chains
To die in captivity
But worse, far worse, to sleep, to sleep
To sleep in liberty.

This great poet knew the danger of taking liberty for granted. The sight of this monument will keep us from ever forgetting our friends, the peoples who are now imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain. As such it is fitting that it is standing in our Capital as we begin the celebration of Captive Nations Week.

Shevchenko is a great Ukrainian—their national hero and poet. But his greatness made him a citizen of the world as well as a fighter for freedom for the Ukraine against czarist Russia. His example of dedication to the unending fight against tyranny, and his immortalization of that fight in great poetry, is a symbol of hope for all men—those who possess that freedom he fought for and, especially, those who do not but who refuse to give up the fight for liberty which he championed by his actions and in his words.

A MESSAGE FOR ALL MEN OF GOOD WILL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, we hear so much these days about cynicism and lack of spiritual values in America that I should like to call attention to a wonderful article which appeared in yesterday's New York Times. It is a verse, inserted as an advertisement, by Mr. Eliezer Goldfarb, a 77-year-old resident of New York.

Mr. Goldfarb, a deeply religious man, was impressed by the lines from the Torah:

I shall tell man of Thy wonderful works and the precious kindness unto all Thy creatures.

According to an article in the Times, he pondered these words as he said his morning prayers in his apartment in midtown Manhattan.

Recently, he decided to put his thoughts into action by purchasing space in the New York Times to express publicly thanks for being an American and for being alive. Undaunted by the cost—nearly $1,000—which represented about a quarter of his life's savings, Mr. Goldfarb persevered in his project.

His verse eloquently states the philosophy and religious conviction of a man whose life has had its ups and downs but who retains a refreshingly happy outlook on things.

Mr. President, I am delighted to have this opportunity not only to bring Mr. Goldfarb's fine sentiments to the attention of this body, but to salute him for his significant and meaningful gesture. It should help restore in each of us something of the faith in religion and in this country that has sometimes seemed to be missing.

As long as there are loyal Americans, imbued with the spiritual values which have made this Nation great, we need have no fear about the future. Allegiance to the fatherhood of God is, after all, the cement which binds together all men of good will the world over—and gives meaning to the lives of each of us.

Mr. President, I am grateful to Mr. Goldfarb for reminding us of these eternal truths and I commend his verse to the deep contemplation of each Member of this body. I therefore ask unanimous consent that his poignant verse, which appeared in the New York Times of July 5, 1964, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, July 5, 1964]

THANKS

Every morning when I get out of bed
I arise with a feeling of being glad.
I count my blessings one by one
And they are so many I can count upon.
Take, for instance, this land I live in:
No country on earth compares in worth
To our standard way of livin'.
Our forefathers who prayed unto God to lead them,
Have left us a heritage of priceless freedom.
Opportunities aplenty one can have the best,
All I need is know-how and the means to pass the test.

Of my friends and neighbors I can talk for hours,
Of races and peoples in this land that is ours.
Without hatred or malice we live as one
In this blessed land oppressed by none.
We have our squabbles but they are few.
In peace dwell we here, Moslem, Christian, and Jew.
No shooting, no looting by rebels depraved;
No crying, no dying by a people enslaved.
And so I pray to God I may never forget,
To thank Him each day for blessings like that.

—ELIEZER GOLDFARB.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGOVERN in the chair). The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from New York is recognized for 2 more minutes.

UNITED NATIONS DRAFT CONVENTION ON ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights should express the sense of the world's peaceloving peoples that racial discrimination in all its forms must be terminated. The recent meetings of the Commission to discuss the draft international convention on elimination of all forms of racial discrimination contain well-founded arguments against anti-Semitism. The people of the world must never forget the Nazi culmination of anti-Semitism witnessed in this century, or permit such practices to be repeated.

Dr. Isaac Lewin, of the Agudas Israel World Organization, ably expressed arguments for the inculsion of language condemning anti-Semitism in this convention. I request unanimous consent that a summary of Dr. Lewin's testimony before the Human Rights Commission be printed in the RECORD.

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

The Chairman suggested that the Commission should hear Mr. Lewin, representative of the Agudas Israel World Organization, a nongovernmental organization which had asked to make a brief statement with regard to article III of the draft convention.

It was so decided.

Mr. Lewin (Agudas Israel World Organization) expressed the appreciation of his organization, which represented Orthodox Jews in 23 countries, for the work done by the Commission on Human Rights and other United Nations bodies to eliminate all forms of racial discrimination.

The draft convention which was being prepared by the Commission was a document of great importance, which embodied the principle of nondiscrimination proclaimed thousands of years ago in the Bible. Nevertheless, it was essential that articles III and IV of the draft should contain a clear condemnation of anti-Semitism, which was the oldest and the most brutal and inhuman form of racial discrimination. Anti-Semitism had begun more than 2,000 years previously in the hellenized Orient and had assumed various forms during ancient times and in the Middle Ages among the nations of Europe. In modern times it was the Germans who had been the bitterest foes of the Jews. In 1841, King Frederick William IV, of Prussia, had issued an order declaring the Jews to be a colony of foreigners. Later, a legal system had been created based on the principle that a nation could include only persons speaking the national language and belonging to the same race. Almost 100 years later, on September 15, 1935, the Reichstag had assembled at Nuremberg and had passed unanimously a "law for the protection of the German blood and the German honor." A citizenship law of the same day had also provided that only persons of German or cognate blood could be citizens of the Reich; the concept of a "Herrenvolk" had thus been sanctioned by German law. Those measures were to lead to the massacre of 6 million Jews.

After the Second World War anti-Semitic propaganda had been revived and had reappeared in Germany in December 1959. That was why the Commission on Human Rights had, at its 664th meeting, in March 1960, adopted resolution 6 (XVI), which in particular condemned manifestations of anti-Semitism as violations of principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and was a threat to the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all peoples. The Commission should not forget those courageous words when drafting a convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. Anti-Semitism was certainly not less an enemy of racial equality than apartheid and deserved an outright condemnation.

It could possibly be said that anti-Semitism was included in the general condemnation of all racial discrimination. There were, however, two arguments to justify the inclusion of a special mention of anti-Semitism in the draft convention. First, anti-Semitism was a movement which could easily escape legal formulas. There were many forms of anti-Semitism which led to discrimination although they did not qualify under a general condemnation of racial discrimination. Thus, there was an ethnological anti-Semitism represented by W. Marr, and the metaphysical anti-Semitism professed by Schopenhauer; there was also the ethical anti-Semitism of Nietzsche, who had opposed Jewish and Christian ethics as the ethics of slaves, not of masters. In fact, Nietzsche had probably been the spiritual father of the Nazi conception of the "Herrenvolk," which had led to the extermination of 6 million men, women, and children. Secondly, the Jewish people were entitled to expect that, less than 30 years after the adoption of the Nuremberg laws, and less than 5 years after a new wave of neo-Nazi propaganda, there would be an open and unambiguous condemnation of anti-Semitism in an international convention. Justice demanded that the evils of anti-Semitism should be considered as no less important than those of apartheid.

He therefore hoped that articles III and IV of the convention would expressly condemn anti-Semitism.

OUR OWN JAPANESE IN THE PACIFIC WAR

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, no greater, no finer, and no more courageous contribution was made to the preservation of the United States and to the cause of freedom in the Second World War than that so heroically made by American soldiers of Japanese extraction. Over the weekend, while reading a copy of the American Legion magazine for July 1964, I discovered a highly interesting article, written by Bill Hosokawa, editor of the Denver Post Sunday magazine section. Mr. Hosokawa records in the article, possibly for the first time to the general public, the fact that 6,000 Nisei in the uniform of our country fought in the Pacific. The article is a moving description of how our fellow citizens who are Nisei by their war-time valor will occupy a very unique niche in America's Hall of Fame. I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the article entitled "Our Own Japanese in the Pacific War" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the American Legion magazine, July 1964]

OUR OWN JAPANESE IN THE PACIFIC WAR

(NOTE.—Our use of Japanese Americans in the Pacific War was so hush-hush that virtually nothing has been told of them until now. Here's their amazing story.)

(By Bill Hosokawa)

One of the least known stories of World War II is the remarkable tale of the unique record of more than 6,000 Japanese Americans, better known as Nisei, in the war in the Pacific against Japan. These Nisei performed a service in the uniform of the United States that nobody else could perform—and at considerable risk of being shot not only by the enemy, but out of mistaken identity, by their own comrades as well.

To this day it is a common belief that we dared use no Nisei in the Pacific. Had it not been for the insistence of Lt. Col. (now brigadier general) John Weckerling and Capt. (now colonel) Kai E. Rasmussen, who were on duty with 4th Army Intelligence at the Presidio in San Francisco in 1941, perhaps we would not have used them.

But nobody who had the misfortune to be at Maggot Hill in Burma with Merrill's Marauders (the 5,307 Composite Group, Provisional) in the Easter season of 1944 has any doubt that Japanese Americans served with distinction against the Japanese.

Maggot Hill was one of the most critical battles of the war in the struggle for Burma. The hill's real name was Npum Ga, and it was not important before or since. Merrill's 2d Battalion held the hill against the vastly superior Japanese 18th (Kurume Shidan) Division, the crack outfit that had swept through Malaya and Burma in earlier campaigns.

If the battle had been lost, the Marauders would have been destroyed as an effective fighting unit, and their mission in Burma would have failed. The primary objective of the 2d Battalion in the battle was to get out alive.

The GI's hung on for 15 tortured days. Finally, on Easter Sunday, they were rescued by the 3d Battalion which broke through enemy lines while the 1st Battalion, near exhaustion after a 5-day march, kept the foe off balance with diversionary attacks.

There were many heroes on Npum Ga, and not the least of them was a shy, slight, bespectacled Japanese American, Sgt. Roy Matsumoto. Matsumoto had the facial characteristics of the enemy, but he was an American, born in California. Like all the other marauders, he had volunteered for the mission. Unlike most of the others he had two jobs—rifleman and translator.

When darkness fell over the jungle Matsumoto crawled out beyond American lines to within earshot of the enemy, where he

lay and listened alone. One night he heard the Japanese planning a dawn attack along a lightly defended sector. A breakthrough would have been disastrous. Risking fire from both sides, as he always did on these missions, Matsumoto slipped back with the information. The 2d Battalion, placing its fate in the hands of Matsumoto's intelligence, concentrated its power at the reported point of attack.

Just as Matsumoto had said, the attack opened at first light. Suddenly the dawn was hideous with the enemy's screams but the GI's, forewarned, were ready. Under their concentrated fire the first wave of attackers crumbled. The second wave hesitated in bewilderment.

Fearing that they might withdraw to fight another day, Matsumoto leaped to his feet and screamed in Japanese: "Charge, you soldiers of Japan, charge, charge, charge."

Reacting with blind discipline, the Japanese rose and advanced straight to their deaths in the withering gunfire. After the attack was beaten off the GI's counted 54 enemy bodies; how many more casualties the foe had been able to drag back was never known. For his part in the victory Matsumoto was awarded the Legion of Merit.

Sergeant Matsumoto was one of 14 Japanese Americans (Nisei) who served with the Marauders. Most of them had equally hair-raising experiences. All were decorated, and half of them won battlefield commissions.

These men were among the more than 6,000 Nisei linguists who were trained to serve with Allied forces in the Pacific during World War II. Of that number, 3,700 served in combat areas before the surrender. They went into action with the marines at Guadalcanal. They took part in every landing in the bitter island-hopping campaign up through New Guinea, the Marianas, Philippines, and Okinawa, and finally participated in the surrender ceremonies in Tokyo Bay.

Our Nisei in the Pacific were assigned to the U.S. Joint Intelligence Center in Hawaii, to every Army division, the Marines, Navy, paratroops, OSS, and OWI units. Some were loaned to British, Australian, New Zealand, and Chinese forces. Attuned to the Japanese tongue, the Nisei were the eyes and ears of Allied fighting forces. Through their skills and courage they saved countless American and Allies' lives and helped shorten the war by many months.

The Nisei served at the headquarters of the 6th, 8th, and 10th Armies, and the I, IX, X, XI, XIV, and XXIV Corps. Also with the 1st Cavalry at Los Negros, Leyte, and Manila; with the 6th Infantry at Sansapor in New Guinea and in northern Luzon; with the 7th Infantry at Attu, Kwajalein, Leyte, and Okinawa; with the 11th Airborne at Leyte, Manila, and Cavite; with the 24th Infantry in New Guinea, Leyte, Corregidor, Verde Island, and Mindanao; with the 25th Infantry at Guadalcanal, New Georgia, and in the Philippines; with the 27th Infantry at Makin Island, Saipan, and Okinawa; with the 31st Infantry in southern Mindanao; with the 32d Infantry at Buna, Aitape, and Leyte; with the 33d Infantry at Baguio; with the 37th Infantry at Munda, Bougainville, Lingayen Gulf, and Manila; with the 38th Infantry during the recapture of Bataan; with the 40th Infantry at Los Negros, Luzon, and Panay Island in the Philippines; with the 41st Infantry at Salamaua, the Marshalls, Mindanoa, and Palawan; with the 43d Infantry on New Georgia, New Guinea, and Luzon; with the 77th Infantry at Guam, Leyte, and Okinawa; with the 81st Infantry at Angaur, Peleliu, and Ulithi; with the 93d Infantry on Morotai, New Guinea, and the Philippines; with the 96th Infantry at Leyte and Okinawa; and with the Americal Division at Guadalcanal, Bougainville, and Cebu.

They were also attached to headquarters of the 5th, 7th, 10th, 11th, 13th, 14th and 20th Air Forces. They were with the marines at Tarawa, Guadalcanal and Iwo Jima; with the Advance Alaskan Department of Aduk; with the British in India and the Australians in Borneo.

Teams of 10 men were usually stationed at division headquarters, with smaller teams on regimental and battalion levels. Nisei interpreters usually landed with the second or third invasion waves—they were too valuable to risk in the first wave—to provide instant translation of the enemy's shouted orders, intercepted messages or captured documents.

The commanders who depended on the Nisei were lavish in their praise. "I couldn't have gotten along without them," said the late Maj. Gen. Frank D. Merrill, whose marauders broke the Japanese hold on Burma and opened the land route into China.

Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, the late General MacArthur's chief of intelligence, declared in Tokyo: "The information received through their skills proved invaluable to our battle forces." Col. G. F. Blunda, commander of the Southeast Asia Translation and Interrogation Center, in New Delhi, India, said each Nisei linguist "was as valuable as an infantry company."

Because they were so important to the Pacific war effort, the American command kept them out of the publicity spotlight. The Nisei G–2 boys, as they were called, received none of the attention showered on their brothers in the 442d (Go for Broke) Regimental Combat Team which fought with such valor, and paid such a price in blood, in Italy and France. During the fighting the linguists were under security wraps. After the surrender of Japan their story was lost in the flush of victory.

Like Sergeant Matsumoto, many of the linguists operated in the front lines and even behind enemy lines. They accompanied marines and GI's on jungle patrols. They tapped phone lines and manned forward observation posts, providing their officers with instant translations of Japanese commands.

In a battle not far from Myitkyina, Burma, Sgts. Robert Honda and Roy Nakada of Honolulu, and Sgt. Ben Sugeta of Los Angeles tapped a telephone wire and listened to communications between elements of the Japanese 18th Division. They overheard reference to an enemy ammunition dump, then located it on a map. U.S. bombers soon destroyed it. Honda later operated with the OSS Kachin Rangers in the Myitkyina-Fort Hertz area for 8 months from March to November 1944. Another Nisei, T/3 Ship Mazawa, now of Chicago, commanded a unit of Kachin tribesmen in setting ambushes for Japanese troops.

Under heavy enemy fire, Sgt. Henry Gosho, now a State Department official, interpreted the foe's shouts in the midst of a battle in Burma, enabling his platoon to shift its firepower to repel a heavy assault.

Gosho served for a time in the U.S. Embassy in Tokyo after the war and is now in Washington, D.C.

Sgt. Hoichi Kubo of Hawaii earned the Distinguished Service Cross for risking his life to talk a group of dangerous enemy holdouts into surrendering. Sgt. Jack Tanimoto of Gridley, Calif., won the Silver Star for similar action on Okinawa.

Some died in battle. Sgt. Frank T. Hachiya of Hood River, Oreg., was awarded a Silver Star posthumously. Hachiya was attached to the 7th Division HQ and did not have to go into combat. He volunteered to cross a valley on Leyte under enemy fire to scout Japanese positions. He was out ahead of his patrol when a sniper shot him. Hachiya killed the sniper and, although mortally wounded, brought back the needed information.

But most of the Nisei worked in the anonymity of command posts and rear echelon headquarters at the tedious and demanding job of translating captured documents. These documents included battle plans, defense maps, tactical orders, intercepted messages, and diaries. Their efforts turned up a mass of information that enabled American commanders to anticipate enemy action, evaluate their strengths and weaknesses, avoid surprise and strike where they were least expected.

Headquarters duty alternated between utter boredom and a series of frenzied, intense, 20-hour days when captured documents were rushed back following battle. Most teams were commanded by an intelligence officer who helped evaluate the findings. Often, captured maps of enemy defense positions were translated and rushed back to the front in time to turn the tide of battle. On the rare occasions when prisoners were captured, they were hurriedly interrogated by Nisei. Lt. Kan. Tagami of Selma, Calif., with the 124th Cavalry in the CBI Theater, said the big difficulty was in overcoming the prisoners' fear that they would be killed. Once the Nisei won their confidence the POW's talked freely. Since the Japanese Army expected its men to die rather than be captured—and since they didn't expect the United States to have Japanese-speaking personnel—Japanese troops were not security conscious. "They talked their heads off," said Lieutenant Tagami.

The album of the Military Intelligence Service Language School, published in 1946, says the Nisei "translated the entire Japanese battle plans for the naval battle of the Philippines. These plans were captured from the commander in chief of the combined Japanese fleets when the plane in which he was hurrying to join his fleet made a forced landing in the Philippines * * * Likewise, the complete Japanese plans for the defense of the Philippine Islands also were made known through the work of the language specialists from the school long before our forces had landed on Leyte."

I have not been able to identify the lost enemy fleet commander for certain, but a Japanese war history says that Adm. Mineichi Koga, who succeeded Adm. Isoroku Yamamoto as commander in chief, was forced down during a storm while flying from Palau to Davao in the Philippines on March 27, 1944. Koga and several members of his staff were killed in the crash.

The Japanese were lulled into a false sense of security in their belief that Americans could not fathom the complexities of their language. They didn't know until the end of the war that every captured document was being rushed back to translating teams.

The enemy's laxness astounded U.S. officers. Our ability to take advantage of it, plus the fact that Japanese codes had been cracked, led one military historian to remark that never did one nation know so much concerning its foe's intentions as did the United States during most of the Pacific campaign.

Yet the skills of the Nisei were almost lost to the Nation by our inability to see their potential.

During the darkening summer of 1941, a handful of American officers tried to alert superiors to the importance of Japanese language specialists in the seemingly inevitable war ahead. Among them were Brig. Gen. John Weckerling, then a lieutenant colonel, and Col. Kai E. Rasmussen, then a captain. Rasmussen had studied Japanese as a military attaché in Tokyo and he knew what a difficult language it was to learn.

Both Weckerling and Rasmussen were on duty with the 4th Army intelligence staff at the Presidio in San Francisco. Wecker-

ling later became deputy assistant chief of staff, G–2, of the War Department general staff. Rasmussen became commandant of the Military Intelligence Service Language School.

"Men who can read, write, and speak Japanese are as necessary as guns, planes, and ships," protested Rasmussen in urging a linguist program. "We do not have these men. Knowledge of the enemy's tongue, as well as the workings of his mind, is imperative if our intelligence service is to function."

Rasmussen and Weckerling knew that only a very few Americans of European ancestry were familiar with Japanese, mostly businessmen or members of missionary families. Our college Japanese language programs were elementary and had had far too few students to serve a national need. There was no time to teach students in these courses enough Japanese to be militarily useful. Even finding qualified teachers was a problem.

The only alternative was to use Nisei—the American-born offspring of Japanese immigrants—who naturally had a Japanese language background. The trouble was that they were an unknown quantity to most highly placed officials. The Nisei had embraced American ways with characteristic thoroughness. But could these youths of an alien race, only one generation removed from the old country, be trusted in battle and in highly sensitive intelligence work against the people of their own blood?

Weckerling and Rasmussen argued that the Nisei were loyal. Rasmussen himself is of foreign birth—he speaks both English and Japanese with an accent—and he reminded the others that the United States is made up of immigrant groups. As it turned out, there was never any occasion to question the loyalty of a single Nisei GI.

The two officers had trouble convincing the War Department of the feasibility of their project. After costly delays they won reluctant approval for a small-scale language school. Indicative of the Department's dim view, the school was placed under the 4th Army, which at the time had jurisdiction over the west coast, and not under the Army's regular specialized training program. The initial appropriation was for only $2,000.

Weckerling and Rasmussen had no time to be discouraged. There was work to be done. But they ran into difficulty almost immediately when they discovered that the vast majority of Nisei were too thoroughly Americanized. Of the first 3,700 men interviewed, only 3 percent proved to speak Japanese fluently. The next 4 percent could be considered fairly proficient in Japanese. Another 3 percent knew just enough so that they could be used after intensive training. And even the best of them had to be taught military vocabulary and usage.

I was among those Colonel Rasmussen interviewed. I thought I could boast a fair speaking knowledge of the language, but he quickly proved me completely inadequate in other respects. First he asked me to read a high school text. I could make out perhaps 2 or 3 characters in 100. The colonel kept lowering the standard until he got down to a level I could handle—third grade.

"Hosokawa," Colonel Rasmussen rasped with ill-concealed disgust, "you'd make a helluva Jap."

Rasmussen turned me down as hopelessly ignorant. Later, I was evacuated from my home in Seattle, Wash., to the war relocation center at Heart Mountain, Wyo., from where I moved to Des Moines, Iowa, to work on the Des Moines Register. For reasons unknown to me, I was never drafted. During the Korean war I served as a correspondent for the Denver Post, covering the defense of the Taegu perimeter, the Inchon landing and first recapture of Seoul.

A job of monumental proportions lay ahead of Rasmussen and he had no time to waste on me. Selective Service provided military intelligence with the name of every draftee of Japanese parentage. Rasmussen and Weckerling, or their aides, interviewed all of them for Japanese language proficiency. The most able were selected for transfer to the school as soon as it could be started. Two were picked to be instructors. One of them was a brilliant attorney named John F. Aiso who was serving as a private first class. Aiso is a native of Los Angeles, a graduate of Brown University in Providence, R.I., and his law practice had earlier taken him to the Far East. Aiso eventually was named director of academic training. He left the service at the end of the war as a lieutenant colonel and today is a California superior court justice.

The two servicemen and two Nisei civilians were ordered to set up a curriculum and prepare textbooks for a Japanese military language school at crash speed. Because of lack of funds, the first texts were mimeographed.

On November 1, 1941, scarcely 5 weeks before the outbreak of war, the 4th Army Intelligence School was opened in a converted hangar at Crissy Field, The Presidio, San Francisco. Half the hangar was used for classrooms, the other for barracks. Orange crates were pressed into service as chairs until furniture could be wangled from more adequately endowed outfits.

There were 60 handpicked students in that first class—58 Nisei and two Caucasians. All day and late into the night they studied Japanese reading, writing, interrogation, translation and interpretation; analysis of captured documents; Japanese geography and mapreading; Japanese military organization and technical terms. For good measure they were given lectures on the social, political, economic and cultural background of Japan.

Fifteen of the students couldn't keep up and had to be reassigned. After 6 months, 35 of the graduates were divided between the Marines headed for Guadalcanal and the 7th Division in the Aleutians. The remaining 10 were added to the faculty to teach an enlarged second class.

The Army meanwhile was evacuating all persons of Japanese origin from the west coast as a security measure. Some 100,000 men, women, and children, citizens and aliens alike, were packed off to inland camps. With the source of students gone from the west coast, the school was transferred to larger quarters at Camp Savage in Minnesota. By then the top brass could see the value of the program. It was reorganized as a military intelligence service language school under direct War Department supervision, and on June 1, 1942, a second class of 200 men, virtually all Nisei, got underway.

The rough spots discovered in the first class were smoothed out and an even more rigorous routine adopted. Classroom sessions started at 8 a.m. and ended at 4:30 p.m. Additional classes were held from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m. The academic term was 6 months. So rapid was the pace that even the more able students had to study every spare minute to keep up. Lights-out was at 11 p.m., but it was common practice to continue cramming by flashlight under bedcovers. Examinations were held Saturday mornings. The rest of the weekends were spent in road marches and field maneuvers, for these men were expected to be soldiers as well as linguists.

No one was happier than members of the faculty when performance records began to come back from distant fronts. A report from the 6th Infantry at Sansapor, New Guinea, reads in part:

"A captured map of the enemy infantry regiment was brought in by the infantry boys * * *. The Nisei language team worked feverishly to decode the vital message contained on the map * * *. We found the disposition of the troops and its future plans. It stated on the map that the (enemy) regiment would commence attacking at 2000. Preliminary information was sent to all commanders concerned * * *. The corps commanding general was informed of the hot news and he immediately ordered all corps, division and independent artilleries to point their guns at the location of the enemy. At 1945 the barrage started with all guns firing simultaneously * * *. The next morning the recon troops went out into the impact area and they found the enemy was practically wiped out * * *. That ended the campaign." What had promised to be a hand-to-hand battle was won solely with intelligence and artillery.

There was one plea common to all these communications: "Send us more Nisei linguists."

By the fall of 1944, the school had turned out 1,600 enlisted graduates, 142 officer candidates and 53 officers. Reflecting the stepped-up tempo of the war in the Pacific, the Army ordered the school's efforts redoubled.

The school was moved to even more spacious quarters in Fort Snelling, near Minneapolis. Almost without exception the students entering later classes knew less Japanese than had those in the first classes, increasing the burden on the instructors. The faculty was placed on duty every evening as tutors. Classes were scheduled 6 days a week. Many of the linguists were shipped off with a bare minium of basic military training.

Just as the Nisei as a group had to prove themselves to the War Department at the outset, many of the linguists faced individual problems in winning the confidence of fellow GI's. Except for the Westerners, most of our servicemen had never encountered Nisei before and many assumed they were Japanese prisoners pressed into American uniform.

Akiji Yoshimura, who now runs a cleaning plant in Colusa, Calif., recalls he had to "prove" he was an American by repeating "Lala Palooza" for soldiers who had heard Japanese were unable to pronounce the letter "l."

"In 1943 I shipped out on the troopship *Lurline*, a converted Matson liner, headed for Burma via Bombay," Yoshimura says. "We were passing under the Golden Gate Bridge headed out into the Pacific, when a GI came up and asked 'Say, how're things in your country?'

"Obviously he thought I was a prisoner of war who had had a change of heart. I replied: 'They look damned good from here.' He was astonished that I didn't have an accent and he didn't know whether to believe me when I explained I was a native Californian on my first trip out of the States."

During the long voyage Yoshimura and other Nisei lectured the troops on Japanese weapons, tactics, customs, and training. By the time they disembarked at Bombay on the way to Burma, even the skeptics had been convinced the Nisei were thoroughly American. They trained for 2 months at Hsamshingyang with the 5307 Composite Unit.

One day in Burma, Yoshimura remembers, he and a Nisei buddy were bathing in a stream out of sight of the bivouac area when a GI new to the Marauders approached.

"You fellows Chinese?" he asked.

Without thinking, Yoshimura replied: "Nope, we're Japanese."

The soldier blanched, and Yoshimura hurriedly assured him the proper term was

Japanese Americans. Yoshimura fought through five major campaigns with the Maurauders, then was sent to the Sino Translation and Interrogation Center in Kunming, China, where he was commissioned.

One of the questions most often asked the Nisei was, "What do you think the Japanese will do to you if they capture you?"

They had a standard reply: "Don't know. But they'll have to run like hell to catch us."

Fortunately, none of our Nisei was ever captured by the enemy, although Cpl. Tony Uemoto, a native of Honolulu, had the uncomfortable experience of being seized by our Chinese allies near Tonkwa, Burma, where he was serving with the 475th Infantry (Mars Task Force). They took his shoes away to prevent escape and marched him 4 hours in his bare feet to American lines as a prisoner.

One of the more fabulous characters of the Burma campaign, S. Sgt. Kenny Yasui, had an even closer shave. Yasui stood 5 feet 2 inches, weighing 120 pounds, and loved dice and poker. He volunteered to go with three GI's to bring in a group of Japanese hiding on an island during the Irrawaddy River mopup.

All four stripped and swam to the island with only their hand weapons. Standing stark naked on a sandbar, Yasui announced loudly that he was a Japanese colonel working with the Americans and ordered all soldiers to surrender.

A Japanese noncom appeared and helped Yasui round up 15 fully armed men. Yasui lined them up and was about to order them to give up their arms when a Japanese officer sprang from a thicket and threw a grenade. Yasui ducked into a foxhole out of harm's way. His companions opened fire, and the officer and several of the Japanese enlisted men were killed.

Yasui took possession of the dead officer's sword, put the survivors through close-order drill to establish his authority, then boarded a makeshift raft and had the prisoners push him back across the stream, much to the admiration of his buddies. Yasui's bravery won him the Silver Star.

By the end of the war in August 1945, the language school was a smooth-running organization with 1,800 students. With victory, the school shifted its emphasis from military Japanese to general Japanese and civil affairs, for the work of the newest linguists was just beginning. Their assignment was to take part in the occupation and reconstruction of the defeated country. The last 2,300 who were trained graduated so late that all their duty was in Japan until the Korean war.

In Japan, the Nisei were put to work interpreting for military government teams, locating and repatriating imprisoned Americans, translating seized military documents, in counterintelligence, rounding up war criminal suspects and interpreting at their trials. They were as valuable in the cleanup after victory as they had been in combat. The very presence of Nisei in the occupation army contributed much to the rapid democratization of Japan. They helped to smash black market operations, evaluate Air Force bomb damage, train Japanese military police, and supervise repatriation of Japanese prisoners.

The school was finally deactivated in June 1946, after graduating some 6,000 men. Today, a skeleton operation is still maintained at the Presidio in Monterey, Calif.

Many of the Nisei decided to make the army their career and spent additional tours of duty in Japan. When war broke out in Korea in 1950, they were among the first American troops sent to the front. The United States was as short of Korean linguists at that time as it had been of Japanese specialists a decade earlier. However, since virtually all adult Koreans are familiar with the Japanese language, the Nisei once again served their Nation's needs. Nisei were rushed to places like Taejon, Chonju, and Taegu, with the 1st Cavalry, the 25th Division, 5th Army RCT, and the 27th Infantry.

Many of our Nisei of the Pacific war have long been civilians again, but others are still serving, not only as linguists but in the broader field of military intelligence.

For example, there's Maj. Ken Sawada, of Denver, who is now stationed at Fort Bragg and who spent two tours of duty in Okinawa. Major Sawada served in Australia, New Guinea, and the Philippines in World War II, was among the first to land in Japan after the surrender, was assigned to counter-intelligence work and interpreted at war crime trials. On his most recent oversea tour he was detached to Thailand to train troops under combat conditions.

As historians get around to evaluating the contribution Nisei linguists made to the war effort, it is likely that a good many eloquent tributes will be voiced. But none will be so meaningful as the words that some unremembered editor wrote for the Military Intelligence Service Language School album; "Information and knowledge of the enemy obtained by these men cannot be measured in words, but by the weight of victory itself."

In September 1962, Colonel Rasmussen addressed a reunion of the Hawaiian veterans of the Military Intelligence Service, at the Hilton Hawaiian Village in Honolulu. Speaking with a voice that had the familiarity and urgency of an air-raid warning, he urged that the United States establish a National Academy of Languages at once as a security measure. Before the men he trained in World War II, he declared: "We must establish the study of languages as a total career, military as well as civilian. When I realize that people behind the Iron Curtain speak 55 languages and more than 200 dialects, it makes me fearful of our responsibilities in this area. Linguists do not appear automatically. You cannot create language experts overnight."

