By Mr. McCULLOCH:
H.R. 12016. A bill to provide that no Federal court shall have jurisdiction of any action to reapportion one house of a State legislature if the other house of such legislature is apportioned according to population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McINTIRE:
H.R. 12017. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1916, so as to provide a standard for a dry 1½-quart container; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.
By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:
H.R. 12018. A bill to encourage the industrial utilization of wheat products; to the Committee on Agriculture.
By Mr. BATTIN:
H.J. Res. 1120. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:
H.J. Res. 1121. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to retirement of Federal judges at the age of 70 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. HALPERN:
H.J. Res. 1122. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 13th day of September as Commodore John Barry Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ASHBROOK:
H.J. Res. 1123. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:
H.J. Res. 1124. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to clarify its provisions insofar as they relate to the making of laws permitting the free exercise of religion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. DERWINSKI:
H. Con. Res. 331. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:
H.R. 12019. A bill for the relief of Chun Soo Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):
H.R. 12020. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Bilidas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 12021. A bill for the relief of Yung Ja Chun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 12022. A bill for the relief of Maria Puglisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. LESINSKI:
H.R. 12023. A bill for the relief of Enzo Lanni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 12024. A bill for the relief of Gio Battisto Cracchiolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MINSHALL:
H.R. 12025. A bill for the relief of Mr. Yong Wha Kim and his wife, Mrs. Young Ja Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MORSE:
H.R. 12026. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos A. Papoulias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:
H.R. 12027. A bill for the relief of Anna Polnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. RYAN of New York:
H.R. 12028. A bill for the relief of Concetto Fruscella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SIBAL:
H.R. 12029. A bill for the relief of Rose Franco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. UTT:
H.R. 12030. A bill for the relief of Tony Boone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. VANIK:
H.R. 12031. A bill for the relief of Dr. Anthony C. Nassif; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:
H.R. 12032. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Horopsima Tumacan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

976. By the SPEAKER: Petition of William Raney and others, Carmichael, Calif., to take steps to reopen the San Francisco Branch Mint; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.
977. By Mr. CAMERON: Petition of Stanely Black, of the K-B Development Co. of Beverly Hills, Calif., urging Congress to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
978. Also, petition of Kenneth R. Harding, director of the Democratic National Congressional Committee of the House of Representatives, urging Congress to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
979. Also, petition of the Canadian Legion, Southern Zone of the Western States Command, urging Congress to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
980. Also, petition of Edmund L. Henshaw, Jr., research director of the Democratic National Congressional Committee of the House of Representatives, urging Congress to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
981. Also, petition of Carpenters' Local Union 1507, El Monte, Calif., urging Congress to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
982. Also, petition of Leon W. Rosenberg, commander of the Department of California, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, urging Congress to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 22, 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:

O Thou God of our salvation: To Thee we lift our hearts in prayer, bringing nothing but our need and the adoration of our contrite hearts.

Before the white splendor of Thy purity, every vileness shrinks away. In Thy light, lift us above the mists of the immediate, and set our perspectives in the wide horizons of abiding verities. In a tangled day, fraught with destiny for the whole world, curb wild tongues which have not Thee in awe. And here in this Chamber, with all mankind looking and listening, let all bitterness, wrath, clamor, and evil speaking be put away, with all malice.

God of justice, save our people
From the clash of race and creed.
From the strife of class and faction
Make our Nation free indeed.

Keep her faith in simple goodness,
Strong as when her life began;
Till it finds its full fruition
In the brotherhood of man.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 21, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

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, and withdrawing the nomination of Charlie T. Cummings, to be postmaster at Alvarado, Tex., which nominating messages were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the 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 message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 745. A bill to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system;

S. 944. A bill to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes; and

S. 2370. A bill authorizing maintenance of flood and arroyo sediment control dams and related works to facilitate Rio Grande canalization project and authorizing appropriations for that purpose.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10300) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10532) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GARY, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. MAHON, Mr. PILLION, and Mr. CONTE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R 319. An act to protect postal patrons from morally offensive mail matter;

H.R. 1341. An act to require passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet certain passenger safety standards;

H.R. 2501. An act to authorize the promotion of qualified Reserve officers of the Army and the Air Force to existing unit vacancies;

H.R. 2502. An act to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, with respect to the remission or cancellation of indebtedness of enlisted members of the Armed Forces and the National Guard to the United States;

H.R. 7215. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians and certain other lands to the Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7419. An act to authorize the conclusion of agreements with Mexico for joint construction, operation, and maintenance of emergency flood control works on the lower Colorado River, in accordance with the provisions of article 13 of the 1944 Water Treaty with Mexico, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7823. An act granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to render judgment on certain claims of N. M. Bentley against the United States;

H.R. 8334. An act to transfer to the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian community certain lands within the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation;

H.R. 10619. An act to amend the act of June 16, 1948, to authorize the construction of an additional bridge across the Chesapeake Bay in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10973. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Lower Pend D'Oreille or Kalispel Tribe of Indians;

H.R. 11083. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the authorization for assistance in the provision of graduate or specialized public health training, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11118. An act to provide for the disposition of funds from judgments in favor of the Nehalem Band of the Tillamook Indians and the Tillamook Band of the Tillamook Indians;

H.R. 11241. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training professional nursing personnel, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11611. An act to establish a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress;

H.R. 11622. An act to permit the vessel U.S.S. *Alabama* to pass through the Panama Canal without payment of tolls; and

H.R. 11754. An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also 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:

H.R. 393. An act to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.;

H.R. 4177. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of St. Paul, Minn., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands heretofore conveyed to such city;

H.R. 6299. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy, to produce and sell crude oil from the Umiat field, Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, for the purpose of making local fuel available for use in connection with the drilling, mechanical, and heating operations of those involved in oil and gas exploration and development work in the nearby areas outside Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7248. An act to change the designated use of certain real property conveyed by the Department of the Air Force to the city of Fort Walton Beach, Fla., under the terms of Public Law 86–194;

H.R. 7499. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee to convey 0.25 acre of land to the city of Oroville, Calif.;

H.R. 10322. An act to extend the provisions of the Act of August 11, 1959, Public Law 86–155, as amended 2 (74 Stat. 396) to provide improved opportunity for promotion for certain officers in the naval service;

H.R. 10736. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. naval hospital, Portsmouth, Va.; and

H.J. Res. 888. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the 91st annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in Washington, D.C., in July 1965, to authorize the granting of certain permits to Imperial Shrine Convention, 1965, Inc., on the occasions of such sessions, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 319. An act to protect postal patrons from morally offensive mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1341. An act to require passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet certain passenger safety standards; and

H.R. 11622. An act to permit the vessel U.S.S. *Alabama* to pass through the Panama Canal without payment of tolls; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 2501. An act to authorize the promotion of qualified Reserve officers of the Army and the Air Force to existing unit vacancies; and

H.R. 2502. An act to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, with respect to the remission or cancellation of indebtedness of enlisted members of the Armed Forces and the National Guard to the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7215. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians and certain other lands to the Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes.

H.R. 8334. An act to transfer to the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian community certain lands within the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation;

H.R. 10973. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Lower Pend D'Oreille or Kalispel Tribe of Indians; and

H.R. 11118. An act to provide for the disposition of funds from judgments in favor of the Nehalem Band of the Tillamook Indians and the Tillamook Band of the Tillamook Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7419. An act to authorize the conclusion of agreements with Mexico for joint construction, operation, and maintenance of emergency flood control works on the lower Colorado River, in accordance with the provisions of article 13 of the 1944 Water Treaty with Mexico, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11754. An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 7823. An act granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to render judgment on certain claims of N. M. Bentley against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10619. An act to amend the act of June 16, 1948, to authorize the construction of an additional bridge across the Chesapeake Bay in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 11083. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the authorization for assistance in the provision of graduate or specialized public health training, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11241. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training professional nursing personnel, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11611. An act to establish a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the concurrence of the distinguished

minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF SPACE SCIENCES CENTER AT UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of a Space Sciences Center on the Tucson campus of the University of Arizona; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON REVISION OF ESTIMATED COST OF CONSTRUCTION AT RICHARDS-GEBAUR AIR FORCE BASE, MO.

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), reporting, pursuant to law, on the revision of the estimated cost of constructing a maintenance dock at the Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Mo.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PENALTIES FOR HANDLING AND COLLECTION OF DISHONORED CHECKS OR MONEY ORDERS

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe penalties for the handling and collection of dishonored checks or money orders (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, fiscal years 1963 and 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON SURVEY OF ACTIVITIES OF SELECTED DEFENSE CONTRACTORS RELATING TO EMPLOYEE RECREATION AND MORALE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a survey of activities of selected defense contractors relating to employee recreation and morale, Department of Defense, dated July 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON FINAL SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the final settlement of the claims of *Clyde F. Thompson, et al., Docket No. 31, Ernest Risling, et al., Docket No. 37, The Baron Long, et al., Bands of Mission Indians of California, Docket Nos. 80 and 80–D, and The Pitt River Indians of California, Docket No. 347, v. The United States of America* (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of James E. Borden, of San Diego, Calif., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Dr. Lincoln Rodon, of Miami, Fla., former Chairman of the House of Representatives of Cuba, relating to the threat of communism in America; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

UPDATING OF SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM—RESOLUTION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and myself, I present, for inclusion in the RECORD, a resolution of the Rhode Island Fraternal Order of Eagles, regarding the great and pressing need for updating our social security program. I ask that the resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Whereas the Fraternal Order of Eagles has pioneered social security legislation and has remained in the forefront on this field; and

Whereas the challenging problems of the aged and unemployed are not solved and are longer today than they were in the 1930's; and

Whereas today there are about 3 million Americans unemployed who must live on unemployment compensation averaging about $31 per week; and

Whereas nearly 7 million American families are obliged to live on less than $2,000 per year; and

Whereas nearly 17 million American families today suffer from malnutrition; and

Whereas problems of better assistance will build a wiser, better, and stronger America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Fraternal Order of Eagles in convention assembled in Bristol, R.I., on this 21st day of June A.D. 1964, hereby urges the Congress of the United States to bring social security laws up to date; and that a copy of this resolution be sent to Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL, Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE, Hon. FERNAND ST GERMAIN, and Hon. JOHN FOGARTY, as well as to the Grand Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, and to the Providence Journal Co.

Dr. RAYMOND A. THOMAS,
W. State President.
JOSEPH F. PANNONE,
W. State Secretary.
GEORGE NAJJAR,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LONG of Missouri, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1666. A bill to amend section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 324, of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238), to clarify and protect the right of the public to information, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1219).

By Mr. FONG, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1991. A bill to charter by act of Congress the National Tropical Botanical Garden (Rept. No. 1234).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the report of the meeting of the American Instructors of the Deaf as a Senate document and providing for additional copies (Rept. No. 1220);

S. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of a committee print of the Committee on Government Operations entitled "Catalog of Federal Aids to States and Local Governments" (Rept. No. 1221);

S. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "A Report of a Study of U.S. Foreign Aid in 10 Middle Eastern and African Countries" (Rept. No. 1222);

S. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of volumes 1 and 2 of selected readings in employment and manpower, of a committee print series (Rept. No. 1223);

S. Res. 322. Resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the compilation entitled "The War on Poverty, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964" (Rept. No. 1224);

S. Res. 329. Resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the remarks by former President Harry S. Truman to the U.S. Senate on May 8, 1964, being the first instance of the operation of a recent amendment to rule XIX authorizing former Presidents to address the Senate (Rept. No. 1225);

S. Res. 334. Resolution providing additional funds for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare;

S. Res. 336. Resolution to print an addendum as part 2 of Senate Document No. 69, 88th Congress, on "World Communism—A Selected Annotated Bibliography" (Rept. No. 1226);

S. Res. 339. Resolution authorizing the sending of observers from the U.S. Senate to the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Jamaica (Rept. No. 1227); and

S. Res. 340. Resolution to print additional copies of a committee print on employment and manpower policy prepared by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Rept. No. 1228).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of additional copies of the hearings on interagency coordination in environmental hazards (pesticides), part I (including exhibits) (Rept. No. 1229).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 335. Resolution to print as a Senate document, with additional copies, a report entitled "Mineral and Water Resources in Nevada (Rept. No. 1230).

By Mr. PELL, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. 808. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the setting aside of an area within the Canal Zone to preserve and conserve its natural features for scientific study, for providing and maintaining facilities for such study, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940 (Rept. No. 1231); and

H.R. 9036. An act to amend the act of October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 634; 40 U.S.C. 193(n)–(w)), as amended, relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Smithsonian Institution and its constituent bureaus (Rept. No. 1233).

By Mr. PELL, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. 2602. A bill to amend Public Law 722 of the 79th Congress, and Public Law 85-935, relating to the National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution (Rept. No. 1232).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated July 8, 1964, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 3015. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Association, Inc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3016. A bill for the relief of Fay Lun Mar (also known as Bick Ngook Lee and Bick Yuk Lee); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3017. A bill for the relief of Santiago Woo and Morjin Chee de Woo; and

S. 3018. A bill for the relief of Maria Chillis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 3019. A bill for the relief of Dr. John Viljoen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 3020. A bill for the relief of Leo Weiss;

S. 3021. A bill for the relief of the Hanover Irrigation District of Worland, Wyo.; and

S. 3022. A bill for the relief of Jadwiga Zuzanna Kobielusz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 3023. A bill to increase the pay of enlisted members of the Armed Forces with 2 years or less service, and to direct the Secretary of Defense to prepare and submit to the Congress a schedule of pay rates for members of the Armed Forces comparable to pay rates authorized for Federal civilian employees; to the Committee on Armed Services.

RESOLUTION

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT, WITH ILLUSTRATIONS, A COMPILATION OF MATERIALS RELATING TO RECLAMATION REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 341); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document a compilation of materials relating to reclamation repayment contracts, prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation of the U.S. Department of the Interior.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, at a recent meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary, H.R. 2753, to disclaim any title of the United States to certain real property in Modoc County, Calif., was considered.

In its consideration of the bill the committee determined that since this legislation was a disclaimer of any right, title, or interest in lands, this legislation was more properly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2753.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 1123

Mr. PEARSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2642) to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1125

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill which provides a new part relating to voluntary assistance for needy children. The purpose is to allow individual Americans to participate in a personal way in the war on poverty by voluntarily assisting in the support of one or more needy children in a program coordinated with city or county social welfare agencies.

I shall discuss it in more detail when the amendment is called up, which presumably will be tomorrow, but it stems from an article which I was asked to write for Parade magazine. The thought for the article came from a letter from a constituent saying:

> What can I do? I have no children of my own. I hear about these poor children in Appalachia and in the slums of New York. What can I do to help them?

I did some thinking about it, and talked with a few people, and then wrote this article for Parade magazine indicating that here was a tangible way in which Americans with warm hearts could help in the war on poverty.

As a result of that article, I have received over a thousand letters, including a little money, some clothing, and crayons and books, from people who wished to help.

I hope very much that this amendment will be carefully gone over by the staff. It was not presented to the committee at the time the bill was before them.

It does not cost any money. It simply says that there shall be set up in the office of the Poverty Administrator a clearinghouse to connect up the children of needy families who need crayons and books, a little money, and love and understanding with those who are ready to give it.

Among these over 1,000 letters which I have received was one from California stating:

> I have six children of my own. This is such an appealing idea that I wish to adopt a little child in West Virginia to help that child.

I hope very much that the chairman and the staff of the committee over the evening will look at this amendment, since it does not involve the expenditure of any money. It is simply a voluntary effort and I hope very much that they will find it possible to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment (No. 1126), intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2642, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. RUSSELL submitted an amendment (No. 1127), intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2642, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota submitted an amendment (No. 1128), intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2642, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. PROUTY submitted an amendment (No. 1129), in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to an amendment by Mr. JAVITS to Senate bill 2642, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. PROUTY submitted four amendments (Nos. 1130, 1131, 1132, and 1133), intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2642, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted an amendment (No. 1134), intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2642, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961 (AMENDMENT NO. 1124)

Mr. CARLSON (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON, and Mr. BEALL) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF JOINT HEARINGS ON THREE BILLS (S. 2838, S. 2839, AND S. 2840) TO MODIFY AND IMPROVE THE FEDERAL BAIL PROCEDURES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, for myself as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, and for the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], as chairman of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce that joint hearings will be held by the two subcommittees on three bills designed

to eliminate inequities in the present Federal bail procedures:

S. 2838 provides that no person shall be denied bail solely because of his financial inability to post bond. Rather, the indigent could be released on his personal guarantee, subject to such conditions as the court or the commissioner might prescribe to insure appearance, unless there is good cause shown why the person should not be released.

S. 2839 provides that all persons convicted of offenses would receive credit toward service of their sentence for the time spent in custody for lack of bail.

S. 2840 provides that persons admitted to bail would be permitted to make a cash deposit with the court in place of sureties or collateral security.

The hearings are scheduled for August 4, 5, and 6, 1964, at 10:30 a.m. in room 1318 of the New Senate Office Building. Any person who wishes to testify or submit statements pertaining to these measures should communicate with the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 may be rescinded.

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

ONLY MONTANA SHOWS REDUCTION IN TRAFFIC DEATH TOLL IN THE PAST 2 YEARS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, according to an article published in the New York Times of July 22, only Montana, of all 50 States, has shown a reduction in its traffic death toll for the last 2 years. Progress in fighting this growing threat to public safety is, in my opinion, highly noteworthy.

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

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

MONTANA ALONE RECORDED DROP IN CAR DEATHS IN 1963

HELENA, MONT.—Montana is the only State in the Nation to have shown a 2-year reduction in its traffic death toll during 1962 and 1963, Gov. Tim Babcock said recently.

The National Safety Council indicated that Montana's closest competitor was Arizona, which recorded two more traffic deaths in 1963 than it had in 1962. A total of 510 persons died on Arizona highways last year.

Montana recorded 229 traffic fatalities in 1963, a drop of 11 percent from the previous year. In 1962 the decrease was 7 percent from the year before, with a total of 256 killed.

SUCCESSFUL FISCAL POLICIES OF THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on yesterday, I placed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times which referred to the great efficacy of the fiscal policies which the Johnson administration has been pursuing.

In the New York Post of July 21, there is published an article written by the very able financial columnist, Miss Sylvia Porter, on the same subject. Miss Porter points out that the Johnson policy of combining discerning frugality in Government with the most massive and general tax cut in history is producing not only vigorous, inflation-free economic growth in the Nation but also a vastly improved fiscal situation for the Federal Government. Treasury borrowing, for example, is down drastically, as the cash position of the Government has vastly improved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article written by Miss Porter printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Post, July 21, 1964]

YOUR DOLLAR: NO NEWS IS BIG NEWS

(By Sylvia Porter)

Last week the U.S. Treasury did not do something which it has said it would do—and just by its failure to act it flashed news of major economic significance and, in this presidential election year, of key political significance too.

What the Treasury did not do is borrow several billions of dollars of new cash to pay its bills during the July-August months of lean tax receipts. This is money which, only a few months ago, it was positive it would have to raise at this time.

Offhand, this piece of negative news may seem mumbo-jumbo to you—but it is far from it. For the Treasury's failure to borrow reflects these important economic-political developments:

Federal Government spending is running well below official projections earlier this year. Cuts in defense spending have been primarily responsible.

Federal Government tax collections are running well above official projections early this year. Rising business activity has resulted in higher collections from more prosperous taxpayers.

The Treasury's cash balance at the close of the 1964 fiscal year on June 30 totaled $10.2 billion, a whopping $2.3 billion more than had been anticipated as recently as late May.

With this tremendous amount in the till, the Treasury felt it could comfortably postpone its planned borrowing.

This it did—and it confined its operations last week to extending the due dates on a large amount of its outstanding I O U's.

In April officials told financial reporters that the Treasury would have to borrow around $4 billion in July. In June they told us the figure might be as low as $2 billion.

Now the estimate is that the Treasury won't have to borrow more than $1.2 to $2 billion in the entire July–September quarter.

In U.S. Government financial terms, this total is chickenfeed. The Treasury always borrows in the second half of a calendar year—when tax collections are low—and then repays as much of the borrowing as it can in the first half of the next calendar year, when tax collections are at a peak.

Considering the fact that the Federal budget is still in the red and we're enjoying the most massive tax cut in history, this dramatic shift in the Treasury's borrowing plans is distinctly news.

From now until November 3 there'll be political overtones and undertones to every story about Government spending, the budget, debt, etc.

This is inevitable in view of the flat statements in the GOP platform about prudent, responsible management of the Government's fiscal affairs * * * evils of spendthrift government * * * belief in a balanced budget * * * repayment of the public debt.

Nevertheless, for the first time in many presidential election years, the GOP will have a tough time making its points about the Democrats' "irresponsibility" come through—and the reason is that from the day he took office, President Johnson has been pushing programs which undermine this charge.

There is a lid on Federal Government spending—and, in fact, there are loud cries of anguish from areas and businessmen hit by spending slowdowns and cutbacks.

The tax cut is working out as anticipated, is pushing up tax collections, is closing the gap between spending and income more rapidly than expected. Withholding on incomes last month were $300 million above June of a year ago—in the face of the sharply reduced income tax rates. Corporation profits are steadily rising to new peaks, and so are corporation tax collections.

At the same time, prices are holding remarkably steady and interest rates are firm—both also astonishing trends in an upswing as strong and long lived as this one.

Last week's "no news" out of the Treasury was news indeed. It was a tribute to the magnificent performance of our economy today and this, of course, is political news of the highest order.

THE SILVER DOLLAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the disappearance of the silver dollar and the scarcity of other coins in circulation have become matters of national concern. Insofar as the silver dollar is concerned, this problem is particularly acute in the State of Montana and its neighboring States, where it is a preferred medium of exchange. The cartwheel has been consigned to the oblivion of private numismatic collections; and, these days, apparently, just about everyone is a numismatist.

The silver dollar, Mr. President, is an important part of the American heritage. Its current use is a reminder of this heritage, as well as a significant element in the commercial life of Montana and other Western States. It is my hope that the conference committee which presently is considering relevant legislation will act to provide for additional coinage of the cartwheels.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Life and Times of Our Silver Dollar" by Bart Barnes, which appeared in the July 7, 1964, issue of the Washington Post, be printed at this point in the RECORD. Mr. Barnes has performed a real service by chronicling the history of the silver dollar in the United States.

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

[From the Washington Post, July 7, 1964]

LIFE AND TIMES OF OUR SILVER DOLLAR

(By Bart Barnes)

It was back in 1794 when the first American silver dollar rolled out of the U.S. mint in Philadelphia, with a Liberty's head engraved proudly on the front and an American eagle on the back. Only 1,757 silver dollars were minted during 1794. A collector would pay anywhere from $300 to $3,500 for one today—though today's cartwheels seem al-

most as scarce, thanks to numismatical thirst. Silver dollars today are as rare as a softhearted banker.