NOMINATION OF FRANKLIN H. WILLIAMS TO BE U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, within the next few days, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations will have approved several nominations that recently have been sent to the Senate by President Johnson. Thereafter the Senate will take action in consenting to the service of the nominees.

I was delighted to read that Mr. Franklin H. Williams was appointed by the President to be U.S. representative to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. I have the pleasure of knowing Mr. Williams, mostly by his excellent reputation, but also personally. An excellent citizen, who has been active in government, he will be an excellent representative to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, whose deliberations are about to commence in Geneva.

On July 1, the Washington Post commented on the appointment of Mr. Williams. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ENVOY TO THE U.N.

In choosing Franklin H. Williams to be the new U.S. representative to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, President Johnson has told the world a great deal about the evolving pattern of American life. Mr. Williams is abundantly qualified for the post by capacity and experience. As head of the Peace Corps Division of University, Private, and International Cooperation and as its Regional Director for Africa, he has displayed a wealth of imagination and concern about social and economic problems.

There is no doubt that he will prove to be a lively and energetic and informed spokesman in this important U.N. agency. We think his effectiveness will be enhanced by the fact that he happens to be a Negro who has always worked and spoken forcefully for the cause of human equality. And we think that his appointment will contribute to the world's recognition that human equality is finding full realization in the United States. The President deserves congratulations on so felicitous a nomination. We hope the Senate will give it speedy and enthusiastic endorsement.

POVERTY AND POPULATION EXPLOSION—THE NEED FOR ACTION AT HOME AND ABROAD

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the war against poverty will be won when we acknowledge the fact that the population explosion perpetuates and intensifies poverty both at home and abroad.

If one may judge from indicators of awareness such as newspaper stories and advertisements, magazine articles, television programs, and a rash of informative books, residents of the United States are better informed about the world population explosion today than ever before in history. There is, of course, one big stumbling block—too many Americans sincerely believe the problem exists only in impoverished pockets of this Nation or outside our boundaries in the land and people masses of South America, Africa, the Middle East, or Asia. But poverty knows no boundaries. It will come uninvited.

Let us look at a few dramatic illustrations of the problem.

I was impressed recently by the full-page advertisement which appeared in many newspapers which was headlined "War on Poverty," and was addressed to President Lyndon B. Johnson. The accompanying cartoon showed a stork carrying a bundle labeled "World Population Explosion" racing neck and neck with a buzzard which was labeled "World Hunger." Eighty-one prominent Americans—all leaders in the fields of business science, education, theology and other humanities—signed the advertisement. These men and women urged the President to help end poverty by curing one of its major causes which they believe is the present explosive growth of population. They believe that a crash program coupling research and action, such as is proposed in the Clark-Gruening resolution, will help us and the scores of poverty-ridden nations dependent upon the United States for economic

aid. The signers believe, as do I, that population growth and poverty are really not political or religious matters. The advertisement is signed by 81 prominent Americans including Frank W. Abrams, former chairman of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey; Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, former U.S. Ambassador to Italy; the Right Reverend Arthur C. Lichtenberger, presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church; William E. Moran, Jr., dean of the School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University; Dr. Benedict J. Duffy, director of the Center for Population Research of Georgetown University; Dr. Thomas H. Carroll II, president, George Washington University; Allan Nevins, historian; Fairfield Osborn, conservationist and president of the New York Zoological Society; the Right Reverend James A. Pike, bishop, the Protestant Episcopal Church, California; and Dr. John Rock, professor of gynecology emeritus, Harvard University, and others no less distinguished.

Out at Georgetown University, the Institute of Social Ethics is sponsoring a series of summer lectures concerning "Christian Social Ethics and Population Control." The public course started June 16 and ends July 24. The pamphlet describing it says:

> The problem of population expansion is one of increasing world concern. * * * It is obvious, then, that an increasing world population poses many grave problems, problems for which the lessons from the past are inadequate as guidelines to solution.

I suggest that public lectures related to the population growth, the contraceptive pill, research in fertility control and other aspects of the population dilemma might have been obviated a decade ago. Georgetown University is performing a valuable service.

Increased population, with its implications, is the topic of three major national magazine articles I read this long Fourth of July weekend. Newsweek for July 6 carries an article entitled "Birth Control: "The Pill and the Church."

The New Republic for July 4 contains a piece by Michael J. O'Neill headed "Debate on Birth Control."

Look magazine dated July 14 has a story by senior editor Leonard Gross on "Latin American Catholics and Birth Control."

They are informative, sometimes pessimistic, but extremely necessary to us as we speed the population dialog. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the three articles be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. As we are concerned about overpopulation in the underdeveloped nations of the world, so should we be concerned about the problem here in the United States.

The facts are brilliantly interwoven in the book "Too Many Americans" written earlier this year by Lincoln Day and his wife, Alice, and published by Houghton Mifflin Co., of Boston, Mass. The authors have training in research and sociology, plus the insight and ability to analyze the statistics available and the trends predictable and to use them informatively.

Grim findings about America's future emerge on nearly every page of "Too Many Americans."

Our yearly population increase of 1.5 percent seems trivial. The Days point out that in no country with a similar level of economic development has the birthrate remained so high for such a long period of time. This rate means we shall double our population of 192 million by the turn of the century and every 40 years thereafter.

Americans marry early, have two to four children per family, know their progeny will have a long and fruitful life. These residents of the United States comprise 6 percent of the world's population and consume one-half of the world's nonrenewable resources. The average American consumes in natural resources as much as 25 or 30 residents of India.

The Days therefore suggest that Americans are failing to apply the hazards of excessive population domestically, although they may appreciate its perils abroad.

"Too Many Americans" contains too many valuable facts for one speech. I recommend its reading and hope it will enable more of us to realize what can happen to a nation which uses up its capital rather than its interest.

Bigger does not necessarily mean better.

The Days bluntly state:

> Population stability must be achieved if any measure of the high quality of life we Americans still enjoy is to be maintained for ourselves and bequeathed to our posterity.

In their concluding remarks, the Days say that a reluctance to undertake population limitation for fear other nations will outnumber us is self-defeating. Such reasoning is obviously specious, for were it so we would have already been overrun in numbers by India, China, and Russia.

The Days hope we can have a society in which "no unwanted child is born; the decision to bear or not to bear a child is made solely by the potential parents; and most important of all for the goal of a stable population, this decision is made in a social and cultural context in which a family of three children is considered large."

If our population growth does not stabilize, we may reasonably assume that we will lose the freedoms and privileges we enjoy today. The loss to the individual will be dispersed among many and become increasingly less. Quantity will curb quality.

We will experience undreamed-of crowding on the highways, in parks, on the beaches. Our public services will expand in size but offer less to the individual. Our professional services will be increasingly impersonal and deteriorating. As our standards decline, our urban sprawl will increase and today's wait to try personal injury cases, which requires nearly 23 months in communities exceeding 750,000 will seem short. The family wishing to visit Yellowstone National Park will make a reservation not a season ahead, but many years ahead.

The concluding paragraphs of "Too Many Americans" are worth our attention, and I ask unanimous consent they be printed in the RECORD at this time:

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

TOO MANY AMERICANS

To advocate the early achievement of population stability by widespread voluntary effort is not to predict that this is the way it will actually come about. Studies of the factors that determine family size are of such recent origin and are based on such a limited range of experience—only about two generations—that forecasts of future American birth rates really have very little to go on. We can hardly predict natality levels over the next decade, much less over the next half century. Conditions quite different from those we have recommended above might possibly arise to effect a decline in the birth rate sufficient to halt our population growth: severe economic depression (such as occurred in the 1930's) or a feeling of helplessness and pessimism in response to national and international circumstances (as seems to exist today in some of the East European satellite countries), for example. But there is nothing in our present demographic situation to suggest that low natality in a modern industrialized country like ours need occur only as a symptom of social malaise. It can also be a symptom of social health—of a condition in which people were willing to think beyond their own personal interests, and in which they were willing to modify their behavior to meet altered social needs.

Reluctance to undertake limitation for fear that others will outnumber us is only self-defeating. It misinterprets the factors that make for world power, and overlooks the fact that the limits of any population must be defined in the context of its own resources, land area, and way of life. Even if tomorrow we managed somehow to halve our rate of growth we would still be adding each year nearly 1.5 million Americans—as many as there are in the city of Cleveland and its suburbs. There is no chance of keeping our population at 190 million. What we hope to attain with the proposals we have made is a population that does not exceed 210 or 220 million.

In the past, the size of their population and the level of economic development relative to the abundance of land and natural resources permitted Americans a period of essentially unrestricted growth. But such conditions no longer exist. Today, 110 million more of us than at the turn of the century must share what our country has to offer, and we must do so at a time when our way of life places far heavier demands on resources and land area. If our numbers continue to increase, not even the most farsighted of plans will permit coping with the problems entailed. Since eventual population stability is inevitable, if not by reduced natality, then by increased mortality, we submit that the wisest course is reduction by the limitation of births now while we still have something worth preserving.

If we are to retain for ourselves and our posterity much of what is valuable in the American way of life, we must bring our population growth to a halt, and we must do so soon. If we are to emphasize democratic and not totalitarian values, this cessation must be achieved by individual couples acting without coercion. If we are to emphasize the value of parenthood and the dignity and worth of the individual, there must be no greater restriction on the proportion who become parents than there is now.

In short, what we must have—and what our recommendations have been aimed at—is a society in which (1) no unwanted child is born; (2) the decision to bear or not to bear a child is made solely by the potential parents; and (3) most important of all for the goal of a stable population, this decision is made in a social and cultural context in which a family of three children is considered large.

EXHIBIT 1

[From Newsweek, July 6, 1964]

BIRTH CONTROL: THE PILL AND THE CHURCH

The setting was informal. Twenty-seven cardinals had come to Pope Paul's private library on the second floor of the Vatican palace to greet the pontiff on the eve of the feast of St. John the Baptist, the saint after whom he had been christened 66 years ago as Giovanni Battista. But even on such a gentle, warmly human occasion the Pope never sheds the authority of his office; when Paul spoke out last week on birth control his words bore the imprimatur of the Bishop of Rome and the Vicar of Jesus Christ, the representative of an unbroken succession of leaders reaching back to St. Peter.

Paul spoke of change, but he knew full well that his 2,000-year-old church, though not immutable and unbending, submits reluctantly to change. The church's movements can be likened to those of a majestic ship; charts and currents must be studied, the wheel turned by the hands of powerful steersmen, innumerable lines pulled taut and made secure while the sails fill with the freshening winds. Even after all this has been done and the tiller turned, the vessel only slowly heels, and comes about on its new course.

RULES

When the doctrinal revision involves such a basic tenet as birth control, the difficulties of navigation are magnified infinitely. Not since the Copernicans suggested in the 16th century that the sun was the center of the planetary system has the Roman Catholic Church found itself on such a perilous collision course with a new body of knowledge while all about swirl dangerous currents. The meaning of the Pope's statement is clear: in all the vast structure of the church, scholars are now scrutinizing nothing less than a position that goes back to Scripture itself and the story of Onan (Genesis 38: 8–10), who refused to obey the levirate law which required him to marry and bear children by his brother's widow; though he slept with her often, he always practiced coitus interruptus—he "spilled his seed upon the ground."

The specific issue moving the church away from traditional opposition to all forms of artificial birth control is the new oral contraceptive pills. The church rule on the pills, a combination of synthetic female hormones that prevent ovulation, had been set down by Pius XII a month before his death in 1958. The pills, Pius XII said, could be used on a doctor's prescription to treat reproductive disorders; used as a contraceptive, however, they were a morally unacceptable form of sterilization. He thus grouped the pill with mechanical contraceptives and onanism as contrary to the traditional church view that the primary end of marriage—and therefore of sexual intercourse—is the procreation and rearing of children. Interference with the power to generate life—by withdrawal, douching, condoms, creams, diaphragms, or chemicals—violates natural and divine law.

What has impelled the church to reconsider this firm and fiercely defended position? The reasons are varied—ecumenical, economic, practical, political, humanitarian, scientific, psychological.

DISPUTES

First of all, within the church, realistic Pope John XXIII helped fan the winds of change by assiduously promoting the current ecumenical dialog between Catholics and Protestants. Birth control is one of the central disputes which divide the major Christian faiths. All major Protestant sects sanction birth control for family planning, although the Church of England did not fully accept it until 1958. Second, over a broader sweep of time, the gloomy, discredited Malthusian picture of an overpopulated world unable to feed itself, seemed slowly to come into focus as birth rates climbed while modern medicine cut infant mortality rates and lengthened the lifespan. The neo-Malthusians are mostly scientists, but a Catholic theologian, Father John O'Brien, of Notre Dame, has warned that each year a population the size of France (50 million) is added to the world's total.

Third, the economic facts of life illustrated how birth rates—for both family and nation—are related to well-being. Poverty no longer need be regarded as the inevitable lot of man, and a family overburdened by too many babies is apt to be poor. As the New Republic pointed out last week in commenting on Paul's announcement: "In many Catholic countries, U.S. foreign aid is currently canceled out by the birth rate as fast as it is given." And, of practical concern to the church's integrity, anticlerical forces are most active precisely in those Latin American nations with high birth rates.

CONCERNS

Of equally practical concern, church leaders now realize that moral theories about contraception are not always observed in connubial practice by Catholic couples. In a recent survey of 1,600 households in the United States, public opinion analyst, Louis Harris, found that those who wanted a relaxation in their church's rigid attitude toward birth control outnumbered those who didn't by better than 3 to 2. And other recent studies conducted in the United States suggest perhaps as many as 70 percent of U.S. Catholics use some form of contraception besides the church-approved rhythm method. Fearing for their marriage and family, otherwise devout Catholics have rejected the church's teachings in good, if troubled, conscience. "I don't confess that I take the pill," says a New Jersey mother of four, "because I don't believe it is a sin."

Finally, there is the oral contraceptive pill itself. It is the product of modern science, supposedly the adversary of religion; yet the pill opens up, rather than forecloses, opportunity for change within the church.

According to its advocates, at least four virtues commend oral contraceptives to Catholics particularly: they involve no mechanical contrivances of any sort; they promise virtually 100-percent effectiveness; the co-developer and principal exponent is the distinguished Roman Catholic gynecologist, Dr. John Rock. And, last and most important, as Rock has argued in his book, "The Time Has Come," the pills can be considered morally acceptable because they imitate the body's own natural endocrine chemistry to prevent the female egg from maturing. "The pill," says Rock, "is the first physiologic method of contraception and it preserves the integrity of the sex act." For these reasons, he holds that the Catholic Church should not place the pill in the same category as any other previous birth-control techniques.

While such compelling secular forces as these seem to bend the church toward a new course, there remain imposingly intractable voices that demand no retreat. If traditional church teaching and current marriage practice are in conflict, the conservatives argue, then the proper remedy is to change the practice. The opposition can be bitter, as when the Right Reverend Monsignor Francis W. Carney, of Cleveland, referred to the 74-year-old Rock, the father of 5 and the grandfather of 13, as a "moral rapist." And in England, recently, when Dr. Anne Biezanek, a Catholic general practitioner and mother of seven, opened a family-planning clinic in the working-class town of Wallasey on the Mersey, near Liverpool, her parish priest refused her the sacraments.

ORIGINAL SIN

The current conservative opposition to birth control reflects the early church fathers' views on marriage. Since the Bible offers no evidence that Adam and Eve had intercourse until after banishment from Eden, the traditionalists concluded that sex in marriage was the shameful byproduct of original sin. In the sixth century, Pope Gregory the Great declared that married couples always sin in having intercourse, not because the act itself is wrong, but because "what is licit is not kept within the bound of moderation." Seven centuries later, St. Bonaventure conceded that marital relations were good if motivated solely by the desire to have children. From this doctrine, the church derived its position that artificial devices were wrong because they frustrated the primary end of marriage.

Today, powerful voices still echo Bonaventure's strictures. The Catholic Marriage Manual, written by the Very Reverend Monsignor George A. Kelly, director of the Family Life Bureau of the New York Archdiocese, states: "The reason why artificial prevention of births is immoral is written into the very nature of the sexual organs and the marital act itself. The sex organs were made by God to reproduce the human race."

An able and personable administrator of an agency that counsels the 5 million Catholics in Metropolitan New York on their family problems, Kelly recognizes that there are sometimes grave reasons for practicing birth control, but holds that continence is the only method condoned by the church. "People can live a life of continence in marriage," he says. "But now they're being told they can use the pill and have more fun."

But physiology, as Rock says, tends to refute the argument that God had only conception in mind. Not only must the sex act take place to effect conception, but the sperm must find its way to the egg and an egg must be available for fertilization. And Rock points out that, even when an egg is available, intercourse results in conception only about 25 percent of the time.

LOVE VERSUS SEX

The church generally recognizes the enhancement of love as one of the secondary ends of marriage. This end justifies sexual intercourse as long as the biological structure of the act is not violated—by, for example, the use of a contraceptive device. In this context, Pius XI, in his 1930 "Encyclical on Christian Marriage," termed birth control "intrinsically vicious."

Advocates of the pill, however, counter that love is not subsidiary but equal to procreation as an end of marriage. Just as there is more to conception than a sex act, liberal theologians argue, there is more to marriage than a series of sex acts. Therefore, they ask, why can't conception be prevented in some cases in order to permit parents to provide better for children already born?

But the only choices morally open to Catholic couples now are partial continence—the rhythm method—or total continence. In the rhythm method, intercourse is avoided during the time of ovulation, which is usually around the 13th to the 17th day of the menstrual cycle. Since a slight rise in body temperature follows ovulation, women practicing rhythm often try to plot their fertile

period by keeping a daily temperature record with a special oral thermometer. But because such records are a rule of thumb at best, and the time of ovulation can vary widely from month to month, most couples must avoid intercourse for about a 10-day period. And even if they follow the rhythm method with reasonable care, the risk of pregnancy is still significant. According to one study, women using rhythm run twice the risk of pregnancy that women using diaphragms do.

AGREEMENT

More and more Catholic theologians are beginning to take up Rock's position that the more effective pill may be just as proper as rhythm. The one who has articulated the argument best is Canon Louis Janssens, of the Catholic University of Louvain. Just as with the rhythm method, says Janssens, the pill does not interfere with the nature and structure of intercourse. But the Belgian scholar points out that in the period immediately after childbirth, ovulation is normally suspended. If a woman, since she is not ovulating at this time, begins to take the pill she is simply helping extend a natural physical process. Janssens' conclusion, published in Ephemerides Theologicae Louvanienses, the theological journal of his university: the pills are not inherently evil. The argument is essentially what Rock has been saying all along. But what gives Janssens' words greater impact is the fact that they appeared under the auspices of Leo Josef Cardinal Suenens, of Brussels. "This is not a maverick talking," one U.S. Catholic theologian noted last week, "but a voice from the mainstream."

For his part, Rock was not happy to be labeled a "maverick." "They can't take my church away from me. It's as much mine as it is theirs," he once remarked.

"I have no martyr instinct," the white-haired physician said last week in his brown clapboard summer home in Temple, N.H., where he spends long weekends working on a new book tentatively titled "Sex, Science, and Survival." "I had no idea of having the church make an issue over the pill." But, typically Irish, he says: "I'm in this fight for good."

PIONEER

His present involvement in the birth-control fight could have been predicted a long time ago. In the 1940's he began teaching his students at Harvard Medical School how to prescribe contraceptives, but he scrupulously avoided offering them to women in his own practice. Earlier, in 1931, he was the only Catholic doctor in Massachusetts to sign a petition asking for repeal of the State's law against the sale of contraceptives. "At the time," Rock recalls, "I felt that the church should not press its views on non-Catholics."

Rock and Dr. Gregory Pincus, of the Worcester (Mass.) Foundation for Experimental Biology, began developing the oral contraceptive in the early 1950's. And the tall, always elegantly tailored Rock became a kind of advance man, describing its contraceptive effects at meetings and in medical journals. In 1958, at a meeting of obstetricians and gynecologists in Cleveland, he proposed for the first time in public that the pill should be acceptable for Catholics. "By this time," he notes, "I had become thoroughly worked up over the population problem and realized what a significant part my church's views played."

But Rock's differences with his church begin and end with the birth-control issue. He has been a devoted Catholic since he was confirmed at the Church of the Immaculate Conception in Marlborough, near Boston. Rock was one of five children. His father, who traced his ancestry to County Armagh, owned a successful liquor store, dabbled in real estate, and promoted the town baseball team. After graduating from Boston's High School of Commerce, Rock worked for more than a year and a half as an accountant, first with United Fruit in Guatemala, then for Stone & Webster in Woonsocket, R.I. "I was fired for incompetence from both jobs," he recalls, "so I thought I'd better go to college."

BOSTON DAYS

At Harvard, Rock hurried through the college in 3 years and entered the medical school. While an intern at Massachusetts General Hospital, he met Anna Thorndike, daughter of a professor of urology. They were married in 1925 by Boston's William Cardinal O'Connell, a close friend of the Thorndikes. "I considered it a most signal favor," says Rock, "which the cardinal rarely expressed."

Rock's wife died 3 years ago, but he still maintains their spacious gray frame home in "Pill Hill," the doctors' section of Brookline. He also has working and living quarters two blocks away at the Rock Reproductive Clinic, established after his retirement from Harvard in 1956. Here he is continuing his research on reproductive physiology and seeing women troubled with infertility. On a recent morning at the clinic, Rock was visited by the 11-year-old son of a former infertility patient. "She had asked me," Rock said, "to tell him the facts of life."

Ironically, the studies that led Rock to the birth-control pill began as a search for ways to overcome sterility. Rock was interested in progesterone, a female hormone secreted by the ovary mainly after ovulation. Progesterone thickens the lining of the uterus to prepare it to receive the ovum, if fertilization occurs. Progesterone also travels through the bloodstream to the brain where it prevents the master pituitary gland from signaling the release of another egg—in this way the body avoids overlapping pregnancies. When fertilization does not occur, the supply of progesterone diminishes and menstruation follows in the normal monthly cycle.

In the early fifties, Rock had the insight to give large doses of progesterone, combined with the female hormone estrogen, to women whose sterility, he believed, might be caused by inadequately developed wombs. During the 3 months they took the hormones, the patients underwent "false pregnancy"; they stopped ovulating and menstruating. When treatment was stopped, the "sterile" women went back to their normal cycles and almost one in every five became pregnant soon after.

REBOUND

A short time later, Pincus and Rock got together to see if new synthetic hormones would work with Rock's patients. The drugs, which were effective in much smaller doses than natural progesterone, stopped ovulation and, when withdrawn, increased fertility, a rebound effect that meant the pills not only prevented babies in women who didn't want them but also helped those that did want babies. In 1956, Rock and Pincus began field trials to test the pill's effectiveness as a contraceptive. The trials involved women in Puerto Rico, Haiti, and Brookline. The trials proved beyond doubt that the pill is the best contraceptive yet devised. In nearly every case where an accidental pregnancy has occurred, the woman, it turned out, had simply skipped her pills.

Because of the proved dependability of the contraceptive pills, they are big business in the United States. When Chicago's G. D. Searle introduced Enovid for birth control in 1960, about 225,000 women began to use it. Today, Searle executives claim Enovid has 2.5 million users. The second birth-control pill, Ortho-Novum (Ortho Pharmaceutical Corp.), was introduced in 1962 and is now used by almost a million women. And last spring, Parke, Davis began distribution of Norlestrin, and Syntex Laboratories marketed Norinyl. These contain a smaller dose of hormones than the original pills did, and both Enovid and Ortho-Novum are now available in the less expensive low dose.

CALENDAR

The pills must be taken faithfully for 20 days each month. To help women keep to the schedule, Enovid now comes in a 20-pill calendar packet with a space for the user to write down the day and date as she removes each pill. Even more ingenious is Ortho's "DialPak." (End of article.) But even these innovations can't prevent accidents, some of them due to ignorance rather than forgetfulness. A Philadelphia man complained to Searle that his wife became pregnant even though he took the pills regularly.

Aside from its effectiveness when properly used, the pill seems also to have dramatically reduced the fears, inhibitions, and apprehensions connected in many young women's minds with sex. "Some young girls call it the magic pill," says Dr. Freda Kehm of Chicago's Association for Family Living. Dr. Seymour Sholder, a Chicago gynecologist, agrees that the pill has improved married life. "Frigidity is often caused by fear of pregnancy; with that gone, so too is the frigidity." Monsignor Kelly's fears are justified: sex is more fun with oral contraceptives.

Indeed, the simplicity with which the pill can be used makes some observers worry about its effect on sexual behavior outside marriage. Not only might it foster promiscuity, Dr. Kehm notes, but it is being used on college campuses in a kind of psychological warfare: "The girl tells the boy she is using the pill when she really is not—then she traps him."

Such reports strengthen churchly concern. The birth-control pills and immorality are often linked in the minds of church conservatives. "Once you say there's no clear-cut moral law on the subject," says Kelly, "then you're saying sexuality has an autonomy all its own."

But in groping for a new interpretation of the traditional church attitude on birth control, the liberals stress the need of giving Catholic couples the autonomy—and the responsibility—for deciding how to enrich their family lives. "Each couple," Canon Janssens notes, "have to ask themselves in conscience what, in their particular circumstances, is the generous measure of fecundity to be achieved."

Meanwhile, John Rock interpreted Pope Paul's statement in Rome last week to mean that the church would put new emphasis on individual conscience, permitting Catholics to make their own careful judgment about the pill. "I have no doubt," Rock concluded with satisfaction, "that the final statement will leave the well-formed conscience of the parents as the final determinant."

CONCLUSIONS

In Rome, Vatican watchers prognosticated that the problem of family planning will be part of "the church in the modern world," the monumental draft schema to be considered by the Vatican Council when it reconvenes in September. And mild-mannered Father Bernard Häring, secretary to the 15-member committee working on the schema, seemed certain last week that the council would clarify "at least the basic principles" of church policy on birth control. "Family and population problems will be faced," Häring said when reached in Collegeville, Minn., where he was conducting a retreat at St. John's University. "The whole spirit of the council assures that it will not be a superficial consideration." But even if the

council fails to act, the conclusions that Paul spoke of could come in a new papal decree.

The debate over the pill may end there, but the larger issues it represents undoubtedly will continue. The spectacle of the church leadership following its flock and responding to pressures from below cannot soon be forgotten. If the church can be likened to a ship, its members can also be ranked like sailors, officers, commanders, and captains. In every aspect of the church's life—liturgy, unification, education—the winds of renewal and reform blow strong.

But the strongest pressure comes from the millions of rank-and-file married laymen who are pounding on the door of doctrine, anxious to take their long-forgotten seats among popes, bishops, and theologians as rightful participants in the church's magisterium.

A PILL A DAY

Some Roman Catholics couples call the church-approved rhythm method of birth control "Vatican roulette." In the same light manner, the wheel above can be termed "contraceptive roulette." The little white pills along the rim are one type of the new female and oral-contraceptive pills; the inner disk with the calendar days on it can be rotated so that one pill pops up on each of the 20 days during the month that the drug must be taken. Skipping a day, the user is reminded, could mean an unwanted pregnancy.

The pills contain synthetic female hormones and prevent ovulation by acting on the brain centers that trigger the release of the egg from the ovary to the Fallopian tubes—the same way the body's hormones stop ovulation during pregnancy.

Schedule

Pills must be taken from the 5th through the 24th day of the 28-day cycle (ovulation occurs around the 15th). Menstruation occurs a few days after pill taking stops. Then, on the day five, the user begins the next month's schedule. To make sure they stick to the schedule, many women keep their pills next to the toothpaste on the bathroom sink or beside the kitchen range. Some doctors advise taking the drug with a meal.

The pills are marketed by four drug firms in the United States (the "DialPak" shown above is supplied by Ortho Pharmaceutical Corp. for its pill, OrthoNovum). A month's supply of pills—which are sold by prescription only—ranges from about $2 to $2.25 in the United States. Prices abroad are also modest.

[From the New Republic, July 4, 1964]

DEBATE ON BIRTH CONTROL

(By Michael J. O'Neill)

The Vatican's Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani has called for a moratorium in the public controversy over the morality of oral contraceptives. The conservative secretary of the Congregation of the Holy Office says "It is not pleasing to the Holy See that one or another local authority express doctrinal concepts on debated questions, which rather require central direction, since * * * in these matters it is necessary to preserve unity of thought and expression." His warning was addressed specifically to the recent statement of Belgium's Leo Cardinal Suenens that science is close to perfecting a family planning pill which the church will be able to accept. But his caution was also aimed at widespread speculation that Rome may soon change its basic teachings on birth control.

Many Catholics are already in revolt against these teachings. A national survey has disclosed that 30 percent of Catholic couples in the United States use contraceptive techniques condemned by the Vatican, and many others are submitting only grudgingly to its dicipline. The old natural law arguments are being challenged by such eminent Catholic theologians as Canon Louis Janssens of the University of Louvain who argues that the oral contraceptives are just as justifiable morally as the rhythm method which the Church endorses.

Catholic intellectuals in this country are hostile. Daniel Callahan, associate editor of the Commonweal, for example, has publicly attacked the Jesuit theologians John C. Ford and Gerald Kelly who attempt to steer a middle course between the conservatives and liberals in their "Contemporary Moral Theology: Marriage Questions" (Newman Press, 1963). Although they recognize conjugal love as a legitimate end of marriage, not just a necessary evil to be tolerated only in the act of procreation as St. Augustine claimed, Fathers Ford and Kelly also resolutely reject contraception. "The church is so completely committed to the doctrine that contraception is intrinsically and gravely immoral," they write, "that no substantial change in this teaching is possible. It is irrevocable."

Callahan charges that their treatise fails to deal forthrightly with the pressing needs of modern Christian marriage which recognizes the personal values as well as biological necessity of conjugal love and which emphasizes the adequate education of children rather than just their conception. He suggests that the restraint of the two moralists is prompted by fear that any substantial change in Catholic teaching "would have disastrous consequences for the church's claim to teach with authority." But he counters that "no theologian today can be expected to be understood if he continues to argue that the primacy of the species takes precedence over the personal good of individuals," and "if he says that one must accept a doctrine or a law on the basis of authority alone."

The U.S. hierarchy is sensitive to the hardships which couples must often endure to comply with the church's decree, Msgr. George W. Casey, pastor of a parish in Lexington, Mass., and a columnist for the Boston Pilot, recently wrote that "the inexorability of the law and the implacability of some experts who expound it seem almost heartless." He was especially stricken by the tragedy of women condemned by nature to deliver defective infants if they become pregnant.

The practical though long-delayed response of the American bishops has been to adopt a more positive attitude toward the value of sex and love in marriage, to urge rather than merely permit intelligent family regulation, and to champion the use of the rhythm method as an alternative to artificial contraception. The Family Life Bureau of the National Catholic Welfare Conference sponsors a nationwide educational program covering everything from teenage petting to family planning.

On another front, the church is vigorously pressing studies aimed at perfecting the rhythm method, which is anything but foolproof. Georgetown University's new Center for Population Research, for example, is collecting data from thousands of women in an attempt to develop accurate information on averages, or "normal," fertility-infertility cycles. This would not only improve the rhythm technique but, quite possibly, provide guidelines for the use of cycle-regulating drugs. Catholic theologians generally agree that the temporary use of such drugs would be morally justified since the purpose would be to regularize cycles in cases where the use of rhythm is otherwise difficult or impossible. Contraception, if it occurred, would then be a secondary result rather than a directly intended primary act. The unsettled question, apart from the fact that a clearly acceptable cycle-regulating drug hasn't yet appeared, is how narrowly or broadly the church might define a "normal" cycle and what terms it might set for a compound's use.

Indications are that the third session of the Vatican Council, which convenes in September, will fail to resolve the issue in any definitive way. But a draft declaration on family and parenthood asserts the personal values of conjugal love, rejecting the Augustine tradition, and accepts the proposition that family limitation may be both necessary and good. For the moment, artificial contraception remains formally condemned. The employment of oral contraceptive drugs for the specific purpose of preventing children is forbidden. But the theological debates over other potential uses of drugs in family regulation continue unabated, despite Cardinal Ottaviani.

[From Look magazine, July 14, 1964]

LATIN AMERICAN CATHOLICS AND BIRTH CONTROL

(By Leonard Gross)

An unpublicized campaign for birth control is underway in Latin America with the acquiescence and measured support of key elements of the Roman Catholic Church. The campaign is provoked by a shocking discovery: staggering rates of criminal abortion. It is underscored by a brutal projection: Without birth control, Latin America, which cannot nourish its 220 million people now, will have three times as many mouths to feed within 35 years.

Though the campaign is in its early stages, its importance cannot be overestimated. Birth control, by rigid tradition, has been the unspeakable subject in Latin America, to a point where the secular leaders not only feared to discuss it with the church, but refused to discuss it with one another. That point has been passed, so suddenly and easily that population specialists are now wondering whether the great controversy the issue was expected to provoke will ever occur. So marked, in fact, has been the willingness of some cardinals and bishops to discuss their position that observers now ask whether Latin American governments have used the church as an excuse for not confronting the issue themselves. One U.S. authority has said, "The official groups are giving the Catholic Church the rap for something that was not its fault. The church is dying to get into this."

This story, which involves almost every Latin American republic, is the product of a search that began a year ago. It is based on more than a score of new studies and reports, and dozens of long conversations with social scientists, doctors and priests. They speak with urgency, because they believe that only public awareness will create the climate essential to an all-out attack on Latin America's primary problem. But they speak gingerly, regretfully, cautiously, mindful of the passions they might unleash. At their insistence, part of this story must be told without names or details that identify them. But what they say, taken together with the accumulating data on attitudes, abortions and population problems, concretizes the theoretical arguments over contraception now swirling through Christendom. These arguments were recognized on May 27 by the publication of an article in the official Vatican journal, L'Osservatore della Domenica, which suggested that the church might reexamine its position in the light of new discoveries about birth-control pills.

The reaction takes several forms. At its heart is an attempt by influential Latin American clerics to disabuse Catholics of the widely held notion that the church opposes birth control, per se.

Until quite recently, clerics had rarely if ever discussed the subject openly. Conservative priests had argued effectively that

discussion would make Catholics aware of the need for birth control and unwittingly encourage them to adopt means unsanctioned by the church. Now, there is evidence that church progressives seem willing to take the risk.

The evidence is found in citations by priests of Pope Pius XII's statement that strong economic and social reasons can relieve Catholic couples of the obligation to have children; in the publication of criticisms by priests of the idea that Catholics must have all the children that God sends them; and in the willingness of priests to have a dialog with family planning groups.

Publicly, priests carefully point out that birth control should be achieved only by the church-approved natural rhythm method. Privately, however, some of them deplore this method as ineffective, particularly among the uneducated. One well-placed priest says flatly:

"Our people badly need birth limitation. We should have been working years and years ago to find a solution. Up to now, no solution has been found. I deny strongly from the scientific point of view that there has been found a real method to check the world's population problem." He sees the rhythm system as presently unworkable for people who cannot read or count, and other contraceptive systems—the moral issue aside—as too expensive. "The Catholic Church sees the need for control. Why doesn't it talk about it? Because it has no answer. And that's where the church is guilty. The church must say clearly that limitation of birth is a duty."

This widely felt sense of responsibility may explain a second type of clerical reaction to the problem.

Workers in Latin American birth-control programs report that they have not met a single instance of resistance by the church, even though they are introducing forbidden contraceptive techniques. One doctor, the head of a hospital where women who request intrauterine devices are being fitted with them, reports indirect word from the church that it would not object. "There's an unwritten agreement. We don't bother them. They don't bother us. If we advertise in the papers, we've got a fight on our hands, but if we rely on word of mouth, we've got plenty of work to do." Another doctor said to a North American colleague: "We consulted our spiritual authorities, and they told us, 'We aren't going to approve it, but we aren't going to oppose it.'"

An executive of the authoritative New York-based Population Council sums up the present Latin American situation: "You can't say you're doing it. You just go ahead and do it." Both sides, he reports, are seeking to avoid "a dramatic confrontation."

A third form of reaction by clerics shows up on the parish level. One young Chilean priest, whose work is mainly among slum dwellers, admits, "It's really difficult to be too strict with them on matters like that when you see how they live." In various parts of Latin America, some priests are reported, on the highest authority, to be so disturbed by the ravages of amateur abortions that they consider contraceptives the lesser evil. A physician in charge of a family planning center in Mexico reports frequent referrals by priests. "The priest who sends the woman recommends treatment to cure her 'irregularity.' But he knows that what we are going to do is plan her family. There are many of these priests. Usually, they are from the slums."

A similar report comes from another doctor interested in family planning. He says: "To have a child when you want to have a child, when you are in love, that is the most beautiful thing. The young priests understand this. From them, we receive an indirect authorization. The priest says to the lady who's had difficulty: 'Go to the physician. Perhaps he can resolve your problem.' You feel the backing to take a wider attitude."

A professor at a Catholic hospital, he explains:

"I am a physician not only for Catholics. I know as a Catholic I haven't the right to impose my ideas on people who don't think as I think. It would not be correct if I taught only Catholic ideas. I am a scientist.

"We have a department for instruction in the licit method. The physicians who attend this department are Catholics. And we have a department for illicit methods. This is attended by physicians who are not Catholics."

The choice of method, this doctor stresses, is left to the individual. "We wash our hands. It is not our decision. I cannot say, 'You can't do that.' It is a position of you inside. Although we are both Catholics, we have different ideas.

"I know that many in the United States will say that this is hypocrisy. We do the best we can with an open mind and heart. I am not in contact with the church on this problem. You're obliged to make a decision when you have strong responsibility."

Like many of his colleagues, this doctor believes that the church's position on oral contraceptives has not been made clear. He says, "Where the position is not clear, the Catholic has the right to use his own judgment."

This viewpoint is becoming more common within the church itself. One cardinal, asked for his opinion about oral contraceptives, replied, "I leave that to my technicians." His "technicians," young priests, mostly Jesuits, are inclining to the theory that pills can be used licitly to assure the success of the rhythm method.

"But, gentlemen," a puzzled visitor asked the priests, "you realize that if you use the pills, you don't need the rhythm method?"

"That's true, isn't it," was one priest's nonplussed reply.

Doctors report great expectations among priests for change in interpretation of natural law that will make oral contraceptives licit. They are closely following the debate among Catholic theologians on this point.

In Colombia, a study published last year by R. P. Jaime Salazar, S.J., cites numerous instances in which pills might be used to delay menstruation at inconvenient times. An example: A girl who "set the date of her marriage precisely during the days of her period."

One Latin American cardinal confided, "We must go with the church concept today, but we must be ready for a change tomorrow."

The most open declaration of clerical support for pills came 2 months ago in Mensaje, an influential Jesuit magazine published in Santiago. Its editors—priests—argue that progestogene synthetic pills, which inhibit ovulation, but do not destroy any egg, are permissible. Progestogene, say these priests, is simply a duplication by man of the natural substance progesterone, which the female body begins to produce, once an egg is fertilized, in order to prevent further ovulation. This natural "protection" continues through pregnancy and lactation.

The nub of the argument of these priests is that such protection can and should be taken over by man after the child is weaned. By limiting family size, man increases the likelihood of a humane setting for the child. Says the article:

"The child is not only a body, but a human being, which has to be fed, dressed, educated, etc. Nature, in its intrinsic dynamism, tends to insure the future of that child, logically as far as she can. Will it then be illicit that man, making use of his intelligence, supports, insures and prolongs this direction of nature? Of course not.

"Taking off from the base that parents not only have to procreate but make possible the normal human development of their children, the church accepts the regulation of births. It is this that is called, and rightly so, responsible procreation. Why then not accept the use of the progestogenes that do nothing but supplement and carry forward the natural dynamism of nature?"

There are several explanations for these changing attitudes. The first is the church's recognition in recent years of Latin America's economic plight, and its determination to do something about it. The population explosion is an integral part of that problem. So fast is the population growing that the area must triple its real income in the next 35 years just to maintain an inadequate standard of living. The "unproductive" population—children 15 and under—is so large that three out of every four available dollars must be spent on schools and health services. Only the fourth dollar can be used to raise per capita production and income.

A Guatemalan physician, Dr. Enrique Castillo Arenales, grimly describes the resulting problem: "We see daily families of 10 or more children who live in one room with no hygienic conditions whatsoever; here, the income, if any, is not more than $20 to $30 a month; they come to the same hospital for their deliveries where they have two more children suffering from anemia or malnutrition in the pediatrics department."

A second explanation for the acquiescent attitude of some priests relates to a recent discovery: Latin America's unbelievable rate of abortions. The dimensions of this problem were not fully realized until a report, given at a conference last year, estimated that there were 129,000 abortions in Chile in 1961. A participant recalls, "It dropped like a bombshell. They all went home and looked up their own records."

Abortion estimates vary widely. One country, Uruguay, produced a figure of three abortions for every live birth. Other nations with a higher birthrate estimate just the opposite—one abortion for every three live births. A new study completed in Santiago adds to the evidence. Of 1,890 women interviewed at random, 26 percent had had criminal abortions. A majority of these women had had several. Fifteen women alone accounted for 187 criminal abortions—13 percent of the total. On the basis of these findings, there were 25,000 criminal abortions in Santiago in 1962. A survey director, Tegualda Monreal, says, "We think it is quite representative. The results could be related to other cities."

Realism provides a third reason for the clerical attitude. There is ample proof that most Latin American families want to limit the number of their children, and are willing to violate church doctrine to do so.

It has always been assumed that lower class families in Latin America have more children than upper class families because they want them. Research has now riddled this assumption. A survey in Lima by J. Mayone Stycos, director of Cornell's International Population Program, shows that while the upper classes consider four children ideal, the lower classes want three children or less. Says Stycos, "If you ask 'Would you rather not have two of your children?' of course, they answer no. But if you ask, 'If you had it to do all over again, how many children would you have?' they give you a number less than the number they have.

"Studies of Catholics in Puerto Rico, Peru, Santiago, Chile, and Mexico City show the lower classes to be overwhelmingly in favor of having small families, and * * * generally favorable toward birth control when they know what it is."

In a survey in Chile, two-fifths of the women queried said they were in favor either of complete freedom or birth control for

families with low income; two-fifths favored birth control for those whose health might be endangered, and only one-fifth were unalterably opposed to birth control. Ninety-two percent of the women questioned were Catholic.

Ninety-one percent of women surveyed in Guatemala "expressed a desire to space their pregnancies and sought contraceptive information, especially regarding sterilization," Roberto Santiso, head of the department of gynecology at Latin American Hospital, reported last year.

Contraception is widely practiced by the upper classes. One physician said that he could name at least one woman in each of 14 prominent families in El Salvador who had been fitted with an intrauterine device.

A new seven-city survey by the U.N.'s Latin-American Demographic Center is now nearing completion. Preliminary findings suggest that the conclusions of earlier studies will be confirmed. Even in Rio de Janeiro, where two-thirds of the women interviewed said they would not take oral contraceptives, most explained that the pills might make them sick. Few mentioned religion.

Carmen Miró, director, and Jorge Somoza, of the U.N.'s center, state: "The persistence of an elevated level of fecundity cannot be attributed to the predominantly Catholic condition of the population, but to the backward economic and social situation. If the obstacles that impede development were removed * * * the religion of the people would not be an impediment to a reduction in the elevated rate of reproduction."

Whatever the reasons for the clerical attitude, the climate for an attack on the population problem has never been better. A few years ago, only El Salvador and Mexico sent delegates to a regional conference of the International Planned Parenthood Federation. This year, all Latin American nations were represented. Standing among them at an animated gathering, a U.S. delegate exclaimed, "Five years ago, a year ago, a meeting like this would have been impossible. These delegates openly representing their country? Never."

Ofelia Mendoza, a field director of the International Planned Parenthood Federation, told the delegates: "The first family planning association was established in Mexico City in 1958. All its activities have been very quiet. The contraceptive services have been given at private clinics.

"In contrast with the caution of this first Mexico City attempt, all the associations which have been established since 1961 have started their activities in the open, and their efforts have been toward the establishment of contraceptive services in public hospitals. Six countries have been successful in their efforts.

"Up to the present time, none of these activities have suffered official government or church opposition and have received enthusiastic support from medical and other professional groups. Of course, there are some priests, nuns, and lay people, including physicians, who made criticisms based on personal, moral, religious, and political beliefs."

In Honduras, the director of the nation's largest hospital has allowed the Honduran Planned Parenthood Association the use of all the hospital's maternal and prenatal clinic facilities for the establishment of a family-planning service. The association intends to provide contraceptive services at the hospital and through medical teams in the slums. It notes that "all contraceptives will be used to meet the medical, social-economic, and religious needs of the clients."

Now the Alliance for Progress has cautiously entered the field. Recent legislation authorizes the Alliance to do population research. But the agency has to move with caution.

"We have to go around and get the groups talking to one another," a high Alliance official explains. "We're down there like innocents, saying, 'Oh, are you interested in this? Why, perhaps we can help you.'"

Early this year, the Alliance ordered field offices to establish information programs "especially designed to alert the more elite groups in Latin America, specifically university professors, Government officials, Army and labor leaders, city and rural planners."

It is not only religious sensibilities that must be respected. The U.S. presence in the population field is certain to raise cries of "imperialism" from Communists and nationalists. Both factions see in the plans for population control a scheme by the powerful nations to keep them dependent.

"The most important thing the United States can do," says Dr. Stycos, "is to see that Latin American leaders are informed about population dynamics and seriously discuss avenues for affecting population growth."

Should the elite groups become sufficiently aware of the problem, then, in the opinion of Dr. Dudley Kirk of the Population Council, "within 5 years, you'll begin to see some effects."

The conservatives in the Catholic Church have yet to react to new developments. Should present trends continue, however, the battle for birth control in Latin America will not be between the church and society, but between enlightenment and ignorance. Says Giorgio Mortara, an eminent Brazilian demographer, "It is important now to show the need for birth control. Whether it is possible to put into effect in Latin America is the second step. Once a need is shown, a way will be found."

THE EARTHQUAKE'S CONSEQUENCES ON ALASKA'S KENAI PENINSULA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, while the Office of Emergency Planning, under the dynamic leadership of Edward McDermott, and the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska, under the chairmanship of Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, are working with might and main to restore Alaska as rapidly as possible, the fact remains that the full extent of the earthquake damage, its latent and indirect effects, have still to be appreciated, and much remains to be done.

Pertinent is a statement from the Chamber of Commerce of Soldotna, a relatively new community, which has sprung up on the Kenai Peninsula. The statement points to the depressing economic effects of the earthquake on that previously promising and progressing region.

I call this matter to the attention of all concerned with the program and problems of Alaska's rehabilitation, and ask unanimous consent that the statement by M. L. Grange, president of the Greater Soldotna Chamber of Commerce, which gives a lot of pertinent facts, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

STATEMENT OF ECONOMIC CONDITIONS ON THE KENAI PENINSULA, JUNE 16, 1964

I. INTRODUCTION

Although the Kenai Peninsula did not suffer a great deal of physical damage as a result of the earthquake, this area has been vastly affected economically, and adversely so. The economic effect has been the same as if the area had received severe physical damage—people out of work and many businesses readily reaching the point of insolvency.

Unfortunately, the areas of little physical damage will not benefit but indirectly from the many State and Federal recovery programs. The greatest portion of the peninsula will not be aided by reconstruction projects.

Loss of the full use of the road to Anchorage is a major cause of the present economic straits of the peninsula. Severe limitations on travel to and from the peninsula for the remainder of the year will greatly decrease the tourist traffic to a negligible trickle. Supply costs to the peninsula will increase and further depress an already harassed economy.

At a regular meeting of the Soldotna Chamber of Commerce held on June 16, 1964, the following statements were made by business persons representing Homer, Coopers Landing, Ninilchik, Anchor Point, North Kenai, Sterling, and Soldotna.

II. STATEMENTS OF LOCAL BUSINESSMEN

Grocery retailer: "My business is down in gross 38 percent from 1963. Also, I can't get the merchandise when I need it and at favorable prices."

Motel, bar, and cafe: "We've had next to no tourists to date. Business is way off and, where I employed six last year, this year I have two employees."

Hardware and building supply retailer: "From last year April is off 48 percent, May down 14 percent, and June so far is down 54 percent. I had planned for an additional employee, but not now."

Fishing lodge and grocery: "Gross business is down 30 to 40 percent from 1963. Had it not been for some business from the road crews, business would have really been bad."

Cafe: "Last year I had two cooks and one waitress working full time. This year there's only me and I still may not make it."

Electric co-op: "Manager stated that for the first time since 1957 their growth and extension of service has stopped and actually declined."

Cafe, gifts, smokehouse: "Owner says there's no business at all. She says her business is dependent on the tourists and there aren't any."

Building supply: "I normally have a lot of traffic from outside of the peninsula but have none this year. My gross is off 15 percent from last year."

Auto repair: "My gross is a little better than last year but my profit is way down because parts and equipment is more expensive to ship it."

Motel and fish camps: "Normally I'm pretty well full, even during the week, but this year I haven't been full one weekend and have no traffic during the week."

Bar and rest: "Gross sales are off 70 percent from 1963. Normally I hire two people at this time of year but I'm working by myself this year."

Retail gas station: "Business down about 50 percent. We need some long-term low-interest money to refinance."

Laundromat: "My business has nothing much to do with the tourist trade but my gross is down 25 to 30 percent from 1963."

Doctor: "We are doing 30 to 40 percent less work and yet our accounts receivable are forever climbing. People just don't have the money to pay."

Printer: "Business is down 30 percent and I'd had to lay off three employees. Erratic

supply of materials which missed deadlines have caused me to lose several customers. I also had to cancel my plans to expand the shop."

Retail dairy: "The earthquake eliminated some competition but I'm selling less milk to fewer people. I've had to extend my routes to sell a bigger volume and in doing so have increased my costs."

Gas station: "I just recently bought this business. We used to employ five people full time and now I have only one full-time employee. I had to cut my service to the public from 24 hours to 16 hours."

Large volume retail grocer: "My volume is only off 8 percent from 1963, but our net profit is nonexistent. We had planned for a big expansion program in 1965 but our plans are undecided now."

Local banker: "There is no question that the earthquake resulted in a serious decline in all business activity on the peninsula. Our problem now is to seek ways of acquiring longer term moneys for business and provide funds to restore depleted working capital."

Fishing lodge: "My business is down 80 percent from 1963 and the rate of decrease gets worse each week."

Clothing retailer: "My business is off about 25 percent from 1963. Normally it picks up by now but hasn't so far this year."

Movie theater: Gross ticket sales are down some 60 percent from 1963.

Appliance retailer and serviceman: "My sales are actually a little better than last year, but my collection on accounts is terrible."

Building supply: "My business is down to where I can't really afford to pay myself. I laid off my last employee yesterday."

Drugstore: "My volume is about the same, but I do the greatest amount of business on a credit basis and my only recent growth is in accounts receivable."

General store: "Sales are down 25 percent and each day more old cash customers are requesting credit."

III. SUMMARY

We all know that the earthquake has severely damaged the peninsula from an economic standpoint. This damage could become permanent if steps are not taken to ease the present strain that threatens to wipe out the many steps forward that the peninsula has achieved to date.

The State can help by giving restoration of the highway to the peninsula the highest priority. Also, all other proposed and approved projects should be given the full go-ahead—the North Kenai Road extension and the addition of new trails and campground facilities.

The Federal Government can help by formally declaring this area an economic disaster area and providing financing under such disaster loan programs as the Small Business Administration. Also additional improvements that are needed in the Moose Range should be authorized at this time with work to commence in 1964.

The incorporated statements of several businessmen of the peninsula are simple statements of fact. They were not rehearsed and I daresay we could have filled many more pages with similar statements. We are not asking for any handout type program and fully expect to pay for the help we receive. However, we recognize a problem and are soliciting the aid and cooperation of both our our own State government and the Federal Government in the solution of this problem.

GREATER SOLDOTNA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
M. L. GRANGE, *President*.

ACTION OF CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on June 29 remarks were made in this Chamber that suggested that the action of the conference committee on the Interior Department appropriations bill allowed itself to be used as a vehicle for the settling of personal grievances of one Member of the House, the Honorable MIKE KIRWAN, of Ohio.

It was alleged in those remarks that an item of $203,600 added by the Senate for rehabilitation of the Berlin National Fish Hatchery in New Hampshire was deleted in conference because Mr. KIRWAN had objected to the votes of some Members of the New Hampshire delegation on other appropriations matters.

Mr. President, I was a member of that conference committee and I think that in fairness to Mr. KIRWAN it should be noted that this action by the House conferees and its approval by the conference committee is entirely in line with past procedures on similar matters. It should be noted that no hearings were conducted in either the House or the Senate on the factors behind this appropriation, nor was this item included in the President's budget.

Indeed, Mr. President, in an almost similar circumstance, a $300,000 appropriation for the control of predatory animals and injurious rodents was added to the fish and wildlife budget at the request of the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who was a member of the conference committee. Since this item, as was the case in the New Hampshire item, was not budgeted nor subject to hearings by either Senate or House committees, it, too, was deleted at the insistence of the House conferees.

Mr. President, I have worked on many appropriations matters with the gentleman from Ohio and I am proud to say that on all I have found him to be most agreeable and truly concerned that the committees and the Congress discharge their function in appropriating public moneys in the most efficient and effective way possible.

Mr. President, we, who represent Western States, where the Federal Government is involved in large-scale public works and rehabilitation measures have found MIKE KIRWAN to be a strong and effective proponent of those measures designed to overcome the obstacles of nature that stand in the path of development of our resources. I commend him for his dedication and devotion to the public welfare.

FARM PARITY DROPS TO 74 PERCENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in many respects and perhaps in all, the most important unfinished business of this Congress is to do something effective to stop the continuing decline in farm purchasing power and to correct the second-class status our farmers and ranchers now hold in our national economy as reflected in the fact that according to the Department of Agriculture the cost-price imbalance for agriculture became so serious that the farm parity ratio is now only 74 percent—the lowest point it has reached since the depression years of the late thirties. This glaring disparity between what the farmers receive for their products and what they must pay for their purchases has reached the alarming point of an emergency situation.

Mr. President, this administration rode to victory in 1960 in part because of its pledge to provide "better times for farmers" and its promise to provide more income for farmers and its campaign orators held out the hope of 100 percent parity for agriculture if the Democratic Party came to power. What does the record show? Its own democratically controlled Department of Agriculture in its current monthly release on "Agricultural Prices" demonstrates dramatically the failure of this administration to fulfill those pledges. Instead of "better times for farmers," farm parity has dropped to a new low for the past quarter of a century. During the last month of the Eisenhower administration, December 1960, parity was at 81 percent and it has been steadily dropping under the pressure of Democrat import and farm policies until it has now fallen to 74 percent.

Comparing the Republican farm years with the Democrat farm years, Mr. President, presents an even more melancholy picture from the standpoint of the American farmer and rancher. During the first 7 years of the Eisenhower administration, farm parity ranged from 81 percent to 92 percent of parity and only in the last Eisenhower years because of a national bumper crop did farm parity ever drop below 80 percent. Thus under the Democrat administration, farm parity has been averaging from 8 percent to 10 percent lower than during the Republican years and its present low level of 74 percent is a full 18 percent below the high point obtained during the Republican administration.

Mr. President, to demonstrate how steadily and seriously our farm situation is deteriorating in this country, let me call your attention to the following table of farm parity ratios during the past 4 years, including the month of June of 1964:

Farm parity ratio

[December 1960: 81]

	1961	1962	1963	1964
January	80	80	78	78
February	81	80	78	77
March	80	80	77	77
April	80	79	78	75
May	78	79	77	75
June	78	78	77	74
July	78	79	79	------
August	80	80	78	------
September	80	81	77	------
October	80	80	77	------
November	79	79	77	------
December	79	79	76	------
Annual average	80	79	------	------

Mr. President, turning now to the yearly averages of our farm parity ratios, taking June of each year as the testing point, I call attention in the following table to the fact we started with a farm parity ratio of 92 percent in the Republican year of 1953 and call attention to the steady decline under the present policies of our Department of Agriculture under Secretary Freeman:

Price parity ratio since June 1953 USDA

June 1953	92
June 1954	88
June 1955	85
June 1956	85
June 1957	81
June 1958	85
June 1959	81
June 1960	78
June 1961	78
June 1962	78
June 1963	77
June 1964	74

REAL PARITY AT 1934 LEVELS

Mr. President, to further point up the economic distress in which the farmer finds himself, the Washington Farmletter for July 3, 1964, and I consider this publication to be one of the most reliable farm letters in Washington, states that if Secretary of Agriculture Freeman had not manipulated the parity formula by including Government payments as part of the "adjusted parity ratio" that parity would actually show that it has reached its lowest point since 1934. Thus after 30 years the farmer finds himself paritywise exactly where he was back in the dark days of the depression of the 1930's.

Mr. President, I quote the paragraphs from the Washington Farmletter published by Wayne Darrow for July 3, 1964, which sets forth the parity decline in which the farmer finds himself:

Parity: The old parity ratio (patched up 14 years ago with a complex "modern parity") dropped in June to 74 percent, the lowest in 25 years. USDA said the 1-point drop in June was due to a 48-cent-a-bushel decline in wheat prices in the transition to lower levels. In weightings in parity index, wheat accounts for 6.9 percent of price received index.

When Government payments are taken into account, as they are now in USDA's new once-a-year "adjusted parity ratio," the parity ratio for 1963—and now—is the lowest since 1934. Government payments as a percent of cash farm receipts are increasing—in 1963 were 4.83 percent of cash receipts—exceeded only six times in the 30 previous years.

NOTICE OF OPPOSITION TO THE PAGE SCHOOL

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I take the floor today briefly for the sole purpose of informing my colleagues that on tomorrow there will come before the Senate a bill which I consider of importance, and upon which there probably will be a rollcall vote. I refer to the bill, which has been reported favorably by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate, to provide for a page school. It will cost the taxpayers more than $1 million to construct the school for pages of the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the Supreme Court. In my judgment, it will be a continuing expense after that.

It happens that I was chairman of the subcommittee that held hearings on and considered this matter. It also happens that I am in the minority on the committee insofar as this bill is concerned. I voted against the construction of the school. The majority of the members of the Committee on Public Works voted to report the bill favorably, with the recommendation that it be passed.

I am simply apprising my colleagues that there is opposition to the bill. I think it is an unnecessary extravagance and is not compatible with the austerity program announced by this administration.

We have very fine pages in the Senate; but the time is coming—I think it is here now—to reappraise the situation. Originally, in 1789, a few runners were employed. Then, over 100 years ago, in 1841, Members of Congress who took an interest in certain orphan boys who were in destitute circumstances had their sympathies aroused. They were successful in having officers of the House engage the boys for service in the House. At that time, $250 was appropriated at the end of the session to pay each of the runners, now called pages.

In my judgment, consideration should be given by Senators as to whether or not it would be advisable today to employ young men and women college students, of the ages of 17 to 22, to serve instead of pages, and have them do what most Capitol elevator operators, policemen, and mail clerks do—attend universities when they are not working at their duties as pages. This would give some college students the valuable opportunity to view the work of Congress firsthand, help them to pay their way through college, and relieve Members of Congress of the responsibility for teenage boys, many of them on their own for the first time far from their parents and homes.

It is time to review the entire situation. The pages are fine boys; but at the present time their salaries amount to approximately $4,700 a year. Under the new pay raise bill, pages in the House and Senate, will receive, as compensation for their services, in excess of $5,000 per annum.

I know that, as a young lawyer with a wife and two children, and struggling to establish a practice, had I been offered a position paying me $4,700 a year, I would have been glad to take that job.

I like the pages. Each one of them is a fine boy. But there is a question as to whether we are justified in spending more than a million dollars to construct a page school. Should not we stop, look, and listen? I say we should. That is why I am apprising my colleagues of my opposition to this proposal.

Change is not necessarily reform. Further hearings should be held on this question. After all, this practice originated with the hiring of orphan boys, who then were made presents of $250 at the end of a session. It should be determined whether we are justified in embarking upon an expenditure of more than $1 million to perpetuate the present system, when a study might determine that it would be a better practice to hire college students who are somewhat older, 17 to 22, instead of those who now act as messengers or pages. Some of the boys who now act as pages would still be eligible in a few years.

In hiring those youngsters, I would not exclude the hiring of girls; I would like girls to receive the same consideration that boys would receive.

This is a serious matter. We should not undertake to spend a million dollars of taxpayers' money until we have gone more thoroughly into the question.

THE COTTON EQUALIZATION PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, earlier this year the administration announced several programs as part of its war on poverty. One was the starting of a new subsidy program for the cotton industry, under which the industry would be paid the difference between the world price and the domestic price of cotton used in American mills.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list in connection with the payment of the first $24 million under the New Frontier relief program. The report is broken down by States, as well as by recipients. It will be rather interesting to read some of the rather sizable payments being made under the administration's war on poverty.

Personally I fail to see how making these large subsidy payments to the cotton industry helps either the consumer or the farmer.

From the taxpayers' standpoint they are an expensive way of buying an election. I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated June 23, 1964, addressed to me, with the accompanying list be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, June 23, 1964.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further reply to your letter of June 12, 1964, regarding payments under the 1963–64 cotton equalization program.

We are enclosing a listing of payments under this program through June 11, 1964. We do not have in the Washington office information showing when these payments were made but they were made during May and the first 11 days of June, 1964.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH M. BIRKHEAD,
Assistant to the Secretary.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, June 15, 1964.