For 10 years, the Philadelphia Mint ground out silver disks but in 1804 the Treasury Department called a halt and the coin was not struck again for general circulation until 1840. The Government could not afford to produce them any more.

It seemed that the mint had outdone itself and had, in fact, produced a dollar that was worth more than a dollar—in bullion. It was not long before the speculators caught on, and most of the new coins ended up in Europe after having been exchanged in the United States for one of the less-valuable Spanish dollars.

The first coins to be minted at Philadelphia were "half dismes," several hundred of which were in circulation by October of that year. Silver for the half dismes came from the personal stock of George Washington and there was some talk that the portrait on them bore a strong resemblance to Mrs. Washington.

The dollar had been adopted as the basic currency unit chiefly because the early settlers in this country had grown accustomed to trading in Spanish dollars, or pieces of eight. This coin was divided into eight parts, a single part being called real or bit. A bit was 12½ cents, a quarter dollar then being "two bits." Spanish dollars were circulated with official sanction in the United States until 1857.

The word "dollar" was a derivation of the German word "thaler," which was a shortened form of "Joachimsthaler." This name was given to a coin intended to be the silver equivalent of the gold gulden—a German coin of the 16th century. Joachimsthal was a mining district of Bohemia and silver from a mine discovered there in 1516 was used in producing a large quantity of silver coins.

Because no two handcut dies were exactly the same, there were often minor variations in the silver dollars minted during a year. First step in the production of a handcut die was to draw the design in the exact size of the coin. A tracing would be made from the drawing. Then a piece of steel would be smoothed and coated with transfer wax. The tracing would be impressed into the wax and an engraver would tool out the steel where relief or raised effect was required.

One such engraver came close to achieving immortality, simply by cutting his own name into one of the silver dollars.

The seated figure of Liberty graced silver dollars from 1840 until 1873. The mint law of that year, however, made no provision for silver dollars and the pieces were not coined again until 1878 when the Morgan or Liberty Head dollars came out. This was the age of silver strikes in the West and the revolution in industry and finance in the East. Named for their designer, George R. Morgan, the Morgan dollars were used widely in the Western part of the Nation while easterners preferred to deal in paper money. At the base of the neck of the Liberty head a minuscule "M," for Morgan, can be seen.

By this time, branch mints had been established throughout the country, and many silver dollars were beginning to bear the markings of the branch mints. Dollars struck at Carson City bore the initials "CC." Trade mark for the New Orleans mint was "O." "S" was the mark of the San Francisco mint.

The 20th century brought some dark days for the silver dollar. A shortage of silver bullion forced a suspension in its coinage in 1904. Then in 1918, the Treasury gathered up 270,232,722 silver dollars and melted them down—11.1 million to be remade into smaller coins and 259.1 million for a silver export to India.

In 1920, the United States having won the war to end all wars, a convention of the American Numismatic Association petitioned the Government to issue a commemorative peace coin. A half-dollar was considered, but the dollar afforded a better chance for artistic effect. The finished product showed an eagle clutching an olive branch, the word "peace" written under his claws. A new feminine head was used to represent Liberty. This coin was minted until 1935.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

THE 1964 PLATFORM OF REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the platform adopted at the Republican National Convention in San Francisco last week.

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

"FOR THE PEOPLE"—REPUBLICAN PLATFORM, 1964, PRESENTED TO THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION, JULY 14, 1964, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

SECTION 1

For a free people

Humanity is tormented once again by an age-old issue—is man to live in dignity and freedom under God or be enslaved—are men in government to serve, or are they to master, their fellow men?

It befalls us now to resolve this issue anew—perhaps this time for centuries to come. Nor can we evade the issue here at home. Even in this Constitutional Republic, for 2 centuries the beacon of liberty the world over, individual freedom retreats under the mounting assault of expanding centralized power. Fiscal and economic excesses, too long indulged, already have eroded and threatened the greatest experiment in self-government mankind has known.

We Republicans claim no monopoly of love of freedom. But we challenge as unwise the course the Democrats have charted; we challenge as dangerous the steps they plan along the way; and we deplore as self-defeating and harmful many of the moves already taken.

Dominant in their council are leaders whose words extol human liberty, but whose deeds have persistently delimited the scope of liberty and sapped its vitality. Year after year, in the name of benevolence, these leaders have sought the enlargement of Federal power. Year after year, in the guise of concern for others, they have lavishly expended the resources of their fellow citizens. And year after year freedom, diversity and individual, local and State responsibility have given way to regimentation, conformity, and subservience to central power.

We Republicans hold that a leadership so misguided weakens liberty in America and the world. We hold that the glittering enticements so invitingly proffered the people, at their own expense, will inevitably bring disillusionment and cruel disappointment in place of promised happiness.

Such leaders are Federal extremists—impulsive in the use of national power, improvident in the management of public funds, thoughtless as to the long-term effects of their acts on individual freedom and creative, competitive enterprise. Men so recklessly disposed cannot be safely entrusted with authority over their fellow citizens.

To Republicans, liberty is still today man's most precious possession. For every citizen, and for the generations to come, we Republicans vow that it shall be preserved.

In substantiation of this belief the Republican Party submits this platform. To the American people it is our solemn bond.

To stay free

The shape of the future is our paramount concern. Much of today's moral decline and drift—much of the prevailing preoccupation with physical and material comforts of life—much of today's crass political appeals to the appetites of the citizenry—can be traced to a leadership grown demagogic and materialistic through indifference to national ideals founded in devoutly held religious faith. The Republican Party seeks not to renounce this heritage of faith and high purpose; rather, we are determined to reaffirm and reapply it. So doing, these will be our guides:

1. Every person has the right to govern himself, to fix his own goals, and to make his own way with a minimum of governmental interference.

2. It is for Government to foster and maintain an environment of freedom encouraging every individual to develop to the fullest his God-given powers of mind, heart, and body; and, beyond this, Government should undertake only needful things, rightly of public concern, which the citizen cannot himself accomplish.

We Republicans hold that these two principles must regain their primacy in our Government's relations, not only with the American people, but also with nations and peoples everywhere in the world.

3. Within our Republic the Federal Government should act only in areas where it has constitutional authority to act, and then only in respect to proven needs where individuals and local or State governments will not or cannot adequately perform. Great power, whether governmental or private, political or economic, must be so checked, balanced, and restrained and, where necessary, so dispersed as to prevent it from becoming a threat to freedom any place in the land.

4. It is a high mission of Government to help assure equal opportunity for all, affording every citizen an equal chance at the starting line but never determining who is to win or lose. But Government must also reflect the Nation's compassionate concern for those who are unable, through no fault of their own, to provide adequately for themselves.

5. Government must be restrained in its demands upon and its use of the resources of the people, remembering that it is not the creator but the steward of the wealth it uses; that its goals must ever discipline its means; and that service to all the people, never to selfish or partisan ends, must be the abiding purpose of men entrusted with public power.

Deeds not words

The future we pledge, then, for freedom, by faithful adherence to these guides. Let the people compare these guides with those of the Democratic Party, then test, not the words of the two parties, but their performance during the past 4 years of Democratic control.

Let the people ask:

Is the Republic stronger today or wiser than when the present administration took office 4 years ago?

Is its guardianship of freedom more respected at home and throughout the world?

For these 4 years the leaders of the Democratic Party have been entrusted with the Nation's executive power and overwhelmingly in control of the Congress. The question must be asked: Have these leaders successfully advanced the purposes of this mightiest nation mankind has known?

Tragically, in each instance, the answer must be "No."

Let the Democratic Party stand accused.

SECTION 2

Failures of foreign policy

This Democratic administration has been, from its beginning, not the master but the prisoner of major events. The will and dependability of its leadership, even for the defense of the free world, have come to be questioned in every area of the globe.

Disregard of Allies

This administration has neglected to consult with America's allies on critical matters at critical times, leading to lack of confidence, lack of respect, and disintegrating alliances.

It has permitted an erosion of NATO force and unity, alienating most of its member nations by negotiating with the common foe behind their backs. It has offered concessions to the Communists while according our allies little understanding, patience, or cooperation.

This administration has created discord and distrust by failing to develop a nuclear policy for NATO.

It has provoked crises of confidence with our oldest friends, including England and France, by bungling such major projects as Skybolt and NATO's nuclear needs.

It has allowed other great alliances—SEATO and CENTO—also to deteriorate, by failing to provide the leadership required for their revitalization and by neglecting their cooperation in keeping the peace.

Weakness Before Communism

This administration has sought accommodations with communism without adequate safeguards and compensating gains for freedom. It has alienated proven allies by opening a "hot line" first with a sworn enemy rather than with a proven friend, and in general pursued a risky path such as began at Munich a quarter century ago.

It has misled the American people and forfeited a priceless opportunity to win concessions for freedom by mishandling sales of farm commodities to Communists. At first it disavowed any intent to subsidize prices or use credit; later it demanded such authority and forced the Democrats in Congress to acquiesce. At first it hinted at concessions for freedom in return for wheat sold to Russia; later it obtained no concessions at all. At first it pledged not to breach restraints on trade with Communist countries in other parts of the world; later it stimulated such trade itself, and thus it encouraged trade with Cuba by America's oldest friends.

This administration has collaborated with Indonesian imperialism by helping it to acquire territory belonging to the Netherlands and control over the Papuan people.

It has abetted further Communist takeover in Laos, weakly accepted Communist violations of the Geneva Agreement, which the present administration perpetrated, and increased Soviet influence in southeast Asia.

It has encouraged an increase of aggression in South Vietnam by appearing to set limits on America's willingness to act—and then, in the deepening struggle, it has sacrificed the lives of American and allied fighting men by denial of modern equipment.

The administration has permitted the shooting down of American pilots, the mistreatment of American citizens, and the destruction of American property to become hallmarks of Communist arrogance.

It has stood by as a wire barricade in Berlin became a wall of shame, defacing that great city, humiliating every American, and disgracing freemen everywhere.

It has turned its back on the captive peoples of Eastern Europe, abandoning their cause in the United Nations and in the official utterances of our Government.

This administration has forever blackened our Nation's honor at the Bay of Pigs, bungling the invasion plan and leaving brave men on Cuban beaches to be shot down. Later the forsaken survivors were ransomed, and communism was allowed to march deeper into Latin America.

It has turned a deaf ear to pleas from throughout the Western Hemisphere for decisive American leadership to seal off subversion from the Soviet base just off our shore.

It has increased the long-term troubles for America by retreating from its pledge to obtain on-the-spot proof of the withdrawal of Soviet offensive weapons from Cuba.

It left vacant for many critical months the high posts of Ambassador in Panama and with the Organization of American States, and thus it failed to anticipate and forestall the anti-American violence that burst forth in Panama.

Undermining the United Nations

This administration has failed to provide forceful, effective leadership in the United Nations.

It has weakened the power and influence of this world organization by failing to demand basic improvements in its procedures to guard against its becoming merely a forum of anti-Western insult and abuse.

It has refused to insist upon enforcement of the United Nations rules governing financial support though such enforcement is supported by an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice.

It has shouldered virtually the full costs of the United Nations occupation of the Congo, only to have the ousted leadership asked back when United Nations forces had withdrawn.

Forsaking America's Interests

This administration has subsidized various forms of socialism throughout the world, to the jeopardy of individual freedom and private enterprise.

It has proved itself inept and weak in international trade negotiations, allowing the loss of opportunities historically open to American enterprise and bargaining away markets indispensable to prosperity on American farms.

Failure of national security planning

Losing a Critical Lead

This administration has delayed research and development in advanced weapons systems and thus confronted the American people with a fearsome possibility that Soviet advances, in the decade of the 1970's, may surpass America's present lead. Its misuse of "cost effectiveness" has stifled the creativity of the Nation's military, scientific, and industrial communities.

It has failed to originate a single new major strategic weapons system after inheriting from a Republican administration the most powerful military force of all time. It has concealed a lack of qualitative advance for the 1970's by speaking of a quantitative strength which by then will be obsolete. It has not demonstrated the foresight necessary to prepare a strategic strength which in future years will deter war.

It has endangered security by downgrading efforts to prepare defenses against enemy ballistic missiles. It has retarded our own military development for near and outer space, while the enemy's development moves on.

Invitations to Disaster

This administration has adopted policies which will lead to a potentially fatal parity of power with communism instead of continued military superiority for the United States.

It has permitted disarmament negotiations to proceed without adequate consideration of military judgment—a procedure which tends to bring about, in effect, a unilateral curtailment of American arms rendered the more dangerous by the administration's discounting known Soviet advances in nuclear weaponry.

It has failed to take minimum safeguards against possible consequences of the limited nuclear test ban treaty, including advanced underground tests where permissible and full readiness to test elsewhere should the need arise.

Distortions and Blackouts

This administration has adopted the policies of news management and unjustifiable secrecy, in the guise of guarding the Nation's security; it has shown a contempt of the right of the people to know the truth.

This administration, while claiming major defense savings, has in fact raised defense spending by billions of dollars a year, and yet has shortchanged critical areas.

Undermining Morale

This administration has weakened the bonds of confidence and understanding between civilian leaders and the Nation's top military professionals. It has bypassed seasoned military judgment in vital national security policy decisions.

It has permitted nonmilitary considerations, political as well as spurious economic arguments, to reverse professional judgment on major weapons and equipment such as the controversial TFX, the X–22, and the nuclear carrier.

In sum, both in military and foreign affairs, the Democratic record all the world around is one of disappointment and reverses for freedom.

And this record is no better at home.

Failures at home

Inability To Create Jobs

This administration has failed to honor its pledges to assure good jobs, full prosperity and a rapidly growing economy for all the American people: failing to reduce unemployment to 4 percent, falling far short of its announced goal every single month of its tenure in office; and, despite glowing promises, allowing a disheartening increase in long-term and youth unemployment.

This administration has failed to apply Republican-initiated retraining programs where most needed, particularly where they could afford new economic opportunities to Negro citizens. It has preferred, instead, divisive political proposals.

It has demonstrated its inability to measure up to the challenge of automation which, wisely guided, will enrich the lives of all people. Administration approaches have been negative and unproductive, as for example the proposed penalties upon the use of overtime. Such penalties would serve only to spread existing unemployment and injure those who create jobs.

It has failed to perform its responsibility under Republican amendments to the Manpower Training Act. It has neglected, for example, the basic requirement of developing a dictionary of labor skills which are locally, regionally and nationally in short supply, even though many thousands of jobs are unfilled today for lack of qualified applicants.

Failing the Poor

This administration has refused to take practical free enterprise measures to help the poor. Under the last Republican administration, the percentage of poor in the country dropped encouragingly from 28 to 21 percent. By contrast, the present administration, despite a massive increase in the Federal bureaucracy, has managed a mere 2-percentage-point reduction.

This administration has proposed a so-called war on poverty which characteristically overlaps, and often contradicts, the 42 existing Federal poverty programs. It would dangerously centralize Federal controls and bypass effective State, local, and private programs.

It has demonstrated little concern for the acute problems created for the poor by inflation. Consumer prices have increased in the past three and a half years by almost 5 percent, amounting in effect to a 5-percent national sales tax on the purchases of a family living on fixed income.

Under housing and urban renewal programs, notably in the Nation's Capital, it has created new slums by forcing the poor from their homes to make room for luxury apartments, while neglecting the vital need for adequate relocation assistance.

Retarding Enterprises

This administration has violently thrust Federal power into the free market in such areas as steel prices, thus establishing precedents which in future years could critically wound free enterprise in the United States.

It has so discouraged private enterprise that the annual increase in the number of businesses has plummeted from the Republican level of 70,000 a year to 47,000 a year.

It has allowed the rate of business failures to rise higher under its leadership than in any period since depression days.

It has aggravated the problems of small business by multiplying Federal recordkeeping requirements and has hurt thousands of small businessmen by forcing up their costs.

This administration has curtailed, through such agencies as the National Labor Relations Board, the simple, basic right of Americans voluntarily to go into or to go out of business.

It has failed to stimulate new housing and attract more private capital into the field. In the past 3 years it has fallen short by 1,500,000 units of meeting its pledge of 2 million new homes each year.

It has sought to weaken the patent system which is so largely responsible for America's progress in technology, medicine, and science.

It has required private electric power companies to submit to unreasonable Federal controls as a condition to the utilization of rights-of-way over public lands. It has sought to advance, without congressional authorization, a vastly expensive nationwide electrical transmission grid.

Betrayal of the Farmer

This administration has refused, incredibly, to honor the clear mandate of American wheat farmers, in the largest farm referendum ever held, to free them of rigid Federal controls and to restore their birthright to make their own management decisions.

It has strangled the Republican rural development program with redtape and neglected its most essential ingredient—local initiative.

It has broken its major promises to farm people, dropping the parity ratio to its lowest level since 1939. It has dumped surplus stocks so as to lower farm income and increase the vicious cost-price squeeze on the farmer.

It has evidenced hostility toward American livestock producers by proposals to establish mandatory marketing quotas on all livestock, to fine and imprison dairy farmers failing to maintain federally acceptable records, and to establish a subsidized grazing-cropland conversion program. It has allowed imports of beef and other meat products to rise to an alltime high during a slump in cattle prices which was aggravated by Government grain sales.

Neglect of Natural Resources

This administration has delayed the expeditious handling of oil shale patent applications and the early development of a domestic oil shale industry.

It has allowed the deterioration of the domestic mining and petroleum industries, including displacement of domestic markets by foreign imports.

It has failed to protect the American fishing industry and has retreated from policies providing equitable sharing of international fishing grounds.

Fiscal Irresponsibility

This administration has mislead the American people by such budget manipulations as crowding spending into the previous fiscal year, presenting a proposal to sell off $2.3 billion in Government assets as a cut in spending, and using bookkeeping devices to make expenditures seem smaller than they actually are.

It has, despite pledges of economy, burdened this Nation with four unbalanced budgets in a row, creating deficits totaling $26 billion, with still more debt to come, reflecting a rate of sustained deficit spending unmatched in peacetime.

It has failed to establish sensible priorities for Federal funds. In consequence, it has undertaken needlessly expensive crash programs, as for example accelerating a trip to the moon, to the neglect of other critical needs such as research into health and the increasingly serious problems of air and water pollution and urban crowding.

This administration has continued to endanger retirement under social security for millions of citizens; it has attempted to overload the system with costly, unrelated programs which ignore the dangers of overly regressive taxation and the unfairness of forcing the poor to finance such programs for the rich.

It has demanded the elimination of a substantial portion of personal income tax deductions for charitable and church contributions, for real property taxes paid by home owners, and for interest payments. The elimination of these deductions would impose great hardship upon millions of our citizens and discourage the growth of some of the finest organizations in America.

This administration has impeded investigations of suspected wrongdoing which might implicate public officials in the highest offices in the land. It has thus aroused justifiable resentment against those who use the high road of public service as the low road to illicitly acquired wealth.

It has permitted the quality and morale of the postal system to deteriorate and drastically restricted its services. It has made the Post Office almost inaccessible to millions of working people, reduced the once admired parcel post system to a national laughingstock—and yet it is intimated that Americans may soon have to pay 8 cents for a first-class postage stamp.

It has resisted personal income tax credits for education, always preferring the route leading to Federal control over our schools. Some leading Democrats have even campaigned politically in favor of such tax credits while voting against them in Congress.

Contrary to the intent of the Manpower Training Act, it has sought to extend Department of Labor influence over vocational education.

Discord and Discontent

This administration has exploited interracial tensions by extravagant campaign promises, without fulfillment, playing on the just aspirations of the minority groups, encouraging disorderly and lawless elements, and ineffectually administering the laws.

It has subjected career civil servants and part-time Federal employees, including employees of the Agriculture Department, to political pressures harmful to the integrity of the entire Federal service. It has weakened veterans preference in Federal jobs.

It has made Federal intervention, even on the Presidential level, a standard operating practice in labor disputes, thus menacing the entire system of free collective bargaining.

It has resorted to police state tactics, using the great power of Federal departments and agencies, to compel compliance with administration desires, notably in the steel price dispute. The Department of Justice, in particular, has been used improperly to achieve partisan political, economic, and legislative goals. This abuse of power should be the subject of a congressional investigation.

Weakening Responsibility

This administration has moved, through such undertakings as its so-called war on poverty, accelerated public works and the new communities program in the 1964 housing proposal, to establish new Federal offices duplicating existing agencies, bypassing the State capitals, thrusting aside local government and siphoning off to Washington the administration of private citizen and community affairs.

It has undermined the federally assisted, State-operated medical and hospital assistance program, while using—and abusing—Federal authority to force a compulsory hospital program upon the people and the Congress.

This enumeration is necessarily incomplete. It does not exhaust the catalog of misdeeds and failures of the present administration. And let the Nation realize that the full impact of these many ill-conceived and ill-fated activities of the Democratic administration is yet to come.

SECTION 3

The Republican alternative

We Republicans are not content to record Democratic misdeeds and failures. We now offer policies and programs new in conception and dynamic in operation. These we urge to recapture initiative for freedom at home and abroad and to rebuild our strength at home.

Nor is this a new role. Republican Presidents from Abraham Lincoln to Dwight D. Eisenhower stand as witnesses that Republican leadership is steadfast in principle, clear in purpose, and committed to progress. The many achievements of the Eisenhower administration in strengthening peace abroad and the well-being of all at home have been unmatched in recent times. A new Republican administration will stand proudly on this record.

We do not submit, in this platform, extravagant promises to be cynically cast aside after election day. Rather, we offer examples of Republican initiatives in areas of overriding concern to the whole Nation—North, South, East, and West—which befit a truly national party. In the interest of brevity, we do not repeat the commitments of the 1960 Republican platform, "Building a Better America," and the "1962 Declaration of Republican Principle and Policy." We incorporate into this platform as pledges renewed those commitments which are relevant to the problems of 1964.

These, then, will be our guides, and these our additional pledges, in meeting the Nation's needs.

Faith in the individual

1. We Republicans shall first rely on the individual's right and capacity to advance his own economic well-being, to control the fruits of his efforts and to plan his own and his family's future; and, where Government is rightly involved, we shall assist the individual in surmounting urgent problems beyond his own power and responsibility to control. For instance, we pledge:

(a) Enlargement of employment opportunities for urban and rural citizens, with emphasis on training programs to equip them with needed skills; improved job information and placement services; and research and extension services channeled toward helping rural people improve their opportunities.

(b) Tax credits and other methods of assistance to help needy senior citizens meet the costs of medical and hospital insurance.

(c) A strong, sound system of social security, with improved benefits to our people.

(d) Continued Federal support for a sound research program aimed at both the prevention and cure of diseases, and intensified efforts to secure prompt and effective application of the results of research. This will include emphasis on mental illness, drug addiction, alcoholism, cancer, heart disease, and other diseases of increasing incidence.

(e) Revision of the social security laws to allow higher earnings, without loss of benefits, by our elderly people.

(f) Full coverage of all medical and hospital costs for the needy elderly people, financed by general revenues through broader implementation of Federal-State plans, rather than the compulsory Democratic scheme covering only a small percentage of such costs, for everyone regardless of need.

(g) Adoption and implementation of a fair and adequate program for providing necessary supplemental farm labor for producing and harvesting agricultural commodities.

(h) Tax credits for those burdened by the expenses of college education.

(i) Vocational rehabilitation, through cooperation between government—Federal and State—and industry, for the mentally and physically handicapped, the chronically unemployed, and the poverty stricken.

(j) Incentives for employers to hire teenagers, including broadening of temporary exemptions under the minimum wage law.

(k) To repeal the administration's wheat certificate "bread tax" on consumers, so burdensome to low-income families and overwhelmingly rejected by farmers.

(l) Revision of present non-service-connected pension programs to provide increased benefits for low-income pensioners, with emphasis on rehabilitation, nursing homes, and World War I veterans.

(m) Reevaluation of the Armed Forces' manpower procurement programs with the goal of replacing involuntary inductions as soon as possible by an efficient voluntary system, offering real career incentives.

(n) Enactment of legislation, despite Democratic opposition, to curb the flow through the mails of obscene materials which has flourished into a multimillion-dollar obscenity racket.

(o) Support of a constitutional amendment permitting those individuals and groups who choose to do so to exercise their religion freely in public places, provided religious exercises are not prepared or prescribed by the State or political subdivision thereof and no persons's participation therein is coerced, thus preserving the traditional separation of church and state.

(p) Full implementation and faithful execution of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and all other civil rights statutes, to assure equal rights and opportunities guaranteed by the Constitution to every citizen;

(q) Improvements of civil rights statutes adequate to changing needs of our times.

(r) Such additional administrative or legislative actions as may be required to end the denial, for whatever unlawful reason, of the right to vote.

(s) Immigration legislation seeking to reunite families and continuation of the "fair share" refugee program.

(t) Continued opposition to discrimination based on race, creed, national origin, or sex. We recognize that the elimination of any such discrimination is a matter of heart, conscience, and education, as well as of equal rights under law.

In all such programs, where Federal initiative is properly involved to relieve or prevent misfortune or meet overpowering need, it will be the Republican way to move promptly and energetically, and wherever possible to provide assistance of a kind enabling the individual to gain or regain the capability to make his own way and to have a fair chance to achieve his own goals. In all matters relating to human rights it will be the Republican way fully to implement all applicable laws and never to lose sight of the intense need for advancing peaceful progress in human relations in our land. The party of Abraham Lincoln will proudly and faithfully live up to its heritage of equal rights and equal opportunities for all.

In furtherance of our faith in the individual, we also pledge prudent, responsible management of the Government's fiscal affairs to protect the individual against the evils of spendthrift government—protecting most of all the needy and fixed-income families against the cruelest tax, inflation—and protecting every citizen against the high taxes forced by excessive spending, in order that each individual may keep more of his earnings for his own and his family's use. For instance, we pledge:

(1) A reduction of not less than $5 billion in the present level of Federal spending.

(2) An end to chronic deficit financing, proudly reaffirming our belief in a balanced budget.

(3) Further reduction in individual and corporate tax rates as fiscal discipline is restored.

(4) Repayments on the public debt.

(5) Maintenance of an administrative, legislative and regulatory climate encouraging job-building enterprise to help assure every individual a real chance for a good job.

(6) Wise, firm, and responsible conduct of the Nation's foreign affairs, backed by military forces kept modern, strong, and ready, thereby assuring every individual of a future promising peace.

In all such matters it will be the Republican way so to conduct the affairs of government as to give the individual citizen the maximum assurance of a peaceful and prosperous future, freed of the discouragement and hardship produced by wasteful and ineffectual government.

In furtherance of our faith in the individual, we also pledge the maximum restraint of Federal intrusions into matters more productively left to the individual. For instance, we pledge:

(1) To continue Republican sponsorship of practical Federal-State-local programs which will effectively treat the needs of the poor, while resisting direct Federal handouts that erode away individual self-reliance and self-respect and perpetuate dependency.

(2) To continue the advancement of education on all levels, through such programs as selective aid to higher education, strengthened State and local tax resources, including tax credits for college education, while resisting the Democratic efforts which endanger local control of schools.

(3) To help assure equal opportunity and good education for all, while opposing federally sponsored "inverse discrimination," whether by the shifting of jobs, or the abandonment of neighborhood schools, for reasons of race.

(4) To provide our farmers, who have contributed so much to the strength of our Nation, with the maximum opportunity to exercise their own management decisions on their own farms, while resisting all efforts to impose upon them further Federal controls.

(5) To establish realistic priorities for the concentration of Federal spending in the most productive and creative areas, such as education, job training, vocational rehabilitation, educational research, oceanography, and the wise development and use of natural resources in the water as well as on land, while resisting Democratic efforts to spend wastefully and indiscriminately.

(6) To open avenues of peaceful progress in solving racial controversies while discouraging lawlessness and violence.

In all such matters, it will be the Republican way to assure the individual of maximum freedom as Government meets its proper responsibilities, while resisting the Democratic obsession to impose from above, uniform and rigid schemes for meeting varied and complex human problems.

Faith in the competitive system

2. We Republicans shall vigorously protect the dynamo of economic growth—free, competitive enterprise—that has made America the envy of the world. For instance, we pledge:

(a) Removal of the wartime Federal excise taxes, favored by the Democratic administration, on pens, pencils, jewelry, cosmetics, luggage, handbags, wallets, and toiletries.

(b) Assistance to small business by simplifying Federal and State tax and regulatory requirements, fostering the availability of longer term credit at fair terms and equity capital for small firms, encouraging strong State programs to foster small business, establishing more effective measures to assure a sharing by small business in Federal procurement, and promoting wider export opportunities.

(c) An end to power-grabbing regulatory actions, such as the reach by the Federal Trade Commission for injunctive powers, and the ceaseless pressing by the White House, the Food and Drug Administration and Federal Trade Commission to dominate consumer decisions in the marketplace.

(d) Returning the consumer to the driver's seat as the chief regulator and chief beneficiary of a free economy, by resisting excessive concentration of power, whether public or private.

(e) A drastic reduction in burdensome Federal paperwork and overlapping regulations, which weigh heavily on small businessmen struggling to compete and to provide jobs.

(f) A determined drive, through tough, realistic negotiations, to remove the many discriminatory and restrictive trade practices of foreign nations.

(g) Greater emphasis on oversea sales of surplus farm commodities to friendly countries through long-term credits repayable in dollars under the Republican food-for-peace program.

(h) Dedication to freedom of expression for all news media, to the right of access by such media to public proceedings, and to the independence of radio, television, and other news-gathering media from excessive Government control.

(i) Improvement, and full and fair enforcement, of the antitrust statutes, coupled with long-overdue clarification of Federal policies and interpretations relating thereto in order to strengthen competition and protect the consumer and small business.

(j) Constant opposition to any form of unregulated monopoly, whether business or labor.

(k) Meaningful safeguards against irreparable injuries to any domestic industries by disruptive surges of imports, such as in the case of beef and other meat products, textiles, oil, glass, coal, lumber, and steel.

(l) Enactment of law, such as the Democratic administration vetoed in the 88th Congress, requiring that labels of imported items clearly disclose their foreign origin.

(m) Completely reorganize the National Labor Relations Board to assure impartial protection of the rights of the public, employees and employers, ending the defiance of Congress by the present Board.

(n) The redevelopment of an atmosphere of confidence throughout the Government and across the Nation, in which vigorous competition can flourish.

In all such matters it will be the Republican way to support, not harass—to encourage, not restrain—to build confidence, not threaten—to provide stability, not unrest—to speed genuine growth, not conjure up statistical fantasies and to assure that all actions of Government apply fairly to every element of the Nation's economy.

In furtherance of our faith in the competitive system, we also pledge:

(1) A continual reexamination and reduction of Government competition with private business, consistent with the recommendations of the second Hoover Commission.

(2) Elimination of excessive bureaucracy.

(3) Full protection of the integrity of the career governmental services, military and civilian, coupled with adequate pay scales.

(4) Maximum reliance upon subordinate levels of Government and individual citizens to meet the Nation's needs, in place of establishing even more Federal agencies to burden the people.

In all such matters relating to Federal administration it will be the Republican way to provide maximum service for each tax dollar expended, watchfully superintend the size and scope of Federal activities, and assure an administration always fair, efficient, and cooperatively disposed toward every element of our competitive system.

Faith in limited Government

3. We Republicans shall insist that the Federal Government have effective but limited powers, that it be frugal and efficient, and that it fully meet its constitutional responsibilities to all the American people. For instance, we pledge:

(a) Restoration of collective bargaining responsibility to labor and management, minimizing third-party intervention and preventing any agency of Government from becoming an advocate for any private economic interest.

(b) Development of truly voluntary commodity programs for commercial agriculture, including payments-in-kind out of Government-owned surpluses, diversion of unneeded land to conservation uses, price supports free of political manipulation in order to stimulate and attain fair market prices, together with adequate credit facilities and continued support of farm owned and operated cooperatives including rural electric and telephone facilities, while resisting all efforts to make the farmer dependent, for his economic survival, upon either compensatory payments by the Federal Government or upon the whim of the Secretary of Agriculture.

(c) Full cooperation of all governmental levels and private enterprise in advancing the balanced use of the Nation's natural resources to provide for man's multiple needs.

(d) Continuing review of public-land laws and policies to assure maximum opportunity for all beneficial uses of the public lands; including the development of mineral resources.

(e) Comprehensive water-resource planning and development, including projects for our growing cities, expanded research in desalinization of water, and continued support of multipurpose reclamation projects.

(f) Support of sustained yield management of our forests and expanded research for control of forest insects, disease, and forest fires.

(g) Protection of traditional domestic fishing grounds and other actions, including tax incentives, to encourage modernization of fishing vessels, and improve processing and marketing practices.

(h) Continued tax support to encourage exploration and development of domestic sources of minerals and metals, with reasonable depletion allowances.

(i) Stabilization of present oil programs, private development of atomic power, increased coal research, and expansion of coal exports.

(j) A replanning of the present space program to provide for a more orderly, yet aggressively pursued, step-by-step development, remaining alert to the danger of overdiversion of skilled personnel in critical shortage from other vital areas such as health, industry, education, and science.

In furtherance of our faith in limited, frugal and efficient government we also pledge:

(1) Credit against Federal taxes for specified State and local taxes paid, and a transfer to the States of excise and other Federal tax sources, to reinforce the fiscal strength of State and local governments so that they may better meet rising school costs and other pressing urban and suburban problems such as transportation, housing, water systems and juvenile delinquency.

(2) Emphasis upon channeling more private capital into sound urban development projects and private housing.

(3) Critical reexamination and major overhaul of all Federal grant-in-aid programs with a view to channeling such programs through the States, discontinuing those no longer required and adjusting others in a determined effort to restore the unique balance and creative energy of the traditional American system of government.

(4) Revitalization of municipal and county governments throughout America by encouraging them, and private citizens as well, to develop new solutions of their major concerns through a streamlining and modernizing of State and local processes of government, and by a renewed consciousness of their ability to reach these solutions, not through Federal action, but through their own capabilities.

(5) Support of a constitutional amendment, as well as legislation, enabling States having bicameral legislatures to apportion one House on bases of their choosing, including factors other than population.

(6) Complete reform of the tax structure to include simplification as well as lower rates to strengthen individual and business incentives.

(7) Effective budgetary reform, improved congressional appropriation procedures, and full implementation of the antideficiency statute.

(8) A wide-ranging reform of other congressional procedures, including the provision of adequate professional staff assistance for the minority membership on congressional committees, to insure that the power and prestige of Congress remain adequate to the needs of the times.

(9) High priority for the solution of the Nation's balance-of-payment difficulties to assure unquestioned confidence in the dollar, maintenance of the competitiveness of American products in domestic and foreign markets, expansion of exports, stimulation of foreign tourism in the United States, greater foreign sharing of mutual security burdens abroad, a drastic reorganization and redirection of the entire foreign aid effort, gradual reductions in oversea U.S. forces as manpower can be replaced by increased firepower; and strengthening of the international monetary system without sacrifice of our freedom of policymaking.

In all such matters it will be the Republican way to achieve not feigned but genuine savings, allowing a reduction of the public debt and additional tax reductions while meeting the proper responsibilities of Government. We pledge an especially determined effort to help strengthen the ability of State and local governments to meet the broad range of needs facing the Nation's urban and suburban communities.

SECTION 4

Freedom abroad

The Republican commitment to individual freedom applies no less abroad.

America must advance freedom throughout the world as a vital condition of orderly human progress, universal justice, and the security of the American people.

The supreme challenge to this policy is an atheistic imperialism-communism.

Our Nation's leadership must be judged by—indeed, American independence and even survival are dependent upon—the stand it takes toward communism.

That stand must be: victory for freedom. There can be no peace, there can be no security, until this goal is won.

As long as Communist leaders remain ideologically fixed upon ruling the world, there can be no lesser goal. This is the supreme test of America's foreign policy. It must not be defaulted. In the balance is human liberty everyplace on earth.

Reducing the risks of war

A dynamic strategy aimed at victory—pressing always for initiatives for freedom, rejecting always appeasement and withdrawal—reduces the risk of nuclear war. It is a nation's vacillation, not firmness, that tempts an aggressor into war. It is accommodation, not opposition, that encourages a hostile nation to remain hostile and to remain aggressive.

The road to peace is a road not of fawning amiability but of strength and respect. Republicans judge foreign policy by its success in advancing freedom and justice, not by its effect on international prestige polls.

In making foreign policy, these will be our guidelines:

Trusting ourselves and our friends

(1) Secrecy in foreign policy must be at a minimum, public understanding at a maximum. Our own citizens, rather than those of other nations, should be accorded primary trust.

(2) Consultation with our allies should take precedence over direct negotiations with Communist powers. The bypassing of our allies has contributed greatly to the shattering of free world unity and to the loss of free world continuity in opposing communism.

Communism's course

(3) We reject the notion that communism has abandoned its goal of world domination, or that fat and well-fed Communists are less dangerous than lean and hungry ones. We also reject the notion that the United States should take sides in the Sino-Soviet rift.

Republican foreign policy starts with the assumption that communism is the enemy of this Nation in every sense until it can prove that its enmity has been abandoned.

(4) We hold that trade with Communist countries should not be directed toward the enhancement of their power and influence but could only be justified if it would serve to diminish their power.

(5) We are opposed to the recognition of Red China. We oppose its admission into the United Nations. We steadfastly support free China.

(6) In negotiations with Communists, Republicans will probe tirelessly for reasonable, practicable, and trustworthy agreements. However, we will never abandon insistence on advantages for the free world.

(7) Republicans will continue to work for the realization of the open skies policy proposed in 1955 by President Eisenhower. Only open societies offer real hope of confidence among nations.

Communism's captives

(8) Republicans reaffirm their long-standing commitment to a course leading to eventual liberation of the Communist-dominated

nations of Eastern Europe, Asia, and Latin America, including the peoples of Hungary, Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Albania, Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Armenia, Ukraine, Yugoslavia, and its Serbian, Croatian, and Slovene peoples, Cuba, mainland China, and many others. We condemn the persecution of minorities, such as the Jews, within Communist borders.

The United Nations

(9) Republicans support the United Nations. However, we will never rest in our efforts to revitalize its original purpose.

We will press for a change in the method of voting in the General Assembly and in the specialized agencies that will reflect population disparities among the member states and recognize differing abilities and willingness to meet the obligations of the charter. We will insist upon General Assembly acceptance of the International Court of Justice advisory opinion, upholding denial of the votes of member nations which refuse to meet properly levied assessments, so that the United Nations will more accurately reflect the power realities of the world. Further to assure the carrying out of these recommendations and to correct the above abuses, we urge the calling of an amending convention of the United Nations by the year 1967.

Republicans will never surrender to any international group the responsibility of the United States for its sovereignty, its own security, and the leadership of the free world.

NATO: The great shield

(10) Republicans regard NATO as indispensable for the prevention of war and the protection of freedom. NATO's unity and vitality have alarmingly deteriorated under the present administration. It is a keystone of Republican foreign policy to revitalize the alliance.

To hasten its restoration, Republican leadership will move immediately to establish an international commission, comprised of individuals of high competence in NATO affairs, whether in or out of government, to explore and recommend effective new ways to strengthen alliance participation and fulfillment.

Freedom's further demands

(11) To our Nation's associates in SEATO and CENTO, Republicans pledge reciprocal dedication of purpose and revitalized interest. These great alliances, with NATO, must be returned to the forefront of foreign policy planning. A strengthened alliance system is equally necessary in the Western Hemisphere.

This will remain our constant purpose: Republicans will labor tirelessly with free men everywhere and in every circumstance toward the defeat of communism and victory for freedom.

The geography of freedom

(12) In diverse regions of the world, Republicans will make clear to any hostile nation that the United States will increase the costs and risks of aggression to make them outweigh hopes for gain. It was just such a communication and determination by the Eisenhower Republican administration that produced the 1953 Korean armistice. The same strategy can win victory for freedom and stop further aggression in southeast Asia.

We will move decisively to assure victory in South Vietnam. While confining the conflict as closely as possible, America must move to end the fighting in a reasonable time and provide guarantees against further aggression. We must make it clear to the Communist world that, when conflict is forced with America, it will end only in victory for freedom.

We will demand that the Berlin wall be taken down prior to the resumption of any negotiations with the Soviet Union on the status of forces in, or treaties affecting, Germany.

We will reassure our German friends that the United States will not accept any plan for the future of Germany which lacks firm assurance of a free election on reunification.

We will urge the immediate implementation of the Caracas Declaration of Solidarity against international Communist intervention, endorsed in 1954 by the Organization of American States during the Eisenhower administration, which declaration, in accordance with the historic Monroe Doctrine, our Nation's official policy since 1823, opposes domination of any of our neighbor nations by any power outside this hemisphere.

We will vigorously press our OAS partners to join the United States in restoring a free and independent government in Cuba, stopping the spread of Sino-Soviet subversion, forcing the withdrawal of the foreign military presence now in Latin America, and preventing future intrusions. We Republicans will recognize a Cuban Government-in-exile; we will support its efforts to regain the independence of its homeland; we will assist Cuban freedom fighters in carrying on guerrilla warfare against the Communist regime; we will work for an economic boycott by all nations of the free world in trade with Cuba; and we will encourage free elections in Cuba after liberty and stability are restored.

We will consider raising the economic participation of the Republic of Panama in the operation of the Panama Canal and assure the safety of Americans in the area. We will reaffirm this Nation's treaty rights and study the feasibility of a substitute, sea level canal at an appropriate location including the feasibility of nuclear excavation.

Republicans will make clear to all Communists now supporting or planning to support guerrilla and subversive activities, that henceforth there will be no privileged sanctuaries to protect those who disrupt the peace of the world. We will make clear that blockade, interception of logistical support, and diplomatic and economic pressure are appropriate U.S. counters to deliberate breaches of the peace.

We will make clear to all Communist leaders everywhere that aggressive actions, including those in the German air corridors, will be grounds for reevaluation of any and all trade or diplomatic relations currently to communism's advantage.

We will take the cold war offensive on all fronts, including, for example, a reinvigorated USIA. It will broadcast not our weaknesses but our strengths. It will mount a psychological warfare attack on behalf of freedom and against Communist doctrine and imperialism.

Republicans will recast foreign aid programs. We will see that all will serve the cause of freedom. We will see that none bolster and sustain anti-American regimes; we will increase the use of private capital on a partnership basis with foreign nationals, as a means of fostering independence and mutual respect but we assert that property of American nationals must not be expropriated by any foreign government without prompt and adequate compensation as contemplated by international law.

Respecting the Middle East, and in addition to our reaffirmed pledges of 1960 concerning this area, we will so direct our economic and military assistance as to help maintain stability in this region and prevent an imbalance of arms.

Finally, we will improve the efficiency and coordination of the Foreign Service, and provide adequate allowance for Foreign Service personnel.

The development of freedom

(13) Freedom's wealth must never support freedom's decline, always its growth. America's tax revenues derived from free enterprise sources must never be employed in support of socialism. America must assist young and underdeveloped nations. In the process, however, we must not sacrifice the trust of old friends.

Our assistance, also, must be conditional upon self-help and progress toward the development of free institutions. We favor the establishment in underdeveloped nations of an economic and political climate that will encourage the investment of local capital and attract the investment of foreign capital.

Freedom's shield—and sword

Finally, Republicans pledge to keep the Nation's sword sharp, ready, and dependable.

We will maintain a superior, not merely equal, military capability as long as the Communist drive for world domination continues. It will be a capability of balanced force, superior in all its arms, maintaining flexibility for effective performance in the rapidly changing science of war.

Republicans will never unilaterally disarm America.

We will demand that any arms reduction plan worthy of consideration guarantee reliable inspection. We will demand that any such plan assure this Nation of sufficient strength, step by step, to forestall and defend against possible violations.

We will take every step necessary to carry forward the vital military research and development programs. We will pursue these programs as absolutely necessary to assure our Nation of superior strength in the 1970's.

We will revitalize research and development programs needed to enable the Nation to develop advanced new weapons systems, strategic as well as tactical.

We will include the fields of antisubmarine warfare, astronautics and aeronautics, special guerrilla forces, and such other defense systems required to keep America ready for any threat.

We will fully implement such safeguards as our security requires under the limited nuclear test ban treaty. We will conduct advanced tests in permissible areas, maintain facilities to test elsewhere in case of violations, and develop to the fullest our ability to detect Communist transgressions. Additionally, we will regularly review the status of nuclear weaponry under the limited nuclear test ban to assure this Nation's protection. We shall also provide sensible, continuing reviews of the treaty itself.

We will end second-best weapons policies. We will end the false economies which place price ahead of the performance upon which American lives may depend. Republicans will bring an end once again to the "peak and valley" defense planning, so costly in morale and strength as well as in dollars. We will prepare a practical civil defense program.

We will restore the morale of our Armed Forces by upgrading military professionalism, and we will allow professional dissent while insuring that strong and sound civilian authority controls objective decisionmaking.