Individual payments, interim cotton PIK program: Following is a listing of individual payments under the interim cotton equalization payment-in-kind program through June 11, 1964. Payments which began about mid-May cover bale openings by domestic

users beginning on April 11 when the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1964 became effective. The total of payments reported through June 11 is $24,561,018.26, of which $18,977,084.14 were sight drafts and $5,583,934.12 were payment-in-kind certificates:

Name and address	Sight-draft payments	Payment-in-kind certificates
ALABAMA		
Avondale Mills, Sylacauga, Ala	$365,070.01	$471,769.05
Aliceville Cotton Mill, Inc., Aliceville, Ala	20,862.14	25,950.67
Bam Cotton Mills, Inc., Geneva, Ala	22,651.91	27,237.86
Botany Cottons, Inc., Gurney Plant, Prattville, Ala	8,871.98	
Danville Yarn Mills, Inc., Bon Air, Ala	74,423.17	
Fayette Cotton Mill, Inc., Fayette, Ala	31,341.18	44,627.76
Geneva Cotton Mills, Inc., Geneva, Ala	22,669.40	28,694.64
The Linen Thread Co., Blue Mountain, Ala	19,550.96	
Opelika Manufacturing Corp., Opelika, Ala	128,411.71	
Riverview Mills, Inc., Geneva, Ala		6,060.79
Russell Mills, Inc., Alexander City, Ala	94,732.56	113,168.44
Union Yarn Mills, Inc., Jacksonville, Ala	47,416.98	57,862.35
Victorian Furniture Corp., Post Office Box 60, Montgomery, Ala	119.99	
Siluria Mills, Inc., Siluria, Ala	26,047.06	32,217.51
Winfield Cotton Mill, Inc., Winfield, Ala	15,687.55	18,067.40
Mount Vernon Mills, Inc., Tallassee Division, Tallassee, Ala	105,483.04	
Standard-Coosa-Thatcher Co., Coosa Spinning Mill, Piedmont, Ala	48,887.73	
West Point Manufacturing Co., Fairfax, Ala	347,948.37	450,145.99
Bemis Bros. Bag Co., Talladega, Ala	78,622.96	
Pepperell Manufacture Co., Opelika, Ala	54,198.17	69,784.46
West Boylston Manufacturing Co., Montgomery, Ala	31,517.26	
Handley Mills, Roanoke, Ala	57,555.68	
Anniston Manufacturing Co., Anniston, Ala	56,101.11	
Lowenstein Cotton & Storage Corp., Box 470, Anderson, S.C	108,758.00	133,407.36
Opp Cotton Mills, Opp, Ala	33,361.83	
Micolas Cotton Mills, Opp, Ala	98,552.87	
Adelaide Mills, Inc., Post Office Box 1320, Anniston, Ala	23,739.95	31,641.48
The Kendall Co., Albertville plant, Albertville, Ala	17,286.42	23,977.91
Cowikee Mills, Post Office Box 422, Eufaula, Ala	72,940.78	95,690.77
Wehadkee Yarn Mills, Box 150, West Point, Ga	9,358.50	14,629.87
Dan River Mills, Inc., Post Office Box 261, Danville, Va		143,640.55
Samson Cordage Works, Anniston, Ala	6,698.64	
Wehadkee Yarn Mills, Talladega, Ala	45,859.06	54,352.08
Johnson Cordage & Gin Co., Prattville, Ala	133.64	
Total	2,074,861.01	1,842,954.14
ARKANSAS		
Pinecrest Cotton Mills, Inc., Pine Bluff, Ark	8,570.25	
Crompton-Arkansas Mills, Inc., Morrilton, Ark	58,721.78	
Total	67,292.03	
CONNECTICUT		
Acme Cotton Products Co., Inc., East Killingly, Conn	1,000.87	
The American Thread Co., Inc., New York City, N.Y	10,223.52	
The Gould Products Corp., Middletown, Conn	651.10	
The Baltic Mills Co., Baltic, Conn	1,773.20	
Total	13,648.69	
GEORGIA		
Not completed.		
ILLINOIS		
Johnson & Johnson, Chicago, Ill	14,643.72	
Bear Brand Hosiery Co., Chicago, Ill	12,233.85	
Total	26,877.57	
KENTUCKY		
January & Wood Co., Maysville, Ky	7,839.65	
Louisville Textile, Inc	2,115.81	
Total	9,955.46	
MAINE		
Pepperell Mills, Biddeford, Maine	83,300.30	106,640.10
Bates Manufacturing Co., Lewiston, Maine	300,608.27	
Subtotal	383,908.57	106,640.10
Total	490,548.67	
MASSACHUSETTS		
Sagamore Manufacturing Co., Fall River, Mass	18,302.83	
United Products Cotton Co., Fall River, Mass	507.71	
Berkshire Hathaway, Inc., New Bedford, Mass	45,222.31	
The Kendall Co., Griswoldville, Mass	4,107.73	
Total	68,140.58	
MISSISSIPPI		
Erwin Mills, Inc., Durham, N.C	110,264.50	
MISSOURI		
Absorbent Cotton Co., Valley Park, Mo	30.03	
American White Cross Laboratory of Missouri, Cape Girardeau, Mo	1,386.26	
Total	1,416.29	

Name and address	Sight-draft payments	Payment-in-kind certificates
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
Chicopee Manufacturing Co., New Brunswick, N.J	$63,826.62	
NEW YORK		
Greenhaven Prison Industry, Stormville, N.Y	1,915.03	
Clinton Prison Industries, Dannemora, N.Y	2,016.50	
Total	3,931.53	
NORTH CAROLINA		
Not yet completed.		
OKLAHOMA		
Oklahoma City Mattress & Feed Co., Oklahoma City, Okla	21.32	
RHODE ISLAND		
Coats & Clark, Inc., Pawtucket, R.I	4,053.79	
Berkshire Hathaway, Inc., New Bedford, Mass	18,895.43	
Total	22,949.22	
SOUTH CAROLINA		
Not yet completed.		
TENNESSEE		
Bemis Bros. Bag Co., Bemis, Tenn	145,584.58	
Cherokee Textile Mills, Sevierville, Tenn	50,540.75	
Dixie Mercerizing Co., Chattanooga, Tenn	97,940.70	
Dyersburg Cotton Products, Inc., Dyersburg, Tenn	55,052.59	
Elk Cotton Mills, Fayetteville, Tenn	41,975.89	
Rockford Manufacturing Co., Rockford, Tenn	29,451.75	
Standard-Coosa Thatcher Co., Chattanooga, Tenn	72,942.03	
Standard Knitting Mills, Inc., Knoxville, Tenn	88,302.75	
Trenton Mills, Inc., Trenton, Tenn	13,843.30	
Werther Bag Corp., Nashville, Tenn	89,235.63	
J. P. Stevens Co., Inc., Kingsport, Tenn		$61,002.69
Subtotal	648,869.97	61,002.69
Total	745,872.66	
TEXAS		
Denison Cotton Mill Co., Denison, Tex	67,453.10	
Central Texas Development Co., West, Tex	3,603.79	
Lone Star Textiles, Inc., Mexia, Tex	37,222.64	
Red River Cotton Mills, Bonham, Tex	18,549.31	
Houston Cotton Mills Co., Houston, Tex	6,377.15	
Hillsboro Cotton Mills, Hillsboro, Tex	13,495.16	
Brenham Cotton Mill, Brenham, Tex	81,326.89	
Mission Valley Mills, New Braunfels, Tex	38,693.65	
Corsicana Cotton Mills, Corsicana, Tex	10,226.25	
Texas Department of Corrections, Huntsville, Tex	10,431.13	
Plainview Mattress Factory, Plainview, Tex	135.52	
Postex Cotton Mills, Post, Tex	50,100.04	
B. I. Cotton Mills, West, Tex	17,374.62	
Sherman Manufacturing Co., Sherman, Tex	99,351.85	
Texas Textile Mills, McKinney, Tex	110,833.64	
Houston Textile Co., Houston, Tex		10,912.52
Subtotal	565,174.74	10,912.52
Total	576,087.26	
SOUTH CAROLINA		
Abney Mills, Greenwood, S.C	235,644.87	
Alice Manufacturing Co., Easley, S.C	257,799.67	
American Thread Co., Inc., New York	87,091.87	
Arkwright Mills, Spartanburg, S.C	77,292.54	95,777.17
Bamberg Textile Mills, Bamberg, S.C	31,232.62	
Beacon Manufacturing Co., Swannanoa, N.C	24,138.92	
Blair Mills, Inc., Belton, S.C	35,788.86	
Blanche Cotton Mills, Inc., Augusta, Ga	4,508.79	
Bowling Green Spinning Co. Gastonia, N.C	29,029.38	
B & I Cotton Mills, Spartanburg, S.C	99,156.97	
Cannon Mills Co., Kannapolis, N.C	89,428.75	
Catlin Farish Co., Batesburg, S.C	28,133.30	
Cherokee Cotton Mills, Inc., Cheraw, S.C	59,581.14	
Chicopee Manufacturing Co., New Brunswick, N.J	80,304.31	
Clifton Manufacturing Co., Clifton, S.C	248,676.21	
Clinton Cotton Mills, Clinton, S.C	74,308.32	
Cone Mills Corp., Greensboro, N.C	48,577.55	
Drayton Mills, Spartanburg, S.C	16,540.42	
Fireston Textiles, Bennettsville, S.C	9,936.55	0
Franklin Process Co., Greenville, S.C	23,549.17	0
Gaffney Manufacturing Co., Gaffney, S.C	49,018.84	
Graniteville Co., Graniteville, S.C	279,395.27	382,417.68
Greenwood Mills, Greenwood, S.C	214,843.90	
Greer Manufacturing Co., Easley, S.C	24,864.45	
Hamer Spinning Mills, Hamer, S.C	28,485.08	
Hamrick Mills, Gaffney, S.C	19,896.56	
Hartsville Mill, Hartsville, S.C	13,700.18	
Hermitage Cotton Mills, Camden, S.C	19,247.54	
Highland Park Manufacturing Co., Rock Hill, S.C	39,262.79	
Inman Mills, Inman, S.C	123,634.80	166,253.48
Jackson Mills, Wellford, S.C	188,322.48	
Joanna Cotton Mills Co., Joanna, S.C	128,746.08	
Joint Research Prototype Mill, Spartanburg, S.C	12,621.83	
Judson Mills, Greenville, S.C	16,581.69	
The Kendall Co., Charlotte, N.C	195,392.40	260,816.84

Name and address	Sight-draft payments	Payment-in-kind certificates
SOUTH CAROLINA—continued		
Lockhart Mill, Lockhart, S.C.	$50,996.33	
Lowenstein Cotton & Storage Corp., Anderson, S.C.	364,124.91	
Lydia Cotton Mills, Clinton, S.C.	116,299.82	
Mackintosh Spinning Mill, Inc., Clover, S.C.	15,744.68	
Manette Mills, Inc., Lando, S.C.	857.02	
Massachusetts Mohair Plush Co., Kingsmountain, N.C.	9,700.07	
Mayfair Mills, Arcadia, S.C.	292,420.68	
Monarch Mill, Union, S.C.	106,019.35	
Mount Vernon Mills, Inc., Baltimore, Md.	193,751.43	
Musgrove Mills, Gaffney, S.C.	14,978.60	
Newberry Mills, Inc., Newberry, S.C.	66,611.67	
Orange Cotton Mills, Orangeburg, S.C.	18,707.90	
Pacolet Yarns, Greenville, S.C.	22,243.45	
Pacolet Mill, Pacolet, S.C.	73,141.31	
Parke, Davis, & Co., Greenwood, S.C.	3,953.69	
F. W. Poe Manufacturing Co., Greenville, S.C.	70,782.46	
Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc., North Charleston, S.C.	1,582.88	
Reeves Bros., Inc., Spartanburg, S.C.	158,019.14	
Riegal Textile Co., Ware Shoals, S.C.	138,850.13	
South Carolina Cotton Mills, Orangeburg, S.C.	40,161.02	
Scotland Mills, Inc., Lancaster, S.C.	26,839.34	
Spartan Mills, Spartanburg, S.C.	279,998.80	
Springs Cotton Mills, Lancaster, S.C.	782,961.12	
J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., Greenville, S.C.		$527,611.98
Townsend Cotton Mills, Anderson, S.C.	4,536.93	
United Merchants & Manufacturers, Inc., Bath, S.C.	97,432.20	
West Point Manufacturing Co., West Point, Ga.	34,720,07	
Woodside Mills, Greenville, S.C.		548,530.04
Total	5,840,446.62	1,961,407.19
VIRGINIA		
Halifax Cotton Mills, South Boston, Va.	14,860.63	
Fieldcrest Mills, Spray, N.C.	42,876.08	
Washington Mills, Fries, Va.	164,708.31	
Dan River Mills, Danville, Va.		344,622.65
Subtotal	222,445.02	344,622.65
Total	567,067.67	
GEORGIA		
J. P. Stevens Co., Inc., Atlanta, Ga.		75,642.71
Avondale Mills, Sylacauga, Ala.	25,813.71	32,375.52
Erwin Mills, Durham, N.C.	8,333.77	
Canton Cotton Mills, Canton, Ga.	89,179.09	
Calloway Mills Co., La Grange, Ga.	46,349.75	
Chicopee Manufacturing Co., Athens, Ga.	24,216.33	
Crompton Highland Mills, Griffin, Ga.	18,608.52	
Crown Cotton Mills, Dalton, Ga.	70,279.29	
Crystal Springs Bleachey, Chickamauga, Ga.	66,497.79	
Eastman Cotton Mills, Eastman, Ga.	40,597.37	
Echota Cotton Mills, Calhoun, Ga.	14,064.89	
Federal Prison Industries, Atlanta, Ga.	31,004.74	
Fitzgerald Mills Corp., Fitzgerald, Ga.	9,224.99	
Flagg-Utica Corp., Grantville, Ga.	13,204.49	
Graniteville Co., Graniteville, S.C.	111,438.79	157,491.81
Habersham Mills, Habersham, Ga.	25,607.79	
Harmony Grove Mills, Commerce, Ga.	43,976.79	
Harriet & Henderson Cotton Mill, Inc., Beryton, Ga.	33,764.83	
Imperial Cotton Mills, Eatonton, Ga.	16,699.02	
Juliette Milling Co., Macon, Ga.	7,461.48	
Klopman Mills, Inc., Greensboro, N.C.	30,696.57	
Monroe Mills, Monroe, Ga.	27,938.10	
Opelika Manufacturing Co., Hawkinsville, Ga.	15,095.53	
Pepperill Manufacturing Co., La Grange, Ga.	85,258.74	110,931.99
Piedmont Cotton Mills, East Point, Ga.	1,551.22	
Social Circle Cotton Mill, Social Circle, Ga.	20,849.53	
Strichland Cotton Mills, Valdosta, Ga.	41,111.46	
Summerville Manufacturing Co., Summerville, Ga.	19,680.11	
The American Thread Co., Dalton, Ga.	31,628.61	
The Hartwell Mill, Hartwell, Ga.	22,749.95	
Thomaston Cotton Mills, Thomaston, Ga.	144,305.91	
Union Manufacturing Co., Union Point, Ga.	3,956.09	
U.S. Rubber Co., Hogansville, Ga.	40,233.30	
Walton Cotton Mill Co., Monroe, Ga.	48,345.18	
Washington Manufacturing Co., Tenville, Ga.	14,045.72	
West Point Manufacturing Co., West Point, Ga.	105,879.47	
Whitfield Spinning Co., Dallas, Ga.	11,954.54	
Willingham Cotton Mills, Macon, Ga.	21,957.39	
Buck Creek Cotton Mills, Columbiana, Ala.	4,619.74	
Chicopee Manufacturing Co., Gainesville, Ga.	48,695.27	
The Jefferson Mills, Jefferson, Ga.	36,240.23	
Rushton Cotton Mills, Griffin, Ga.	18,166.14	
Swift Spinning Mills, Columbus, Ga.	64,558.06	
The American Thread Co., Tallapcosa, Ga.	21,276.90	
Lavania Manufacturing Co., Hickory, N.C.	1,476.80	
B. F. Goodrich Textile Products, Thomaston, Ga.	150,963.34	
Tifton Cotton Mills, Tifton, Ga.	25,899.51	
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Cedartown, Ga.	18,246.07	
Fieldcrest Mills, Inc., Spray, N.C.	68,735.16	
Dundee Mills, Inc., Griffin, Ga.	94,968.25	
Mary-Lella Cotton Mills, Greensboro, Ga.	20,415.65	
Reeves Bros., Inc., Columbus, Ga.	44,246.28	
Moultrie Cotton Mills, Moultrie, Ga.	14,828.06	
Georgia Duck & Cordage Mills, Scottdale, Ga.	11,000.40	
Pepperell Manufacturing Co., Tindale, Ga.	189,397.26	216,118.04
Riegal Textile Corp., Trion, Ga.	251,721.60	
Callaway Mills, La Grange, Ga.	94,554.19	
Swift Manufacturing Co., Columbus, Ga.	81,554.33	
Coats & Clark, Inc., Clarkdale, Ga.	11,987.43	
The John P. King Manufacturing Co., Augusta, Ga.	82,720.04	
Coats & Clark, Inc., Albany, Ga.	2,476.88	
Fulton Cotton Mills, Atlanta, Ga.	41,637.96	

Name and address	Sight-draft payments	Payment-in-kind certificates
GEORGIA—continued		
Whittier Mills Co., Atlanta, Ga.	$23,347.02	
Puritan-Cordage Mills, Athens, Ga.	1,917.30	
Atlantic Cotton Mills, Macon, Ga.	11,719.82	
Trio Manufacturing Co., Forsyth, Ga.	4,856.34	
Scottdale Mills, Inc., Scottdale, Ga.	33,516.66	
Gainesville Mills, Gainesville, Ga.	45,181.82	$59,801.88
New Holland Mill, New Holland, Ga.	96,161.39	130,646.10
Bibb Manufacturing Co., Macon, Ga.	316,514.37	
Total	3,317,161.10	
NORTH CAROLINA		
Acme Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C.	40,975.48	
Alexander Mills, Forest City, N.C.	40,812.59	
Amazon Cotton Mills Co., Thomasville, N.C.	31,918.25	
American & Efird Mills, Inc., Mount Holly, N.C.	120,394.55	
Arista Mills Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.	22,088.30	
Balston Yarn Mills, Inc., Lincolnton, N.C.	5,760.23	
Bartex Spinning Co., Clayton, N.C.	8,964.60	
Bannit (Rockingham), New York, N.Y.	6,270.74	
B. I. Cotton Mills, Asheville, N.C.	145,563.26	
Bladenboro Cotton Mills, Inc., Bladenboro, N.C.	51,054.12	
Bonnie Cotton Mills, Kings Mountain, N.C.	8,130.45	
Borden Manufacturing Co., Goldsboro, N.C.	36,851.16	45,039.15
Botany Cotton, Inc., Gastonia, N.C.	48,121.30	
Caldwell Cotton Mills Co., Lenoir, N.C.	25,944.87	
Cannon Mills Co., Kannapolis, N.C.	709,380.01	
Carlton Yarn Mills, Inc., Cherryville, N.C.	2,995.07	
Carolina Mills, Inc., Maiden, N.C.	152,080.94	
China Grove Cotton Mills Co., Inc., China Grove, N.C.	52,257.46	
The Chronicle Mills, Belmont, N.C.	22,574.69	
Clayton Spinning Co., Gastonia, N.C.	14,236.30	
Cleveland Mills Co., Lawndale, N.C.	36,719.47	
Climax Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C.	27,483.04	
Clyde Fabrics, Inc., Newton, N.C.	24,792.09	
Cane Mills Corp., Greensboro, N.C.	646,619.74	
Corriher Mills Co., Inc., Landis, N.C.	30,716.59	
Craftstun Yarns, Inc., Kings Mountain, N.C.	32,943.82	
Cramerton Mills, Cramerton, N.C.	45,541.40	
Crescent Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C.	13,573.56	
Cross Cotton Mills Co., Marion, N.C.	30,464.91	
Dacotah Cotton Mills, Inc., Lexington, N.C.	33,875.27	
Dora Yarn Mill Co., Cherryville, N.C.	2,428.20	
Dover Mill Co., Shelby, N.C.	3,523.51	
Dover Yarn Mill, Inc., Shelby, N.C.	1,219.33	
Durham Hosiery Mills, Durham, N.C.	1,212.37	
Eagle Yarn Mills, Inc., Belmont, N.C.	13,955.69	
Eastern Manufacturing Co., Selma, N.C.	32,047.86	
Edenton Cotton Mills, Edenton, N.C.	31,867.03	
Elizabeth City Cotton Mills, Elizabeth City, N.C.	15,571.59	
Elk Cotton Mills, Inc., Fayetteville, Tenn.	11,895.97	
Erlanger Mills, Inc., Lexington, N.C.	17,840.87	
Erwin Mills, Inc., Durham, N.C.	303,767.29	
Esther Mills Corp., Shelby, N.C.	284.44	
Falls Manufacturing Co., Granite Falls, N.C.	17,196.14	
Fieldcrest Mills, Inc., Spray, N.C.	92,262.42	
Firestone Textiles, Gastonia, N.C.	8,421.07	
Flint Plant, Gastonia, N.C.	41,574.00	
Gambrill Melvin, Inc., Bessemer City, N.C.	11,489.27	
Gibson & Cushman, Inc., Lincolnton, N.C.	7,545.39	
Glenn Raven Cotton Mills, Inc., Kinston, N.C.	1,577.68	
Globe Mill, Mount Holly, N.C.	11,517.35	
Golden Belt Manufacturing Co., Durham, N.C.	9,775.80	
Groves Thread Co., Inc., Gastonia, N.C.	40,502.99	
Hadley Peoples Manufacturing Co., Silver City, N.C.	52,024.76	
P. H. Hanes Knitting Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.	74,815.91	96,648.69
Harriet Cotton Mills, Henderson, N.C.	55,854.10	
Hart Cotton Mills, Tarboro, N.C.	33,791.22	
Hayes Cotton Mills Co., Lenois, N.C.	13,129.22	
Henderson Cotton Mills, Henderson, N.C.	65,869.83	
Henry River Mill Co., Henry River, N.C.	1,224.86	
Hickory Spinners, Inc., Hickory, N.C.	9,169.94	
Highland Cotton Mills, Inc., High Point, N.C.	58,075.09	
Holt-Williamson Manufacturing Co., Fayetteville, N.C.	10,863.58	
Howell Manufacturing Co., Cherryville, N.C.	7,807.28	
Hudson Cotton Manufacturing Co., Inc., Lenoir, N.C.	4,897.23	
Imperial Yarn Mill, Inc., McAdenville, N.C.	14,239.61	
Ivy Weaver Plant No. 174, Hickory, N.C.	8,873.47	
Johnston Manufacturing Co., Charlotte, N.C.	34,303.81	
Johnston Spinning Co., Monroe, N.C.	14,900.66	
Jordan Spinning Co., Saxapaw, N.C.	10,490.29	
Kasas Mills, Inc., Casar, N.C.	1,183.32	
Kindley Cotton Mill, Inc., Mount Pleasant, N.C.	8,186.42	
Kings Mountain Manufacturing Co., Kings Mountain, N.C.	6,227.71	
Klopman Mill, Inc., Greensboro, N.C.	40,913.00	
Lily Mills, Co., Shelby, N.C.	7,438.79	
Linford Mills, Inc., Belmont, N.C.	14,815.32	
Linn Mills Co., Inc., Landis, N.C.	28,385.04	
Lions Club Industries for the Blind, Durham, N.C.	361.98	
Little Cotton Manufacturing Co., Wadesboro, N.C.	29,345.94	
Long Shoals Cotton Mills, Inc., Lincolnton, N.C.	8,222.04	
R. C. G. Love Plant, Gastonia, N.C.	7,396.80	
Lowenstein Cotton & Storage Corp., Anderson, S.C.	44,187.26	57,632.24
Majestic Manufacturing Co., Belmont, N.C.	6,881.93	
Macanal Mills, Salisbury, N.C.	15,262.45	
Marion Manufacturing Co., Marion, N.C.	13,242.90	
Marshall Mill No. 2, Charlotte, N.C.	8,647.34	
Mauney Mills, Inc., Kings Mount, N.C.	7,167.42	
J. D. Mills, Inc., Henderson, N.C.	19,996.14	
Moore Cotton Mill Co., Lenoir, N.C.	2,351.37	
Mooresville Mills, Mooresville, N.C.	68,949.75	
Moorehead Mills, Inc., Spray, N.C.	9,960.79	
National Yarn Mills, Inc., Belmont, N.C.	22,420.12	
Oakboro Cotton Mills Co., Mount Pleasant, N.C.	8,408.01	

Name and address	Sight-draft payments	Payment-in-kind certificates
NORTH CAROLINA—continued		
Oakdale Cotton Mills, Jamestown, N.C.	$13,371.21	
J. M. Odell Manufacturing Co., Pittsboro, N.C.	10,881.91	
Paola Cotton Mill, Inc., Statesville, N.C.	14,937.32	
Parkdale Mills, Inc., Gastonia, N.C.	54,331.61	$70,927.61
Park Yarn Mills Co., Kings Mountain, N.C.	7,443.67	
Peck Manufacturing Co., Gastonia, N.C.	35,047.99	
Peerless Spinning Corp., Lowell, N.C.	3,351.27	
Perfection Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C.	10,979.80	
Phenix No. 1 Plant, Kings Mountain, N.C.	73,963.17	
Pickett Cotton Mills Corp., High Point, N.C.	20,181.39	
Piedmont Processing Co., Belmont, N.C.	18,220.28	
Pilot Mills Co., Raleigh, N.C.	11,660.22	
Quaker Meadows Mills, Inc., Hickory, N.C.	4,037.86	
Randolph Mills, Inc., Concord, N.C.	42,630.38	
Rhodes-Whitener Mills, Inc., Raylorsville, N.C.	17,605.90	
D. E. Rhyne Mills, Inc., Lincolnton, N.C.	2,861.94	
Roberta Manufacturing Co., Concord, N.C.	16,416.14	
Robinson Mills, Inc., Gastonia, N.C.	21,146.32	
Rockfish-Mebane Yarn Mill, Inc., Chattanooga, Tenn.	40,344.91	
Rocky Mountain Mills, Rocky Mount, N.C.	74,122.81	
Rowan Cotton Mills Co., Salisbury, N.C.	26,423.86	
Roxboro Cotton Mills, Roxboro, N.C.	55,760.37	
Royal Cotton Mill Co., Saxapahaw, N.C.	13,311.48	
Rudisill Spinning Mills, Inc., Hickory, N.C.	4,576.97	
Sadil Cotton Mills Co., Inc., Kings Mountain, N.C.	14,445.01	
Schneider Mills, Inc., Taylorville, N.C.	3,455.27	
Scotland Mills, Inc., Lancaster, S.C.	66,555.97	
Sellers Manufacturing Co., Saxapahaw, N.C.	10,837.19	
Shelby Mills, Inc., Shelby, N.C.	395.65	
Sherrill Yarn Mills, Inc., Taylorsville, N.C.	$666.51	
Shuford Mills, Inc., Hickory, N.C.	23,279.35	
Smitherman Cotton Mills, Troy, N.C.	16,833.63	
Smithfield Spinning Co., Smithfield, N.C.	3,319.90	
A. M. Smyre Manufacturing Co., Gastonia, N.C.	38,879.55	
South Fork Manufacturing Co., Belmont, N.C.	16,518.84	
Spindale Mills, Inc., Spindale, N.C.	26,219.83	
Spray Cotton Mills, Spray, N.C.	5,504.80	
Sterling Cotton Mills, Inc., Franklinton, N.C.	5,413.32	
J. P. Stevens & Co., Greensville, S.C.	0	$183,142.29
Stowe Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C.	23,709.20	
Stowe Thread Co., Belmont, N.C.	5,872.62	
Superior Yarn Mills, Inc., Mount Holly, N.C.	19,781.38	
Textiles, Inc., Gastonia, N.C.	144,418.68	
Tolar, Hart & Holt Mills, Inc., Gastonia, N.C.	21,623.55	
Travara Textiles, Inc., Graham, N.C.	21,378.24	
Tuscarora Cotton Mills, Mount Pleasant, N.C.	6,213.93	
United Spinners Corp, Lowell, N.C.	167.57	
U.S. Rubber Co., Gastonia, N.C.	14,925.10	
Valdese Manufacturing Co., Valdese, N.C.	18,891.92	
Virginia Mills, Inc., Swepsonville, N.C.	5,777.65	
Wade Manufacturing Co., Box 32, Wadesboro, N.C.	30,671.94	
Washington Mills, Inc., Lawrinburg, N.C.	1,783.14	
Wennonah Cotton Mills Co., Lexington, N.C.	9,699.10	
Wiscassett Mills Co., Albemarle, N.C.	134,957.81	
Worth Spinning Co., Stoney Point, N.C.	3,980.92	
Total	5,499,893.50	453,389.98

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—JULY 12 TO 18

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, last Saturday we celebrated a day which is symbolic of the birth of freedom for America. I daresay that there were many who treated that day as just another holiday away from work, with only a bare thought as to the meaning of the Fourth of July.

Next week, thousands will observe a week underscored by a hope—a hope that some day freedom again will be restored to the peoples in the Communist orbit.

We cannot afford to forget these people, for they are a constant reminder of what could happen to us. And in observing Captive Nations Week, July 12 to 18, we will be telling them that we, who cherish our freedom, have not forgotten those who have lost theirs and need our help to regain it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

TWO-PART RETIREMENT SYSTEM FOR NEVADA UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 287) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Nevada among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement.

MAJ. JACK J. SHEA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 981, House bill 8201.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8201) for the relief of Maj. Jack J. Shea, USAF.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, is the bill open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 5, it is proposed to strike out "$1,392.26", and to insert in lieu thereof "$568.20".

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have a brief explanation of the amendment. It reduces the amount of the allowance to the amount which represented an overpayment at the time when the overpayment procedure was first discovered.

On page 2 of the committee report, I read a statement which points this out:

> It is significant to note that at the time the mistake was first discovered the overpayment amounted only to $568.20. Major Shea protested the adjustment in his pay date and appealed the determination that a repayment was in order, as was his right. It is startling to note that during the pendency of Major Shea's appeals the overpayment was compounded by further erroneous payments from early in 1957 until in 1963. It was this negligent handling of Major Shea's pay accounts that allowed his alleged overpayment to accumulate to the sum of $1,392.26.

My amendment reduces the amount of the bill to $568.20 because that was the amount at the time when the major first became aware of the arrears. I cannot understand why an allowance over and above that amount should be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

E. A. ROLFE, JR.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 990, H.R. 2215.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2215) for the relief of E. A. Rolfe, Jr.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 6, after "Arkansas," it is proposed to insert "and assessment of deficiency by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for any of said years against the said E. A. Rolfe, Junior,".

Mr. MILLER. I have a brief explanation of the amendment. It is a technical amendment which would make sure that the statute of limitations, which the bill would waive, would operate in favor of both the taxpayer and the Internal Revenue Service. From what I know of this case, the statute of limitations would operate in favor of the individual and would give relief in this meritorious case. I have no reason to believe that it would not operate also in favor of the Service. However, as a matter of proper procedure, if the statute is waived for the taxpayer, it should be waived for the Internal Revenue Service, also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 503 OF THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949 TO AUTHORIZE GRANTS FOR COLLECTION OF SOURCE MATERIAL DEALING WITH THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1001, H.R. 6237.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services, within the limits of appropriated and donated funds available therefor, to make allocations to Federal agencies, and grants to State and local agencies, to colleges and universities, and to other nonprofit organizations and institutions, for the collecting, describing, preserving and compiling, and publishing of documents which are basic to an understanding and appreciation of the history of the United States. For the accomplishment of these purposes, the bill would authorize an appropriation to the General Services Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years an amount not to exceed $500,000 each year, the bill further provides that prior to the making of allocations to Federal agencies and grants to State and local agencies and nonprofit organizations and institutions, the Administrator of General Services should seek the advice and recommendations of the National Historical Publications Commission.

Further, H.R. 6237 would require the Administrator of General Services to submit an annual report to the Congress concerning the projects undertaken, including detailed information on the receipt and use made of all appropriated and donated funds and would require the recipients of grant assistance to maintain adequate records, open to audit and examination by the Administrator and the Comptroller General of the United States or any of their duly authorized representatives, of moneys received and expended.

Heretofore, the National Historical Publications Commission, established pursuant to section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, has been concerned with planning, encouraging, and assisting publication projects. H.R. 6237 authorizes the funds necessary for the Commission to more adequately maintain a well-balanced program, consistent with national needs and responsibilities, for the preservation and publication of source material significant to our Nation's history.

The two principal results of this proposed legislation would be, first, assurance by multiplication of copies of the preservation of historical source material of national significance which might otherwise be lost and, second, the broader distribution of such historical source materials to colleges and universities, to public and research libraries, and to scholars, students, and our educated citizenry generally, thereby increasing its use and multiplying its values.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have had the privilege of serving for the past 4 years as a Senate member of the National Historical Publications Commission, and I have followed with a great deal of interest the course of this bill.

As the Senator from Montana has pointed out, the whole purpose of the bill is to preserve documents dealing with our early history and to make them available to historians in the days to come.

It is not an effort to write history; it is an effort merely to preserve the original historical papers.

In less than 200 years our National Government has grown from a handful of States acting together in their mutual self-interest, to a vast executive, legislative, and judicial complex governing the lives of 180 million people. The story of this growth, and its trials and triumphs, is the story of the development of a free democracy. It is most important that we preserve the historical records of this development so that we may have a complete and accurate picture of the events and personalities which contributed to the formation of our Government.

Not only is it important to increase the accessibility of these documents, but it is imperative that they be edited and presented more reliably than has been true in the past. Rather than give a historian's interpretation of historical events, or a simple narration of what took place, the Commission has tried to preserve and publish the actual records of the formative years of our Government. To date, the Commission has initiated, in cooperation with other Federal, State, and local nongovernmental agencies, more than 20 separate documentary publication projects. The first volumes of the Jefferson, Adams, and Franklin papers have already been published and have been received with much acclaim. Little-known details of the lives and ideas of the men involved are at last being brought to light and put forth in a comprehensive and readable form. Through the efforts of the Commission such knowledge will now be available to all interested in their Nation's history. In addition to these high-priority projects which the Commission felt had too long been neglected, 10 more projects are now in the planning stage.

I feel it is most important for the National Historical Publications Commission to continue the work which it has so excellently begun. Though State historical societies, universities, and research institutions can make vast contributions to the preservation of our historical records, the Commission is in the best position to focus and coordinate the efforts in this area. It serves as an informed and discriminating channel to evaluate priorities and prevent duplication of activity.

The bill represents an effort that we should carry forward at this time in order to make original historical documents available in a form in which they can be used. It is a matter of great importance to me. I am happy to see the bill go forward.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement made by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 4, 1964, at the time when the bill was reported by the committee, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Mr. President, under the authority granted to the General Services Administration in this legislation, the U.S. Government will, at long last, begin a service which has been badly needed for many years—the collection and publication of documents and other source materials significant to the history of our Nation.

Presidents of the United States, as far back as Thomas Jefferson, have endorsed the idea of careful compiling of our historic documents. Former Presidents Hoover, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, as well as President Lyndon Johnson, have urged more attention to the problem of collecting source documents which provide better understanding of our national beginnings, tradition, and history.

Under the provisions of this legislation, an amount not to exceed $500,000 will be appropriated to the General Services Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each of the 4 succeeding years. It is expected that this amount will be matched by private contributions, so that a total amount of $1 million will be utilized in this important work, annually.

The General Services Administration provided our committee with a list of papers significant to the development of our Nation. It is apparent that much of this work will go undone if some assistance is not provided to the colleges, universities, scholars, and private groups who are interested in such undertakings. Informed witnesses told the committee that a number of projects are being held in abeyance for lack of some small support. Many universities can provide personnel and research facilities, but lack the little extra money to fully implement historical research projects. This appropriation is expected to give them the impetus to go ahead.

Thus far, our country has not given the support to this type of project that other nations have provided, but, under this legislation, we can expect to do slightly more than most other countries are doing. It is hoped that we can overcome any lag which may exist.

During the course of our hearings, this legislation was endorsed by many historic societies, historians, and officials of universities and colleges. The members of the Committee on Government Operations in reporting H.R. 6237 expects that enactment of this legislation will give assistance and encouragement to the collection, reproduction, and compilation of documents which bear significantly on our history and heritage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 6237) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CATALINA PROPERTIES INC.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 933, H.R. 2262.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2262) for the relief of Catalina Properties, Inc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert "in accordance with the findings of fact of the United States Court of Claims in the case of Catalina Properties, Inc. v. The United States, Congressional No. 12–60, decided July 18, 1962,".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the committee report in justification of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 964) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Catalina Properties, Inc., the sum of $29,425.01, representing the amount determined by the Court of Claims, pursuant to congressional reference, to be equitably due Catalina Properties, Inc. The bill provides that the above sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of Catalina Properties, Inc., against the United States arising from rental payments on the Catalina Hotel, Miami Beach, Fla., which were lost during the period from about December 15, 1952, to about March 15, 1953, because of inaction of certain officers and employees of the United States.

The provisions of this bill are identical with those of H.R. 12701 in the 87th Congress, which passed the House and Senate but did not receive Presidential approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RECESS TO 1:30 P.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 1:30 o'clock p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, at 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess until 1:30 o'clock p.m. of the same day.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MCGOVERN in the chair).

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business, H.R. 287, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 2136.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2136) to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments, on page 2, line 17, after the word "any", to strike out "substantial portion"; on page 3, line 19, after the word "inserting", to insert "before the words, 'matter pertaining to', the words 'public relations' and"; on page 4, line 13, after the word "with", to strike out "respect to any matter pertaining" and insert "reference"; in line 15, after the word "or", where it appears the second time, to strike out "pertaining" and insert "with reference"; in line 16, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to insert "domestic or"; in the same line, after the word "foreign", to strike out "or domestic"; on page 6, line 22, after the word "contributions", to strike out "made in connection with activities which require his registration hereunder which are required to be reported under the preceding provisions of this clause" and insert "the making of which is prohibited under the terms of section 613 of title 18, United States Code"; on page 7, line 20, after the word "mercantile", to insert a period; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'financial, mercantile, or public relations'."; on page 10, line 25, after the word "section", to strike out "3" and insert "4"; in the same line, after "(g)", to insert "or (h)"; on page 11, at the beginning of line 23, to insert "(g) If the Attorney General determines that a registration statement does not comply with the requirements of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder, he shall so notify the registrant in writing, specifying in what respects the statement is deficient."; on page 12, line 2, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "Whoever acts" and insert "It shall be unlawful for any person to act as an agent of a foreign principal at any time ten days or more after receipt of such notification without filing an amended registration statement in full compliance with the requirements of this Act and the regulations issued thereunder."; in line 7, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the comma and "shall, without regard to any penalties provided in subsection (a) of this section, be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or both"; at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "(g)" and insert "(h)"; and on page 15, line 2, after "chapter 29", to insert "of title 18,"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The term 'foreign principal' includes—

"(1) a government of a foreign country and a foreign political party;

"(2) a person outside of the United States, unless it is established that such person is an individual and a citizen of and domiciled within the United States, or that such person is not an individual and is organized under or created by the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and has its principal place of business within the United States; and

"(3) a partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of persons organized under the laws of or having its principal place of business in a foreign country."

(2) Subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, the term 'agent of a foreign principal' means—

"(1) any person who acts as an agent, representative, employee, servant or in any other capacity at the order, request, or under the direction or control of a foreign principal or of a person any of whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised, directed, controlled, financed or subsidized in whole or in major part by a foreign principal, and who directly or through any other person—

"(i) engages within the United States in political activities for or in the interests of such foreign principal;

"(ii) acts within the United States as a public relations counsel, publicity agent, information-service employee or political consultant for or in the interests of such foreign principal;

"(iii) within the United States solicits, collects, disburses, or dispenses contributions, loans, money, or other things of value for or in the interest of such foreign principal; or

"(iv) within the United States represents the interests of such foreign principal before any agency or official of the Government of the United States; and

"(2) any person who agrees, consents, assumes or purports to act as, or who is or holds himself out to be, whether or not pursuant to contractual relationship, an agent of a foreign principal as defined in clause (1) of this subsection."

(3) Subsection (d) is amended by striking out "clause (1), (2), or (4) of".

(4) Subsection (g) is amended by inserting before the words, "matter pertaining to", the words "public relations" and before the semicolon at the end thereof the words "of such principal".

(5) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(o) The term 'political activities' includes the dissemination of political propaganda and any other activity which the person engaging therein believes will, or which he intends to, prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, persuade, or in any other way influence any other person or any section of the public within the United States with reference to the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country, or a foreign political party or with reference to the domestic or foreign policies of the United States.

"(p) The term 'political consultant' means any person, including, without limitation, any economic, legal or other consultant, who engages in informing or advising any person with reference to the political or public interests, policies or relations of a foreign country or of a foreign political party or with reference to the domestic or foreign policies of the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such Act is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by striking out the second, third, and fourth sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Except as hereinafter provided, every person who becomes an agent of a foreign principal shall, within ten days thereafter, file with the Attorney General, in duplicate, a registration statement, under oath on a form prescribed by the Attorney General. The obligation of an agent of a foreign principal to file a registration statement shall, after the tenth day of his becoming such agent, continue from day to day, and termination of such status shall not relieve such agent from his obligation to file a registration statement for the period during which he was an agent of a foreign principal."

(2) Subsection (a)(3) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or by any other foreign principal".

(3) Subsection (a)(4) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "including a detailed statement of any such activity which is a political activity".

(4) Subsection (a)(6) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "including a detailed statement of any such activity which is political activity".

(5) Subsection (a)(7) is amended to read as follows:

"(7) The name, business, and residence addresses, and if an individual, the nationality, of any person other than a foreign principal for whom the registrant is acting, assuming or purporting to act or has agreed to act under such circumstances as require his registration hereunder; the extent to which such person is supervised, directed, owned, controlled, financed, or subsidized, in whole or in part, by any government of a foreign country or foreign political party or by any other foreign principal; and the nature and amount of contributions, income, money, or thing of value, if any, that the registrant has received during the preceding sixty days from each such person in connection with any of the activities referred to in clause (6) of this subsection, either as compensation or for disbursement or otherwise, and the form and time of each such payment and from whom received;".

(6) Subsection (a)(8) is amended to read as follows:

"(8) A detailed statement of the money and other things of value spent or disposed of by the registrant during the preceding sixty days in furtherance of or in connection with activities which require his registration hereunder and which have been undertaken by him either as an agent of a foreign principal or for himself or any other person or in connection with any activities relating to his becoming an agent of such principal, and a detailed statement of any contributions of money or other things of value made by him during the preceding sixty days (other than contributions the making of which is prohibited under the terms of section 613 of title 18, United States Code) in connection with an election to any political office or in conection with any primary election, convention, or caucus held to select candidates for any political office;".

(7) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(f) The Attorney General may, by regulation, provide for the exemption from registration, or from the requirement of furnishing any of the information required by this section, of any person who is listed as a partner, officer, director, or employee in the registration statement filed by an agent of a foreign principal under this Act, where by reason of the nature of the functions or activities of such person the Attorney General having due regard for the national security and the public interest determines that such registration, or the furnishing of such information, is not necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

SEC. 3. Section 3(d) of such Act is amended by striking out the words "financial or mercantile".

SEC. 4. Section 4 of such Act is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by inserting after the words "political propaganda" the words "for or in the interests of such foreign principal"; and by striking out the words "send to the Librarian of Congress two copies thereof and file with the Attorney General one copy thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "file with the Attorney General two copies thereof".

(2) Subsection (b) is amended by inserting after the words "political propaganda" where they first appear the words "for or in the interests of such foreign principal"; by inserting after the words "setting forth" the words "the relationship or connection between the person transmitting the political propaganda or causing it to be transmitted and such propaganda;"; and by striking out the words "each of his foreign principals" and inserting in lieu thereof "such foreign principal".

(3) Subsection (c) is amended by striking out the words "sent to the Librarian of Congress" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "filed with the Attorney General".

(4) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(e) It shall be unlawful for any person within the United States who is an agent of a foreign principal required to register under the provisions of this Act to transmit, convey, or otherwise furnish to any agency or official of the Government (including a Member or commiteee of either House of Congress) for or in the interests of such foreign principal any political propaganda or to request from any such agency or official for or in the interests of such foreign principal any information or advice with respect to any matter pertaining to the political or public interests, policies or relations of a foreign country or of a political party or pertaining to the foreign or domestic policies of the United States unless the propaganda or the request is prefaced or accompanied by a true and accurate statement to the effect that such person is registered as an agent of such foreign principal under this Act.

"(f) Whenever any agent of a foreign principal required to register under this Act appears before any committee of Congress to testify for or in the interests of such foreign principal, he shall, at the time of such appearance, furnish the committee with a copy of his most recent registration statement filed with the Department of Justice as an agent of such foreign principal for inclusion in the records of the committee as part of his testimony."

SEC. 5. Section 5 of such Act is amended by inserting after "the provisions of this Act," where they first appear the words "in accordance with such business and accounting practices,".

SEC. 6. Section 6 of such Act is amended by inserting the letter "(a)" after the section number and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) The Attorney General shall, promptly upon receipt, transmit one copy of every registration statement filed hereunder and one copy of every amendment or supplement thereto, and one copy of every item of political propaganda filed hereunder, to the Secretary of State for such comment and use as the Secretary of State may determine to be appropriate from the point of view of the foreign relations of the United States. Failure of the Attorney General so to transmit such copy shall not be a bar to prosecution under this Act.

"(c) The Attorney General is authorized to furnish to departments and agencies in the executive branch and committees of the Congress such information obtained by him in the administration of this Act including the names of registrants under this Act, copies of registration statements, or parts thereof, copies of political propoganda, or other documents or information filed under this Act, as may be appropriate in the light of the purposes of this Act."

SEC. 7. Section 8 of such Act is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by adding before the period at the end of paragraph (2) a comma and the following: "except that in the case of a violation of subsection (b), (e), or (f) of section 4 or of subsection (g) or (h) of this section the punishment shall be a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than six months, or both".

(2) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(f) Whenever in the judgment of the Attorney General any person is engaged in or about to engage in any acts which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of this Act, or regulations issued thereunder, or whenever any agent of a foreign principal fails to comply with any of the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder, or otherwise is in violation of the Act, the Attorney General may make application to the appropriate United States district court for an order enjoining such acts or enjoining such person from continuing to act as an agent of such foreign principal, or for an order requiring compliance with any appropriate provision of the Act or regulation thereunder. The district court shall have jurisdiction and authority to issue a temporary or permanent injunction, restraining order or such other order which it may deem proper. The proceedings shall be made a preferred cause and shall be expedited in every way.

"(g) If the Attorney General determines that a registration statement does not comply with the requirements of this Act or the

regulations issued thereunder, he shall so notify the registrant in writing, specifying in what respects the statement is deficient. It shall be unlawful for any person to act as an agent of a foreign principal at any time ten days or more after receipt of such notification without filing an amended registration statement in full compliance with the requirements of this Act and the regulations issued thereunder.

"(h) It shall be unlawful for any agent of a foreign principal required to register under this Act to be a party to any contract, agreement, or understanding, either express or implied, with such foreign principal pursuant to which the amount or payment of the compensation, fee, or other remuneration of such agent is contingent in whole or in part upon the success of any political activities carried on by such agent."

SEC. 8. (a) Chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 613. Contributions by agents of foreign principals

"Whoever, being an agent of a foreign principal, directly or through any other person, either for or on behalf of such foreign principal or otherwise in his capacity as agent of such foreign principal, knowingly makes any contribution of money or other thing of value, or promises expressly or impliedly to make any such contribution, in connection with an election to any political office or in connection with any primary election, convention, or caucus held to select candidates for any political office; or

"Whoever knowingly solicits, accepts, or receives any such contribution from any such agent of a foreign principal or from such foreign principal—

"Shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years or both.

"As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'foreign principal' has the same meaning as when used in the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, except that such term does not include any person who is a citizen of the United States.

"(2) The term 'agent of a foreign principal' means any person who acts as an agent, representative, employee, servant, or in any other capacity at the order, request, or under the direction or control of a foreign principal or of a person any substantial portion of whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised, directed, or controlled by a foreign principal."

(b) Chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 219. Officers and employees acting as agents of foreign principals

"Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government or in any agency of the United States, including the District of Columbia, is or acts as an agent of a foreign principal required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

"Nothing in this section shall apply to the employment of any agent of a foreign principal as a special Government employee in any case in which the head of the employing agency certifies that such employment is required in the national interest. A copy of any certification under this paragraph shall be forwarded by the head of such agency to the Attorney General who shall cause the same to be filed with the registration statement and other documents filed by such agent, and made available for public inspection in accordance with section 6 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended."

(c)(1) The sectional analysis at the beginning of chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"613. Contributions by agents of foreign principals."

(2) The sectional analysis at the beginning of chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"219. Officers and employees acting as agents of foreign principals."

SEC. 9. This Act shall take effect ninety days after the date of its enactment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate primarily reflects the progressively larger role in world affairs that the United States has had to play in the past 20 or so years. Particularly since World War II, American foreign policy has become a central point of reference to the policies and basic interests of virtually every nation in the world. Thus, the efforts to influence American policy have become correspondingly greater and subtler over this same period.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has for some time been aware of the growing tendency of foreign political and commercial interests to influence American policy by other than the conventional diplomatic representations. Besides the Department of State, the Congress has also been the object of the efforts of the domestic representatives of foreign principals to influence American foreign policy generally and specific areas of policy such as foreign aid legislation.

It should be understood that the committee's concern with this problem began long before certain of my colleagues and I sought to amend the sugar legislation and to curtail the influence of the so-called sugar lobbyists. The bill before the Senate, I repeat, is designed to assure, as far as possible, the public disclosure of all persons acting for or in the interests of foreign principals whenever their activities are entirely or partly political in nature.

I emphasize the fact that the bill does not prohibit the representation of foreign principals, but merely requires, and its objective is to require, the public disclosure of that fact.

As such, the committee believes that the bill will enable the Department of Justice to cope more effectively with a problem that has changed considerably since 1934, when the first Un-American Activities Committee was established to investigate Nazi and other subversive propaganda then being circulated in the United States.

As a result of its findings, this committee, chaired by the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, reported a series of legislative recommendations that resulted in the passage in 1938 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act. The first, and primary, legislative recommendation of Congressman MCCORMACK's committee was:

That the Congress shall enact a statute requiring all publicity, propaganda, or public relations agents or other agents who represent in this country any foreign government or a foreign political party or a foreign industrial organization to register with the Secretary of State of the United States, and to state name and location of such employer, the character of the service to be rendered, and the amount of compensation paid or to be paid therefor.

Since passage of the act, it has been amended twice, and in 1942 jurisdiction was transferred from the Department of State to the Department of Justice. However, the object of the statute remains as originally set forth by Mr. MCCORMACK's committee.

The Committee on Foreign Relations instructed the staff in the spring of 1961 to undertake a survey of certain nondiplomatic activities that had attracted the committee's attention. As a result of questions raised by this initial survey, a broader study was undertaken by the staff in order to determine if a full committee investigation would be advisable. Following upon this additional survey of the problem the committee decided in July 1962 to report Senate Resolution 362, which authorized "a full and complete study of all nondiplomatic activities of representatives of foreign governments, and their contractors and agents, in promoting the interests of those governments and the extent to which such representatives attempt to influence the policies of the United States and affect the national interest."

At this time, the committee also issued a preliminary study which illustrated the kinds of activities in which nondiplomatic representatives of foreign governments have been engaged. This study included, anonymously, some actual cases, which I will insert in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. But a few of them I will read at this point:

In 1961, a foreign government's U.S. public relations firm whose registration statement indicates it was hired to promote tourism filmed nine newsreels, seven of which dealt with political events within the foreign country. The news films were distributed to major U.S. newsreel companies and shown in theaters across the country with no indication to the audiences that the films were paid for by the foreign government.

In 1955, the Washington editor of a monthly national magazine received money from a foreign government for public relations work on their behalf. During the period he wrote at least one article on that particular country for his own magazine. In addition, he served as a paid consultant to a congressional subcommittee which was making a study of political activities within the country he represented.

In 1961, the U.S. public relations firm for a foreign client gave financial support to an American committee of nationals from the country involved. The chairman of this committee, who received a weekly salary from the public relations firm, led a delegation to Washington to complain about U.S. policy toward his former homeland. He contacted Members of Congress and officials at the White House and Department of State, but failed to disclose during these meetings that he was receiving funds from a foreign principal.

In 1959, a private American organization requested the congressional delegation of a large eastern State to answer a mailed questionnaire dealing with a controversial foreign policy issue that involved a government allied to the United States. The American organization did not disclose to the Senators and Congressmen the fact that the questionnaire they were requested to answer had been drawn up by a lawyer who represented the foreign nation involved. Nor did the organization inform the legislators that their replies were to be passed on to the foreign country's diplomatic representatives in the United States.

In 1959, officers of a major U.S. radio network signed an agreement with officials of a small Caribbean republic calling for the network to carry a "monthly minimum of 425 minutes of news and commentary" about the foreign country. News material was to be supplied by the foreign government and the network officials agreed not to broadcast anything inconsistent with the foreign government's best interests. For 18 months of this service, the foreign government paid the network officials $750,000. The deal collapsed shortly after it was signed when the top network official involved resigned from office.

In 1956, a New York City law firm hired as general counsel for legal matters in the United States for a foreign government helped arrange a special presidential economic mission to its client country.

Following Senate approval of this resolution, the committee undertook a still more comprehensive investigation, with additional staff assisted by accountant-investigators supplied by the General Accounting Office and with the cooperation of the Justice Department and the State Department.

As indicated in the committee report, "some 250 registration statements on file with the Department of Justice were reviewed and 50 were chosen for closer review. From these 50, 15 individuals representing 9 registrants were called to testify before the committee in executive hearings. Their selection was not made because they were necessarily typical of the majority of nondiplomatic agents. Rather, they were chosen because the types and sometimes obscure patterns of their activities represented, in the judgment of the committee, violations of the spirit and purpose of the Foreign Agents Registration Act. It was from a study of such situations that the committee hoped to determine legislative needs as well as suggested changes in executive agency procedures and safeguards."

In January 1963, the committee reported favorably Senate Resolution 26, which expanded the committee's study to include the activities of agents with nongovernmental foreign principals. Throughout the year, the committee held public and executive meetings both with public officials and registered agents.

The chief provisions of this bill would have the effect of:

First. Giving the Attorney General power to enjoin an agent from acting for his foreign principal if the agent's filings with the Department of Justice are found to be inadequate. Under present law the Attorney General could only seek to prosecute agents under a criminal provision if their registration was inadequate.

I believe that perhaps this is one of the most important sections in the bill. Our investigation indicated that because of the severity of the remedy carried in the existing law, the Department of Justice has found it very difficult to enforce the law and, in a sense, have been deterred from enforcing the law, because of the feeling that it cannot obtain a criminal conviction when there is a failure of such a person to file adequate reports. Therefore, I believe, as a matter of administration and of obtaining compliance, that this first provision, giving the Department injunctive power, is probably one of the most important sections in the bill.

Second. Requiring an agent to disclose his foreign principal in all communications with agencies and officials of the U.S. Government, including Members of Congress.

I am sure Members of the Senate remember that one of the most notorious lobbyists appeared before committees of Congress and, I am sure, spoke directly with Members of Congress, without revealing his interest in a particular legislative proposal. I am confident that members of my committee, including myself, did not know—I certainly did not know—of the relationship of one of these men, who was the subject of further study, and of his interest in the legislation.

Further, the agent would be required to file a copy of his last previous registration statement at any time he testifies before congressional committees on behalf of his foreign principal.

If that provision had been in the law at the time I spoke of, when the subject involved the Philippines, I am confident that the result would have been different.

Third. Prohibiting an agent from soliciting campaign contributions from or acting as a conduit for campaign funds from foreign principals. The amendment further requires that all foreign agents file a report of campaign contributions made with funds other than those directly received from their foreign principal.

Fourth. Prohibiting contingent fee contracts between agents and foreign principals.

Fifth. Defining with greater precision the persons whose political activities in this country on behalf of foreign interests require registration.

In general, the bill is intended to enable the Department of Justice to regulate more effectively those activities which the statute is designed to cover. The bill is also intended to exempt those activities with a genuine commercial purpose which is served by other than political activities.

I emphasize this because I think there is some misunderstanding of this aspect of the proposed legislation. The existing law restricts exemptions to financial and mercantile activities. The committee believes that in addition to these activities, legal, public relations, and other activities should be exempted where their objectives are stricly commercial and where these objectives are advanced by nonpolitical means.

Some American businessmen have expressed concern that, while the commercial exemption provision is broadened by the committee bill, it could nevertheless require registration by representatives of domestic subsidiaries of foreign parent corporations or foreign subsidiaries of domestic parents which do no more than carry on normal commercial activities involving contacts with the Government. Let me make unmistakably clear the committee's strong view that all activities of agents or foreign principals that are not political in nature can and should be exempted.

The committee went to some length in its report to dispel any doubt on this point. During the hearings on the bill last November, I asked Mr. Katzenbach for the Justice Department's view of the application of the act, as presently written, to foreign subsidiaries of domestic parent corporation, and more specifically to the question of whether the activities of a particular agent can be determined to be on behalf of a foreign subsidiary or its domestic parent. Mr. Katzenbach replied:

> You have to assume, first, that none of the exemptions apply to this particular activity. Most of these, I suspect, are within the commerical exemption.

He went on to say:

> I think that really in this sort of instance one can go along fairly well on form. If you are acting for and being paid by the foreign subsidiary of a domestic corporation that in itself ought to really be enough, and I would think there is no particular advantage to the Government in that instance in piercing corporate veils or attempting to decide which way it would be done. I think the more difficult cases are those in which you are acting on behalf of and paid by the American entity, whereas the activities really are more closely related to the foreign subsidiary. I think that is the more difficult case, and I suspect one could get by in that instance, in most instances, without a registration.

Mr. Katzenbach, it should be emphasized, was addressing himself to existing law, not to the committee amendment, which, as I have indicated, significantly broadens this commercial exemption. That fact is that all of those who might conceivably have to register under the committee bill are already required to do so under the much broader existing law.

Some of the businessmen who have not yet been reassured on this question submitted to the committee staff a list of examples of the kinds of activities carried on by agents of foreign subsidiaries of domestic parent corporations and the domestic subsidiaries of foreign parent corporations that they fear might fall within the scope of the bill. With respect to domestic parent corporations, it seemed clear that none of the examples, as set forth, would require registration. With respect to domestic subsidiaries of foreign parent corporations, some of the examples seem clearly exempt, while some others would—and should—require registration under both existing law and the committee bill.

What the committee has sought to exempt are routine commercial activities designed to reach commercial objectives. It has not, however, exempted political activities designed to reach commercial objectives.

Mr. President, the bill before us, as indicated, is the product of more than a year of investigation and study. We have heard a great deal in the past about the powers of Congress to investigate and the purposes to which such investigations are put. I strongly believe that we have a responsibility to study areas in which activities undertaken by individuals may harm the public interest. Such investigations should be directed, however, toward those areas where the harmful activities are either untouched by existing law, or inadequately covered. The responsibility of the Congress is to determine in such cases whether new or amended statutes are required.

Where harmful activities are already covered by the law, or where they are beyond legislative remedy, the responsibility for regulating them rests elsewhere. Clearly, a law is only as effective as its enforcement, and the committee, as indicated in the report, "is encouraged by testimony that cooperation between the executive departments has increased with regard to enforcement of the Foreign Agents Registration Act and circulation of information disclosed under the act."

An inherent part of the problem of regulating the activities of nondiplomatic agents of foreign interests is the public's right to know the source of material inspired by foreign agents and conveyed by the mass media. The first amendment guarantees freedom of the press, but only the press itself can make the public aware of the source of material which it may convey to the public, but which originates with representatives of foreign interests.

The committee's hearings disclosed a number of cases of what one prominent editor characterized as "corruptions" of our mass media. Again, only the press, perhaps behind the urging of the public and the Congress, can take whatever steps are necessary to meet its public responsibilities in this sensitive area.

Mr. President, as I have tried to indicate, the scope of our country's oversea commitments and responsibilities are unique. More than that, they are vital to our own and to the security of the free world. The responsibility to see that American foreign policy is adequate to its responsibility is a collective one. The officials responsible for our policies must rely on the informed support of those whom they govern. The bill is basically intended to serve that purpose.

I strongly urge that the Senate act favorably upon the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have listened with the greatest of interest to the development by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas of the amendments to the Foreign Agents Registration Act. The Senator from Arkansas has given the subject much attention, as has the committee of which he is the chairman, in developing the bill.

As he himself noted in his presentation, the bill involves serious fundamental questions. He stated the problem, and I think his language is as good as any on what the problem is. He said—and I believe my recollection is fairly accurate—that the bill seeks to exempt from registration anyone who pursues routine commercial activities designed to reach commercial objectives.

He said the bill seeks to bring about the registration of those who would engage in commercial activities to reach political objectives.

The only trouble with that definition is that it leaves out a large number of people and a great number of situations, because many commercial activities seek to reach objectives which are mixed economic and political objectives; and the test which is prescribed by the bill, as its intent is described in the committee report, would clearly bring about a requirement for registration in many situations in which, in my judgment and in the judgment of many in the commercial world, there is no intention whatever to bring about such registration.

I shall, in the course of these remarks, specify in detail many of those situations, and I also shall submit an amendment which I believe will clarify the limitations of the statute.

To begin with, I point out that I agree with the statute. I favor the registration of foreign agents in an effective way, so as to close the loopholes; but in the process of closing those loopholes, I do not believe we can engage in an unrealistic appraisal of actual practices of business concerns which are genuinely American businesses.

The report is significant on this score; insofar as the subject matter which I am raising is concerned, the report deals with a description of what is intended to be accomplished by section 3 of the bill. I read from the report as follows:

Section 3 would amend section 3(d) of the act by exempting all activities with a bona fide commercial purpose which are private and are not political activities. The existing provision appears inadvertently to have been narrowed from its original scope by an amendment adopted in 1961, which restricted exemptions to financial and mercantile activities. The committee intends that legal, public relations, and other activities should be exempted when they have a commercial end and meet the other requirements of the section. The extension is not intended, however, to exempt activities having a bona fide commercial end but which employ political means to arrive at that end as, for example, in the case of the representative of a foreign manufacturer who brings pressure on the Department of Defense to reverse a "buy American" policy.

Then the report deals with exactly this point, on page 12; I shall refer to it, because it is very important:

Both this subsection and the preceding subsection, as well as others in the proposed bill, employ the phrase, "for or in the interest of" the agent's foreign principal. It is, of course, recognized that thorny questions of interpretation will arise under these provisions. In situations involving complex corporate structures, it may prove difficult to make a factual determination as to whether certain material serves the interests of a foreign principal. The registered agent of a foreign corporation may also perform services for the corporation's domestic affiliate.

I digress here for a moment, to point out that there are American companies which have foreign subsidiaries and foreign affiliates, as there are also foreign companies which have American subsidiaries and American affiliates which are very American in their ownership and in their line of business. These are the problems with which we feel the bill deals unrealistically.

I continue reading from the report:

Conceivably, booklets and news releases disseminated by the agent on behalf of the domestic affiliate may appear to some to fall within the scope of the proposed language; others may reach a different judgment. Clearly, this is not a question for which the law can establish strict criteria. However, the Department of Justice has stated that it is prepared to advise on hypothetical situations in order to help to resolve uncertainties under this and other provisions of the act. It is also clear that the authority for determining the scope of the language "for or in the interest of a foreign principal" lies with the Department of Justice, not the registrant. For example, the mere assertion by a registrant that a letter from him to a newspaper editor is not "for or in the interest of" should not decisively affect the judgment of the Justice Department, assuming, of course, the letter in question bears on matters of interest to the registrant's foreign principal.

To show how thorny this subject is, I continue to read from the committee report on page 12, the second paragraph:

In the situation where an agent of a U.S. parent corporation acts as agent for a foreign subsidiary or where a foreign corporation establishes an American subsidiary, the committee recognizes that the interests of the parent and subsidiary are not invariably the same. Where in either of these cases the domestic affiliate or agent engages in political or other activities covered by the act, the predominant interests served—

And I beg Senators to take note of those words—

will in every case decide the question of registration. For example, the question of a U.S. parent's ability to repatriate profits earned by its foreign subsidiary is predominantly in the interests of the parent rather than the oversea subsidiary. Likewise, questions arising under the National Labor Relations Act affecting the domestic subsidiary of a foreign parent would probably be predominantly in the interests of the local subsidiary to resolve.

Therefore, by implication, although the committee does not say so, one would assume that in those situations registration would not be required. The significance of those two examples is that they show cognizance on the part of the committee, as well as on the part of the drafters of the proposed legislation, of the fact that there are situations which do not represent the preponderant interest in a foreign subsidiary by an American company and, likewise, situations which do not represent the preponderant interest of a foreign principal in a subsidiary of that foreign corporation.

Now we come to the point where the shoe pinches:

Where, on the other hand, the local subsidiary is concerned with U.S. legislation

enlarging the U.S. market for goods produced in the country where the foreign parent is located (as in the case of sugar quota legislation, for example) the predominant interest is foreign. Likewise, where the foreign subsidiary of a U.S. parent is concerned with U.S. legislation facilitating investment or expansion of production abroad the locus of the interest will, also, as a general rule, be predominantly (even if not ultimately) foreign.

The first question which suggests itself is this: What about the local subsidiary of a foreign corporation concerned with U.S. legislation relating to sugar produced in this country?

This is the point which has caused many of the major corporations of the United States to be cast in deep doubt about this matter, and has caused the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to have grave questions about this matter, which is the reason for the amendment which I shall propose.

I point out that the best one can say for the committee report is it proposes that the Department of Justice shall decide whom it will prosecute and whom it will not prosecute under this particular measure.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, at that point, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to finish, first.