We will return the Joint Chiefs of Staff to their lawful status as the President's principal military advisers. We will insure that an effective planning and operations staff is restored to the National Security Council.

We will reconsecrate this Nation to human liberty, assuring the freedom of our people, and rallying mankind to a new crusade for freedom all around the world.

We Republicans, with the help of Almighty God, will keep those who would bury America aware that this Nation has the strength and also the will to defend its every interest. Those interests, we shall make clear, include the preservation and expansion of freedom—and ultimately its victory—everyplace on earth.

We do not offer the easy way. We offer dedication and perseverance, leading to victory. This is our platform. This is the Republican way.

Committee on resolutions

Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, of Wisconsin, chairman.

Representative GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, of California, Assistant National Security Affairs.

Representative CHARLES E. GOODELL, of New York, Assistant Domestic Affairs.

Alabama: J. R. Bennett, Mrs. Joseph Simpson.

Alaska: Theodore Stevens, Mrs. Emily Savage.

Arizona: Representative JOHN J. RHODES, Mrs. Richard Timmons.

Arkansas: James Grimes, Mrs. W. L. Jameson.

California: M. Philip Davis, Mrs. Ivy Baker Priest Stevens.

Colorado: Senator PETER H. DOMINICK, Mrs. Ione McMurtry.

Connecticut: Representative ABNER W. SIBAL, Mrs. Anna-Mae Switaski.

Delaware: William V. Roth, Jr., Mrs. G. Herbert Calhoun.

District of Columbia: George A. Parker, Miss Catherine D. Scott.

Florida: Victor Hruska, Mrs. Janet Showalter.

Georgia: Roscoe Pickett, Mrs. W. C. Calhoun.

Hawaii: E. E. Black, Mrs. Carla Osborne.

Idaho: George Knowles, Mrs. Irma Scott.

Illinois: Representative LESLIE C. ARENDS, Mrs. Marguerite Stitt Church.

Indiana: John Burkhart, Mrs. Jean Bond.

Iowa: Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Mrs. Anna Lomas.

Kansas: Richard D. Rogers, Mrs. Ellamay Kay.

Kentucky: Edwin G. Middleton, Miss Edith Napier.

Louisiana: Tom Stagg, Mrs. George Belchic, Jr.

Maine: Sumner T. Pike, Mrs. Charlotte H. White.

Maryland: Edward T. Miller, Mrs. K. Black Massenburg.

Massachusetts: Representative SILVIO O. CONTE, Mrs. Janet K. Starr.

Michigan: Richard C. VanDusen, Mrs. Irma Liverance.

Minnesota: Representative CLARK MACGREGOR, Mrs. Russell T. Lund.

Mississippi: Charles E. Klumb, Mrs. Katherine B. Sheely.

Missouri: Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Mrs. James A. Reed.

Montana: Representative JAMES F. BATTIN, Mrs. Harry Roe.

Nebraska: Robert B. Crosby.

Nevada: William B. Wright, Mrs. Geraldine Stocker.

New Hampshire: Dr. J. Duane Squires.

New Jersey: Representative PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mrs. Katherine K. Neuberger.

New Mexico: John Donnell, Mrs. R. P. Waggoner.

New York: Joseph F. Carlino, Mrs. Wilma C. Rogalin.

North Carolina: John A. Wilkinson, Mrs. Louis G. Rogers.

North Dakota: Dr. B. J. Clayburgh.

Ohio: Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON.

Oklahoma: David A. Bartlett, Mrs. Dorothy Stanislaus.

Oregon: John Dellenback, Miss Shirley Field.

Pennsylvania: Senator HUGH SCOTT, Mrs. June Honaman.

Puerto Rico: Luis A. Ferre.

Rhode Island: Bayard Ewing, Mrs. D. Eldredge Jackson, Jr.

South Carolina: W. W. Wannamaker, Jr., Mrs. Norman C. Armitage.

South Dakota: William Gibson, Mrs. Bert Phillips.

Tennessee: Harry C. Carbaugh, Mrs. Garrison Elder.

Texas: Senator JOHN TOWER, Mrs. Tobin Armstrong.

Utah: Gov. George Dewey Clyde, Mrs. Oma Wilcox.

Vermont: George W. F. Cook, Mrs. Clifford B. Harwood.

Virginia: Jack L. Middleton, Mrs. Virginia Lee Whitford.

Virgin Islands: Jose Shaubah.

Washington: Jack England, Mrs. Fred Niemi.

West Virginia: Representative ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

Wisconsin: Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, Mrs. T. W. Norris.

Wyoming: Richard R. Jones, Mrs. Asa Jarrett.

Dr. William B. Prendergast, executive director.

William J. Baroody, Jr., assistant executive director.

Miss Catherine D. Scott, secretary.

Mrs. Barbara B. Kendall, assistant secretary.

EXCESSIVE FOREIGN OIL IMPORTS SHOULD BE CUT BACK NOW

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the situation of excessive oil imports, damaging to our national economy, contributing to unemployment and creating a very real problem for a major segment of the oil industry, is becoming increasingly urgent.

The serious and deteriorating condition of our domestic oil industry is evidenced by steady declines in industry employment, wells drilled, and crude oil prices over the past 7 years. In fact, over these years employment in the oil and gas producing industry has declined by more than 50,000—15 percent of the total industry work force in 1957. Similarly, since 1956, the total number of all wells drilled per year has decreased by 14,500—a 25-percent decrease over this period. Crude oil prices have also declined steadily for the last 6 years and in 1963 were down 20 cents a barrel or 7 percent from the 1957 level.

The Department of the Interior announcement of June 25 that oil imports into the United States for the next 6 months are to be increased more than 70,000 barrels daily over the previous level, adds to the already critical oversupply situation that our domestic industry faces.

In my own State, the Texas Railroad Commission has recently ordered that Texas oil producers operate under the lowest percentage factor for allowable production in 18 months.

This is the fourth straight month that this percentage factor has been reduced.

Mr. President, an Associated Press article from the Houston Post of Friday, July 17, 1964, entitled "August Percentage 18-Month Low, 26.5," is clearly symptomatic of the oil industry's dilemma. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Houston Post, July 17, 1964]

AUGUST PERCENTAGE 18-MONTH LOW, 26.5

AUSTIN.—The State Railroad Commission ordered Thursday that Texas oil producers must operate next month under the lowest percentage factor—26.5 in 18 months.

The action marked the fourth consecutive month the commission has reduced the percentage factor.

The commission adopted the order after hearing 6 of 13 purchasing company spokesmen say their August purchases will call for a reduction in the monthly quota.

Application of the 26.5 percent of potential formula results in an August production ceiling of 2,794,312 barrels daily.

July production was limited to 2,788,685 barrels daily under a 27-percent order. August 1963, production was ordered held to 2,868,850 barrels daily under a 28.5-percent order.

The previous low percentage factor was 26 in January 1963, the first month the percentage system was used.

Two of the top three purchasers, Indiana and Mobil, dropped their nominations one percentage point from last month. Both complained of high surplus crude stocks, Indiana's totaling 3.7 million barrels.

Only four purchasers predicted purchasing decreases from July, while five predicted they will increase buying.

Purchasers' nominations, by percent, in barrels per day: 29—Sun, 107,027; Texaco, 140,000; 28—Humble, 412,440; 27—Atlantic, 76,165; Gulf, 206,110; Sinclair, 100,000; and Standard of Texas, 35,800; 26—Mobil, 230,900; Shell, 165,700; Indiana, 238,000; Cities Service, 81,000; Phillips, 124,736; and Continental, 26,500.

District allowables, in barrels per day, and decrease from July: 1—50,291, down 113; 2—118,522, down 1,691; 3—363,191, down 3,323; 4—213,270, down 2,335; 5—31,101, down 329; 6 (outside east Texas)—130,515, down 1,529; 6 (east Texas)—104,924, down 1,518; 7—B—136,694, down 954; 7—C—121,026, down 1,366; 8—1,145,035 down, 13,937; 9—249,190, down 985; 10—130,253, down 522.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, because of this urgent problem, I have written a letter to Hon. Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, urging consideration for proposals to limit oil import quotas for the next 3 months so as to balance import volumes with the substantially lower demand for petroleum products in the summer season.

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

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

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I hope you will be able to take favorable action on a proposal which has been submitted to your office to limit oil imports for the next 3 months to 40 percent of the total allocation for the upcoming 6-month period. This emergency action would permit importing companies to import the remaining 60 percent of their allocation during the last 3 months of the year, balancing imports with the substantially lower demand for petroleum products in the summer season.

With concurrent favorable action on a measure to cut the Department of Defense procurement of foreign jet fuel and gasoline by 35,000 barrels daily, oil imports could be reduced by 200,000 barrels daily for the next 3 months. Such action would be compatible with the U.S. Bureau of Mines' forecast of a crude oil supply of approximately 200,000 barrels daily in excess of the predicted demand in districts I–IV for the month of July.

If executed, these proposals could afford temporary relief to the critical oversupply situation that the domestic industry has faced for the last 7 years. This ever-

worsening economic crisis has been reflected in serious declines in drilling activity, employment, and prices.

In fact, since March, domestic production has been cut by 300,000 barrels daily. I believe that it is only fair and just that foreign imports share the burden of these conditions with our home producers.

I strongly urge these reasonable and equitable recommendations be accepted. If I can supply additional information, I hope you will call on me.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the plain facts as to the conditions now existing in the domestic oil industry require that something be done. It is only fair and just that foreign oil importers share the burden of these unfavorable and still-deteriorating conditions with our own industry's producers and employees.

I have always believed that our national security and welfare require the equitable consideration of the domestic oil industry in the determination of oil import levels. I now urge this emergency action by Secretary Udall to insure that this principle be carried out.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be granted an additional 15 seconds.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator be granted 1 additional minute.

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

TRIBUTE TO EARLE B. MAYFIELD, FORMER U.S. SENATOR

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Earle B. Mayfield, of Tyler, Tex., who died there last June 23 at the age of 83, was one of the 26 men who have served in this body from Texas since that State entered the Union in 1845.

Senator Mayfield served here for 6 years, and achieved wide renown as an orator, and as a specialist in transportation law. His total service of more than a score of years in high public office brought him many achievements, much acclaim, and increasing recognition and honor as the passage of time permitted a cooler appraisal of his permanent accomplishment, unscorched by the temporary hot winds of political controversy.

He was always a man of honor; always the soul of courtesy. He spoke, dressed, and looked like a U.S. Senator.

In his life after retirement from the body, the good name of the Senate was upon his acts and deeds. As a successful lawyer, rancher, and businessman, he lived the best ethics and ideals of the Senate until the end of his days.

Senator Mayfield's family and my family have been friends for generations. At a rally given in my honor by citizens of Tyler last April 30, he was there with his beloved wife and spoke generously of and for me. We miss him. We mourn him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles from the June 25, 1964, edition of the Tyler Courier-Times entitled "Earle Mayfield Services Today," and "Senator Earle B. Mayfield" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Tyler (Tex.) Courier-Times, June 25, 1964]

EARLE MAYFIELD SERVICES TODAY

Funeral services for Earle Bradford Mayfield, 83, former U.S. Senator from Texas who died at his Tyler home Tuesday, were held at 2:30 p.m. today at Marvin Methodist Church.

Dr. Harry V. Rankin and Dr. Walter Kerr officiated. Burial was in the family plot at Oakwood Cemetery, with Masonic graveside services conducted by St. John's Masonic Lodge 53 of Tyler. Burks-Walker-Tippit Funeral Home directed arrangements.

Mr. Mayfield served as U.S. Senator from Texas from 1922 until 1929. He also was a former Texas railroad commissioner and a State senator. His home was at 505 South Chilton.

Survivors include his wife, Mrs. Ora Mayfield; two sons, John S. Mayfield, of Syracuse, N.Y., and Earle B. Mayfield, Jr., of Dallas; two brothers, John P. Mayfield, of Corsicana, and Dr. Jack Mayfield, of Houston; and a sister, Mrs. Irwin Hill, of Houston.

Pallbearers were T. C. Harvey, Jr., Ocie Grimes, George Jones, James W. Aston, James D. Berry, Judge Joe Estes, Brady Gentry, Joe Swann, Fred Hall, and Pete White.

Honorary pallbearers were James S. Gresham, C. N. Avery, Ben Sutton, James Truelove, Henry Carter, Wilton Daniel, and Gus Pinkerton, Sr. Members of the Marvin Methodist Church Board of Stewards and Friendly Bible Class also were honorary pallbearers.

[From the Tyler (Tex.) Courier Times, June 25, 1964]

SENATOR EARLE B. MAYFIELD

The death of Senator Earle B. Mayfield Tuesday ended a life that had contributed much to Tyler, Tex., and the Nation.

The career of Senator Mayfield was a brilliant and unusual one. A native of Overton, he engaged in business here for a few years after his graduation from Southwestern University in Georgetown in 1900.

Then he moved to central Texas and in 1906 was elected as the youngest man ever to become a State senator to that time, though he had not resided in the district long enough to cast a ballot himself.

After 6 noteworthy years in the State senate, during which time he produced an impressive array of farsighted legislation that is still in effect today, he became the youngest man ever elected to the Texas Railroad Commission in 1912.

He was a highly effective railroad commissioner in those days when the commission had more business concerning railroads than oil.

After 10 years on the railroad commission, he was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1922, becoming the only Texan ever to serve in both the Texas Senate and the U.S. Senate. His impact on the national legislative body was noteworthy in that he succeeded in passing more legislation through the upper Chamber than any Member had ever done during a 4-year period.

Senator Mayfield's work in the State senate included chairmanship of the Senate committee that succeeded in establishing the State Department of Agriculture. He authored bills establishing agricultural experiment stations. He was joint author of the Mayfield-Jenkins bill outlawing bucket shops in Texas. He worked for judicial reform, a cash basis for State operations, a better educational system, and more funds for State hospitals. A series of railroad bills also bore his stamp.

In the U.S. Senate he passed a measure giving railroads the right to extend their lines into undeveloped sections of Texas without having to get permission of the Interstate Commerce Commission—a notable decentralization of Federal power in one field. He introduced a large number of bills on agricultural and transportation matters.

In 1924 he headed the Texas delegation to the Democratic National Convention in New York. He was also a delegate to the Democratic National Conventions of 1928 in Houston and 1932 in Chicago.

Senator Mayfield returned to Tyler in 1931. He practiced law and served as president of the Mayfield Grocery Co.

An outstanding orator, he believed fervently in the U.S. constitutional plan of separation of powers as "the greatest ever devised by the genius of man."

Senator Mayfield kept himself informed of current events at all times. He was a devoted reader of newspapers and never hesitated to offer his comments upon current events and to offer constructive criticism or commendation.

He was a cheerful and friendly person, beloved by the many thousands of citizens with whom he regularly came in contact.

In his last large-scale public appearance, he was invited to speak to the Texas State Senate in Austin last year. His address was an eloquent plea for responsibility in government and freedom in individual life under the Constitution.

Senator Mayfield will truly be missed in Tyler and all over Texas. He had won, and bore nobly, the title of elder statesman.

DUAL EMPLOYMENT AND DUAL COMPENSATION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on July 9, during the debate on H.R. 7381, the dual employment and dual compensation bill, I introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, starting on page 16188, a statement by the American Federation of Government Employees in opposition to that legislation.

Last week, while I was in my State of Montana, inspecting flood damaged areas, I received from the Reserve Officers and Air Force Association a letter which purports to answer the allegations made in the statement by the American Federation of Government Employees.

In the interest of fairness to all parties concerned, and so that more light may be brought to bear on a subject which needs enlightenment, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JULY 17, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We were most surprised by your insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 9, 1964, of the letter from a local leader of the American Federation of Government Employees in connection with H.R. 7381, the dual employment and dual compensation bill.

We say this, first, because the National Federation of Government Employees is officially supporting H.R. 7381 as reported by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and has been active in its development since its introduction last year.

Secondly, we are convinced that you are anxious to see fair play done on this issue.

Surely, none of us affected would desire deliberately to distort the admittedly complicated question of dual employemnt and dual compensation. The arguments cited by the local AFGE representatives are distortions which, upon a little reflection and study, have been found wanting. These are the several main points:

Point 1. That dual employment and dual compensation is peculiar to the civil service. The facts are that it is the limitations on dual employment compensation that are peculiar only to the civil service. A retired military man can go anywhere else on the economy, get a job without restriction or without limitation of pay. Conversely, any man with private means, with earned retirement or retainer pay from any company can be hired by the Government without restriction or limitation on his pay. Only men who have served their country in the military service and, in most cases, must leave the service with retirement pay far less than necessary to support their growing families are (or should be, they say) restricted from civil service employment or limited in their compensation.

In this same connection there is again brought up the tattered argument that if a civil servant retires and then decides to return to active service with the civil service, he cannot draw his retired pay. The military man is in exactly the same situation. A retired officer or enlisted man recalled to active duty immediately loses his retired pay and is paid at the normal rate for the grade in which he is recalled.

Point 2. That the hiring of military retirees will vastly increase the costs of Government and be a burden on the taxpayer. The AFGE chapter states that "the 'dual compers' now occupy lifetime civil service jobs at double expense to the Government." This is patently untrue. It is further stated that the "proposed dual compensation legislation would increase Federal * * * costs by $500 million per year." This is utter nonsense.

In the first place, it is obvious that there are a certain total number of civil service jobs, each one at an established rate of pay, that must be filled to do the Government's job. This is the total civil service payroll cost. Even if all military retirees were completely prohibited from accepting civil service jobs the cost would not be reduced one iota. Full salaries must be paid to someone filling the job. Yet, in the meantime, the military retiree, whether he has no employment or accepts a position in the civilian economy, still draws his retirement pay. Therefore, it is easy to see that whether only one or 100,000 military retirees are employed in the civil service the costs to the Government in terms of total civil service payroll costs and total military retirement costs remain precisely the same.

As a matter of fact, a method by which the Government could save money is contained in H.R. 7381. That would be by hiring as many retired regular officers (if they could get them to come to work at reduced pay) as possible. Since each one hired would have his retired pay reduced several thousand dollars, a considerable savings would accrue to Government each year.

Point 3. That military retirement is a system of featherbedding. In this the local director infers that the "early or premature retirement" of military personnel is a deliberate attempt on their part to featherbed and enjoy two careers in the Government. This early or premature retirement is forced on the great proportion of retirees because of military exigencies. Particularly among officers, very few would choose to retire at 20 years but would prefer a complete and full military career. This is not possible because of the composition of the military forces during and subsequent to World War II and the necessity to provide for a flow of promotion and for youthful leadership. This requirement is too well known to require further elaboration.

As far as enlisted men are concerned, most of them are encouraged to retire early after 20 years of service for somewhat the same reason as the officers. However, there is another reason in their case—that is the low level of pay rates for enlisted men does not enable them properly to support and educate their families.

Therefore, virtually all, particularly the Reserve officer and enlisted man accepting involuntary early retirement, must seek other employment. Even if their retirement pay were such that they could enjoy a life of leisure the rest of their years this monumental waste of talent would be a criminal blow to the national economy.

Also, the letter carries the inference that military retirees flock to the civil service. Again, this is not true. Industry, education, even the professions are, in most cases, seeking their talents. The ones who seek and take civil service positions are generally those whose specialties are of peculiar value to the Government, or who, having served the public in one capacity, have a sincere and continued interest and desire to serve their Nation in a public position.

Related to this is the next argument postulated:

Point 4. The military retiree will dominate the civil service if H.R. 7381 is passed. It continues again to argue that the early retirement of military personnel will aggravate this situation.

The facts are, as brought out in testimony before the House committee, that less than 2 percent of civil service employees today are retired military personnel. H.R. 7381 will bring into the competitive area—and under pay restrictions that will discourage almost all from seeking Government employment—only an additional 10 percent of retirees. Ten percent of 2 percent is 0.2 percent, a not very significant number.

Let us all jointly contemplate one thing in this connection. What if, as they appear to urge, the military were prohibited from retiring until age 60 or 65 (and there are many, many military people who would eagerly accept this)? Surely this would require an enlarged military force, as young men would have to be brought in at the same rate in order to maintain vitality in the fighting forces. The only place the older military personnel could be used would be to fill the positions, in uniforms, now occupied by the some million civilians in the Defense Establishment. There could be no other way, as the American public could not be expected to support the real "featherbedding" that would otherwise be involved—to the tune of a million jobs. Thus, over a few years, virtually all civilian positions would have to be eliminated and there would be but a handful of civilian employees in the entire Defense Establishment.

Point 5. That H.R. 7381 is being passed to favor the military. We think the real reasons have been obscured for the enactment of H.R. 7381, other than to clarify the current hodgepodge of laws and decisions in connection with dual employment/dual compensation. The purpose is to afford the Government the opportunity to compete with industry for the most capable, competent employees, whether among veterans, from colleges, from other civilian pursuits, or from military service of long standing.

It would be easy to continue to refute the many other insidious innuendoes contained in the letter, such as the totally unrelated issue of Reservists serving in Congress, the merits of the military noncontributory retirement system (legally described as "earned pay withheld") versus the civil service "contributory" system, and the astounding inference that the military is "antiveteran." But why attempt to broaden what appears to exist in some minds as a schism between the military man and the civil servant.

We don't think it exists. We don't think you think it exists. We all want to serve our Government as civil employees, as military personnel, as citizens and as taxpayers. On this particular issue, we ask a fair evaluation of the honest questions involved and a fair settlement as a result. H.R. 7381, as reported by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, is one step in that direction.

Sincerely,

A. A. BRACKETT,
Colonel, USAF (Retired), Reserve Officers Association.

JACKSON V. RAMBEAU,
Colonel, USAF (Retired), Air Force Association.

COUNTY PROBLEMS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, during the past 10 years we have experienced a phenomenal increase in the role of local government. With our attention so frequently directed to the actions of the Federal Government, we frequently neglect the increasing importance of local government services.

Today, county governments are spending nearly $10 billion each year and are employing 1 million people to serve America's increasing population and their growing needs.

The growth of local government has largely resulted from a boom in citizen interest in civic affairs. This local initiative, coupled with increased intergovernmental cooperation, has created a new era, which can best be described as an era of constructive cooperation.

While much has already been done to improve our Nation's communities, we still need to tangle with many unsolved problems and unmet needs.

A recent editorial published in the Suburban Record, of Montgomery County, Md., highlighted "Seven Scourges" which affect nearly every American community. These problems, which were delineated by Bernard Hillenbrand, executive director of the National Association of Counties, must be solved. The solutions require local initiative and intergovernmental cooperation.

Postponement of the attack on these problems will place an indeblible mark on America's landscape; it will result in a soiled heritage for our children.