That decision, on the basis of the so-called predominant interest theory—that is, what is the predominant interest in every case—is causing grave questions to arise in the Department of Justice. Anyone who has antitrust-law experience wishes to know when the Department will act and when it will not act, according to its authority under certain laws. It can be appreciated why American business feels that it will be placed in great jeopardy if this matter is allowed to reach the point where there always will be a question as to whether the Department of Justice will or will not act in a particular case, thus involving such businesses in many borderline situations, a whole list of which I propose to read to the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In order to pinpoint this matter, does the Senator from New York maintain that the bill covers areas that are not covered by existing law?

Mr. JAVITS. I believe that, under existing law, there has been established a pattern which enables many of these activities to continue—and they are continuing—free of registration. It is felt that with the proposal which is now before Congress, and with the interpretation placed upon that statute by the committee itself, many of these activities will be caught within the net of the new law. That is the reason for the desire to amend it in order to deal with these specific factual situations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I state to the Senator that it is my belief—and I think it is the committee's belief—that the exemption provision is broadened by the committee bill. If the activity the Senator describes or proposes to describe is presently exempt, I think it will be clearly exempt under the bill.

What I think the Senator is suggesting is that, perhaps because of lax enforcement today, many people have been doing something in violation of the law, in that they have not registered; and they think that because this bill provides for more effective methods of enforcement, such as the injunctive process, the law will henceforth be enforced more rigorously. Is that the correct conclusion to be drawn from the Senator's statement?

Mr. JAVITS. That is completely incorrect. I cannot agree with the Senator that the Justice Department can be indicted because it has been lax and has not made people register. In my judgment, it is fair to assume—and it is the only assumption that can be made—that it has not believed that such people should register. The way in which the committee is setting up the ground rules for this particular statute is new; it introduces provisions not heretofore in the law. Under these criteria, which I have read with great care, there is very real concern that activities never intended to be reached by the bill will nonetheless be reached.

For that reason, it is felt that some clarification is required. I think the Senator has had this whole question discussed with him by me and by others. But so far we have seen no light cast on these situations, which, as I have said, I shall describe in some detail, and which perhaps represent the twilight zone. I can understand that situation perfectly—as between what the Senator defined in his opening remarks as the commercial objective, and what seems to be defined in the bill as a political objective.

We are dealing not so much with a political objective alone. It seems to me that the Senator has emphasized the political objective. It is true that we are dealing with a political objective, but we are also dealing with foreign principals. This is the Foreign Agents Registration Act, not merely a lobbyist registration act. I think what needs to be clarified is that both of these concepts—that is, the concept of a political activity and the concept of a political activity pursued for the benefit of a foreign principal are areas in which I think it is very necessary to have the law spelled out in much more specific terms than has thus far been done.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The whole purport of the committee report and the discussion of the committee is not that we shall bring in added registrants and require the registration of those not now registered. The existing law with respect to criminal penalties is, I think, very strong with respect to those required to register. What really concerns the committee is that those who do register do not disclose adequately what they are doing. That is the thrust of the bill and of the report.

One of the most important elements in the bill is the injunctive power given to the Justice Department with respect to the adequacy of the registration. If one chooses not to register at all, that is a willful violation; and he would be subject to criminal penalty, under the existing law, as well as under the bill. It seems to me that the committee broadened the exemption by the slight change in language to which the Senator referred, from the financial and mercantile exemption to a broader concept, the language of which the Senator just referred to. It is a little broader.

Mr. JAVITS. The language is "financial and mercantile."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We are talking about exemption, not coverage. The exemption in the law is a narrower concept than the language in the bill now, which reads:

> Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only in private and nonpolitical activities.

This is an exemption, I submit in all fairness, that is broader language than what is contained in the existing law. To be exempt under the present law, a person must engage or agree to engage only in activities which are financial or mercantile and which are also both private and nonpolitical. Under the bill, it will suffice if the activities are private and nonpolitical, even though they may not be financial or mercantile. I think the committee was trying, not to broaden the scope of activities which require registration, but really to make the registration more sufficient than now required.

Mr. JAVITS. Often a bill designed to catch a felon will catch an innocent victim. The way the committee has interpreted the particular provision which it is now inserting—which is new language—means, in my judgment, and in the judgment of people who have a great deal at stake in this matter—and I have named who they are; there is no secret about it, as the Senator well knows—that this arrow will miss the target, and will hit a completely different target. I suggest to the Senator that we have tried very hard to agree upon what should be the thrust of the bill.

If the Senator would hear me on some of the examples which have been referred to, then perhaps it might be possible to refine the issues, in order to give assurances which appear to be lacking in the language of the bill and in its interpretation as contained in the report.

I wish to give some of these examples, which have been furnished to me. They are typical situations. It is claimed that registration might be required—although, from what the Senator says, this is not so at all.

All of us are very well aware that hundreds of American companies—businesses engaged in the production of oil, automobiles, aluminum, steel, and other metals; also chemicals, rubber, office equipment, and in the international telephone business—operate abroad in a very widespread field. If my memory serves me, we have approximately $70 billion invested in direct investments throughout the world in many of these operations. Here are some of the instances which are submitted to me as being placed in jeopardy by the way in which the statute is interpreted in the committee report. The U.S. oil companies' international operations would like the Interior Department to increase the import tax on residual fuel oil

Among the major beneficiaries would be its subsidiary in Venezuela, where production would be increased. Nevertheless, a great beneficiary would also be the American company concerned.

Another example is an automobile company which has a German subsidiary which assembles and markets cars in Europe. The Germans propose a tax on horsepower, which would have the effect of discriminating against cars of the type handled by subsidiaries of U.S. companies, but would benefit smaller German cars. The parent company wishes to discuss the subject with the State Department. That is, an American company seeking to discuss the question with the State Department, so that the State Department might intervene to prevent a subsidiary of the American company from being discriminated against.

A Brazilian subsidiary of a U.S. utility is threatened with expropriation or with unfair competition from a government-owned company. The parent wants to familiarize the executive branch and the Congress with this situation.

An American cosmetics company, with a French subsidiary which manufactures perfume, wants to testify in behalf of lower U.S. excise taxes on cosmetics. If the excise tax were lowered, a principal beneficiary would be the French perfume subsidiary, whose production would increase.

An American electrical appliance manufacturer, interested in increasing its capital investments in its subsidiaries in Latin America, wishes to see the U.S. investment guaranty program strengthened and desires to present its case to the executive branch and to members of the appropriate congressional committees. The investment guarantees would apply, of course, to the foreign subsidiaries.

An integrated American aluminum company, obtaining its raw material, bauxite, from a subsidiary incorporated abroad, is alarmed by the threat of a tariff that would decrease its foreign production and wants to express its views to members of the executive branch and the Congress.

An American metal producer markets in various parts of the world through foreign subsidiaries. It finds that the Russians are killing the market in certain countries by dumping the metal, for political reasons, and it wants to speak to officials in the executive branch.

A U.S. computer manufacturer incorporates a manufacturing subsidiary in Belgium in order to better compete in the Common Market. It wishes to bring a number of Belgians to this country to familiarize them with a new line of products, and desires to facilitate visa arrangements with the Justice Department. The beneficiary would be a foreign national.

An American chemical company wishes to expedite an export license at the Commerce Department for some materials urgently needed at the plant of its subsidiary in Central America.

An American rubber company has a European subsidiary which manufactures tires. The subsidiary wants to begin marketing its production in certain African countries, and asks the parent to obtain information from the Commerce and State Departments about U.S. attitudes toward private investments in that area, political conditions, marketing data, and so forth.

There are other examples. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I have been very instrumental in the establishment of a great private investment company known as ADELA, the Atlantic development group, which is going to be incorporated in Luxembourg. A very large number of the investors in that enterprise will be American. The preponderant investment will be here.

Interestingly, under the proposed bill, none of these activities would require registration if the foreign operations were conducted through a branch. If, however, the foreign operation is conducted through a subsidiary, registration would appear to be required.

Then there are a great many very important foreign companies which have subsidiaries in the United States. The activities of such subsidiaries might be very, very much confined to the benefit of the subsidiary. A number of examples are as follows:

First. Contacts with the executive branch or the Congress on tariff legislation, or appearances before the Tariff Commission concerning trade negotiations.

Second. Discussions with appropriate Government officials concerning disposals from the strategic stockpile which could affect the U.S. market for various materials.

Third. Meetings with Internal Revenue Service on the application of various U.S. taxes to the domestic subsidiary.

Fourth. Discussions with the Food and Drug Administration regarding a spice which a U.S. subsidiary imports from a foreign parent and wishes to use in a food product marketed in this country.

Fifth. Negotiations with the Customs Bureau concerning the proper tariff classification of an imported product.

Sixth. Appearances before executive agencies and the Congress on customs simplification matters.

Seventh. Informing the foreign parent on discussions held with the Council of Economic Advisers concerning possible U.S. Government actions to increase interest rates or to enforce the wage-price guidelines.

Eighth. Discussions with the State and Commerce Departments concerning U.S. attitudes toward trade with the Soviet.

Ninth. Discussions with the State Department concerning interpretation of tax treaties.

Tenth. Representations concerning the effects of Federal excise taxes on markets in the United States for a product whose raw materials are supplied by the foreign parent.

Eleventh. Attempts to combat a drive to impose burdensome labeling requirements on imported products.

Indeed it is claimed that there really was not presented during the committee's investigation any evidence indicating any necessity to require registration by legitimate companies, primarily American in their ownership and base, conducting normal liaison relations with the U.S. Government on subjects of basic commercial importance.

I think that is borne out, as I have said, by the phrase which I found in the presentation of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], which seemed to me so clear. I think if the Justice Department really follows out that intent, and, in view of all the examples which I have stated, requires registration as a foreign agent of persons who engage in commercial activities in order to reach objectives which may be partially political—almost any American business pursues those objectives all the time—we shall indeed have a very much broader registration requirement than we have now, and there will be considerable jeopardy to the individual companies, in that regard.

In order to incorporate in precise language what I have in mind, I send to the desk an amendment to the bill, and ask that it be stated by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). The Chair informs the Senator from New York that his amendment will not be in order until the committee amendments are agreed to.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, in line 17, it is proposed to insert, after the words "amended by", the words "inserting a dash after the words 'does not include' and adding thereafter '(1)', by"; and on page 3, line 18, to delete the period at the end thereof and add thereafter the following: ", and by adding at the end of subsection (d) the following:

"'(2) any corporation, or any officer, director, employee, servant or attorney of any corporation organized under or created by the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States having its principal place of business within the United States which is at least 80 per centum owned as of record by citizens of the United States and which is regularly and primarily engaged in bona fide commerce, industry, or finance, solely by virtue of activities of any such person in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of any bona fide business corporation or other similar association or organization or combination of persons

"'(i) directly or indirectly at least 50 per centum beneficially owned, or

"'(ii) owned by not more than 20 persons and directly or indirectly at least 5 per centum beneficially owned

by the corporation engaging, or the corporation the officers, directors, employees, servants, or attorneys of which engage in such activities.' "

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I realize we have a problem; yet I believe the bill requires amendment, because certainly the problem is not met by the bill. I say that for this reason. The amendment is, for all practical purposes, an assertion that as for businesses and activities which are substantially owned in the United States, the act shall not apply in terms of foreign agents' registration. That is a generic exemption of a whole class of companies and people.

What the Senator from Arkansas and the committee have been saying is, "Let us seek to exempt a class of activity, that class of activity to be defined within very broad permissive provisions that the act contains."

It can be very easily understood why the people and the corporations concerned are unwilling to submit themselves—and there are a number of them, many of them with great complexities—to this determination by the Department of Justice on a case-by-case basis. One example very opposite to this situation is the antitrust laws. At the same time, it can be easily understood why the committee feels that in some cases even an American principle may be acting for itself, or acting as a subsidiary of a foreign corporation, or acting as the parent of a foreign corporation, and may engage in an activity which comes within the confines of the statute.

The real problem which has been raised is due in the first place, to the effort to regulate, by registration, something which probably is very difficult to regulate; and, second, due to the way in which the committee in its report has set a standard of judgment based upon predominant interest, a criterion which is extremely hard to get to.

I would suggest—and I know the chairman of the committee is wrestling with these questions—this possibility to the chairman: I would say that where there is a very heavily predominant interest in the United States, we deal with it in a specific way. The major part of my amendment deals with 80-percent ownership by Americans. It may very well be that the only way in which this Gordian knot can be cut is to provide that, in the case of an American company which has a very substantial interest in a foreign subsidiary, for the purpose of this statute such a corporation shall be considered as an American company, and not acting for a foreign principal. On the other hand, if a foreign company has an American subsidiary, it would have to be very substantially owned in the United States in order to avoid foreign-agent registration.

Therefore, I suggest to the Senator from Arkansas the possibility of agreeing upon some practical percentage which would make a generic exemption, on the ground that for the purpose of this registration statute it would be necessary to have some rule of thumb other than the uncertain definition of the Department of Justice.

For example, we could provide that an American company would be considered an American company, no matter what it did in this field—even if it were to act in the interest of a foreign subsidiary—provided the foreign subsidiary was two-thirds beneficially owned by the American company.

That is a very high percentage because partnerships and joint ventures abroad often proceed on a 50–50 percent basis. Such a company might well be considered as substantally owned in the United States. Suppose we were to provide, in reverse, that when we are dealing with an American subsidiary of a foreign company, that company would have to be 50 percent beneficially owned in the United States in order to qualify as an American company.

That is a rule of thumb, I agree, and it is an arbitrary standard; but at the same time it is an effort to get away from the predominant-interest subject, which means that the Department of Justice would have to give a railway letter—and I am sure the Senator understands what I mean—any time a doubtful situation existed.

It is important to try to set up some standard by which, for the purpose of this act, we can say that if an American company has subsidiaries abroad, which subsidiaries are owned to the extent of two-thirds, they will be considered to be American companies, whereas if the foreign companies are owned to the extent of one-half, we will consider those subsidiaries to be American companies.

I am not entirely wedded to this percentage; I have merely proposed it in an effort to resolve the issue.

It does seem to me that unless we proceed in this way, we cannot have a sense of assurance or a sense of being at all precise, as one should be in writing a statute.

In order to avoid a number of thorny questions, I believe that some percentage basis as a determinant of what is an American company should be acceptable. I would also not mind if we provided 80 percent of such ownership as to a parent company. In other words, a parent would have to have 80 percent ownership in the United States, and with the subsidiaries, it must own at least x percent of the subsidiaries. I suggested 80 percent. With respect to a foreign subsidiary in the United States, I have suggested that it would have to be 50 percent beneficially owned by Americans. That might be a way in which we could get away from the concept. What I have tried to do is to suggest a solution which will deal with the foreign aspect of this question, rather than with the activity.

I would appreciate having the Senator's comment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, what is involved is the nature of the activity. The Senator from New York is thinking, I suppose, of an ordinary commercial corporation. Suppose it were one of the large unincorporated public relations firms. It might be 100 percent owned by Americans. It could operate just as would an American citizen, who is not incorporated either, and could represent a foreign government. He could represent it in the ordinary course of commercial activities, without having to register. All he would do would be to follow the law, not seek to influence the policy of the Government, particularly as we have seen happen in the notorious cases of lobbyists who come to Congress to lobby before a committee, without ever telling that they are employed. What is involved is the nature of the activity and the end it is intended to reach. If we provide exemptions on the basis of relationships rather than on the basis of the kinds of activities involved, then in a few years, all the lobbyists would be organized in accordance with the particular type of exemption, and they would do whatever they pleased, whenever they liked. I would rather have no bill than to provide such an exemption.

These concepts of political and public policy interests grew up around existing law. There is nothing new in the bill. The bill relates to the power of injunction enforcement beyond the broadened exemption. The words of art have already been developed under existing law.

I do not see how the Senator believes anyone will be grossly misused or injured by the very minor provisions, particularly in this part of the act.

Rather than create an arbitrary standard for exemption on the basis of corporate structures, I would rather have no bill at all; I think we would do better with existing law, by trying to enforce it a little better. The proposals of the committee make it easier to enforce, because it is not necessary to go before a grand jury and get an indictment, put people in jail, or fine them heavily. Under the bill, such representatives can be regulated and the law administered much more easily. All those who would be required to register under the bill also have to register under the existing law.

Mr. JAVITS. In the first place, I think the Senator's point is answered by the amendment, in view of the way the amendment deals with the commercial and business activities of the particular person and of the particular corporation that may be called upon to register. The amendment deals with the activities of the subsidiary of the particular company which is in that particular line of business. It also deals with the domestic subsidiary of a foreign company which is engaged in that particular company's line of business and he engages in its activities in that particular line of business.

As to a company which represents or makes a business of representing other companies, such as a public-relations company, I see no objection whatever to eliminating it completely from this amendment. I have no intention or design to the contrary. We are looking to companies which pursue normal activities throughout the world, and have a real concern that they will be caught in this particular net.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What is "normal" in that case? The Senator cited a great many examples. I reviewed, with the

staff, the first 12, which deal with U.S. parent corporations with foreign subsidiaries. We were unanimous in believing not one of those would be required to register.

As to the second group, foreign parent corporations with U.S. subsidiaries, we could not arrive at a conclusion as to most of them, primarily because there was not enough information.

What is involved is the kind of activity. For example, someone mentioned a Canadian company whose legitimate purpose or legitimate objective is the perfectly normal one of unloading surpluses onto the American stockpile. The Canadian company wants to get rid of its surplus at a price. We have established stockpile policies. The Canadian company comes here openly, with a lawyer, and follows open procedures, without trying to influence policy, but merely to abide by existing policy. It does not seem to me that an activity of that kind would fall within the pattern of the bill.

But suppose the company came before members of a committee that was investigating the matter or had jurisdiction over it, and sought to change the law or change the policy. That would be pursuing the legitimate business objective of selling its metals or whatever its products might be, but by using political means. If the company did that, it would be required to register. We do not say it would be prohibited from doing even that. We do not say it could not approach members of the Government; but if it did, it would be representing a foreign agent or a foreign principal, and it ought to let it be known that it is paid by a Canadian concern and is engaged in that kind of activity. I do not see how that would be a great imposition on such a company.

But if it was doing a normal business, not seeking to influence the policy of the Government through political activities, it would not have to register. It does not have to register under existing law; it would not have to register under the bill.

I cannot approve a big exemption of unknown extent. I would rather have no bill than to have such an exemption.

Mr. JAVITS. In the first place, the Senator from Arkansas picks out stockpiling, which is a relatively small part of the business of foreign companies or foreign subsidiaries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was merely citing an example.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand; but it is a most invidious example. The Senator did not pick out an ordinary example of clothing or appliances; he picked out stockpiling.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If one is selling, there is no reason why he should not attempt to sell those articles, unless he was trying to sell them to the Army or the Navy. But if he were, he would have to register.

Mr. JAVITS. He would have a perfect right to sell them to the Army or the Navy. But the Senator does not include in his example an American company, owned by thousands of American stockholders, and having a Canadian subsidiary whose representative is in the United States, trying to explain something to Congress or to the executive department.

Let us assume that the subsidiary is owned 100 percent by the American company, as the American company itself is 100 percent owned by Americans. The Senator from Arkansas would have it rely on whether the Department of Justice thought or did not think it was representing a foreign principal.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is perfectly clear that it would not register. There is no doubt at all. I do not think that is even a marginal case. Under those facts, it would register if it did any lobbying. It would register with Congress under the domestic lobbying act. The registration certainly would not be as a foreign agent.

Every one of the cases the Senator cites would scare us all to death. They would not have to register under those facts. There is no question about it.

Mr. JAVITS. It is the Senator from Arkansas who is trying to scare us to death. The Senator refers to language in the bill that shows that they would not have to register under these facts; but where is the language that says they would not have to register—except for that in the committee report, which provides that the Department of Justice shall determine what is the predominant interest, if they are lobbying in Washington. Where in the bill is there anything to exculpate a company because it is an American company?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I read from page 23 of the report, section 3(d):

> Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only in private and nonpolitical activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of such foreign principal or in the soliciting or collecting of funds and contributions within the United States to be used only for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering * * *.

It is the words:

> Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only in private and nonpolitical activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce.

As the Senator describes the case, it is as clear as the nose on one's face that it comes under that exemption.

Mr. JAVITS. May I describe this?

It is a mixed political and economic activity, and whether the Attorney General would require the agent to register would be strictly up to the Attorney General.

In response to what the Senator said to me, why does not the Senator consider taking the amendment to conference, in the expectation that in the course of that attritional process we shall be able to agree upon some formula which, apparently, we find it difficult to work out on the floor—a formula which will be fair in the matter of the twilight-zone, thorny questions that we have been debating rather than to ask that the matter now be passed, without any qualifying consideration whatever. At the conference, the Senator will have great control over what proposed legislation will result. But, at least, further recognition will be given to a situation which is apparently deeply troubling a very large part of American business.

It seems to me that in this debate I am only buttressing the feeling that these concerns are not imaginary, that they are real, that the matter will really, in all practicality, be left on the most open-end basis, with the Attorney General deciding on a case-by-case level when he will do what.

In other words, I do not believe that the mere definition of private and nonpolitical activity in furtherance of a bona fide trade or commerce of such foreign principal exempts anything except what the Attorney General wishes to exempt. It seems to me that all of the activities I have described, which the Senator says will not require registration, are mixed economic and political matters. At the very best, one can say they are mixed rather than that they stand alone and of themselves.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I regret that the Senator is pushing this matter. It is not a matter of life or death, to me. I am not going to destroy the bill by making an exemption. I would rather put the bill off. I did not know the Senator would be so positive in his insistence upon this exemption. If the Senator wishes to have this amendment considered, perhaps he should consider having the chairman of the House committee submit it in the House. That is one way that he could approach it.

Mr. President, in order to clarify the RECORD, I believe I should insert at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Department of Justice. It is signed by Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Deputy Attorney General, and is dated June 29, 1964. He was the representative of the Department who followed these hearings, and he is thoroughly familiar with the activities.

I believe it might be pertinent to read a paragraph or two of the letter; he is commenting on an amendment similar to the Senator's, though slightly changed:

> The proposed amendment would change section 1 of the act so as to exclude from the definition of the term "foreign principal" foreign subsidiaries of American business corporations and foreign parents of American business corporations provided such parent corporations are not controlled or financed by the government of a foreign country or a foreign political party.
>
> Thus, in effect, it would exclude any American parent or subsidiary of a foreign business corporation from occupying the status of an agent of a foreign principal irrespective of the nature of the activity engaged in by the parent or subsidiary if it is on behalf of the foreign business corporation.

That is the part of it which I cannot accept—to set aside this class and say that it does not matter what they do, that they are exempt. The real criteria is: What are they doing? That is the criteria which applies to corporations generally: How do they go about achieving their objective, even though that objective is a normal business objective? Are they going to be corrupting the legislator, or bribing the executive, or influencing them in some unacceptable way? That is what is involved. That is why I cannot go for a specific exemption of a class of people, irrespective of the means they seek to achieve their

ends—even though the ends may be commercial, not political.

Personally, I believe, with the members of the committee, that we are not going to take that kind of exemption.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter to which I just referred printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., June 29, 1964.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice on a draft amendment to S. 2136, "To amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended," submitted to your committee by certain corporations, a law firm and one public relations firm.

The proposed amendment would change section 1 of the act so as to exclude from the definition of the term "foreign principal," foreign subsidiaries of American business corporations and foreign parents of American business corporations provided such parent corporations are not controlled or financed by the government of a foreign country or a foreign political party.

Thus, in effect, it would exclude any American parent or subsidiary of a foreign business corporation from occupying the status of an agent of a foreign principal irrespective of the nature of the activity engaged in by the parent or subsidiary if it is on behalf of the foreign business corporation.

This Department is opposed to legislation which would result in an absolute elimination of an entire class of persons from the purview of the registration requirements of the act, since past experience has illustrated that future unforeseen contingencies make such an absolute exclusion undesirable, particularly in this instance as will be indicated. Such a provision is not necessary in order to eliminate from the registration requirements the subjects of the proposed amendment in connection with their normal business operations.

Section 3(d) of the act as presently constituted and as it would be amended by S. 2136 serves to exempt from registration any corporation engaged only in private and nonpolitical commercial or mercantile activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of its foreign principal. Accordingly, any American subsidiary or parent of a foreign corporation whose activities fall within this category may presently avail itself of the exemption. However, the effect of the proposed draft amendment to S. 2136 would be to remove from application of the act such corporations even if they engage in political activities as currently defined by the act or as proposed in S. 2136. Under S. 2136, the obligation to register is imposed only upon those corporations which represent the political or public interests of their foreign principal. With reference to the proposed definitions of political consultant and political activities in S. 2136, you advised Arthur H. Dean, senior partner, Sullivan & Cromwell, during his testimony before your committee on November 20, 1963, that the act as it would be amended was not intended to reach the normal operations of an American corporation or its attorney.

None of the activities of an American parent or subsidiary of a foreign corporation or its attorneys could bring them within the act if the proposed amendment to S. 2136 were adopted. Agents of those corporations who would fall within the proposed exclusion could conceivably engage in political activity of precisely the character that Congress initially intended to be disclosed by its passage of the Foreign Agents Registration Act and the proposed exclusion could, in some instances, defeat the basic purpose of the act.

For the above reasons, this Department is opposed to the suggested change to S. 2136.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Deputy Attorney General.

Mr. JAVITS. I appreciate the Senator's purpose and his idea. That is the very thing which is being opposed here. As I interpret it, the Senator's concept is that if an American company—taking the extreme case—100 percent American owned, has a subsidiary abroad which it owns 100 percent, and then comes to Congress or the Executive and seeks to do something which is in the interests of that foreign subsidiary, the Senator says that at the very best the Attorney General will have to decide whether that is representing a foreign principal. At the very worst, it will depend on what they do, what kind of question it is that they raise.

It seems to me that if we have an American lobbying statute, and if American companies can lobby all they wish without the need to register as an agent of a foreign principal—which some American companies may particularly wish to do—then one is imposing a rather onerous burden by asserting that because they operate abroad through a subsidiary they are put in doubt and in jeopardy under this whole statute, on the ground that they are really not an American company owning an American subsidiary.

I do not believe that the Senator can have it all that way, either. I do not believe that is fair, in view of the fact that we have an adequate American lobbying statute which theoretically, as the Senator first argues, under the guise of relaxing the restrictions of the statute, many people will be "caught in the net." The Senator states that they should have been caught before, but the law has not been well administered.

I cannot propose to assume that. We must assume that it has been well administered, and that they will be "caught in the net" now, because of the interpretation placed upon it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not say that. The Senator is speaking exactly contrary to the interpretation. I said that the way the Senator originally described it left the impression that there are a number of people who, under existing law, should have registered, but that the law has been very laxly enforced.

I did not say it would not be because of the bill, but only because the Department was more vigorous in its enforcement. That well may happen without a bill. I do not know. The Department has been chastened by its experience in the hearings. But that was not because of the language in the bill at all—or what I said. The bill has not broadened the coverage at all. It has broadened the exemption.

I do not follow the Senator at all in what he is saying—what he is attributing to me, at least. We have not broadened. We are not interested in broadened registration. We are interested in proper enforcement and a thorough checking of those who are registered.

There was only one case of a nonregistered agent, and that was simply a case of a clear violation, and the party pleaded nolo contendere. Our whole trouble was that there were cases of registrants who did not register fully and properly. That was all we are interested in—as to the coverage of certain people who have not been complying under the approach of the Senator to this problem. A domestic corporation could have a foreign subsidiary and the principal of the domestic firm could hire himself out, and he would be completely exempt, no matter what he did.

We had some cases of American citizens with foreign principals—subsidiaries, if one likes—it does not make any difference whether an individual or a corporation. They hire themselves out and come over here and do all sorts of things through the American Government, and we all become involved in aid, sugar, and handouts of various kinds. It is a dangerous area in which to create any exemptions. I cannot be a party to them.

Mr. JAVITS. The extreme case which has just been described is that there is accommodation to the point of view which I have set forth. The Senator asserts that he does not believe they will have to register, that the Attorney General will let them off the hook. In the first place, the difficulty there is that we have to have an ad hoc decision on every particular situation. This becomes an uncomfortable situation for companies engaged in a very wide range of business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Who decides that? This does not change the committee. The Attorney General stated that he would be perfectly willing to give advisory opinions. Consider the existing law. No one has advanced this, but someone has got to take the responsibility of saying whether one should register.

I do not see that there is any difference compared to the present law. One can ask the Attorney General ahead of time, "Under these circumstances, should I register?"

The Attorney General has placed himself on record as being perfectly willing to render opinions about this matter. What is the difference between that situation and the situation which exists now?

Mr. JAVITS. The difference between that situation and that which exists now is that the committee has now set forth exactly how it intends this matter to be handled on the predominant interest theory. That is left completely to the Attorney General. The Attorney General does not have to give advisory opinions unless he wants to give them. The present Attorney General may want to render opinions. The next Attorney General may not want to do that.

One should not be left in jeopardy every time he goes to see a Senator or Representative as to whether he should register under the act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why is one not in jeopardy today?

Mr. JAVITS. One is not in this kind of jeopardy because he is not faced with a new law, such as we have before us now, the enforcement of which has been spelled out very clearly by the committee in charge of the legislation.

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

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

INVESTIGATION OF ROBERT G. BAKER BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senate Rules Committee has announced that it has completed the investigation of the Bobby Baker case. I regret to say that I must disagree with this report. The Rules Committee may have stopped its investigation, but it has not completed it.

The majority membership of the Rules Committee have backed down when confronted with a possibly embarrassing disclosure, and by their failure to pursue this investigation they are vulnerable to the charge of attempted whitewash. The failure of the committee to call certain key witnesses to clear up highly important questions cannot be defended. Likewise their insistence that Members of the Senate are above questioning is indefensible.

As the author of the original resolution which started this investigation I am disappointed with the results of the committee's work.

Today, I shall cite another example of the incomplete work of the committee by showing how Mr. Robert Baker apparently charged an estimated $3,000 in personal telephone calls to the Government.

These allegations that Mr. Baker had charged many of his personal business telephone calls to the Government were presented to the committee. When questioned in the committee about these calls Mr. Baker, upon the advice of his attorney, took the fifth amendment. But the committee should not have stopped here; all of Mr. Baker's expenditures should have been audited.

Significantly, Mr. Baker took the fifth amendment on the excuse that if he answered the question the answer might incriminate him. He was right. The correct answer would have incriminated him. There is no question but that Mr. Robert Baker did charge many of his personal business telephone calls to the U.S. Government as being official calls.

This is a clear violation of the law and collection proceedings should be handled by the Department of Justice.

Between October 1, 1961, and March 31, 1964, Mr. Baker made 1,211 telephone calls at a total cost of $3,473.41. These calls were all listed as official calls and charged to the Government through his office as secretary to the majority.

As a comparison, during this same period the secretary of the minority made only 88 official telephone calls at a total cost of $142.55.

With the majority membership of the Senate about double the minority membership it could be understood why Mr. Baker's official telephone calls would be proportionately higher, but under no circumstances could a justification be made for his telephone calls being 25 times higher.

As evidence of Mr. Baker's arrogance when asked about these calls I shall quote from his testimony before the Rules Committee on February 25, 1964. At that time he was being questioned as to why certain calls had been charged to the Government, and in each instance he took the fifth amendment.

The Rules Committee has in its files an itemized breakdown of all of these telephone calls.

The questions and answers from the committee records of February 25, 1964, are as follows:

Senator CURTIS. Mr. Baker, on or about November 30, 1962, you made a long distance call to Milwaukee, to Mr. Max Karl, head of the MGIC Corp. A similar call on April 2, 1963, a similar one on April 22, 1963, a similar one on May 8, 1963; will you tell the committee whether or not those calls were made at Government expense?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct that the witness answer the question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

I depart from the reading of this testimony, to state that the MGIC Corp. is a corporation in which Mr. Baker bought a substantial bloc of stock, at a very low price in relation to its market value, and thereby realized a substantial profit. He registered the stock in the name of some of his friends and certain Government employees.