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

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

COUNTY PROBLEMS

In a speech delivered last week before the 42d Annual Convention of the Izaak Walton League of America, held at Davenport, Iowa, Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director of the National Association of Counties, cited seven scourges which are a plague on almost every community in the Nation.

He listed them as:

1. Automobile graveyards that line the highways.
2. Open, exposed garbage disposal dumps.
3. Dilapidated signs and billboards.
4. Pollution of our water and air resources.
5. Unwarranted spot and leapfrog residential development.

6. Homes built on the flood plains.
7. The lack of local planning.

Mr. Hillenbrand said: "It is not necessary for me to enumerate the ill effects of the seven scourges. Their depressive impact on property values, esthetic sensibilities, and health considerations are readily apparent.

"Despite the deleterious effect of the seven scourges, they can be controlled and eventually eliminated through an active program of public participation in the development of local plans to improve a community and a similar degree of enthusiastic support in the implementation of these plans.

"This goal can be achieved through an enlightened, informed, and interested public. We need active and effective citizen planning committees which will join forces with their local governments in a constructive manner to help guide the development and destiny of every community in the Nation."

Mr. Hillenbrand cited remarkable accomplishments of county governments during the 1950's when it was recognized that a large vacuum existed between municipal and Federal programs of park and outdoor recreation development. Among the accomplishments cited:

An increase from 5,000 to 42,000 the number of volunteer leaders in county recreation programs.

A tripling of the number of county parks from 933 to 2,610.

A doubling of county park acreage to a total of 430,707 acres.

A 1960 total of 20,263 full-time employees who worked on various aspects of county park and recreation programs.

A doubling of county park and recreation expenditures from $67 million to over $122 million in only 5 years.

It would seem that Montgomery County is keeping pace with both the Nation's problems and its accomplishments.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF CAPE COD CANAL

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this summer marks the 50th anniversary of the Cape Cod Canal. Having once lived in a house overlooking the canal, I am personally acquainted with the vicinity, and have been across and through the canal many times. During World Wars I and II, our defense traffic passed through it, safely inshore from the submarine menace. Today, it is a great boon to our Nation's coastwise commerce, and is well known to yachtsmen and the operators of fishing boats. Fishermen angling for Cape Cod's famous striped bass often line its banks.

Construction of the canal, which is the widest artificial waterway in the world, was begun under private sponsorship in 1909, and was completed in 1914. Owned since 1928 by the Federal Government, the canal is operated toll free, as the northernmost section of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway. In the olden days, we thrilled to the passage of the New York steamship, for which the canal was cleared as she passed through it full speed. A convenience to businessmen, this line was a wartime casualty; but the canal still serves coastwise traffic, decreasing the route between Boston and New York by over 70 miles.

The canal is also famous as the gateway to Cape Cod, a region of early historical significance, and now attractive to tourists from all over the country and from many parts of the world. The anniversary committee estimates that more than 2.5 million people will visit the canal this summer, many of them during the 2-week celebration period at the end of July and the beginning of August. Several hundred local residents have planned an exciting program of entertainment for people of all ages. It will include a variety of contests for schoolchildren, fireworks, dancing, a tour of old Cape Cod homes, and an art show by the Bourne-Wareham Art Association. There will also be a parade, in which representatives of all branches of the U.S. Armed Forces will participate; and there will be an exhibition by the Thunderbirds, the U.S. Air Force precision flying team.

In effect, all local residents have joined to extend genuine Cape Cod hospitality to the thousands of people who will visit the canal this summer. These active citizens are offering not only an interesting program of entertainment, but also an informative presentation which will make the many visitors aware of the importance of Cape Cod's past history and present contributions. We congratulate the anniversary committee and the hundreds of volunteers who have given their time and have expended their efforts in order to make the 50th anniversary celebration of the Cape Cod Canal a successful one.

"THE ECONOMICS OF HIGHER EDUCATION"

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the explosion within the ranks of college-age youth is putting tremendous and urgent pressure upon our institutions of higher education to accommodate the influx of students seeking a college degree. At the same time, the increasing demands of our modern society for those whose academic background has prepared them for the growing complexities of technology, business, and government, alike put a strain on the financial resources of students, who, as a result, all too often are squeezed out of the formal learning process.

Members of the Senate are familiar with my bill to help relieve the individual student's financial situation. S. 2490, with its provisions for scholarships, expanded loan opportunities, loan insurance, and a work-study program, will shortly be reported to the full Labor and Public Welfare Committee by Senator MORSE's Education Subcommittee, I believe. The able chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Oregon, has recently assured me, by letter, that he intends to hold an executive session of his subcommittee on this bill as soon as possible. In the meantime, the two volumes of testimony on the bill are available for those who wish to secure full information.

The other problem, that of classroom pressures, was recently discussed in relation to the State of Indiana by one of the Nation's leading radio stations, WOWO, of Fort Wayne. In an editorial, the station's general manager, Carl W. Vandagrift, considered "The Economics of Higher Education," in broadcasts on June 29 and June 30.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE ECONOMICS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

(By Carl W. Vandagrift, general manager, WOWO, Fort Wayne, Ind.)

The economics of higher education are beginning to dictate that educational opportunity can no longer be measured in terms of brainpower. There was a time when a bright youngster could reasonably expect to attend the college of his choice. However, with the tidal wave of high school graduates flooding college campuses throughout the country, institutions of higher learning have had to restrict admissions to the brightest students and those who because of scholarships or family financial backing could afford the expense of a 4-year college education.

The problem of relieving the high cost of education to otherwise qualified students has been a major concern of educators in Indiana. They discussed this problem last week during a meeting of the Colleges and Universities Study Committee of the Indiana General Assembly. The presidents and representatives from three of Indiana's State-supported colleges and universities spelled out their plan for the creation of 4-year, degree-granting institutions to be located in Indianapolis, Lake County, South Bend, and Fort Wayne. They explained that, because the major cost of education today is for board and room, a college education achieved within commuting distance would enable thousands of otherwise qualified, but financially unable, students to gain a college education.

It was also pointed out that some 62 percent of the students attending the present 2-year extension centers in Indiana come from families earning less than $7,000 a year. These families would be hard pressed financially in affording 4 years of campus living for their children. Another problem facing the 2-year extension centers is overcrowding. Already, regional campus applications are up 50 percent for this fall over last fall. This is one of the reasons behind creations of the joint Indiana-Purdue regional campus in Fort Wayne.

It seems to us that the 4-year regional campus offers a real opportunity to provide a college education for Indiana's young men and women. By bringing a post-high-school education within commuting distance of the majority of the people, the measure of educational opportunity in Indiana can again be related to brains, rather than dollars.

We hope the Indiana General Assembly will give serious thought to this proposal.

STRIP MINING PRACTICES: A "RIDICULOUS PARADOX"

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has been holding hearings on S. 1013. The hearings are continuing next week.

This bill provides for a study by the Secretary of the Interior concerning strip and surface mining operations, a study to be completed in not more than 2 years, with a report to the Congress.

Recently, two Indiana newspapers, both members of the Scripps-Howard chain, published editorials commenting on the bill. They pointed out that while we spend increasing sums to preserve

recreation and scenic areas, strip-mining practices make new barrens and despoil whole countrysides. The editorial was entitled, in a phrase used by Senator YOUNG, a "ridiculous paradox."

Although these Indiana newspapers did not mention the fact, I was one of two cosponsors who originally joined Senator LAUSCHE in presenting this bill to Congress. I believe it deserves the support of the Senate, and I intend to make a statement of support, for the hearing record.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, which appeared in the Evansville, Ind., Press on June 26, and in the Indianapolis Times on June 27, be printed in the RECORD.

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

RIDICULOUS PARADOX

Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio, is backing a bill sponsored by his fellow Ohioan, Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, to stop the destructive practice of strip mining operations. The Lausche bill would merely direct the Interior Department to make a study—but the Senator hopes this will help dramatize the frightfulness of this scenic destruction.

"While State governments permit strip miners to ravish the land," Senator YOUNG said, "it is at the same time suggested that Federal funds be used to rehabilitate it. This is a ridiculous paradox."

The "ridiculous paradox" goes even further. While States and the Federal Government spend increasing sums to preserve recreation and scenic areas and to create parks, the strippers despoil whole countrysides.

NATIVE ALASKANS SUPPORT POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, last month the representatives of Alaska's 43,000 Eskimo, Indian, and Aleut people gathered for a significant and productive conference in Fairbanks. The gathering was notable for the unity demonstrated by the native groups. It showed that native leaders are aware of their people's needs and are developing the organization and the methods through which they may press for their objectives. As I said in a telegram to the conference, native participation in Alaska's bright future will in large measure be dependent upon the unity which their leaders achieve, the responsibility they display, the inspiration they furnish.

The conference spent considerable time discussing the proposed Economic Opportunity Act, and passed a resolution supporting the legislation. Villages and organizations were urged to acquaint themselves with the proposed program and the ways in which natives might find it beneficial. This was good advice, and I hope the native groups will follow through. There are several provisions in the bill, such as community-improvement programs, adult education programs, liberalized small-business loans, work-experience and training programs, and investment grants for rural families, which could be of substantial benefit to native Alaskans and their communities. But in almost every case, the individuals and the communities would have to formulate their needs and take the initiative in making requests. Otherwise, the program would be of little benefit. Therefore, I commend the conference for watching the legislation and for alerting the natives as to its possibilities. I plan to do my part in informing our people as to which provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act, when it is passed, they might find most helpful.

I ask unanimous consent that the report from the conference be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONFERENCE OF NATIVE ORGANIZATIONS, FAIRBANKS, ALASKA, JUNE 26–27, 1964

The conference just concluded was a historic step for the native people of Alaska. For the first time, leaders representing the State's 43,000 Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut people joined hands to discuss their common problems.

The conference will be remembered, and perhaps honored, in commemoration, by future generations of natives, as the beginning of self-improvement for our native population.

It will be remembered as a beginning of understanding between the Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut people; an understanding that will have far-reaching results. It will be remembered for the beginning of native political responsibility that has not been given proper emphasis heretofore.

The benefits from this and subsequent gatherings will enrich our native population, thus reflecting on the well-being of our great State of Alaska and the Nation.

ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED

Cook Inlet Native Association.
Alaska Native Brotherhood.
Inupiat Paitot.
Fairbanks Native Association.
Gwitchya Gwitchin Ginkhye.
Arctic Native Brotherhood.
Dena Nena Henash.

VILLAGES REPRESENTED

Tanana, Noorvik, Kotzebue, Point Hope, Unalakleet.

I. UNITY

The conference emphasized the continuance and strengthening of local, regional, and statewide conferences and organizations to unite the native people of Alaska. One of the chief methods stressed to bring about better unity was improvement of communication on a year-round basis.

John Hope, grand president of the Alaska Native Brotherhood and chairman of the meeting, pointed out that jealousy and sectionalism are detrimental to unity among natives. On the other hand, conferences of all the natives are extremely beneficial toward lessening sectionalism and rivalry.

Leaders of any organization, whether it be on the village, regional, or State level should not entertain their responsible offices as steppingstones for personal ambition at the expense of their organizations and people.

II. POLITICAL ACTION AND EDUCATION

Each native community is urged to take an active part in politics by joining existing political organizations. Where these organizations do not now exist in the villages, these villages are encouraged to initiate them.

The importance of joining political parties and working in them at the precinct level is emphasized because political appointments, such as postmasterships, can thereby be obtained.

Women can play an important role in making each locality or area more aware of the importance of political affairs. They can help to make political organizations work more effectively by their participation in all political activities.

It is important for villages to form political information or action committees to acquaint all the natives of the mechanics of voting, of the issues that are important to a given area, to the history of a candidate. Voters of limited education should be assisted in classroom-type instruction in learning how to sign their names, how a ballot looks, should be given sample ballots, should be taught to recognize the candidates' names and should be taught how to mark their ballots.

It is urged that the natives become acquainted with the candidates for office and acquaint the candidates with the needs of their areas.

The potential political power of the politically educated natives was stressed with 20 percent of the total vote of Alaska in native hands.

III. EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

Education is a key to the solution of the economic, social, and political problems now facing Alaska natives. The living standard of the native will be raised by the degree of his education level. A great part of the responsibility for increasing the educational level of natives lies with parents. Parents should insist that their children attain the most education possible.

Certain educational standards must be met before positions can be filled on the local, State, and National level both in government and private industry.

The Fairbanks Native Association is conducting a statewide survey of educational problems and needs and leaders in various sections of Alaska were urged to help in conducting the survey.

Because of an inadequate State budget in dealing with problems of sanitation, local leadership is vital in this area. Leaders should work in each community to assure a good supply of drinking water and a safe and sanitary sewage disposal system.

IV. WAR ON POVERTY

The conference is enthusiastic about President Johnson's war on poverty and felt it had much application in Alaska. The villages and organizations are urged to become fully aware of its programs and to be able to take full advantage of antipoverty legislation. In view of the feeling on these matters, the conference passed the following resolutions:

V. RESOLUTION

Whereas the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, has proclaimed a war on poverty; and

Whereas a condition of poverty, or near poverty exists in certain sections of Alaska, especially among our native villages; and

Whereas no relief is in sight for the immediate future; and

Whereas the plight of Indians of America has been given special attention by President Johnson, in his state of the Union message and subsequently in speeches across the Nation; and

Whereas Alaskan natives will benefit materially from programs now being advocated for Indians of the United States, by various Federal and State agencies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Conference of Native Organizations, representing the 43,000 natives of Alaska, assembled in Fairbanks, Alaska, n this 27th day of June 1964, respectfully request the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Gov. William A. Egan, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, and Representative RALPH J. RIVERS, include Alaska in any program, Federal or State, to improve the economic condition of our original Americans; be it further

Resolved, That the Conference of Native Organizations endorse and support the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 now before the Congress of the United States.

VI. RESOLUTION

Whereas it is evident a planned program for the economic development of our native communities is essential for improving the overall living standard of our Alaskan native; and

Whereas a 10-year program is being developed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and

Whereas a long-range program is definitely a recognized need: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Conference of Native Organizations, assembled in Fairbanks, Alaska, on this 27th day of June 1964, endorse in principle the program of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as submitted to our conference; be it further

Resolved, That each community be appraised of the program for the purpose of evaluation.

VII. IMPACT OF CONFERENCE

Conference delegates were unanimous in their enthusiasm for the results of this conference and recognized it as a major step in the uniting of the native peoples of Alaska for their common good. The delegates unanimously agreed that this type of conference must be carried on as an annual occurence.

The Cook Inlet Native Association of Anchorage made a tentative invitation to host next year's conference.

In recognizing the importance of the conference, the delegates hereby request all villages and organizations to plan and work throughout the year toward financing delegates to the forthcoming conference.

* * * * *

IX. DELEGATES

Mardow Solomon, president, Gwitchya Gwitchin Ginkhye, Fort Yukon.

Peter Simple, vice president, Gwitchya Gwitchin Ginkhye, Fort Yukon.

Guy Okakok, chairman, Inupiat Paitot, Barrow.

Bernard Nash, president, Village Council, Point Hope.

Tony Joule, member city council, Kotzebue, Alaska.

Robert Newlin, president, city council, Noorvik.

Barbara Trigg, representative, Arctic Native Brotherhood, Nome.

Alfred Grant, representative, Tanana.

Nick Gray, vice president, Cook Inlet Native Association, Anchorage.

Ralph Perdue, president, Fairbanks Native Association.

John Hope, grand president, Alaska Native Brotherhood, Juneau.

Frank Degnan, mayor, Unalakleet.

Alfred Ketzler, representative, Nenana.

Ed Lutsen, representative, Fairbanks Native Association.

Howard Rock, executive secretary, Inupiat Paitot, Fairbanks.

X. HONORED GUESTS

William Byler, executive director, Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc.

Jay A. Rabinowitz, judge of the superior court, Fairbanks, Alaska.

Herbert Soll, State district attorney, Fairbanks.

Satyendra (John) Mathur, division of sanitation, Alaska Department of Health and Welfare, Fairbanks.

Roy Peratrovich, Tribal Operations Officer, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Juneau.

ATTORNEY GENERAL KENNEDY URGES NEW IMMIGRATION LAW

Mr. HART. Mr. President, earlier today, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy testified before a House subcommittee on the urgent need to reform and modernize the discriminatory and outmoded Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. He said:

It is my conviction that there are few areas in our law which more urgently demand reform than our present unfair system of choosing the immigrants we will allow to enter the United States. It is a source of embarrassment to us around the world. It is a source of anguish to many of our own citizens with relatives abroad. It is a source of loss to the economic and creative strength of our Nation as a whole.

Mr. President, the appearance of the Attorney General follows that of Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and, in my book, is an event of great importance. It is the first time in many years that members of the Cabinet have appeared before committees of Congress to support long-needed reform in America's method of selecting immigrants. It is my understanding that Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz will appear tomorrow to testify on the economic aspects of the proposed legislation.

President Johnson and his administration are giving firm leadership in a significant area of public policy—and for good reasons, put so clearly in the Attorney General's statement.

I hope Congress will proceed expeditiously to consider the pending legislation, S. 1932 and H.R. 7700. The companion bills have broad support on both sides of the aisle. Throughout the country, in every segment of our society, there is tremendous support for immigration reform. Enactment of these bills would put on the statute books an immigration law which would benefit our tradition and ideals, and meet the needs of our decade. It would mark a great achievement for the American people.

Mr. President, it is hoped the statement by the Attorney General will be widely read. I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT F. KENNEDY BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE REGARDING H.R. 7700, A BILL TO AMEND THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT, WEDNESDAY, JULY 22, 1964

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, it is a privilege for me to appear today to testify in support of H.R. 7700, the administration's immigration bill.

It is my conviction that there are few areas in our law which more urgently demand reform than our present unfair system of choosing the immigrants we will allow to enter the United States. It is a source of embarrassment to us around the world. It is a source of anguish to many of our own citizens with relatives abroad. It is a source of loss to the economic and creative strength of our Nation as a whole.

I come here, on the first anniversary of the submission of this bill by President Kennedy, to urge the correction of these faults by the speedy enactment of H.R. 7700.

As you know, President Kennedy took a special interest in immigration matters throughout his public life. He considered this bill sound and felt that the reforms it would make in our immigration laws were urgently needed.

President Johnson shares deeply in this concern. He gave his emphatic support to the reforms proposed by this bill in his state of the Union message. Since then, he has several times declared this bill to be one of the most significant measures now before Congress.

Mr. Chairman, this measure is simple. It is fair. And, when its provisions are understood, it is uncontroversial. The most remarkable thing is that we did not insist on these reforms long ago.

This measure would make it easier to bring to the United States persons with special skills and attainments that we need and want.

It would reunite thousands of our citizens with members of their families from whom they are now needlessly separated.

It would remove from our law a discriminatory system of selecting immigrants that is a standing affront to millions of our citizens and our friends abroad.

It would provide for the needs of refugees and serve our traditional policy of aiding those made homeless by catastrophe or oppression.

And, finally, H.R. 7700 would accomplish all these necessary goals without damaging the interests of any person or group, either here or abroad.

I. BACKGROUND

Mr. Chairman, the central fact with which our immigration policy must deal is that there are far more people who would like to come to the United States than we can accept.

At the present time, there are approximately three-quarters of a million people who have applied for admission to our country. Over the next 5 years, another three-quarters of a million will apply. There are differing views of how many immigrants the United States can absorb. But none of us, I am sure, believe we can admit them all.

As a result, the basic problem for our immigration policy is to choose fairly among the applicants for admission to this country. When this bill was in preparation, President Kennedy felt that it was essential to concentrate on this basic problem, and to avoid confusing the issue by proposing any substantial changes in the amount of authorized immigration.

Therefore, with one minor exception—an increase in the minimum national quota from 100 to 200—this bill leaves the present ceiling on authorized quota immigration. The question posed by the bill is not whether quota immigration should be substantially increased, but simply how we are to choose those who are admitted.

Since 1924, our standard for choice has been the national origins quota system. Under this system, quotas are assigned to each country on the basis of the national origins of the population of the United States in 1920. The goal was to preserve the racial and ethnic composition of the population of the United States as it was then.

There are a great many objections to this system. A simple one is that it does not work, even on its own terms.

One reason is that this system assumes each country will fully use its quota. But not all countries do so. England and Ireland, for example, are assigned 83,000 numbers—over half our immigration total—and yet these countries send only about 32,000 immigrants each year. The unused numbers are lost. At present, if quota numbers assigned to one country are not used by that country, there is no provision for their transfer to other countries. Consequently, more than a third of the authorized quota goes unused each year, even though thousands of otherwise eligible immigrants in other countries are eager to be admitted. The failure of the national origins system is also shown by the continual changes special legislation has made on the pattern of immigration

over the years. That pattern so poorly reflects the needs of our own citizens and of our foreign policy that inevitable pressures build up and must be relieved by humanitarian special bills. As a consequence, our actual immigration over the past 15 or 20 years has been further altered from that purportedly imposed by our permanent immigration law.

A second major objection to the national origins quota system is that it fails to serve the national interest.

No matter how skilled or badly needed a man may be, if he was born in the "wrong" country he must wait to come here, while others who are less qualified come at will. An Italian scientist—or a skilled Portuguese workman, or a Greek chef, or a Polish craftsman with special skills—obviously brings more to this country than an unskilled laborer who happens to come from a northern European country. But now, the unskilled immigrant, even without relatives here and with no claim on this country, comes first. There is no good reason for this result.

It takes only a brief look through the files of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to learn how damaging this system is to the United States. Let me cite a few representative cases.

One involves a widely known Turkish physician and scientist who sought to come to this country to pursue important research on treatment of heart attacks. An American medical school was anxious to have him. He was anxious to come. But because the Turkish quota is oversubscribed, he could not be admitted. He already has had to wait for a year and a half—and will have to wait months more before he can receive a visa.

In another case, a physicist from South Africa is anxious to come here to pursue basic research in the structure of metals. A leading American industrial firm is anxious to hire him here, and it has been determined that the supply of persons available to do such work here is inadequate. But again, the quota is oversubscribed and the physicist will have to wait nearly 2 years.

Stories like these are repeated again and again. A Filipino woman, expert in teaching deaf children, is prevented from accepting a job in a State school. A Korean radiation specialist cannot accept an opportunity to come here to do research. A Japanese microbiologist, a Greek chemist, an Egyptian urologist, and many others like them—all are barred, harassed, and discouraged by our immigration law.

The third objection to the present system is perhaps even more compelling. This objection is that the system is cruel.

One of the primary purposes of civilization—and certainly its primary strength—is the guarantee that family life can flourish in unity, peace, and order. But the current system separates families coldly and arbitrarily. It keeps parents from children and brothers from sisters for years—and even decades. Thus, it fails to recognize simple humanity. It fails to recognize the legitimate interests of large numbers of American citizens.

Again, our files are full of cases which, out of the simplest compassion, ought never to have been allowed to occur. Let me cite a single example.

A Providence, R.I., man, now an American citizen, is seeking to bring his daughter here from Italy, following the death of her husband. Because the father is a citizen, the daughter is eligible for a visa in the second preference category of the Italian quota. Her father's petition for her is near approval and she will soon be eligible to come to the United States.

She also will soon be forced to make a cruel choice. While she will be able to come to the United States, her three children, aged 9, 7, and 1, will not be eligible to come with her. Under the regulations, the preferential status that covers the Providence man's children does not extend to his grandchildren. They would have to wait nearly 4 years to be admitted.

What kind of answer is this for a potential American from a land whose Amerigo Vespucci gave our land its very name? What kind of fairness does this reflect for generations of Americans who came here from Italy in the spirit expressed by Americans like Philip Mazzei, in words later adopted by his friend, Thomas Jefferson, that "all men are by nature created free and equal to each other in natural rights"?

What kind of humanity does this demonstrate to our millions of citizens of Italian descent, whose continued contribution to our common country is evidenced simply by a rollcall of the Medal of Honor winners, or of political or economic or scientific leaders like Senator Pastore or Enrico Fermi or A. P. Giannini?

Giovanni da Verrazano, the 16th century Italian navigator, discovered parts of our country. Are we to say to Italians of a later day that they cannot come to the same country because they are Italian?

The contributions of Fiorello LaGuardia or Arturo Toscanini are known around the world. Are we to bar ourselves from the undoubted contributions of later generations of Italian immigrants and their descendants?

The same can be said about Poles or Greeks or Turks or Ukrainians or Slavs—or people from all over the world who have given our country its strength. Why should an American citizen who was born in one country be able to get a maid or a gardener overnight from another country, but be forced to wait a year or more to be reunited with his mother? Or many years, in the case of a married brother or sister. The fact is that the existing system provides no reason. Yet it remains the foundation of our immigration law. It simply doesn't make any sense.

Finally, the national origins system contradicts our basic national philosophy and basic values. It denies recognition to the individual and treats him as part of a mass. It judges men and women not on the basis of their worth but on their place of birth—and even, in some cases, the place of birth of their ancestors.

This system is a standing affront to many Americans and to many countries. It implies what we in the United States know from our own experience is false: that regardless of individual qualifications, a man or woman born in Italy, or Greece, or Poland, or Portugal, or Czechoslovakia, or the Ukraine is not as good as someone born in Ireland, or England, or Germany, or Sweden.

Everywhere else in our national life, we have eliminated discrimination based on one's place of birth. Yet this system is still the foundation of our immigration law.

The inadequacies of the system have been deplored by both major parties and by four successive Presidents. President Truman said that its assumptions were opposed to the American tradition and a constant handicap to our foreign policy. President Eisenhower, calling for revision of the immigration laws in 1956, stated that the root of the problem lay in the unfair and discriminatory national origins system. President Kennedy, in proposing the bill now before the subcommittee, called the system arbitrary, without basis in logic or reason.

Now, President Johnson, calling for passage of the administration bill in his state of the Union message, has urged that we turn away from an irrational and irrelevant concern with the place of an immigrant's birth, and turn instead to a meaningful concern with the contribution the immigrants can make to this society.

There is wide agreement, therefore, on the inadequacy of the present system.

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 contains a sound system of preferences that reflects the objectives we should pursue. Thus, the act gives first preference to quota immigrants with special skills, education, or training that are urgently needed in the United States. It gives other preferences designed to reunite families—for parents and unmarried sons and daughters of citizens, for spouses and unmarried sons and daughters of resident aliens, and a partial preference for brothers, sisters, and married sons and daughters of citizens.

As the law now stands, of course, these preferences do not really govern our immigration policy because they operate only within national quotas. That is to say, the mother of an Italian-American enters before a stranger from Italy—but not before a stranger from a Northern European country.

However, if we can use these preferences as the criteria, without regard to national origins, we can erect a rational and humane immigration policy. That is the purpose of H.R. 7700.

II. GRADUAL ABOLITION OF THE NATIONAL ORIGINS SYSTEM

The administration bill is drafted to accomplish two separate tasks with respect to quota immigration. First, it provides for the gradual elimination of the national origins system. Second, it establishes a new system for the distribution of quota numbers. Both aspects of the bill are simple in essence, but both involve complexities that this committee will want to explore.

It is clear enough that the present system is unsound and inadequate. However, it is also clear that it cannot be changed overnight. Since 1924, this system has created such monumental inequities that an immediate and complete change would create almost as many problems as it would solve.

For example, there are long waiting lists in Italy and Greece, which now have small quotas. If we went immediately to a first-come, first-served system, without limitation, our entire quota immigration for several years would come almost entirely from those two countries. This would shut off immigration unfairly and abruptly for a number of years from almost every other country.

Accordingly, the bill includes several provisions designed to accomplish a smooth and fair transition from the old system to the new. First, it provides that the old quota system should be abolished gradually, over a 5-year period. During each of the 5 years, the old quotas would be diminished 20 percent. The quota numbers taken from the old system each year, together with all unused numbers, would be distributed on a new basis. At the end of 5 years, all quota immigration would be on the new basis.

Second, the bill would limit the immigration from any one country to 10 percent of the whole number of quota immigrants authorized for the year. Since the total authorized would be 165,000 per year, the bill could not increase immigration from any country to more than 16,500. It seems to me fair and reasonable that no single country, out of the hundred or so in the world, should supply more than 10 percent of our immigration while others wait.

But this limitation would only apply if applicants were in fact waiting for admission from other countries. Under this bill, unlike the present law, there would be no unused quota numbers. If they were not used initially by the country to which they are assigned, they would be reassigned to countries which need and want them.

Finally, the bill provides the flexibility needed to deal with unforeseeable problems of fairness and foreign policy. In the past, several of our close allies have established immigration patterns based on our law as it has been. They are not responsible for the fact that the quotas on which they came to rely were the result of a discriminatory system. Sudden change might hurt them unduly.

Accordingly, the bill as originally submitted, authorizes the President, with the advice of an Immigration Board, to reserve up to 50 percent of the authorized numbers where he finds that it is necessary both in the national security interest and to avoid undue hardship resulting from changes being made by the bill.

The President's authority under this provision would, of course, have to be exercised in strict accordance with the criteria established by the bill, and in no case could the President give to a country any greater immigration than it has been receiving under existing law. In essence, the President would have authority only to slow the rate at which quota numbers are taken away, primarily from northern European countries, in the course of transition to a new, fairer system.

As the Secretary of State has explained, the same procedure could be used for the emergency needs of refugees. We cannot know in advance when natural disaster or tyranny will strike. Accordingly, the bill provides that the President may, with the advice of the Immigration Board, reserve a portion of the quota pool for the benefit of refugees.

Since this bill was first introduced, we have been able to make more extensive and detailed studies of the problems involved in the reservation of numbers. These studies show that the authority to reserve numbers in the interests of the national security can safely be lowered to 30 percent of the numbers in the reserve pool, without affecting the vital interests of our allies.

Similarly, the authority concerning refugees can, we believe, safely be lowered to 10 percent. I recommend, therefore, with the concurrence of the Department of State, that these changes be made in the bill.

To insure that these and other Executive functions will be properly performed, the bill would establish a seven-member Immigration Board. Three members would be appointed by the President, two by the President of the Senate, and two by the Speaker of the House. Congress would thus be able continually to participate in the administration of the policy established by the bill.

Although the existing system would be replaced only gradually, one form of present discrimination would be abolished immediately. Now, persons traceable by ancestry to what is called the Asia-Pacific Triangle must come in—if at all—under the quotas assigned to the countries of their ancestors. Thus, the members of a family of Japanese ancestry that has lived in Britain for centuries would nevertheless have to come in under the Japanese quota. This provision has little effect except needlessly to insult Asians. It would be abolished by the bill.

III. THE NEW SYSTEM

The new system of allocating quota numbers in this bill is based on the system of preferences in existing law. Within the system of preferences, the time of registration would govern—the principle of first come, first served.

As under existing law, those who have the greatest ability to contribute to our society would receive first preference. Other preferences, as under existing law, would favor the reuniting of families. If there were two applicants with equal claims—such as two engineers, the earliest registrant would be admitted first. Race and national origin would play no part.

Although the system of preferences used in the bill is based on the preferences in existing law, some changes would be made. Present law grants a first preference only to persons whose skills are "needed urgently" in the United States. Experience has shown that this standard is unnecessarily restrictive. It hinders us from admitting outstanding people who can enrich our economy or our culture. The bill therefore would grant first preference to those whose immigration would be "especially advantageous" to the United States.

In addition, the bill would eliminate the present requirement that to qualify for first preference an immigrant must already have secured employment in the United States. Few businessmen are willing to hire an applicant they have never seen. Thus, as a practical matter, first preference has been available only to those with friends or relatives in the United States who can arrange employment in advance. This requirement has prevented the admission of many outstanding immigrants. Its elimination will serve the national interest.

A further change in the preference structure concerns parents of citizens and resident aliens. Parents of U.S. citizens, who receive a second preference under present law, would be given nonquota status by the bill. Parents of aliens admitted for permanent residence now receive no preference at all. They would be granted fourth preference status.

These amendments will not affect large numbers of people. But to those concerned, the benefits will be great.

Finally, the bill grants a partial preference to immigrants capable of filling particular labor shortages in the United States. Under present law, if an immigrant does not meet the rigorous standards of the skilled specialist category, he is not entitled to preference, even though he may answer a definite labor need in the United States which other immigrants do not.

The new system, in summary, is based on the principle of first-come first-served, within preference categories, subject to limitations designed to prevent excessive benefit or harm to any country. The system is basically simple. It is sound. And it is fair.

The remaining matters dealt with in the bill are for the most part of interest primarily to the Department of State. There is one item, however, to which I would like to devote a few words.

IV. IMMIGRANTS AFFLICTED WITH MENTAL HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION PROBLEMS

Present law imposes an absolute, unwaivable ban on the immigration of any alien who is mentally retarded or who has—or has ever had—a mental health problem. This provision is a sorry expression of the ancient, discredited view that the mentally afflicted are objects of hopeless shame. It conflicts squarely with the enlightened and humane attitudes toward these problems that Congress accepted last year when it enacted the Mental Retardation and Mental Health Construction Act.

Our existing law repeatedly creates heartrending and insoluble situations. Families which are able and willing to care for an afflicted child or parent are forced to choose between giving up their opportunity to come here or leaving their loved ones behind. This applies also to persons who were once mentally ill. Even though long since successfully treated, they are forever barred.

In many cases, these results serve no conceivable interest of the United States. They are in conflict with the medical advances in the fields of mental health and mental retardation.

This bill would, therefore, authorize the admission of mentally afflicted persons for permanent residence so long as the public interest could be adequately protected. The Attorney General and the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service would be authorized to establish the necessary criteria and controls to protect the public interest. This authority would extend only to close relatives of American citizens or immigrants already admitted for permanent residence.

This new provision would foster the preservation of the family unit and eliminate much needless suffering.

V. OTHER ISSUES

I want to offer this morning for the consideration of the subcommittee a projection of the effect of this bill on immigration to the United States over the next 5 years. A full explanation of that projection, with the methods by which it was reached, will be presented to the subcommittee by Mrs. Helen Eckerson of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. Chairman, 40 years ago the national origins system was adopted on the theory that immigration posed a threat to the ethnic composition of the United States. Today, even if one were to accept the assumptions underlying that theory, as I do not, the idea that quota immigration could significantly affect our population is absurd.

The quota immigration of the United States under this bill would involve 165,000 people per year. The increase this bill would provide is far less than that. Yet we live today in a nation of 192 million people. Births alone increase the population by almost 4 million each year. Immigration from the Western Hemisphere, not subject to quotas, accounts for more each year than quota immigration from the rest of the world combined.

Whatever basis there may have been for the ignoble fears that prompted the adoption of the national origins system, clearly there is none today.

Another argument traditionally made against immigration reform is that it assertedly would contribute to unemployment here. Secretary Wirtz, who I understand will be the next witness before the subcommittee, will have a great deal to say on that subject and I will leave its detailed development to him. However, I would like to make one point. Far from creating an unemployment problem, immigration of the kind and quantity for which this bill provides would increase, not decrease, employment opportunities for American workers.

Only about one immigrant out of three additional immigrants admitted by this bill would enter the labor market. This reflects the fact that these immigrants would include a greater proportion of women and elderly people than the population generally. What it means is that our economy will get three consumers for every worker that is admitted. And our economy generates jobs at a rate of better than one for every three consumers.

Another fact not widely understood is that our quota immigrants today are not the uneducated, unskilled people who came at various times in the past. Today, our standards for admission are so high that our quota immigrant workers are predominantly educated and skilled.

They do not take unskilled jobs away from our unemployed. They fill jobs that are going begging because there are not enough workers available in our economy who have the needed skills. By doing this, these immigrants make possible expansion of production and the creation of far more new jobs than they take. Immigrants today bring to this country and spend a great deal more than they take in wages.

What I have said might not hold true if immigration were greatly increased. What we are talking about however, is only a yearly intake of 69,000 workers—in an economy with a work force of more than 78 million. At this rate, quota immigration helps and stimulates our economy and creates more jobs than it absorbs.

VI. CONCLUSION

These are facts and they are important. But, more than that, we are concerned with the feelings and the fate of thousands of human beings and their families. We are concerned with a very fundamental question which asks whether we believe, as we say we believe, in the dignity and worth of each individual.

The present system is inconsistent with our principles and out of step with our history. This Nation was built by immigrants of courage and ability who came from many lands. We have had Presidents whose forebears were English, Irish, Welsh, Scotch, German, and Dutch. We have benefited from the genius of Einstein, Bohr, Fermi, and thousands of others. As President Johnson has said, we can properly ask of people "What can you do for our country," but we should never ask "In what country were you born?"

I believe that the American people really do not want the present system to continue and that the time has come to enact this bill. It will not solve all the problems of immigration, but it will relieve those which are basic and most pressing. Furthermore, it will demonstrate for the world our dedication to individual freedom and our confidence in the future.

Oscar Handlin, the historian, observed: "Once I thought to write a history of immigrants in America. Then I discovered that immigrants were American history." Mr. Chairman, let us remember that history and look with confidence to the future, recognizing that our investment in new citizens will be repaid thousands of times over.

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

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2642) to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the pending business is now the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Which act, if I may ask?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the number of that bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. S. 2642.

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION INTO THE SO-CALLED CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, until recently, the mass invasion of Mississippi by demonstrators, agitators, agents of provocation, and inciters to mob violence, under the cover of the so-called civil rights movement has been difficult to expose as to its real motivation and leadership because the identities of many of the participants, and many of the leaders, has not been known. But in the light of recent developments, including arrests of some of the demonstrators at Moss Point, Holly Springs, and Drew, Miss., evidence of Communist participation and leadership is being brought into the open.

Before I talk about that in detail, let me make a few general observations on this subject, and call attention to some instances of Communist participation in mass demonstrations in cities outside the South.

The question of Communist infiltration into the so-called civil rights movement, with special emphasis on the violence which has become so much a part of that movement, is not new. By April of this year, so much evidence had piled up of Communist infiltration and Communist influence in racial agitations that Mr. Joseph Alsop devoted one of his columns to what he called "The unhappy secret" of Communist success in infiltrating civil rights movement. At about the same time, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover took notice of this same situation, and commented publicly upon it.

For many years in this country, Communist efforts have continued to recruit Negroes into the party, and to infiltrate Negro organizations. The Communists have had some notable successes along this line, in the past, but nothing like the degree of success they have had more recently, and especially during the last 6 or 10 months.

While it is true that some Negroes understand that it is foolish to think they could work with Communists without aiding the Communist Party and its objectives, far larger numbers do not realize this, or do not stop to think of it.

As I have pointed out, the Communist Party has never ceased its efforts among Negro groups. Rather, in true accord with Communist theory, the party has continued to fish in the troubled waters of racial discontent. The Communist Party, of course, has never had any aim but to exploit the Negroes and their problems for the benefit of the party's objectives.

One of the reasons the party recently has begun to record substantial successes in this field is easy to see. In the vast maelstrom of racial conflict, with its violence and threats of violence, which has been stirred up in recent years by Federal activities in this field, the older Negro organizations have been pushed toward the background, while brashly new and far more militant groups have come to power in greater and greater degree.

Among the leadership of these groups, those Negroes who are honestly non-Communist are for the most part relatively ignorant of the nature of communism, and inexperienced in dealing with it. In fact, these new Negro leaders are almost naive with respect to communism. Young and relatively inexperienced, they undoubtedly have felt that they have to prove their militancy in order to maintain their leadership. Once committed to mob demonstrations and other forms of violence, they have sometimes sought and often accepted advice from specialists in mob demonstrations and violence. They have let Communists infiltrate their groups. They have let Communists rise to positions of power. In an increasing number of cases, they have allowed Communists to work their way into positions of leadership, where these Communists have been able to use, and are now using, some of these newer Negro groups, and the adherents of these groups, to increase both the tempo and the volume of violence and rioting and general disorder.

The Communists, of course, engage in these activities and incitements, not because they think that doing so will in any way help the Negro people, or serve as a catalyzing force to bring about a fair solution of the race problem.

The Communists are in this position because it is to the interest of the Communist world conspiracy to promote and foster discontent of every possible kind, and because violence and disorder, especially between the races, are specific strategic objectives of the Communist Party in this country.

Appearances of Communist agitators and leaders in connection with demonstrations and mob action have not been confined to the South. Many instances can be cited respecting such appearances of Communists in other parts of the country.

CHICAGO

According to an exclusive series of news stories in the Chicago American, based on many weeks of investigation, and printed in September of 1963, Communist efforts to infiltrate the Chicago organization of CORE had met with a substantial measure of success even by that date. Specific identification had been made of a number of Communists participating in CORE-sponsored picket lines and other demonstrations. Those included a former Daily Worker editor, Eugene Feldman, and the head of the 42d Ward Communist Club, Charles McCord. McCord has been for many years a close associate of Claude Lightfoot, vice chairman of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.; and Claude Lightfoot participated directly, in person, in the food-and-jobs demonstration at the Illinois Public Aid Commission in Chicago on January 31 of this year. Another participant in that demonstration was Theresa Ehrlich, identified as a "Stalinist" by the Worker, who participated in another demonstration in Chicago on May 14 of this year, when she tried to lead a hunger march on the Chicago office of Gov. Otto Kerner.

CLEVELAND

Thirty-one persons who had been active in one or more subversive organizations were among the so-called civil rights demonstrators in Cleveland in April of this year. This was disclosed when Mayor Locker, of Cleveland, gave a list of the 31 names to the Department of Justice. One of the names, according to the Cleveland press, was Eric Reinthaler. Reinthaler is not a casual hanger-on around the edges of the CORE organization. He is, or at least was in April, cochairman of the finance committee of the CORE organization for the entire city of Cleveland, and according to police records he was one of the most

active participants in the April demonstrations in Cleveland. Reinthaler has a long record of Communist activity. He presently claims that he is no longer a member of the Communist Party, and the party says the same thing through its current officers, both Reinthaler and the party stating that Reinthaler was expelled from the party for some unidentified violation of party discipline. The fact remains that Reinthaler was at one time secretary of the Communist Party for the entire Ohio Valley, and between April 1961 and July 1962, when he was released from Federal prison at Milan, Mich., he served 15 months on a conviction for filing a false non-Communist affidavit under the Taft-Hartley Act.

NEW YORK

Another organizer for the Communist Party, according to testimony given under oath before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in February 1963, was Jesse Gray. Gray himself appeared before the investigating committee and swore that he was not a member of the Communist Party at the moment he was testifying. But he took the fifth amendment on the question of whether he had been a member of the Communist Party the year before, or up until 10 a.m. the morning of the hearing. At the same hearing, Gray refused on fifth amendment grounds to answer whether he had been "executive officer or representative" of the Communist Party in Harlem, and he took the fifth again on the question: "Are you now that representative?"

In June of this year, Gray was so active in connection with a demonstration reputedly sponsored by ACT, one of the new supermilitant of the Negro groups, that he was arrested by Chicago police.

This is the same Jesse Gray who has more recently been a leader in the riots in New York's Harlem area. This is a man who has not only incited to violence, but who has called specifically for bloodshed. In typical Marxist language, he has called police "Facists," thus supporting one of the longtime objectives of the Communist Party, to undermine respect for the police forces of the country. He has told Negroes, in public, that colored men are going to die, and that it is their choice whether they choose to die in Vietnam or Harlem. On Sunday, July 19, this man Jesse Gray called specifically for guerrilla warfare. He went into the pulpit at the Mount Morris Presbyterian Church in New York's Harlem district and declared:

> This city can be changed by 50,000 well-organized Negroes. They can determine what can happen in New York City.

Gray declared that "there is only one thing that can correct the situation, and that's guerrilla warfare." He called for "a hundred skilled black revolutionaries who are ready to die," and said they were needed to correct what he called "police brutality" in Harlem.

ST. LOUIS

William S. Massingale, former vice chairman of the Communist Party of Missouri, and Communist candidate for alderman in St. Louis in 1943, is not a member of CORE; but he was extremely active in sit-in demonstrations at one of the major banks of St. Louis and at the St. Louis City Hall. These sit-ins were supposed to have been conducted by CORE, and their alleged purpose was to protest what CORE characterized as racially biased hiring practices at certain downtown St. Louis banks.

According to the St. Louis Globe Democrat, in spite of Massingale's Communist Party record, he not only denied membership in CORE but denied membership in the Communist Party as well.

SAN FRANCISCO

On July 12 of this year, a so-called human rights march in San Francisco had an identified Communist and a known leader of Communist fronts holding two top spots in the organizing group.

William H. Chester, vice president of a Communist front, cited as an exploiter of Negroes, and an officer of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, was coordinator of the march. A man named Revels Cayton, who was a member of the California Communist Party State Committee back in 1946, was one of those active in organizing the march. Cayton has been identified in sworn testimony as one of the top Communists on the Pacific coast in the trade union movement during the days of the maritime federation.

Quite a number of what might be called second generation agitators, many of them sons and daughters of oldtime Communists, have been showing up in these alleged civil rights demonstrations. In San Francisco, for instance, where 127 people were arrested on March 7 in connection with demonstrations at the Sheraton-Palace Hotel, 58 were arrested during demonstrations at a downtown auto showroom on March 14, and 226 were arrested in the so-called auto row rioting on April 11, 1964.