Continuing to read:

Senator CURTIS. Mr. Baker, records indicate that you made a number of calls to San Juan, P.R., to one Paul Aguirre. Will you state whether or not those calls were made at Government expense and, if so, what Government business was discussed?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct that the witness answer the question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

* * * * *

Senator CURTIS. Mr. Baker, the telephone records indicate a number of calls made by you from Miami, Fla. For instance, February 26, 1963, you called from Miami, Mr. Tucker. Was the purpose of that call your private business or Government business?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct that the witness answer the question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

I point out that Mr. Tucker was the Washington law partner of Mr. Baker. Mr. Tucker was handling some of the fees that they were receiving on the side.

Continuing to read:

Senator CURTIS. On this same day of February 26, 1963, there was a conversation between Miss Tyler, Mr. Ed Levinson, who was then at the International Airport Hotel. I refer to, Mr. Witness, that the Witness Black stated his business was gambling. Do you know whether or not that call was charged to the Government?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct that the witness answer the question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

Senator CURTIS. On the 20th of February the records indicate—this is 1963—that you called Ed Levinson at his Fremont Hotel at Las Vegas, Nev. Will you tell us whether or not that call related to your official duties or whether it related to private business?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct that the witness answer the question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

Senator CURTIS. Will you tell us who paid for the call?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

Senator CURTIS. Mr. Baker, the telephone records indicate that on the 20th of November 1962 or—excuse me—on the 5th of December 1962, you called Mr. Clint Murchison, Jr., at Dallas, Tex. Will you state whether or not that call pertained to your official duties as secretary of the majority or whether or not it was your private business?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the witness answer the question?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

Senator CURTIS. Did the Government pay for that telephone call?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct that the witness answer the question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of these interrogations by committee members of Robert Baker, in connection with specific telephone calls, be printed in the RECORD, along with his answers thereto.

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

Senator CURTIS. Mr. Baker, the telephone records indicate many other calls; I am selecting some for the purpose of informing the Senate in the event any further laws or rules or regulations pertaining to Government facilities are necessary. The records indicate a great many calls to and from your office, official Government office, to Ocean City. Will you tell us whether or not any of those calls which related to your private business were paid for by the Government?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct the witness answer the question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

Senator CURTIS. Mr. Baker, the record indicates a number of calls made by you to one Nick Popich, New Orleans, La. Will you tell us whether or not those calls were made as part of your official duties?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

Senator CURTIS. I request that he be ordered to answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct that the witness answer the question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

* * * * *

Senator CURTIS. Did the Government pay for any calls that you made to Nick Popich which did not relate to your official duties?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

* * * * *

Senator CURTIS. Mr. Baker, the records indicate that the 26th day of April 1963—I withdraw that. Mr. Baker, on March 7, 1963, you called Fred Black who was in Beverly Hills, Calif. Will you tell us whether or not that was in connection with your official Government business?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct that the witness answer the question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

Senator CURTIS. Will you tell us whether or not that call was made at Government expense?

Mr. BAKER. I stand by my previous answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I order and direct that the witness answer the question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I stand by my previous answer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I do not think the fact that Mr. Baker took the fifth amendment in this connection closes the case. Certainly the accounts in his Government office ought to be audited by the Comptroller General. The result of this audit should be forwarded to the Department of Justice.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY SYSTEM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Prof. James Tobin, of Yale, former member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has written an article, which was published in the May issue of the Harvard Review of Economics and Statistics, in which he criticizes the actions of the managers of the international monetary system, particularly the reactions of the central bankers of Europe toward the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.

Although I would place more of the responsibility than he has on our own officials who had at their disposal the enormous resources of the United States to resist European pressures, and could have tackled the question of world monetary reform with greater foresight and imagination, I am in sympathy with his criticism. This is not to say that during the past few years those who are responsible for operating the system here and abroad have been devoid of all ideas or initiative. On the contrary, they have introduced innovations which have been effective in postponing a crisis.

My own dissatisfaction is that their approach to adapting the international monetary system to current world conditions has been timid, being more disposed toward taking ad hoc measures than to come face to face with the basic question of whether the adjustment mechanism implicit in the existing system is flexible enough to bring about, within a reasonable time, correction in the imbalances in the international monetary system, and whether this adjustment mechanism places equal burdens on the countries which are in surplus positions and those which suffer payments deficits. Presently major imbalances take years to eliminate, and require, on the part of deficit countries, measures which hamper growth and world trade.

The financial managers must also answer the question whether the stock of international credit—liquidity—will be adequate in the near future to provide countries suffering temporary balance-of-payments deficits sufficient time to take corrective action without halting or inhibiting measures designed to expand their economies. The answers to these questions cannot be delayed indefinitely without great cost to every country concerned.

Professor Tobin sums up the case against the present approach as follows:

> The dollar crisis will no doubt be surmounted * * *. The world monetary systems will stay afloat, and its captains on both sides of the Atlantic will congratulate themselves on their seamanship in weathering the storm.
>
> But the storm is in good part their own making. And if the financial ship has weathered it, it has done so only by jettisoning much of the valuable cargo it was supposed to deliver. Currency parities have been maintained, but full employment has not been. The economic growth of half the advanced non-Communist world has been hobbled, to the detriment of world trade in general and the exports of the developing countries in particular. Currencies have become technically more convertible but important and probably irreversible restrictions and discriminations on trade and capital movements have been introduced. Some Government transactions of the highest priority for the foreign policy of the United States and the West have been curtailed. Others have been "tied" to a degree that impairs their efficiency and gives aid and comfort to the bizarre principle that practices which are disreputably illiberal when applied to private international transactions are acceptable when Government money is involved.

The central bankers' disposition to discuss major international financial problems in private is, in my view, one of the major deterrents to substantial progress in this field. Therefore, on July 10, 1963, I submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 53, in which I proposed that a well-prepared international monetary and economic conference be convened by the President, to recommend needed changes in existing financial institutions and to consider other pressing economic problems placed before the conference by a preparatory committee.

I renew my proposal with the full realization that both the Paris Club and the IMF are conducting studies regarding the adequacy of international monetary institutions and international liquidity, for what is needed is basic reform, and this requires a framework in which agreements can be made.

I ask unanimous consent that Professor Tobin's thoughtful article; as well as an editorial dealing with this subject, from the June 24 edition of the Washington Post; and an article from the June 22 edition of the New York Times, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the Review of Economics and Statistics, May 1964]

EUROPE AND THE DOLLAR

(By James Tobin)

The dollar crisis will no doubt be surmounted. "The dollar" will be saved. Its parity will be successfully maintained, and the world will be spared that ultimate and unmentionable calamity whose consequences are the more dreaded for never being described. The world monetary system will stay afloat, and its captains on both sides of the Atlantic will congratulate themselves on their seamanship in weathering the storm.

But the storm is in good part their own making. And if the financial ship has weathered it, it has done so only by jettisoning much of the valuable cargo it was supposed to deliver. Currently parities have been maintained, but full employment has not been. The economic growth of half the advanced non-Communist world has been hobbled, to the detriment of world trade in general and the exports of the developing countries in particular. Currencies have become technically more convertible but important and probably irreversible restrictions and discriminations on trade and capital movements have been introduced. Some Government transactions of the highest priority for the foreign policy of the United States and the West have been curtailed. Others have been "tied" to a degree that impairs their efficiency and gives aid and comfort to the bizarre principle that practices which are disreputably illiberal when applied to private international transactions are acceptable when Government money is involved.

These are the costs. Were, and are, all these hardships necessary? To what end have they been incurred?

They have been incurred in order to slow down and end the accumulations of dollar obligations in the hands of European central banks. It is fair to ask, therefore, whether these accumulations necessarily involved risks and costs serious enough for the countries concerned and for the world at large to justify the heavy costs of stopping them.

Which is easier? Which is less disruptive and less costly, now and in the long run? To stop the private or public transactions that lead one central bank to acquire another's currency? Or to compensate these transactions by official lending in the opposite direction? I do not suggest that the answer is always in favor of compensatory finance. But the issue always needs to be faced, and especially in the present case.

Several courses were open to European countries whose central banks had to purchase dollars in their exchange markets in recent years. (a) They could have built up their dollar holdings quietly and gladly, as they did before 1959. (b) By exercising their right to buy gold at the U.S. Treasury, they could have forced devaluation of the dollar or suspension of gold payments. (c) They could have taken various measures to correct and reverse chronic European payments surpluses. (d) By occasional withdrawals of gold and by constant complaints they could have brought tremendous pressure for

discipline upon the United States without forcing a change in the dollar parity.

European central banks and governments chose the fourth course, with token admixtures of the third. They have made world opinion, and American opinion, believe there is no other choice. Almost everyone agrees that the pressure of the balance-of-payments deficit upon the United States is inescapable arithmetic rather than the deliberate policy of foreign governments. Yet for almost 10 years previously, U.S. deficits were no problem. Clearly it is a change in human attitude and public policy, not inexorable circumstance, which has compelled us to take corrective actions.

It is true that the concern of financial officials about the dollar was only an echo—and a subdued echo at that—of the fears, hopes, anxieties, and speculations that arose in private financial circles in the late 1950's. But financial officials do not have to follow the private exchange markets; they can lead instead. By an equivocal attitude toward private suspicions of the dollar, European officials kept pressure on the United States. Never did they firmly say that they would not force devaluation or suspension of gold payments. Instead, they succeeded in making the maintenance of gold-dollar convertibility at $35 per ounce a unilateral commitment of the United States, under three successive administrations. Once a banker has solemnly assured the world and his depositors that he will never fail, he is at the mercy of those depositors capable of making him fail.

Memories are short, and gratitude is not a consideration respected in international relations, especially when money is involved. But the United States had and has considerable moral claim on European governments and central banks.

The present excess supply of dollars is in many respects an unwinding of the dollar shortage of the immediate postwar period. Capital left Europe because the Continent was vulnerable to military attack, its governments were unstable, its industries were prostrate and uncompetitive, and its currencies were inconvertible. Capital has returned to Europe when events have overcome the special advantages which North America seemed to have in these respects. It is therefore relevant to recall the behavior of the United States when the shoe was on the other foot.

During the dollar shortage the United States: gave Western European countries (other than Greece, Turkey, and Spain) $32 billion of military and economic aid; lent them $11 billion additional (in spite of the default of European governments of debts connected with World War I); acquiesced in substantial devaluations of European currencies, without which European exports would still not be competitive; and acquiesced in exchange controls, capital controls, quantitative restrictions on imports, and discriminations against the United States and other non-European countries—by no means all of which are liquidated even now. After enabling Europe to overcome the dollar shortage, the United States has been expected to adjust to its reversal without the tools that Europe used in its turn. Rightly so, because many of these tools were illiberal expedients—the more reason for replacing them now with compensatory intergovernmental finance.

The United States has undertaken, at considerable cost in real resources and foreign exchange, to defend Western Europe against the Soviet Union. This is in theory a joint effort, but European governments do not even yet fulfill their modest commitments to NATO. While European political leaders solicit constant reassurance that U.S. military power will remain visibly in Europe, their finance ministers and central bankers complain about the inflow of dollars.

The United States has not only tolerated but encouraged the development of a European customs union which attracts American capital and discriminates against American exports (especially the products of industries, notably agriculture, where North America has a clear comparative advantage).

The United States has borne a disproportionate share of the burden of assistance to uncommitted and underdeveloped nations, in which European countries have a common political and, one might hope, humanitarian interest.

The United States has provided a reserve currency. In the late forties no other international and intergovernmental money was available except gold; and the supply of gold was not keeping up with the demand. U.S. deficits filled the gap with dollars. It is true that this gave the United States a favored position among countries. Anyone who can print money can choose how new money will be first spent. The United States did not seek this privileged role; it arose by accidental evolution rather than conscious design. As it happens, the United States did not exploit it to live beyond our means, to make the American people more affluent. We used it rather for broad international purposes. No doubt in the long run the creation of new international money should be a privilege and responsibility more widely and symmetrically shared. But once the United States and the world are adjusted to the creation of international money via U.S. deficits, it is scarcely reasonable suddenly to ring a bell announcing that the world's financial experts have now decided that these deficits—past, present, and future—are pernicious.

The United States has not pushed its moral case before world public opinion. This is because many Americans believe, or prefer to believe, that balance-of-payments deficits, like venereal diseases, betray and punish the sins of those whom they afflict. Others regard them as simply matters of arithmetic and circumstance. Still others are afraid that making a moral argument will indicate to our all-powerful European creditors insufficient resolution to overcome the difficulties. On their side, the Europeans have neatly segregated the contexts. Their financial officials wash their hands of tariff and trade policies, agricultural protection, defense and aid appropriations, and their governments' budgets. Any European failings on these counts are facts of life to which the United States must adjust, rather than reasons for more patience or more credit.

By the narrowest of bankers' criteria—all moral claims aside—the United States is a good credit risk. Its balance sheet vis-a-vis the rest of the world, not to mention its internal productive strength, indicates the capacity to service a considerably increased external public debt. The United States has been confined to the types of credit that can be given on the books of central banks. European Parliaments cannot be asked to vote long-term loans to Uncle Sam, although the American people voted through the Congress to tax themselves to finance the Marshall plan when Europe's credit rating was nil.

Meanwhile, European central banks are uneasy holding short-term dollar assets. They prefer gold. Why? Because they might some day force us to give them a capital gain on gold holdings. We compensate them with interest on their dollar holdings when they forgo this speculative possibility. But bygones are bygones; and past interest earnings are irrelevant when future capital gains beckon. On its side, the United States has had nothing to lose and much to gain in guaranteeing to maintain the value of official dollar holdings. After stubbornly resisting this suggestion on obscure grounds of principle, the U.S. Treasury now belatedly and selectively guarantees value in foreign currency.

The only remaining reason to refuse the U.S. credit is that the United States, like any other deficit country, must be "disciplined." Disciplined to do what?

To stop an orgy of inflation? The United States has the best price record of any country, except Canada, since 1958—before there was a balance-of-payments problem. The rates of unemployment and excess capacity during the period scarcely suggest that the Government has been recklessly overheating the economy with fiscal and monetary fuel.

Nevertheless, many Europeans say that when they buy dollars they are importing inflation. It is hard to take this claim seriously. First of all, if acquisitions of dollars are inflationary so are acquisitions of gold, and Europe shows no signs of saturation with gold. Second, the classic mechanism of international transmission of inflation is certainly not operating. We have not inflated ourselves into an import surplus adding to aggregate demand in Europe. To the contrary, we have maintained a large and secularly growing export surplus. Third, although central bank purchases of foreign exchange have the same expansionary monetary effects at home as other open market purchases, it is not beyond the wit or experience of man to neutralize these effects by open market sales or other monetary actions. Fourth, U.S. farmers and coal producers, and Japanese light manufacturers, among others, stand ready to help European governments reduce their living costs and their payment surpluses at the same time. The truth is that Europe does not really want a solution at the expense of its balance of trade.

Perhaps we are to be disciplined to cut foreign aid. European governments do not attach the same importance as we do to aid programs, especially in the Western Hemisphere. Clearly we need a better understanding on development assistance and burden sharing among the advanced countries.

Should the United States be disciplined in order to cut off private exports of capital, by controls or by tight monetary policy or both? This has been a major and successful focus of European pressure. The U.S. authorities have responded by pushing up U.S. interest rates, more than a full point at the short end, and by proposing the interest equalization tax. European pressure is motivated in part by nationalistic and protectionist aims—keep the rich Americans from buying up or competing with local industry. This may or may not be a worthy objective, but its worth is the same whether international payments are in balance or not.

Two other issues are involved. The first concerns capital markets and controls. Should the United States move toward poorer and more autarkic capital markets, or should the Europeans move toward more efficient and freer capital markets? Much of U.S. long-term capital movement to Europe does not represent a transfer of real saving. Instead it is a link in a double transatlantic chain connecting the European saver and the European investor. The saver wants a liquid, safe, short-term asset. The investor needs long-term finance or equity capital and seeks it in the United States. Unfortunately, another link in the same chain is official European holding of short-term dollar obligations. But the Europeans themselves could, through institutional reforms, do a great deal to connect their savers and investors more directly and to reduce the spread between their long and short interest rates.

The second issue is the appropriate international level of interest rates. Evidently national rates must be more closely alined to each other as international money and capital markets improve. But surely the low-rate country should not always do the alining. This would impart a deflationary bias

to the system. In principle, easy fiscal policy could overcome this bias, but only at the expense of investment and growth. In the present situation European countries are fighting inflation by tightening their money markets rather than their budgets. They are forcing the United States to fight unemployment with a tight money, easy budget mixture. If interest rates are raised whenever a country faces either inflation or balance-of-payments difficulties, while expansionary fiscal policy is the only measure ever used to combat deflation, a number of swings in business activity and in payments will move the world to a mixture of policies quite unfavorable to longrun growth.

In summary, the adjustments forced on the United States to correct its payments deficit have not served the world economy well. Neither were they essential. European countries have had at their disposal several measures which are desirable in their own right, not just as correctives to the present temporary imbalance in payments. To the extent that they are unprepared to take these measures, they should willingly extend compensatory finance. International financial policy is too important to leave to financiers. There are more important accounts to balance than the records of international transactions, and more important markets to equilibrate than those in foreign exchange.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 24, 1964]

EUROPE AND THE DOLLAR

Many high Government officials, particularly those on leave from universities, look to the day when they can discard their masks of anonymity and discuss sensitive policy issues without fear of committing indiscretions. James Tobin, the distinguished Yale economist, was close to the balance-of-payments problem when he served on the Council of Economic Advisers, and now he exploits that experience with telling effect in his candid reflections on "Europe and the Dollar" which appear in the current number of The Review of Economics and Statistics.

The thrust of Professor Tobin's excellent article is that the policies which the United States is following in an effort to correct its payments deficit have not served the world economy well. Nor are they essential.

When the European central bankers in 1959 decided that their dollar holdings were excessive, there were several alternatives. They might have gone on accumulating dollar claims as they had for nearly a decade; or by exercising their right to buy gold from the Treasury they could have forced a suspension of payments or the devaluation of the dollar. A third alternative would have been measures to eliminate the European payments surpluses. But instead they chose a policy of needling coercion: occasional withdrawals of gold, doubts about the integrity of the dollar and loud demands for a balance-of-payments "discipline" that resulted in tighter money, higher interest rates, and unemployment in this country.

What the Europeans forgot in their zeal to place this country in the position of a profligate supplicant was the record of generosity during the postwar period of the dollar shortage. Instead of demanding "discipline" the United States extended $43 billion in gifts and loans to the countries of Western Europe. It acquiesced in substantial devaluations of European currencies and in the establishment of capital and exchange controls, some of which are still in force. It encouraged the formation of the Common Market, a customs union which attracts American capital and discriminates against American exports.

In glimpsing into the future, Mr. Tobin is concerned over the trend of world interest rates. In order to eliminate disequilibrating movements of capital, the levels of interest rates among trading countries must be closely alined. But the United States as the low-interest country should not always do the alining, for doing so imparts a strong deflationary bias to the world system: "In the present situation European countries are fighting inflation by tightening their money markets rather than their budgets. They are forcing the United States to fight unemployment with a tight money-easy budget mixture. If interest rates are raised whenever a country faces either inflation or balance-of-payments difficulties, while expansionary fiscal policy is the only measure ever used to combat deflation, a number of swings in business activity and in payments will move the world to a mixture of policies quite unfavorable to longrun growth."

[From the New York Times, June 22, 1964]

BANK CIRCLE SCORED—FORMER KENNEDY AID TAKES DIM VIEW OF INTERNATIONAL MONETARY OFFICIALS

(By M. J. Rossant)

The tight little central banking fraternity, which is responsible for keeping the international monetary system in operation, recently got a rough going over from a former official of the Kennedy administration.

James Tobin, who served on the President's Council of Economic Advisers, was never in the inner circle of monetary and financial officials. But he was reasonably close. From what he observed, he has come to the conclusion that "international financial policy is too important to leave to financiers."

This may well be true, but Mr. Tobin neglects to mention his candidates to take over the task of running the monetary system. It is doubtful that he would give the job to politicians, for that would mean continuous confrontations with General de Gaulle.

In all likelihood, the international fraternity will keep on doing business at the same old stand. But Mr. Tobin's slings and arrows have some validity.

EUROPE CRITICIZED

Writing in Harvard University's Review of Economics and Statistics, he argues that international cooperation to defend the dollar has been costly, exaggerated and one sided. Washington, he states, has been doing most of the cooperating, with the Europeans either dragging their feet or actively forcing the United States to take steps that hurt its domestic growth.

Most observers have been full of praise for the cooperation achieved by the monetary authorities. But though Mr. Tobin admits that cooperation has worked, he is sparing with his compliments and his respect.

Central bankers are men of mystery. They have their secret "gold pool" in London; they have the committee of 10, which is working out new arrangements to strengthen the international monetary mechanism; there is another closed-door study being undertaken by the International Monetary Fund, and regular meetings of the fraternity take place at the Bank for International Settlements in Basle. It is all very cozy, with no interruptions by television or the press.

The fraternity has no special hand clasp, but all of its members are closemouthed. Most were incensed when Reginald Maudling, Britain's Chancellor of the Exchequer, publicly expressed demand for new measures in 1962. That sort of thing just isn't done. The fraternity may not be as image-conscious as politicians, but it has succeeded in putting on an impeccable and unassailable solid front by settling all differences in private.

DIM VIEW TAKEN

As an outsider, Mr. Tobin cannot be accused of giving away any fraternity secrets. But he has a very dim view of most central bankers and financial officials. He infers that they are ungrateful, ungenerous, and narrowminded; he adds that they are a suspicious lot, given to making constant complaints.

In fact, he blames the fraternity with weathering the dollar storm "only by jettisoning much of the valuable cargo it was supposed to deliver." He charges that international cooperation was at the expense of full employment in the United States, a curbing of world trade and other restrictive developments.

As Mr. Tobin sees it the European branch of the fraternity could have done a great deal more to keep the financial ship in order and the dollar protected from disruptive storms.

He takes them to task for failing to dispel private suspicions about the dollar. Instead of making clear that they not demand gold in exchange for their growing pile of dollars, he says that they added to the pressure on the United States by forcing three successive administrations to make unilateral commitments to maintain the existing price of gold.

Their attitude, Mr. Tobin states, placed the United States in an unenviable position, for "once a banker has solemnly assured the world and his depositors that he will never fail, he is at the mercy of those depositors capable of making him fail."

Mr. Tobin believes that the Europeans in recent years did not match the generosity displayed by Washington earlier. If they had been willing to make use of their surpluses and shared the costs of defense and aid, the United States would have been faced with a much easier problem.

But the Europeans, he points out, "wash their hands of tariff and trade policies, agricultural protection, defense, and aid appropriations, and their governments' budgets."

Mr. Tobin's harsh indictment is not without substance. The fraternity is powerful, but only within carefully circumscribed limits. Central bankers who sought to make their influence felt on trade or defense or other politically sensitive areas would soon be out of a job—and the fraternity.

The cooperation that has been achieved by central bankers has shortcomings, but it has been working more smoothly than in some other areas. Indeed, there has been a notable lack of cooperation on trade agreements and a virtual unraveling of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization alinement.

Despite all of their human failings, their cautiousness and conservatism, and shortsightedness, central bankers have been more constructive than they were in the years between the wars.

The fraternity may not be moving fast enough, but Mr. Tobin is overestimating their importance by blaming them for being uncooperative. Getting admitted into the fraternity is in the hands of politicians.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2136) to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment which I previously offered and send another amendment to the desk, which I ask to be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York is withdrawn.

The clerk will now read the amendment presently offered by the Senator from New York.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 7, line 20, to strike out the period and insert: "and inserting

after the words 'beneficial' the words 'or other activities not serving substantially a foreign political interest.' "

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe the words of the amendment which I have sent to the desk occur in section 3(d) after the words "foreign principal." I do not think the amendment has been read correctly. I would like to read the amendment for the RECORD, if I may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to read the text of the amendment for the RECORD so it will be clear:

On page 7, line 20, strike out the period and insert: "and inserting after the words 'foreign principal' the words 'or other activities not serving substantially a foreign political interest.' "

Those words will be added to the exemption clause of the Foreign Agents Registration Act as it was reported to the Senate and would, in my judgment, tend to qualify, in accordance with our discussion, the activities which are exempt from the statute, and to include yet another category which will fit a great many of the specific examples which I gave, and which have been confirmed by the Senator from Arkansas and which will enable the Attorney General, in the enforcement of the law, to have some provision of the law to which he can refer in his definition of what is exempt and what is not exempt, rather than be confined to the specification of the intent as set forth in the committee's report.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. 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. JAVITS. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment which I have just offered, and offer the following amendment. I shall read the amendment, to help the clerk:

On page 7, line 20, strike out the period and insert the following words: "and by inserting after the words 'foreign principal' the words 'or other activities not serving predominantly a foreign interest.' "

Now I ask the clerk to state the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 7, line 20, to strike out the period and insert the following words: "and by inserting after the words 'foreign principal' the words 'or other activities not serving predominantly a foreign interest.' "

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am glad we have been able to work out something which will give the Attorney General a standard by which a whole range of activities can be properly dealt with, with the knowledge of those being dealt with and the Attorney General himself. I hope the Senator from Arkansas will accept the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall be glad to accept the amendment. I do not think it does violence to the committee report. I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, before passage of the bill, I would like to say to my colleague, the Senator from Arkansas, to the committee, and to the Attorney General, that I hope very much the fact that we have debated this question and have included another standard in the bill will make clear to the Attorney General, whoever he may be, who is administering the act, what is exactly the thrust of the statute as amended. As the Senator from Arkansas explained so properly, the statute is being amended in order to get what was felt would be a tighter administration.

It is not intended to reach activities of a character which no one ever expected would be reached in this fashion, a good many of which we have described as coming from domestic companies with subsidiaries abroad and coming from domestic subsidiaries of foreign companies. We have chosen to make our distinction based upon activity. That follows the views of the Senator from Arkansas. We have also made it very clear that the mere fact that an activity has some political complexion or some foreign interests does not necessarily make it an activity which brings the person directing it under registration.

I hope very much that all this legislative history will be considered in respect of the administration of the law, which will heavily depend for its administration, in good commonsense and with accommodation to the activities of the American business world, upon the way in which the Attorney General takes to heart what we have said here today.

I am very grateful to the Senator from Arkansas for his cooperative spirit and open mind.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator. The Senator has been very reasonable about this matter. I was reluctant to open up exemptions which could be far-reaching and which I thought would destroy the effectiveness of the bill. I do not regard this bill as a panacea for all our ills, but it can be useful if it is properly administered. I believe the Department of Justice will administer it properly.

I believe that the hearings and these discussions will clarify the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 2136) was passed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MRS. MARJORIE CURTIS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanmous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1106 (H.R. 4811).

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4811) for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Curtis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a brief explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1168) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay Mrs. Marjorie Curtis, of La Monte, Mo., $1,000 in full settlement of her claims against the United States for the inconvenience and disruption incident to the crash of a B–47 aircraft of the U.S. Air Force on her farm on February 27, 1956, and in further settlement of all her claims for personal injuries, pain, and suffering traceable to that crash.

STATEMENT

The facts in the case are set out in House Report 231 and are as follows:

On February 27, 1956, a U.S. Air Force B–47, while on an Air Force mission, crashed and burned on a farm approximately 4½ miles north of La Monte, Mo. The main part of the fuselage hit about 30 feet from a farmhouse occupied by Mr. and Mrs. Clay Curtis as tenants. Mrs. Curtis and her son Danny escaped from the house which was burned down with a total loss of their personal property therein. The crash also destroyed certain farm implements owned by the Curtises, including a tractor.

The committee has carefully considered the circumstances of this matter which have resulted in an appeal to the Congress for legislative relief. A subcommittee hearing was conducted on the bill on April 4, 1962, and, subsequent to that hearing at the request of the subcommittee, additional information was presented to it. The compensation provided in the amended bill is intended to provide for payment for certain losses which could not be paid under existing administrative or judicial procedures. However, the committee has found that the unusual circumstances of this case justify the payment in an amount of $1,000 on the basis of broad considerations of equity and justice.

As will appear from a reading of the report on the bill from the Department of the Air Force, the total loss of personal property referred to above was the subject of a settlement with the Air Force under the terms of the Military Claims Act (31 U.S.C.

223b). However, that settlement did not take into consideration the unusual hardship which was imposed on that family. Approximately 8 years prior to this crash, Mrs. Curtis lost the sight of one eye. Thereafter she suffered a diminution of about 80 percent of the sight of the other eye due to a prior and hereditary organic affliction. While the Air Force report states that the crash neither caused nor aggravated Mrs. Curtis' condition, this committee has concluded that the crash had a very clear and burdensome effect upon her life which is also related to her blindness.

The Air Force report notes that the settlement was unable to take into consideration the item of inconvenience which resulted from the readjustments Mrs. Curtis had to make as the result of acclimating herself to new housing arrangements. Obviously, prior to the destruction of her home Mrs. Curtis was familiar with the location of the items within that house and its general layout. This enabled her to carry on her household tasks and daily living to the fullest extent of her ability despite the severe diminution of her sight. However, the bare outline of the facts, as reflected in the Air Force report, do not truly reflect the unfortunate effect of this crash upon the Curtis family.

On the day of the crash, Mrs. Curtis and one son, who was ill and therefore at home, escaped from the house with some minor burns. Another son returning home on a schoolbus was intercepted by two soldiers and was barred from his home without fully knowing what had happened to the family. The father, Mr. Clay Curtis, returned home from a farm sale to find complete destruction and to discover that his fences were down and his livestock had strayed away. It is reported to the committee that he became a nervous wreck and found it difficult to begin to provide for his family and rearrange his farming operation. The crash destroyed farm machinery including the tractor and combine. While the depreciated value for the machinery was the subject of the Air Force settlement, the replacement machinery had to be purchased at inflated prices to enable continued farm operation. Mr. Curtis had to borrow money to provide a home for his family and continue farming. The Curtises built a garage on a tract of 80 acres they owned across the road from the site of the crash. Water had to be carried to this temporary house. In a letter to the sponsor of the bill, Mrs. Curtis described the impact on the family in this way: "* * * My garden was located in a field a quarter of a mile from the house as we were told by authorities that all of that ground that had fuel spilled on it from the jet would not produce. Much worry, nervousness, and shock occurred from the crash and many inconveniences were suffered. Clay worked so hard trying to keep things going under difficult situations and he worried so much over the settlement and the fact that we had to go so deeply in debt that his health was impaired. We asked on the claim for $6,000 for inconvenience, nervousness, and shock. This was not allowed to us in the settlement. * * *"

Mrs. Curtis further referred to the attempts they made to secure payment on the claims and finally the delays and disappointments in 1961 incident to the consideration of the private bill introduced in their behalf. Finally she described the events which led up to the tragic death of her husband when he took his own life: "* * * The latter part of October, Clay said to me, "You wonder why I am so despondent, but I counted so strong in May to hear something and in September also." His constant worry and poor health this summer evidently caused his mind to snap with the tragic results you will read about in the clippings. He was a person who always dealt honestly with everyone and felt he should be treated the same way."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate, and open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TWO-PART RETIREMENT SYSTEM FOR NEVADA UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 287) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Nevada among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have submitted an amendment to the bill, and I had intended to propose another.

The first amendment would amend the Social Security Act to raise from 18 to 21 years the maximum age of children receiving survivor benefits if they are attending schools during those additional years.

The other body, in its wisdom, has included this provision in the social security bill pending before it. I very much hope—and I believe I have reason to believe—that the Senate Committee on Finance will consider with sympathy and will likely adopt this provision when it comes before it, and therefore I see no need for pressing the amendment at this time.

With respect to the other amendment, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has assured me that he will give every consideration to the situation of children surviving one who was not either a natural or an adoptive parent but who stood in loco parentis to the children. This is a very vexing problem. It is one which the Senator from Virginia has assured me will have sympathetic consideration by the committee.