The leader of the demonstration at the Sheraton-Palace was an 18-year-old Negro girl called Tracy Sims, who lives with Linda Carlson, daughter of Frank Carlson, a longtime Communist Party member in Los Angeles, and Rosanne Forest, daughter of Jim Forest, former Communist Party leader in St. Louis. Rosanne Forest was one of those arrested at the Cadillac showroom demonstration on March 11. Other second generation agitators arrested in connection with one or more of the San Francisco demonstrations included Nora Lapin, daughter of the late Adam Lapin, who was a Daily Worker correspondent; Carl Granich, the son of the Worker columnist, Mike Gold; Betinna Aptheker, daughter of Herbert Aptheker, who is editor of the Communist publication Political Affairs. Conn Hallinan, Mathew Hallinan, and Terrence Hallinan, three sons of Vincent Hallinan, of San Francisco, who was the 1952 Progressive Party presidential candidate; and Mark Comfort, son-in-law of an Oakland, Calif., printer named Robert Black who was identified by sworn testimony, given in 1953, as a Communist Party member.

One of the new breed of second-generation agitators is Joni Rabinowitz, of New York, daughter of Victor Rabinowitz, who was identified by sworn testimony as a member of the Communist Party, who has represented the party and party members in many legal actions, and who is attorney in the United States for Fidel Castro.

Victor Rabinowitz is the law partner of Leonard Boudin, also prominent in defense of the Communist Party and its members and its causes. In March of this year the Supreme Court of the United States upheld an order that Rabinowitz and Boudin must register with the Department of Justice under the Foreign Agents Registration Act as representing Communist Cuba.

Young Joni Rabinowitz, herself, has a police record, having been tried for perjury in Albany, Ga., in November 1963. This is the same Joni Rabinowitz who was cochairman of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee at Antioch College in Ohio.

In this position she was closely associated with one Larry Rubin, who was cochairman of the same Fair Play for Cuba Committee while he was attending Antioch College, and who spoke in public as late as April 13, 1964, under the auspices of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. Joni Rabinowitz is presently believed to be in the South, but I am not informed of her exact present whereabouts.

Now we get to the point where we begin to see emerge some of the outlines of the Communist domination of the invasion of Mississippi by collegiate and other groups.

The Larry Rubin who, with Joni Rabinowitz, was cochairman of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee at Antioch College in Ohio, is the same Larry Rubin who, according to the news stories printed throughout the North, was brutally assaulted on June 30 at Holly Springs, Miss.

The fact is that this Larry Rubin was not assaulted, and was not hurt. He was pushed in a personal altercation not involving the civil rights program, but suffered no injury. The altercation did involve damage to an automobile truck, but there was no injury to Larry Rubin.

I mention this matter in some detail because this Larry Rubin is the cousin of Daniel Rubin, known as Danny Rubin, who is the Communist youth organizer for the Communist Party, U.S.A. on a national basis. All of the Communist efforts to propagandize and control and recruit young men and women in this country comes under Danny Rubin.

At the time it was charged that Larry Rubin had been assaulted in Holly Springs, Miss., Rubin had on his person an address book containing the names and addresses of many persons with known Communist connections.

Addresses or phone numbers included in the book included those of Advance, the nationwide Communist youth organization; the Philadelphia headquarters of the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors; the national headquarters of the Communist Party, U.S.A.; Cross Currents Press, which prints a publication called Current Soviet Documents, recommended in the press release by the Soviet Embassy as a good source for the full text of Communist

Party and government decisions, speeches by Communist Party and government leaders, and so on; the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, a Communist front organization with headquarters in New York whose avowed purpose is to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities and destroy the Federal Bureau of Investigation; the Washington office of CORE; the New York office of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee; a Monroe, N.C., address for Edward Lamansky, leader of the student group who went to Cuba by way of Czechoslovakia only a week or so ago in defiance of State Department regulations; Carey McWilliams, onetime chairman of the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, Chicago office, one-time associate editor of a publication called Black & White, identified by the California Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist-controlled publication; a sponsor of the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, an organization cited as a Communist front by both the House Special Committee on Un-American Activities in 1944, and by the Pennsylvania Commonwealth Council in January 1942; a former member of the National Committee on the International Juridical Association, cited as "a Communist front and offshoot of the International Labor Defense," a sponsor of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in 1947; an active member of the National Lawyers Guild for many years; and honorary member of the Association of Young Writers and Authors which is an affiliate with the Southern Negro Youth Congress, an organization cited as subversive and among the affiliates of the Communist Party, U.S.A., in a letter by Attorney General Tom Clark in 1947; and over a span of years one of the most active workers in behalf of many Communist causes.

Here are some more names from the Larry Rubin notebook:

Marvin Markman, a founder of Advance, the Communist youth organization; the National Council of Soviet-American Friendship; the National Guardian; New Century Publishers, an official Communist Party publishing house; and the New York Headquarters of the National Council of Soviet-American Friendship.

I will not go on with the list, but there are more of the same kind of names and addresses.

One Ronald Ridenour was arrested at Moss Point, Miss., on June 24, 1964. Now, who is Donald Ridenour? He was kicked out of Costa Rica in 1964 for carrying Communist literature into that country. The arrest was made after a riot in Costa Rica which resulted in the killing of four persons. Costa Rican authorities said Ridenour was an agent of international communism. When arrested in Costa Rica, Ridenour and a comrade had in their possession a large quantity of Communist literature, knives, and an automatic pistol. Ridenour also has a police record in this country. On March 7 of this year he was arrested at a party at the home of Frank S. Pestana, in Los Angeles, Calif. Both Pestana and his wife, Jean, are identified Communists who went to Cuba in May 1962, in defiance of State Department regulations. I shall have more to say about Pestana and his activities in a little while.

The arrest of Ridenour and others at Pestana's home was for disorderly conduct. During the process of the arrest Ridenour and another young man named Dan Bessie, hurled insults and screamed "Gestapo" at the police officers.

The 1963 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities lists Dan Bessie as a temporary officer of the Constitutional Liberties Information Center handling public relations. The Constitutional Liberties Information Center is listed as a Communist front. This Dan Bessie is the son of Alvah Bessie, one of the infamous "Hollywood 10." Alvah Bessie, after he had been identified by five witnesses under oath as a Communist, claimed fifth amendment privilege in refusing to answer questions about his Communist Party membership.

A little while ago I promised I would have more to say about Frank Pestana, who recently showed up in Drew, Miss., as cocounsel for demonstrators arrested there.

That is very close to my home.

According to the 1947 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, Frank Pestana was an instructor in the Peoples Educational Center for the winter term commencing January 20, 1947. The Peoples Educational Center has been identified as a Communist school. In the 1951 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, Frank Pestana was named as having been identified as a member of the lawyers group of the Communist Party in Alameda County, Calif.

On October 1, 1952, Pestana himself went before the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a witness, and refused to answer all questions regarding his Communist Party affiliations, invoking the fifth amendment.

In November 1954, Pestana spoke before sessions of the Civil Rights Congress on the subject of "What To Do When Arrested." The Civil Rights Congress has been identified as a Communist-front organization.

The 1959 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, in referring to a Communist-led strike at Warner Bros. in Hollywood, stated:

> It soon developed that the strikers were represented by a battery of Communist lawyers, Frank Pestana, Ben Margolis, Charles Katz, and Leo Gallagher, all repeatedly identified by witnesses as Communist Party members.

In 1961, the California committee reported that Pestana had been active in "virtually all of the major Communist-front organizations in southern California." In 1963, according to the California committee, Pestana went before the Challengers Club in Compton, Calif., to raise funds for the Communist-controlled Constitutional Liberties Institutional Center. The 1963 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities identified Pestana as a member of the "legal cabal, consisting of lawyers, who offer their services in behalf of those members of the Communist Party and fellow travelers who may become embroiled with the law."

It is easy to see that what Mr. Pestana has been doing in Mississippi has not constituted a new line of endeavor for him.

How about Maynard Omerberg, who joined with Pestana in representing the demonstrators arrested at Drew, Miss.? Omerberg is listed in the 1963 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities in the same group in which Pestana was placed, "lawyers who offer their services in behalf of those members of the Communist Party and fellow-travelers who may become embroiled with the law."

The 1961 report of this same California legislative committee carried a long citation on Maynard Omerberg, which pointed out, among other references, that in 1944 he was a lecturer at the Communist school in Los Angeles; in 1948 he was a candidate for Congress on the Independent Progressive Party ticket from the 15th Congressional District of California; in November 1948, he signed a handbill for the Civil Rights Congress protesting the jailing of the 10 members of the Communist Party who refused to testify before the Los Angeles grand jury; in July 1949, he was a sponsor for the Bill of Rights Conference, a Communist-controlled front created for the purpose of resisting "the increasing assault upon constitutional rights, and which was extremely active during the trial of the 12 national leaders of the Communist Party of the United States in New York City; in June 1951, Omerberg addressed a meeting of the Civil Rights Congress protesting the Supreme Court decision which affirmed the conviction of the 11 Communist leaders; and in the same year he was a contributor to the Civil Rights Congress publication setting forth the history of the potent Communist front.

Recently the National Lawyers Guild sent representatives into Mississippi to open offices there, quite openly for the purpose of meddling into the problems of the State of Mississippi.

One of those involved in this effort is George Crockett.

Those people are directing the agitators in the State. Many of the people involved are young people, but most of them are old hands, with long Communist affiliations.

And who is George Crockett? He is a Negro lawyer from Detroit, a member of the National Lawyers Guild, and the attorney who represented the chairman of the Michigan Communist Party in the New York City Smith Act trial. He was one of those placed in contempt of court by Judge Medina at the conclusion of that famous trial of Communist leaders, for his arrogant, provocative, and flagrantly contumacious conduct during the course of the trial.

Crockett was accompanied, in setting up his Mississippi headquarters for the legal defense of the invaders, by Mr.

Benjamin Smith, of New Orleans. This Benjamin Smith has long been associated with the Southern Conference Educational Fund, with Mr. James Dombrowski and with Carl and Anne Braden, whose associations and activities are well known. This Benjamin Smith, like Victor Rabinowitz, is registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act as an agent of Fidel Castro.

I am informed that another legal carpetbagger who has come to the State of Mississippi to participate in the invasion under the banner of civil rights is Martin Popper, a longtime Communist legal eagle, identified as such in December 1955. In Mississippi, according to my information, Popper has showed up as counsel for the family of Michael Schwerner, one of the three men missing in Neshoba County, Miss.

Other National Lawyers Guild attorneys have been sent into Mississippi under the aegis of the Guild's Committee for Legal Assistance to the South, to return to the North and make statements and give speeches about how bad things are back in Mississippi.

For example, Marvin Kessler, a New York attorney, gave a press conference, when he got back, in which he declared it was the consensus in Neshoba County, Miss., that "the people who beat and terrorized Negro members of the Mount Zion Methodist Church of Longdale, and who burned their church June 16, were the same people who knowingly and deliberately wanted to destroy the three missing civil rights workers and who in fact did destroy them."

Kessler shared the platform with two other National Lawyer Guild members, Sanford Katz and Ralph Shapiro, both of whom told their audiences about what they described as the difficulties that out-of-State attorneys face in Mississippi courts.

Some of the propaganda being spewed out in the North comes from members of the second-generation agitators group who have been to the South and returned. To give an example: in Newsweek magazine for July 13, 1964, at page 19, there was a story about Bob and Lisa Mandel, who were identified only as 20-year-old newlyweds from Reed College, Oreg. The article detailed their description of what they called their tolerance in the face of hostility from intransigent Mississippians. What Newsweek did not reveal is that this particular Bob Mandel is the son of William M. Mandel, a Communist commentator with a long record of party activity.

Here is another example: The San Francisco Examiner printed an article on July 10 of this year about the desperate plight of what was described as a civil rights worker who had been jailed in Gulfport, Miss. The article was accompanied by photographs of the allegedly worried parents of the poor boy. But the paper failed to identify the parents as being known Communists.

The boy who was arrested was Steve Miller, son of Hugh B. Miller and Helen Schnedzler Miller, both identified as Communists in sworn testimony in 1957. Miller is an officer of the San Francisco chapter of the National Lawyers Guild.

In 1960, he replaced Benjamin Davis, a known Communist, as president of the National Lawyers Guild Bay Area unit. He was a signer of a clemency petition for Carl Braden, one of the leading racial agitators in this country.

Mrs. Miller, whose maiden name was Helen Hoeder, was let out of the Labor Department just before World War II as a result of Communist activity.

Communist incitement to violence by Negroes in the South, under the banner of civil rights, neither begins nor ends with sending lawyers, party-trained organizers of demonstrations, and mob violence, and youthful agitators into Mississippi and other southern areas. The party's agitators and provocateurs are busy in other States throughout the country, especially in major cities, and I have cited some instances of this. The Communists also have their own Cuban version of "Lord Haw-Haw," who daily beams broadcasts at the South, specifically inciting to racial violence. This broadcaster is Robert F. Williams, who fled from the United States just before a grand jury in North Carolina indicted him on a charge of kidnaping a white couple during 2 days of racial violence.

Williams was active in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee for some time prior to his hasty departure from the United States. In Cuba, Williams broadcasts as a paid hireling of Fidel Castro. Williams, in his broadcasts, is constantly calling for a specific action or types of action necessarily leading to or resulting in or involving violence. To give only one example: he recently called upon Negroes of the South to manufacture "lye bombs" to be used in racial demonstrations. A short time later, a roadblock in Louisiana, searching cars for contraband, uncovered a substantial number of such "lye bombs." The implication is inescapable that these were prepared, and were intended to be used, in accordance with the broadcast advice of Castro's Negro Communist "Lord Haw-Haw," Robert Williams, of North Carolina.

Let me quote a few passages from a speech by this man Williams, broadcast over Havana radio—Castro calls it "Radio Free Dixie"—on July 13 of this year.

On that occasion, Cuba's "Lord Haw-Haw" said:

> Dark cats are picking up on a whale of a beating at the hands of the ofay devil * * *. The ofay devil is on the prowl. Vicious thug cops are throwing dark blood all across the racist land * * *. Mississippi is no more than an oversized firecracker * * *. Nonviolence is what is dead. Nonviolence is no match for savage cops slinging head-whipping clubs * * * our people must be willing to die and to kill for freedom. Our lives have been miserable and tormented since the first slave ships brought us to America. They will continue to remain so until we prove ourselves willing and ready to meet the violence and terror of oppression with the violence and terror of liberation.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The fate of the whole racist nation hinges on the pace set in Mississippi. The word is: "Go for broke. Polish Bladie Mae, wheel out the old lye can or the old shooting irons, stock ammunition and organize to give 'Mr. Charlie' one whale of a tail beating."

On June 9 or June 10 of this year, five SNCC workers from Greenwood, Miss., were arrested in Columbus, Miss., on traffic charges. In their automobile were found a large number of copies of a publication called the Crusader, which quite obviously, these SNCC workers were distributing. This publication, a photostat of which I hold in my hand, carries on its front page the name of Castro's Cuban "Lord Haw-Haw," Robert F. Williams, as its publisher, and the back page shows that it was printed in Cuba.

Meanwhile, the Communist Worker is calling for a Federal takeover of the State of Mississippi. Every demonstration, every racial disturbance, every riot in Mississippi lends fuel to the fire which the Worker is trying to fan into a flame big enough to be used as an excuse for the Federal intervention which the Worker advocates.

Of course, the use of students, and others who claim to be students, makes it difficult to establish the alinement of each individual who is engaged in the Communist conspiracy to further or to participate in the invasion of Mississippi. Undoubtedly there are those who aid and abet the Communist Party's activities without being party members, and perhaps without knowing that the party is manipulating them. The fact remains that with passing time, the operating heads of this offensive against the sovereign State of Mississippi, the men who are using these students as stooges and pawns, are beginning to stand out for all to see. I have named some of them today. I shall name others as they become involved or disclosed.

Mr. President, the people of Mississippi are like the people everywhere. They do not seek racial violence. They do not want it. There is a conspiracy to thrust violence upon them. The people of my State do not know what happened to the three individuals who are missing in Neshoba County, Miss., any more than my colleagues in this Chamber know. After nearly a month of intensive search by 500 or 600 men, including Navy personnel, the Mississippi Highway Patrol, and numerous volunteers, while racial agitators in both the North and the South proclaim that the missing ones have been the victims of persecution and racial violence, and many news stories give currency to this accusation, the fact remains that no shred of evidence has yet been produced to show that this accusation is true in any respect.

The people of Mississippi hope devoutly that these three who are missing have not been harmed; but many people in our State assert that there is just as much evidence, as of today, that they are voluntarily missing as there is that they have been abducted. No one wants to charge that a hoax has been perpetrated, because there is too little evidence to show just what did happen; but as time goes on and the search continues, if some evidence of a crime is not produced, I think the people of America will be justified in considering other alternatives, as more valid solutions to the mystery, instead of accepting as true the accusation of the agitators that heinous crime has been committed.

The character of those who are beginning to loom as the most important and most powerful in conducting the operation in Mississippi which I referred to earlier as an invasion under the guise of civil rights does not justify faith in their motives. It does not justify reliance on their statements. It does not justify the public pillorying of the innocent population of our entire State, nor public attacks on the honor of that State and its public officers. The people of Mississippi have been subjected, and are being subjected today, to a degree of vilification, a multiplication of indignities, a quantity and quality of provocation, unequalled since the black days of Reconstruction which followed the War Between the States. That the people of Mississippi are holding their tempers so well, that their natural human urge to defend themselves is being so tightly restrained, that they have been so little moved to counteraction in the face of such provocation, I say is to their everlasting credit.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, last week the United States observed the sixth Captive Nations Week. There can be no more poignant reminder of our own liberty than the continued subjugation of lands from which so many of our citizens derive.

The 300 million captive peoples are the proud possessors of indigenous customs, languages, and cultures. Back and forth across their ancient lands war has raged for centuries. First by one foreign power and then by another, their territory has been partitioned and parceled out; their populations have been fragmented and flung afar; their resources have been drained and depleted. Oppression and tyranny are, in short, companions constant to these peoples.

Those that are deprived of freedom do not desire it less. Their longings for liberty lost often culminate in dramatic sacrifices. From behind the Iron Curtain, millions have fled for freedom, forsaking their native lands, their homes, and property, and in many cases, their families.

The Communist captivity of these careworn countries is far more repugnant than past despotism. More than land and people and resources, the Communists also aim to consume the minds of their captured satellites. This is the disgraceful and distinguishing characteristic of Communist totalitarianism. Earlier oppressors have demanded only submissive actions; the Communists require servile minds. The Communists would sequester not only the wealth of a nation, but also its soul.

From time to time, to their courageous credit, these captive nations have signified that, although their lands are occupied and their borders sealed, their societies fractured and their wounds unhealed, the Communists have neither consumed their spirit nor suppressed their faith in freedom.

Let us salute these noble people; let us hallow forever the enduring spirit of Kossuth and Kosciusko; and let us remind ourselves that, in the words of Somerset Maugham:

If a nation values anything more than freedom, it will lose its freedom; and the irony of it is that if it is comfort or money that it values more, it will lose that, too.

ALLEGANY STATE PARK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, within 330 miles of New York City, there is still wilderness in the full sense of the word. In the southwestern corner of New York State lies the Allegany State Park, a 65,000-acre area devoted to wildlife preservation and camping. Here a person can hike for hours without seeing people, buildings, or any other sign of human life.

This rich wilderness tract, which serves New Yorkers as well as all citizens of our country, is steeped in history, and serves as a vacation spot for historians as well as naturalists and lovers of the outdoors. The park is next to the famed reservation for the Seneca Indians, an area well known in New York State history. Surely the Allegany Park is one of the more delightful vacation spots on the east coast.

I ask unanimous consent to have an article describing this park, its facilities and historical background printed in the RECORD.

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

WILDERNESS IN THE EAST—ALLEGANY PARK IS 65,000 ACRES OF WILDLIFE AND THICK FORESTS

(By William Stockdale)

OLEAN, N.Y.—The open season on pleasure runs for 365 days a year at Allegany State Park near here. The largest facility of its kind in New York State, this vast wilderness area is busy the year round with campers, vacationists, sportsmen and other aficionados of the great outdoors.

Situated about 330 miles from New York City in the far southwestern corner of New York State, the popular playground attracts more than 750,000 visitors annually. A mammoth park in itself, the preserve takes on an added wilderness aspect as it sweeps down to the Pennsylvania border and joins the even larger Allegheny National Forest in the State.

NOT SPELLBOUND

Note the difference in how Allegany is spelled. In New York, the spelling for the park, the town and the river of the same name is "Allegany." As a sovereign State, New York retained its spelling even after the U.S. Geographic Board made the official spelling "Allegheny." Thus, the Allegany River becomes the Allegheny when it crosses into Pennsylvania.

On a road map of New York State, the park appears as a patch of green resembling a huge umbrella raised over the northern border of Pennsylvania. Its 65,000 acres comprise the largest wilderness area of any New York State park, since the even more expansive Adirondack and Catskill wilderness regions are classified as forest preserves.

Summer is the busiest time of year at Allegany State Park, but the other seasons attract their share of visitors, too. From Memorial Day to Labor Day, the park's 400-odd cabins usually are booked to capacity, and the trailer and tent areas, the most extensive in any State park in New York, are in great demand.

In the fall, from Labor Day to mid-October, many persons visit the park to admire the foliage displays. The hunters also arrive in force, and shortly afterward the first snow brings out the skiers and the winter sports fans. One big attraction in the spring is the excellent fishing. As the trees blossom, bird watchers and picnickers begin to arrive.

A SPECTACLE IN ITSELF

Allegany State Park does not have any single prize attraction. It does not, for example, have the spectacular gorge and chasms that have earned Letchworth State Park to the north the title of "Grand Canyon of the East." Nor, for that matter, does it have a great waterfall, magnificent caves, or age-old trees.

What it does have in abundance is wilderness—pure and simple. In a world fast succumbing to the advance of the bulldozer and concrete mixer, this is a precious commodity.

It is possible to drive mile after mile through this park without seeing people or buildings or other signs of human activity, or even animals. The trees that line the road form such a complete canopy overhead that only cracks of sunlight trickle through.

Suddenly, a chipmunk stands on his hind legs in the middle of the road watching a car's approach, darting off at the last moment. Later, a woodchuck lumbers awkwardly across the road to disappear into the bushes. If the automobile engine is quiet enough, or is shut off, birds can be heard singing overhead.