On the basis, first, that the primary amendment I have, extending survivor benefits from 18 to 21 years to children attending school, is contained in the bill pending in the other body, and, second, with the assurance of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] that the other amendment, dealing with foster parents, or with people who stand in loco parentis, will have every consideration by the committee, I am prepared to withdraw my amendments to the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from New York has brought up two proposals, both of which he indicated the chairman of the Finance Committee has commented upon. I am privileged to read a statement by the Senator from Virginia. I read it in his behalf, so that the RECORD may be very clear on the points raised by the Senator from New York:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Since children's benefits were first authorized by the Congress in 1939, benefits have been terminated at age 18. The one exception was passed in 1956 when benefits were authorized for permanently and totally disabled children at any age if they had become disabled before 18.

Amendments similar to the one proposed by the Senator from New York have been offered in previous Congresses and each time rejected primarily because of the cost, which is now estimated to be $175 million a year.

This amendment is identical to a provision in the social security bill H.R. 6638 which has been approved by the House Ways and Means Committee. No doubt that bill will be passed by the House soon after the recess. I can assure you that the Committee on Finance will give immediate consideration to the bill and especially to the amendment which he advocates.

I think there is a great deal of merit in the amendment but would like to consider it along with the other major amendments proposed in the House bill, all of which increase the cost of the program. I can say that it will have my sympathetic consideration.

In reference to the proposal which would permit children to receive social security benefits on the basis of the wage record of an individual who has supported them, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has made the following statement:

This amendment also appears to have merit. I shall be pleased to have the staff of the Senate Committee on Finance to make a thorough study of the proposal so that it may be considered as an amendment when the social security revision bill is received from the House.

Mr. President, those are the statements of the Senator from Virginia.

I should like at this time to associate myself with the proposals of the Senator from New York, so that the Senator from Virginia may know that other Senators are deeply concerned with these problems.

With respect to the pending bill, under a provision of section 218 of the Social Security Act which is designed to facilitate the social security coverage of members of State and local government retirement systems, 17 specified States are permitted to divide a State or local government retirement system into two parts for purposes of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance coverage, one part consisting of the positions of members who desire coverage, and the other consisting of the positions of members who do not desire coverage. Services performed by the members in the part consisting of the positions of members who desire coverage may then be covered under old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, and, once those services are covered, the services of all persons who in the future become members of the retirement system must also be covered. The 17 States which are now permitted to extend coverage under this provision are California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Minnesoto, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin. H.R. 287 would add Nevada to this group of States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Minnesota and to the Senator from Virginia [Mr.

BYRD]. I wish to point out that the House bill will be a much more felicitious medium for doing what I am trying to do. I am pleased that the chairman of the committee will give sympathetic consideration to it. There is no point in standing in the way of the pending bill. Therefore I withdraw my amendments to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 287) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TEN THOUSAND PEACE CORPS MEN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in these times of great international problems, our newspapers are filled with the news of how unpleasant people—and nations—can be to their neighbors. Violence holds the headlines; hate and mistrust have motivated that violence.

But in the midst of this, I have great news. It will not appear on any front page tomorrow; yet I think it is significant beyond most news that will.

There are, today, more than 10,000 Americans in the Peace Corps, either serving overseas or training to do so. The fact of 10,000 people in the service of their country, without salary, is a remarkable thing. More than 1,500 volunteers will complete their service and will come home this summer.

This body does not need me to praise these fine Americans. It has too often in the past voted overwhelmingly to support the Peace Corps. But let me add my voice to the chorus of nations where our fellow citizens are serving, and say "Well done. May your numbers increase."

I salute the Peace Corps on having placed in the field so many people to help people help themselves with its great education and training program.

STATEMENT BY AFL–CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY AT SIGNING OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL OF 1964

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the AFL–CIO, representing more than 16 million workers, has long been a forceful and effective advocate of the legislation to protect further the civil rights of all Americans.

Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, was present at the White House when President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Mr. Meany issued a very significant statement expressing the views of organized labor.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Meany's thoughtful and meaningful statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NEWS FROM THE AFL–CIO

The signing of the civil rights bill is, of course, a great historic occasion, the culmination of a remarkable legislative achievement. But far more than that, this signing represents a challenge to American society—a challenge that calls for the full realization in fact of the rights now established by law.

The trade union movement, like every other segment of American life, must do its part in meeting that challenge.

More than a year ago I called upon all State and local central bodies of the AFL–CIO to set up communitywide programs on civil rights, in keeping with a policy unanimously adopted by the 1961 AFL–CIO Convention. We have established a top-level task force to assist in this job. A considerable number of these programs have been established in concert with civil rights organizations, church and civic groups, and local government officials.

The results have been encouraging, but the effort must be broadened. Therefore, I have today urged all the State and local central bodies to intensify existing programs and to initiate them where they do not yet exist. In particular, I proposed a greater involvement of employers in every community.

The rights set forth in the new law—such as the rights to register and vote—will not be automatically bestowed upon those who have hitherto been denied them. Nor should they lie in abeyance until enforced by Federal prosecution, while the rest of the community sits back. This would flout the national consensus which the civil rights law represents.

The basic rights of all Americans which this law confirms are also the responsibility of all Americans, in their own communities. I expect the trade union movement to do its part in seeing that the responsibility is fulfilled.

In addition, the labor movement has a special responsibility. Title VII of the law, covering fair employment practices, will not take effect until a year from today, but we cannot wait.

The labor movement has fought for fair employment practices legislation for many years. We have worked hard and effectively to bring equal opportunity closer to reality in unionized establishments and within union organizations. We have never claimed total success; that is why we asked the support of law. But it is undeniable that racial discrimination is worst where there are no unions.

Now we must prepare to go further. I will ask the AFL–CIO executive council, at its meeting on August 3, to call a national conference of affiliated unions and State central bodies to work out a program through which the AFL–CIO can best help to implement the terms of the civil rights law.

One important phase of such a program will deal with title VII. It seems obvious to me that the AFL–CIO, which serves as spokesman and champion of all workers in so many other respects, should also take the lead in assuring fair employment practices. We have already established machinery to process and resolve civil rights complaints by union members; it is my hope that means can also be devised through which the affiliated unions of the AFL–CIO can process grievances of workers against employers—organized and unorganized—as well.

By the time title VII takes legal effect, voluntary compliance would be widespread. To this end, we now look for the full cooperation of employers and employer organizations.

We in the AFL–CIO are proud of our part in helping to bring about the measure that today has become law. Just as we did everything in our power to support its enactment, so will we exert every possible effort to clothe it with full reality.

As we have said many times, this requires more than full enforcement, and even more than full community efforts; it requires a full employment economy. But until that end is achieved, we and all other Americans have a deep obligation to make the spirit which this signing represents become an inherent part of the life of our Nation.

TEXT OF MR. MEANY'S LETTER TO ALL OF THE STATE AND CITY CENTRAL BODIES OF THE AFL–CIO

You will recall that in June 1963 I wrote to you, urging the prompt establishment of biracial committees or councils in every community to accelerate the destruction of racial barriers at every level.

My letter was prompted by a request from President Kennedy. However, as I pointed out, what the late President asked was no more than the policy adopted by the 1961 AFL–CIO convention.

Now the civil rights bill is not just an objective; it has been signed into law by President Johnson. The "continental divide" has been crossed. The full achievement of civil rights for all Americans is no longer a matter of good will, it is a matter of law.

It would be tragic for America, and for the labor movement, if law were the only reliance now. Enlightened self-interest, as well as abstract justice, demands that we in the AFL–CIO exert maximum leadership to bring about massive compliance in every phase of community life.

Therefore I call upon those of you who have set up and joined in community civil rights programs to intensify your efforts. And I call upon those of you who have thus far failed to act to delay no longer.

In particular, I urge you bring about the fullest possible involvement of the employers in your community, both organized and unorganized. Employers as a whole have stood aloof from the civil rights struggle; they cannot remain aloof from the law.

In every sense, we in the AFL–CIO have a special obligation to implement the law we supported and the principles it represents. This can best be carried out in the States and communities. I urge you to move promptly and vigorously; and I again remind you that my office stands ready to provide whatever advice, counsel, or technical assistance you may need.

THE MEANING OF THE LATIN AMERICAN REVOLUTION—ADDRESS BY MSGR. JOSEPH GREMILLION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, at the meeting of the United States Conference for the World Council of Churches, held in Buck Hill Falls, Pa., an important discussion of current problems in Latin America took place. The conference heard and discussed a remarkable address on the "Meaning of the Latin American Revolution," delivered by Msgr. Joseph Gremillion, director of socioeconomic development for the Catholic Relief Services. Monsignor Gremillion, who is the first Catholic priest to address the United States Conference of the World Council of Churches, pointed out that it is a mistake to label the social revolution now taking place in Latin America as Communist inspired. The current social revolution, he said, is not a Communist plot, but is a response to the oppressed peasantry and slum dwellers in Latin America. Monsignor Gremillion stated that the Catholic church, which is predominant in Latin America, has awakened to the new realities of the hemisphere, and is now supporting the social revolution in many countries.

Monsignor Gremillion, in his perceptive address, carefully documented a theme on which I have spoken a number

of times in recent months; namely, that the church has become a progressive force in Latin America; that the aims of the church in many instances coincide with those of the Alliance for Progress.

I am particularly encouraged by the fact that the forum for Monsignor Gremillion's address was the meeting of the World Council of Churches. This is a good indication that the ecumenical spirit, which has developed rapidly since the pontificate of Pope John XXIII, is now making itself felt among American Protestant leaders and Catholic leaders who jointly share a concern about the present problems of Latin America. It is encouraging to see the growing cooperation between American Catholics and American Protestants in the various programs which American groups conduct in Latin American countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address, entitled, "The Meaning of the Latin American Revolution," delivered by Msgr. Joseph Germillion, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE MEANING OF THE LATIN AMERICAN REVOLUTION

(Address by Msgr. Joseph Gremillion, director, socioeconomic development, Catholic Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference, New York, N.Y.)

My friends in Christ, Mario Lopes works on a banana plantation in northeast Brazil. I met Mario Lopes 5 months ago, in December 1963, while visiting the office of the state federation of peasants' labor unions in Natal. Natal is a city of 100,000 people, located in the hub of Brazil's convulsing sharecropper northeast.

As I entered the narrow office Mario Lopes and two fellow members of his local union where in agitated discussion with officials of their state federation of farmworkers' unions. A fresh crisis for their 3-year-old organization had fallen the night before. Mario Lopes and 150 fellow workers who form the local sindicato on 5 nearby plantations had gone on strike, the first full-fledged work stoppage in the short history of the young Christian inspired peasants' movement.

I asked Mario, "Why did you go on strike?"

"Because we get so little that we have to become thieves to feed our children," he shot back without hesitation.

"What are your wages?"

"Three hundred cruzeiros a day. And we work only 3 days a week on the average." Three hundred cruzeiros equals 25 U.S. cents for a day's work.

"But that is not the whole story," Mario went on. "The owner of the plantation will not allow us to raise a couple of goats to give milk to our little ones. That is why we organized our union, so all of us can stand together for a little justice."

"Well, what does the owner of the plantation think about all this?"

"Oh, he does not like it at all. And especially he does not like me, because I head up the union. That is how the strike actually began yesterday. The landlord told me I was fired, that I must vacate my house and get off his land in 24 hours."

"Then what happened?"

"I took a stick in my hand," Mario gesticulated. "I told him that he and I had better draw a line on the ground to show where his land ended and mine began, because I would only leave my place a dead man. The landlord walked away. The 30 men who work with me held a meeting. They decided to stand behind me and have a show down. Then the 120 workers on neighboring plantations, who are fellow members in our local sindicato, they also voted to back us up. So now we're all on strike."

At this point Jose Martins spoke up. He is vice president of the peasants' federation which covers all that State, Rio Grande del Norte. He explained the overall goals of the State's 60,000 farmworkers who have formed 46 local sindicatos in the past 3 years under his leadership.

"We want an 80-percent increase in wages (from 25 to 45 U.S. cents a day). We want a family subsidy of 35 cruzeiros (3 cents) a day extra for every child in the worker's family. We want the plantation owners to recognize our right to form a union, that they must bargain with us altogether.

"We're really part of a big movement," the State labor official went on, "spreading over all the State and country, even joining with other nations of Latin America and the world."

Mario Lopes and his sharecropping brothers in misery—and in hope—personalize the great fresh reality which is the new Latin America. Mario's new experience and new leadership, his new comradeship in the cause of justice for all, give flesh and sinew, spirit and drive to the fact of a societywide revolution.

The high degree of social justice which now obtains in Western Europe and North America is the product of a slow, maturing process which has come about through two centuries of change and struggle. This profound transformation has been marked by the highlights of the American and the French Revolutions of the late 1700's, by the civil wars of the 1800's both here and in Europe, by the Jeffersonian-Jacksonian popular movements and the Lincolnian emancipation, by the struggles of labor and farm organizations and the antimonopoly legislation of 1900, by the New Deal of the 1930's, and the racial strife of our day.

For a hundred years North America has enjoyed political stability and economic advance to a degree unmatched in any other part of the globe, in any other century of history. The Catholic Church in the United States as a spiritual body has been supported and nourished by the gradually maturing natural life of our affluent, industrial society.

Quite the opposite has taken place in Latin America. The church there has been battered and weakened by ideological and political conflict, by social and economic fossilization. In her human manifestations the church has shared the ills of the civic body, whose outmoded feudal structures have at last collapsed to produce the crisis of the hemisphere.

This revolution is now actually happening. It is no longer a "should" or an "ought." The old feudal structure is being overturned consciously by the oppressed peasants and slum dwellers themselves, with help, true, from others. A new economic and social system is unfolding, but in today's embryo tomorrow's fresh creation cannot yet be well discerned.

Note here my use of present participles. Because Latin America is in the midst of a process, a convulsive change which has neither wholly begun or wholly ended. The ancient regime is not yet dead; the new order is not yet born. In short, the new Latin America is in gestation. In some places travail has begun, with all its pangs and shrieks, anxiety—and hope.

We of the Roman Catholic Church, in and outside Latin America, have, as a whole, awakened to these new realities only in the past 5 or so years. The church is now stirred by this Latin travail. In the statistics of church membership, after all, Latin America accounts for one-third of our 550 million members. We are accustomed to speaking of it as one-third of the visible Body of Christ. Speaking to a group of Latin bishops during the past session of the Council, Pope called Latin America "a continent with a Christian tradition, yet a menaced continent."

Bishop Manuel Larrain of Talca, Chile, for 20 years the most forward-looking prelate in Latin America, and now President of CELAM, the Council of Latin America's 650 bishops, took up this theme in an address 2 months ago. "What we have to face," says Bishop Larrain, "is the hard, painful birth of a new civilization. The danger arises if we do not become aware of this event, and if we cannot give guidance to all the dynamic drives stirring up in our continent."

Bishop Larrain attributes this hard, painful birth of a new civilization to two causes, operative above others. These two he terms "quantitative" and "qualitative." First, he cites the "demographic explosion." "We are at present 200 million inhabitants; in 1980 we will be over 350 million; toward the close of the century, we will be about 600 million. This means that we must get all these rapidly increasing masses of people incorporated into educational and social channels, so that the rapid changes brought about by the demographic explosion can really find the fair and adequate solutions which are necessary."

The qualitative cause, which the presiding bishop of the Latin American hierarchy cites, refers to "modifications in social and cultural structures. Latin America is undergoing a rapid, overall transformation: changes take place in the cultural, social, political and civic fields, giving the continent a new physiognomy upon which we must focus for the future. How do these structural changes become especially apparent? Until a few years ago, the rural population of Latin America, 60 to 70 percent of the people, were excluded from cultural and economic, social and civic life. The rapid spread of communications media, of radio, television and roadways, has suddenly incorporated these huge marginal masses into the life of the nation, thus causing deep structural changes."

Bishop Larrain then points out that along with the facts of population growth and basic structural change, a significant phenomenon comes forth from within the human will: "Active participation of the whole population in the life of the nation, and most of all, the extraordinary desire for human betterment manifest among all strata of society. The troubles presently affecting our continent are those caused by a stream seeking its course, and we must give our continent the course it requires.

"Many a time," the bishop continues, "we have—let us be honest—erroneously described these troubles by simply calling them revolt, the agitation of Communists. While at bottom they are but a desire for improvement, for human advance, for finding a just and humane solution, a solution which allows men to fulfill that longing for betterment and perfection which lies at the core of all their spirits." (Opening address to First Latin American Meeting of Caritas, Santiago, Chile, February 1964.)

We see then that Mario Lopes, the dollar-a-week banana worker, and Bishop Larrain, the cultivated head of Latin America's Catholic hierarchy, agree closely on their continent's ills and in the seeking of drastic remedies. This accord, this growing understanding and joint action of the high and the low within the church may well turn out to be the most telling transformation of all Latin America's intertwining revolutions. The church, as a whole, is no longer to be identified with the landed aristocracy, with the political oligarchy and the oppressive status quo. Bishops, priests, and lay leaders provide much of the new ferment for institutional reform.

This hopeful and dramatic change among Catholics manifests itself in many ways.

The authentic social teaching of the church is now reaching the people through pastorals and public statements of national conferences of bishops, through newly written catechisms and preaching campaigns with heavy social content, and through many intermediate and grassroots teaching and training centers, usually directed and manned by lay leaders. These are comparable to the labor schools which sprang forth in North America during the great depression of the 1930's.

I have here the 1962 Pastoral of the Chilean Bishops on "Social Reform and the Common Good," and the 1963 statement of the Brazilian Bishops' Council on "Basic Reforms for a Just Social Order." Both these documents apply the two great Encyclicals of Pope John, "Mater et Magistra" (Christianity and Social Progress) and "Pacem in Terris," to the concrete realities of Chile and Brazil. The chapter headings of the Brazilian statement give a good fell of its content and spirit: "Transformations Can No Longer Be Postponed," "The Rural Question," "Reform of Business," "Tax Reform," "Administrative Reform," "Electoral Reform," "The Presence of the Church Through Laymen."

I quote from the last section:

"The presence of the church in the transformation of the temporal is concretized through free and responsible laymen who, like all men of good will, manifest a spirit of understanding, of distinterestedness and a desire to collaborate loyally in attaining objectives good in their nature, or that, at least, can move toward the good." ("Pacem in Terris.")

A principal author of the Brazilian statement and of the social apostolate over the whole continent is Archbishop Helder Camara, executive secretary of Brazil's Council of Bishops and vice president of Celam, the Council of Latin American Bishops. Archbishop Helder Camara has startled many persons with his fresh ideas and activities. Last year he circulated his personal thoughts in this 24-page mimeographed statement entitled "Exchange of Ideas With Our Brothers in the Episcopate in the Course of the Second Vatican Council."

Archbishop Helder Camara is one of the Latin leaders of the movement known as the Church of the Poor. This voluntary grouping of clergy seeks, in his words, "to study the mystery of the Poor One (Christ) and to discover practical ways to help the church find again the lost paths of poverty." He suggests that the titles of eminence, beatitude, and excellency be abandoned, and that "we [bishops] lose the obsession to be of the nobility and drop our coats of arms and mottoes.

"It seems like nothing, but how this creates distance between our clergy and our faithful. It separates us from our century which has already adopted another style of life. It separates us especially from the workers and from the poor."

I share with you the thoughts of these two leading Latin bishops in order to convey something of the self-criticism, universal concern and doctrinal deepening which underlie and motivate the church's new social apostolate. And it must be stressed that this far-ranging renewal has entered, and increasingly influences, the main stream of church life and policy. I need only cite that Bishop Larrain was elected president of the Council of Latin American Bishops 6 months ago by the delegate bishops from each of the 20 national episcopal conferences. And I point out that Archbishop Helder Camara, until now only an auxiliary, with no diocesan jurisdiction of his own, was elevated by Pope Paul 2 weeks ago to the Archdiocese of Recife, the leading post in Brazil's northeast, the troubled area where Mario Lopes, the banana worker, and 15 million of his brothers in Christ subsist in subhuman misery.

Raul Cardinal Silva, a recognized leader of the social apostolate throughout Latin America, also first gained attention for his work with the poor as national director of Caritas, Chile. I first met Father Silva in the slums of Santiago in 1957. A few days before, this priest had led by night a group of squatters, newly arrived from their rural serfdom, onto the military drill field on the outskirts of the capital city. There they were building their hovels—of odd strips of zinc and thatch and wood—while Father Silva fended off the police and negotiated a long-term payment arrangement so each family could acquire title to their homesite. Out of these experiences, Father Silva and his coworkers developed 120 housing cooperatives and savings and loan associations which now provide 1,500 new homes a year. Another proof of the transformation in the church of Latin America is that within 3 years this simple padre of the slum dwellers became Archbishop of Santiago and Cardinal Silva. A year ago he was elected president of Caritas Internationalis, the world federation of all Catholic social service organizations, my own included.

A year ago, the New York Times reported: "Chile's Roman Catholic Church is trying to help solve critical political and economic problems here to improve the lot of the common man. The move is under the leadership of 55-year-old Raul Cardinal Silva, who calls for drastic and social reforms. Despite some gains, there is general agreement here (Santiago) that there are gross social inequalities. But the meat of the latest message from the church hierarchy is that reforms are going entirely too slowly and that too many so-called faithful Christians in Chile are showing cold indifference to problems of the masses that have now reached the emergency state." (Nov. 5, 1962, New York Times, international edition, p. 7.)

On my arrival recently at the residence of Bishop Silvio Haro of Ibarra, on Ecuador's altiplano, a formal committee of laymen was awaiting me as a director of Catholic Relief Services—NCWC, an official agency of the bishops of the United States. These committee members were not the hacienda owners, not the affluent merchants of the town, nor beplumed Knights of St. Gregory in battle array. No, the bishop had gathered around him those closest to his heart—delegates from the festering slums and scrubby mountain farms. As can happen readily among the unlettered, ceremony was overcome, not to say crushed, and they spoke out spontaneously, giving testimony from the heart.

The change within the church of their own diocese as manifested by their own bishop was the principal theme. I saw there that the church is now being recognized as friend and mother of the poor, champion of the oppressed, promoter of a just social order by the afflicted themselves. One mother, weary with worry, malaria, and a nursing baby at her open breast, broke up the meeting. "This palacio," she said, "the bishop's palace, is no longer reserved for the rich from the big haciendas. Now it has become our house, my house, the home of the poor." This weary mother broke up the meeting because Bishop Haro burst into tears and left the room. And so did I.

It is a truly humbling experience for us of the affluent United States of America, the "colossus of the north," to encounter in our brothers south of the border this new incarnation of the Christ of the Gospels, as the poor Nazarene who had not whereon to lay His head. Down there Our Lord is becoming visible in His church, in ways which we Americans in our suburban parish complacency find it difficult to understand.

Nourished by Pope John's encyclicals, and Pope Paul's further insistence upon this social teaching, strengthening by the spirit of aggiornamento and by the new regional and world solidarity fostered by the Vatican council, the church goes about her newly grasped and complex task of redeeming the temporal. She seeks amid strife and near-chaos to humanize the social order, so that all men might realize and live the dignity which is theirs as children of God and brothers in Christ.

Forty-year-old Bishop Marcos McGrath, former dean of theology at Chile's Catholic University, and newly appointed ordinary of Santiago, Panama, explains the role of the church today. He states that our catechisms are often deceptively simplistic in their description of the church's threefold mission to teach to rule and to sanctify. "Since the time of St. Robert Bellarmine, in reaction against Protestant rejection of external church authority, our manuals of theology have fixed their attention sometimes too exclusively on the visible aspects of the church. Take for example St. Robert Bellarmine's definition of the church: "The society composed of men united among themselves by the communion of the same sacraments, under the jurisdiction of their legitimate pastors and above all of the Roman pontiff."

"The church is a mystery," Bishop McGrath of Panama asserts. "She (the church) is an object of faith, which we can only partially understand and which therefore, in the words of Pope Paul VI, 'permits ever new and more profound inquiries into her nature.' (Address inaugurating the second session of Vatican II, September 29, 1963.)"

Bishop McGrath wrote these words for the keynote address at the first annual meeting of CICOP, the Catholic inter-American cooperation program, this past January in Chicago. CICOP is a newly launched initiative to promote understanding, friendship, and concerted effort among Catholics of the United States and our confreres of Latin America. CICOP operated under the aegis of the NCWC, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and is presided over by six cardinal presidents, the archbishops of Boston, Chicago, St. Louis, Caracas, Lima, and Santiago. A thousand Catholics attended the 4-day meeting in Chicago last January, including Cardinal Silva, Archbishop Helder Camara, Bishop Larrain, and other Latin leaders, clergy, and lay. We were especially pleased and honored to have as participants Dr. Roswell Barnes, executive secretary of the U.S. office for the World Council of Churches, as well as the Reverend Dana Green, of the National Council of Churches, and representatives of other national Protestant bodies.

CICOP reflects another important fact about the awakening and renewal of the Latin Church: This occurs in growing solidarity with the church of the United States, Canada, and Europe—indeed of the whole world. In the last 5 years we have come more to know and to love one another, and to care about the whole Body of Christ, the universal people of God, the entire household of faith.

In response to the invitation of the bishops of a hundred dioceses, 3,589 priests, brothers, sisters, and lay volunteers from our country have gone to work in Latin America, an increase of over 100 percent in the past 10 years. In 1961 Pope John asked the religious congregations of the United States to send 10 percent of their 203,000 members into the southern vineyard by 1970. Pope John set up in Rome the Pontifical Commission for Latin America to coordinate this great collaborative movement from Europe and North America.

Let us return to Bishop McGrath's doctrinal analysis of the role of the church in time and history: "The church is the divine leaven working in the mass of society. Father Henri de Lubac put it smartly when he wrote that the mystery of the church is more difficult to understand than the mystery of Christ, as the latter is more difficult than

the mystery of God. Why? Because the church involves all this mystery.

"The mystery of the church is not simply that Christ, with His redemptive death 2,000 years ago, set the church in motion to let it carry on by itself until the end of time. This would be rather the description of a human empire. 'The church,' says Bossuet, 'is Christ communicated by the Holy Spirit.' And we believe that Christ is more active in His church today than when He walked visibly over the hills of Palestine. Literally, in His own words, it was better for the church that Christ should go away so that He could send forth, infuse the Holy Spirit into the souls of all believers (John 16: 7); thus bringing it about that as Christ is the Son of God, so 'all those who did welcome Him, He empowered to become the children of God, all those who believe in His name.' (John 1: 12)."

My friends in Christ, I quote literally from Bishop McGrath and other Latin leaders, because I do not wish to tell you merely what I, a North American, a gringo, think about the meaning of the Latin American revolution. I prefer letting Latin church leaders speak for themselves. And I now stress these doctrinal roots, because our Latin confreres insist that only deepening faith can adequately nourish a social apostolate of such range and difficulty as that now required, and now appearing, to redeem that fermenting continent. I quote at length from Bishop Marcos McGrath because he was dean of a major faculty of theology, and because he was selected by his fellow Latin Bishops for membership in the Theological Commission of the Second Vatican Council, where he now serves with distinction.

"It is God then who acts through Christ in His church," the Bishop continues. "Toward what end? Toward unity; the unity of all men in the love of God; in the unity of the living God. All born and yet unborn are to be incorporated into Christ; with Him they form the church, they are the church. He acts upon all near and afar through the invisible Spirit of God, and through the visible ministry of His members. A 'truly tremendous mystery,' said Pope Pius XII, that we depend upon one another for our salvation. We are not saved singly but in society, in dependence upon so many around us for all that we have, all that we know, all that we desire."

Bishop Marcos McGrath of Panama continues: "The mission of the church is specifically religious. But she strives to make man and his whole life religious. The community of believers unites about the altar in the community of worship, and creates in the home and far beyond it the community of love. This is the obvious projection of the church.

"Quickly, however, Christianity touches upon the temporal order—the world of work, of art, of science, of education, of business, of politics: of all that is not specifically religious * * * human relations involve basic values * * * both doctrines and moral principles.

"The application of these principles then rests principally with the Christian himself: whether it be in settling a family quarrel or launching a union into a major strike. The Christian active in the temporal order finds himself rubbing shoulders and convictions with men of very diverse creeds. In all honesty of purpose he must strive for a serious cultivation of temporal values in themselves, material well being, culture, science, and the like, and in their proper relation to peace and spiritual progress. In this he will link arms with all men of good will whenever possible, with never a need to impose his religious creed on others.

"The church," the bishop concludes, "as a religious society is distinct from the temporal order. Christian men, however, live deeply imbedded in the temporal order. Christ makes Himself present in each of these two manners: indirectly, through doctrine, directly, through its personal and prudential application."

We see then, in short, the Latin Catholicism, in doctrine as well as in practice, is becoming incarnational. And I purposely stress the doctrinal renewal even more strongly than the concrete application. I could have listed and documented the astonishing proliferation of welfare agencies, cooperative and rural movements, community development, adult education and leader training programs which have burst forth in city slums, mountain villages, and jungle outposts.

But I insist that the deepened and broadened Faith which nourishes this new resurrection deserves consideration prior to mere facts and statistics. The new peasants' movement of Mario Lopes is important, and so is Mario's bishop, Eugenio Sales, who inspired the movement and set up the center to form the leaders who trained Mario. (This Natal training center was partly financed, incidentally, by a $30,000 grant from MISEREOR, the German Bishops' fund for social development.) But more important still is the fresh concept of Christ and His church which led Bishop Sales to pioneer this social movement 5 years ago.

Dr. John A. Mackay, in a paper given here in 1961, before the study conference of the Committee on Cooperation in Latin America, correctly reported that these following questions were being asked in Roman Catholic circles of the Western World:

How can Hispanic Catholicism become incarnational? That is to say, "How can it become related to life in such a way that it shall transform life?" In a word, how can historical Roman Catholicism in Latin America become truly revelant to the human situation and constitute a spiritual redemptive force? (John A. Mackay, "The Latin American Churches and the Ecumenical Movement," booklet published in April 1963, p. 3.)

My brothers in Christ, I thank God that I can report that this is now happening, and has indeed already occurred to a marked degree. And I know that my Latin American confreres join me in thanking God that your own interest in this spiritual awakening is so great that you have graciously asked to hear of it.

Time does not permit an adequate account of how this incarnational apostolate actually works, nor to assess its failures and successes, nor to point out its dangers or excesses. Mario Lopes and thousands upon thousands of other Christian leaders are active at all levels of Latin America's new temporal society, now aborning. According to the natural competence of each, and in keeping with their varying gifts of Christian vision, they struggle with land tenure and sharecropping reforms: with technical training and leader formation; with capital formation, job creation, and wage-profit equity; with legislative, tax, and administrative reforms; with the countervailing forces of worker, peasant, and slum-dweller unions.

Will there be time enough for this social apostolate to take effect? So much must be done; the pressure of totalitarian shortcuts is so great. Perhaps our Christian comrades will fail, in this or that country, maybe in the whole continent. Even if they do not succeed in renewing their temporal society, they are succeeding in renewing the church. The latter is infinitely the more important. Although failure in the temporal may mean going underground or waiting in the upper room another generation, the ferment for another birth is at work, because Christ lives on in them as the people of God.

These struggling men and women are nourished by a new grasp of the faith, imparted by a new emphasis on preaching the word—often by the laity themselves—and by the liturgical reforms already brought about by Pope John's aggiornamento.

I know that they are nourished too by the ecumenical spirit which sustains us all, by this visible expression of care and concern and friendship which we Christians now manifest for one another. I know that our Latin confreres are nourished even more by the invisible sustenance of Christ in their own souls in response to your own understanding, love, and prayers.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMUNITY ACT OF 1955, AND EURATOM COOPERATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1070, S. 2963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2963) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, and the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this bill will be the pending business of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM — ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, tomorrow, the Senate will have a good deal of committee work to complete. It is our sincere hope that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may be able to complete the markup of the bill known as the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the so-called antipoverty bill.

Because of the heavy committee schedule tomorrow and the desire of the leadership to move as many bills as possible, there will be no session of the Senate on Tuesday.

I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, July 8, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 6, 1964:

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

LeRoy Collins, of Florida, to be Director, Community Relations Service, for a term of 4 years.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Franklin B. Dryden, of Kentucky, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, vice Justice H. Chambers, resigned.