All the species of wildlife common to the East can be found here. There are whitetail deer, beaver, porcupine, and even black bear.

Park rangers say that any visitor can, with certainty, see most of these creatures. Some of the shyer animals, among them mink, fox, beaver, and weasel, also can be observed but this requires more patience.

There are different approaches to spotting the wildlife. Many find guard duty by the trash bins the easiest way to see the bears. But one of the best methods of seeing other animals is by sampling the park's 50 miles of fine hiking trails.

The trails are of a primitive nature, in keeping with the wilderness character of the park. Although easily followed, they are unlike many hiking trails in other parks in that they are not plastered with markers.

The park is particularly popular with campers, and what the visitor does after he arrives and pitches his tent depends on his personal preference. He can simply relax and enjoy the wilderness, or if he craves activity, there are beaches, swimming pools, and facilities for boating, tennis, and softball.

In the course of exploring the park, one may be drawn to the so-called "bear caves." These are simply large rock formations, but, despite the fact that they have nothing to do with bears, they are nevertheless interesting.

BIG BOULDERS

There are other areas, such as Thunder Rocks, where large boulders may be seen, some of them partly covered with moss. Generally, they are concealed in the shade of the dense forest.

Drinking water is available from springs and deep wells. One ranger observed that a certain spring was the most popular attraction in the park last summer as residents from nearby communities came to fill their jugs and bottles with the clear, sweet water.

As one drives along the park roads, he can see neglected apple trees on a hillside, or a clearing where a cabin stood or possibly a logging mill. It is evident that, while this is wilderness, it is not virgin wilderness.

People once lived in this vast wooded area and earned their living off the land by logging and planting. The forest today is second growth, and the original pines are gone. The State bought up the homes, the people moved off and the wilderness was recovered.

Almost surrounding the park is the Allegany Reservation of the Senecas. In fact, the main road into the wilderness preserve, State Route 17, passes through Salamanca, one of the few cities lying entirely within an Indian reservation.

The Senecas currently are campaigning to get Federal compensation for the flooding of part of their land in connection with the construction of the Kinzua Dam, across the State line in Pennsylvania.

LOSING GROUND

The park expects to lose only about 400 of its 65,000 acres to the dam project, but close to 80 Indian families on the adjacent reservation are being moved to higher ground.

Mineral rights were often retained by the absentee landlords, and five natural gas wells operate today inside the park, in addition to a few oil wells. Park authorities require the oil and gas people to cover their tracks and plant trees around their rigs to protect the wilderness character of this manmade wilderness.

CYPRUS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the 82-percent Greek majority in Cyprus does not seek unreasonable ends; it asks merely that the old democratic principle of majority rule be made a reality in Cyprus.

We have witnessed the disruptive effects of veto "rule" on parliamentary and international councils before. What Cyprus now seeks is a flexible system of government that will steer the nation vigorously in response to the needs of its people and the challenges of the modern world.

The need for majority rule is well supported in a letter to the editor of the Christian Science Monitor, July 1, 1964, written by Mr. Gus Chekares, an American businessman who recently visited Cyprus. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as a great nation bearing heavy responsibilities for preserving the peace, America is obligated to press for an early end to the tragic strife in Cyprus. Only in an atmosphere of peace can a just resolution of Greek and Turkish demands be found in a system based upon majority rule with reasonable protection of minority interests.

EXHIBIT 1

TOURIST IN CYPRUS

To the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

As an American businessman presently visiting Cyprus, I would appreciate the opportunity of conveying to your readers my impressions and observations of the situation on this strife-torn island. My curiosity was aroused by the conflicting statements and letters appearing in our American papers; hence the reason for my visit.

The Greek Cypriots, who compose 82 percent of the island's population, are a freedom-loving people, a people who loved the British as friends but not as masters. They are at a loss to understand why Britain foisted upon them the constitution they now have.

The Greek Cypriots are perplexed and insulted when the American press refers to them as terrorists. They point out that this is the same press that a few years ago referred to the freedom-loving Hungarians as freedom fighters. They are quick to point out that they, like the Hungarians, are fighting for the right of self-determination. Nothing more; nothing less.

Why the American press has been following the British line is beyond their comprehension. Why was it right, they ask, for the United States to fight Britain for their independence, and wrong for the Cypriots?

There are well over 125,000 Greeks living in Turkey and 90,000 Turks living in Greek Thrace, but neither of these minorities has veto powers over the majority of the country in which they live. Why then should the Turkish Cypriots, who compose only 16 percent of Cyprus' population have veto powers over the 82-percent Greek majority?

The Greek Cypriots point with pride to the fact that they are of the same blood, heritage, language, culture, and religion, as the mainland Greeks. The only alternative to self-determination acceptable to them is enosis, meaning union with the mother country, Greece.

Greece on the other hand has very forcibly informed Turkey that a state of war will exist the very moment the Turks attempt to invade Cyprus. As a matter of fact war was narrowly averted only a few weeks ago when the Turks had a task force ready to invade Cyprus. It was President Johnson who stayed the invasion by issuing a stern warning to the Turkish Government, and the entire world breathed easier.

In conclusion, it is my humble opinion that Cyprus should be given, without delay, a constitution similar to the one we have in the United States. On the other hand, if we permit the present situation to continue, it might very well fester into another Cuba.

NICOSIA, CYPRUS.

GUS CHEKARES.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The basis for the terms of the Constitution of Cyprus was the Zurich Agreement negotiated by the Premiers of Greece and Turkey in 1959. Britain did not take part in their conference but subsequently concurred in what was agreed there.)

WELCOME FOR PRIME MINISTER ABDUL RAHMAN

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, today the Prime Minister of Malaysia, Abdul Rahman, is beginning a 3½-week visit to the United States and Canada. We are certainly pleased that he is here, and extend to the Prime Minister our heartiest and deep-felt best wishes.

It is indeed unfortunate that our welcome must be qualified with apologies. The knowledge that our country has been training Indonesian armed forces which may be used against the country of Malaysia, a country supported by our ally, Great Britain, must be very disturbing to Tunku Rahman. Such activities should be discontinued at once, not only because of our friendship with Malaysia but also because our whole policy toward Asia is undermined when we subsidize a country like Indonesia which in turn is training Red Chinese guerrilla forces to combat free Asian nations.

The Prime Minister must not misunderstand and think that such policies reflect the attitude of the American people. Most of the American people—far and away the great majority—have watched the development of Malaysia with great interest and sympathy. We wish this new country well as it faces a great crisis almost before its independence celebrations have come to an end. Americans everywhere have watched the firm and resolute activities of Malaysia's new Prime Minister and have admired his allegiance to the principles of freedom for all Malaysia's citizens and independence from those outsiders who want to make territorial gains at the expense of Malaysia's sovereignty.

We hope that the Prime Minister Rahman's visit will be a pleasant and productive one. We also wish him well in his fight against Indonesia and his attempt to make his country a productive and growing member of the free world.

I sincerely hope that our State Department will take this opportunity to make clear to Prime Minister Rahman that our Government will not continue its support of Indonesia, and will make clear its grave concern and displeasure with the policies Sukarno is pursuing toward his peaceful and progressive neighbor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HON. L. HOWARD BENNETT CHALLENGES GRADUATES OF ALLEN UNIVERSITY IN COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Honorable L. Howard Bennett, assistant to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Rights, recently delivered the commencement address at Allen University, Columbia, S.C. In his remarks Judge Bennett discussed the momentous challenges confronting Negro college graduates in these difficult times. I quote one particularly important passage from this address:

> You are leaders and you who will be joining the ranks of the adult community must accept this challenge of freedom and responsibility. We cannot permit the sharpness of the effort to be blunted, the force of the thrust weakened, the focus and relevance of this crusade misdirected by senseless mass demonstrations that are pointless, harassing, and vindictive.
>
> It is time now that the responsible leadership make it clearly known and understood that the human rights cause does not sponsor or approve demonstrations that are apparently futile exercises in calisthenics.

Judge Bennett has distinguished himself as a person courageously striving for true racial justice in all sections of America. He has made a lasting contribution to good relations among white and Negro residents of Minnesota and he has continued this outstanding record during his more recent service in the Department of Defense. I commend him for this balanced and forthright address and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Columbia, S.C., State of

May 31, 1964, commenting on Judge Bennett's address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the commencement address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Commencement address at Allen University, Columbia, S.C., May 25, 1964, by Hon. L. Howard Bennett, principal assistant to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Civil Rights)

THE MISSION OF THE COLLEGE GRADUATE: TO ACCEPT THE CHALLENGE

Bishop Carey Gibbs, reverend clergy, Dr. Wright, members of the board of trustees, distinguished platform guests, members of the faculty, parents and friends, and members of the graduating class of 1964, I greet you on your commencement morning.

Commencement is a joyous occasion and I consider it a great privilege to be here and to share this happy hour of high achievement with you.

First of all, I offer my heartiest congratulations to all of you—to the members of the graduating class, to President Wright and the faculty, to the parents, relatives, and friends of the graduates. All of you have made significant contributions to the educational process which culminates in what we in America call graduation day.

I am especially desirous to congratulate you parents—you mothers and fathers of these fine, beautiful young women, and fine, handsome young men. Congratulations to you parents whose love, labors and sacrifices, hopes and prayers are this morning coming to fruition, and are in some measure being realized here in this place, at this hour.

Congratulations to Dr. Wright and the members of the faculty and administrative staff who have taken seriously the trust of having had committed to your custody these young ladies and young men for your providing them with guidance and development, education, and inspiration.

When an organism is challenged it puts into operation forces that are needed for its protection and survival. If it does not recognize the challenge and does not respond to it, it eventually deteriorates and succumbs. A challenge is essentially a test, a contest, a showdown of some nature. It can be a confrontation of ideas and concepts, or a competition of systems of government, or ways of life. At the least, it is the prick or sting that arouses us from comfortable repose and alerts us to mobilizing our resources to meet a threat. It is the challenge of the irritating presence of a grain of sand that initiates the enveloping and crystallizing process that ends in the formation of a gem pearl. The human body when attacked by foreign bodies, or disease germs, also responds to the irritation—the challenge—by producing antibodies, or by enveloping the germs and sealing them off.

It is some threatening sound, often inaudible to the human ear, that alerts many of the inhabitants of the animal world to bestir themselves, and gird and mobilize their whole animal being to meet a real or fancied attack.

The human personality is often lethargic and indifferent until threatened and challenged. From your own experiences you can recount how the better and the best self of an individual, or your own self, really does not emerge or manifest itself until there is some crisis—some challenge. You see a person in peril, drowning, or menaced by flames, or in the path of some imminent disaster. Or there is illness, or death, or some lesser personal or family tragedy. Or as students you procrastinated for most of the semester and did not study, but the threat of failure challenged you to great effort in studying and preparing for the exams in order to pass the course.

Whatever the circumstances, the situation was disturbed. There was threat, challenge out of which came motivation, mobilization of resources and action. To be challenged is to be motivated. Arnold Toynbee, the eminent historian, tells us from his study of civilizations and history that unless a civilization, a society, a nation, is challenged it decays and dies. And unless an individual is challenged, motivated and responds to the stimulus of challenge, the individual slumps into a state of nonpurposive existence and for all social purposes dies.

Thus it is that challenge has social utility as well as physiological value. It is something akin to the power of discontent, if not a facet of that process.

John W. Gardner, president of the Carnegie Corp., tells us in his stimulating book, "Renewal in Societies and Men," that to meet a challenge we have to see it, recognize it and be aware that it exists. Listen to what he says for it is relevant to our discussion:

"To accomplish renewal, we need to understand what prevents it. When we talk about revitalizing a society, we tend to put exclusive emphasis on finding new ideas. But there is usually no shortage of new ideas; the problem is to get a hearing for them. And that means breaking through the crusty rigidity and stubborn complacency of the status quo. The aging society develops elaborate defenses against new ideas—'mind-forged manacles,' in William Blake's vivid phrase.

"But a society that has learned the secret of continuous renewal will be a more interesting and a more vital society—not in some distant future but in the present. Since continuous renewal depends on conditions that permit the growth and fulfillment of individuals, it will also be a society fit for freemen."

Let us then first speak of the challenge of the quest for fulfillment.

The first year course in biology tells of organisms such as the paramecium and the ameba and their strong and tenacious urge to exist. These one-celled animals exist, they reproduce. They multiply by fission. But their existence is hardly more than the protoplasmic urge to exist—to stay filled with the capacity to continue, to divide by fission and multiply. Here is the lowest form of organic life. But note well that one of the properties of protoplasm alone is irritability.

Man has more than the desire to exist to reproduce. He has the desire to fulfill—the urge to fulfill. To fulfill is more than mere animal or physical existence. Fulfillment seeks to achieve certain goals and objectives. It is purposeful and meaningful. Unless the quest for fulfillment is a dynamic force in the life of an individual, that individual's life does not get much beyond the mere existence of the one-celled animals.

Your graduation here today is one leg on the quest for fulfillment. The quest for fulfillment means, among other things, the creation in your own mind of the kind of person you want to be, and the kind of life you want to live. The psychiatrists and psychologists will declare either categorically or strongly suggest (depending on the school of thought) that your image of self has already been created and that little if anything can be done about it. I will concur to say that the major structure of your personality has been formed and the potentials created. But at this juncture in your development we have not seen the emergence of either the full flowering of your personality or the full potential of your talents. There are many untapped resources, many latent abilities, considerable skills and capacities that are still to mature. There are many years ahead for creative, purposeful, and constructive living. The pattern and the plan may be present, but the major fulfillment lies ahead. The goals and objectives may be described, but they are not yet wholly and fully attained.

Your receiving your baccalaureate today is one fulfillment. It is important and significant but it is only a beginning.

This point of high achievement in your young lives should provide you with a new opportunity for reflecting and planning, determination and dedication as to what kind of person you want to be, what kind of life you want to live. Do not settle for mere existence. Resolve this day to make the utmost and highest use of your every talent and ability. Resolve and determine this day that you will live creatively and constructively, not only for yourself, but for your family and for your community.

The quest for fulfillment is beyond the individual self. We live as a part of a social organization. We are influenced by it, but we can also influence it. Resolve this day to dedicating your life to influence it for good and the betterment of mankind.

The challenge of the quest for fulfillment moves from self to family to community and with it goes the imperative to help in the making of the good society or what Josiah Royce, the great Harvard philosopher, calls the beloved community. Time and space are almost obliterated by the rapid means of communication. It is more than a pretty phrase that all the world is a neighborhood. To live in the world community requires of all of us the application of high intelligence on how we can live together in peace and harmony. Our generation must find solutions to such problems as poverty, urban slums, family disorganization, juvenile delinquency and crime, racial discrimination and its attendant tensions, mass transportation, automation, the wise use of leisure time, and on ad infinitum.

The quest for fulfillment then is to live to your highest capabilities for self and society, for family and community. It was Royce who said:

"I believe in the beloved community and in the spirit which makes it beloved, and in the communion of all who are, in will and in deed, its members. I see no such community as yet; but nonetheless my rule of life is: Act so as to hasten its coming."

Let us now speak of the challenge of freedom and responsibility.

Freedom is a whole coin, and any diminishing of the reality of freedom substantially dissipates all of it.

No American citizen is truly free until all Americans are free. Lincoln saw this clearly more than a hundred years ago. In his message to the Congress on December 1, 1862, Lincoln said:

"In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free—honorable alike in what we give, and what we preserve.

"We shall nobly save, or meanly lose, the last best hope of earth. Other means may succeed; this could not fail. The way is plain, peaceful, generous, just—a way, if followed, the world will forever applaud, and God must forever bless."

It was in these words that Lincoln stated the case, in part, for having issued the Emancipation Proclamation. Slavery not only held the slave in bondage, it also placed limitations on the white man. Slaveowner as well as laborer; plantation patriarch as well as city storekeeper. In freeing the slave, Lincoln hoped the freedom of all would be assured. But freedom did not come with the emancipation and more than a hundred years later it became incumbent upon another President to restate the same verity.

"To strike the chains of a slave is noble. To leave him the captive of the color of his skin is hypocrisy. While we in America have freed the slave of his chains, we have not freed his heirs of their color. Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware

of race, until opportunity ceases to squint its eyes at pigmentation of human complexions, emancipation will be a proclamation—but it will not be a fact. To the extent that the proclamation of emancipation is not fulfilled in fact, to that extent we shall have fallen short of assuring freedom to the free." (Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson; Detroit, Mich.; Jan. 6, 1963.)

Scores of men in high position and low have said the same thing in many ways. Yet freedom has not come and neither the message nor its irrefutable validity and logic have been effectively communicated to all the people. This failure to break through and communicate is itself a challenge. The late Louis Worth used to always admonish us students at the University of Chicago that in order to be understood the persons or people to a conversation or dialog had to avoid talking past each other; that in order to communicate and be understood required that the dialog be carried on within the same "universe of discourse." That is to say that listeners and hearers alike had to use the same language, with words of common meaning and connotation, and thereby the effort at communication and understanding could proceed with meaningfulness. The civil rights movement—the Negro freedom movement—today is beset with the failure to effectively communicate.

The strident and raucous voices of reaction and bigotry have not helped the situation for their distortions, half-truths, and untruths have confused the people. Neither have the affirmative proponents in the debate made their point. The challenge to achieve freedom involves the art of communication and in this instance communication requires first of all a clear definition of the goals and objectives. The definition must carry with it an interpretation in depth. The trite phrases, the cliches, the shallow exhortations are not adequate and will not do the job which an intelligent handling of this vexatious and complex problem requires.

Wisconsin, Indiana, and Maryland are unfortunate but clear evidence of this fact.

In some sections there has been such a concentration on protest demonstrations that little attention has been given to telling what the demonstrations are about and what are the root causes which give rise to them.

We have not persuasively made the point that these demonstrations are the product of deep-rooted social, economic, and psychological ills that have afflicted, disabled, and disadvantaged the Negro since slavery and for a hundred years since emancipation.

Let us ask ourselves a few questions:

Where does the Negro work? What is the pattern of his employment? What is his economic status?

More than 75 percent of all Negro workers are found in the three lowest occupational categories: service workers, semiskilled and unskilled laborers, and farmworkers. But only 39 percent of all white workers are in these three categories.

In 1963 the median annual income of the Negro family was $3,233. For the white family it was 45 percent higher—$5,835. What is even more significant is that instead of the gap narrowing in the past decade it has been widening. In 1952 the gap was 43 percent compared to a 45-percent gap in 1963.

In 1961, 5.7 percent of the white men in the labor force were unemployed, but 13 percent of the nonwhite men were unemployed.

In the youth population between the ages of 16 to 21, Negroes are only 15 percent of the Nation's youth population, but 50 percent (one-half) of Negro youth are both out of school and unemployed. James Bryant Conant, distinguished President-Emeritus of Harvard, and former High Commissioner of Germany, tells us this is one of the burning embers that poses a serious social problem of human decay, deterioration, and an explosive potential in our big cities all over America.

Where does the Negro live?

One out of every six dwellings occupied by Negroes is dilapidated. In the white sector only 1 in every 32 dwellings is so classified by the census.

In 1961 of all the public housing units in the Nation, Negroes occupied 47 percent of them; yet the Negro is only 11 percent of the Nation's population.

These statistical facts appear clinically clean when recited, but a view of the teeming masses of Negroes, young and old, north and south, in the slums and ghettoes of rural and urban America are appalling pictures and constitute an ugly and disturbing condition in our Nation.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The goals and objectives of the Negro crusade are to banish segregation and discrimination from America, to do away with second-class citizenship, to remove from his shoulders all of the disabilities which burden him simply because he is Negro. It seeks to obtain equal opportunity to work, to be upgraded and promoted; and to receive the same or comparable pay, and have the same working conditions as any other worker. He wants to live in a clean and decent neighborhood with parks and playgrounds and wants this housing to be available anywhere he can afford to rent or buy.

He wants to send his child to a good school with good teachers and wants that educational program to be realistic and geared to the acceleration and cultural enrichment that the circumstances dictate.

Negroes want to participate in every aspect and at every level of the political process: To register, to vote, to hold office, to obtain political appointment, to function in the legislative, executive, and judicial processes, and to serve on the policymaking administrative boards and commissions.

And of equal importance, the Negro wants the equal opportunity to assume all of the responsibilities, perform all of the duties of a citizen so that he can make his full, unhampered contribution to the making of Royce's "beloved community," Hutchins' "good society," and President Johnson's "great society."

The demonstrators chant and the placards read "Freedom Now." I know the deep longing for freedom now. Freedom requires, demands responsibility, and in the march toward equality there is also the requirement for responsibility now.

The movement for freedom will continue with quickened tempo and more intensity, and the massive efforts to close the gap and achieve equality will press forward. There will be more picketing and demonstrations, but responsibility and good judgment and sound reasoning say that we cannot and must not allow this movement to lose or diminish its peaceful, nonviolent character. We should take lessons from the successful and persuasive methods that appealed to America's sense of decency and gained support for the cause. They were dignified, orderly, saturated with a spiritual quality, and fortified with the invincible armor of Christian love.

We can ill afford to have the imprint and character which Martin Luther King has given to this movement tarnished and demeaned or destroyed by irresponsible demonstrations that degenerate into rowdy, ugly, disorderly mob-like emotional outbursts.

You who are leaders, and you who will be joining the ranks of the adult community must accept this challenge of freedom and responsibility. We cannot permit the sharpness of effort to be blunted, the force of the thrust weakened, the focus and relevance of this crusade misdirected by senseless mass demonstrations that are pointless, harassing and vindictive.

It is time now that the responsible leaderships make it clearly known and understood that the human rights cause does not sponsor or approve demonstrations that are apparently futile exercises in calisthenics. If a demonstration is not specific in its reference and articulate in its statement of objectives, it is harmful. If it does not directly address itself to the solution of a problem, the correction of a stated wrong, the redressing of a known grievance, the achieving of a right, then such a demonstration is a disservice to the whole civil rights cause. They must cease.

Indiscriminate inconveniencing of motorists on the highway, the malicious wasting of water, the mean and harassing practice of going into supermarkets to collect carts full of groceries, and other merchandise, having them checked and their prices totaled, and then walking away without completing the transaction is not a way to win friends, influence people or obtain justice and equal rights.

In any national debate there will be distortions and misstatements. The word has gone out and the impression is abroad, and unfortunately believed by many well-meaning persons that—

Negroes want to take away the rights of the white people.

Negroes want to take away their jobs.

Negroes want to destroy the way of life, the good life of white America.

Certainly the Negro does not want to take away the just rights of any man. He wants the protection of the Nation's laws and the same rights of all Americans.

The Negro does not want to take away the job of any white person. What he wants is the same opportunity—the equal opportunity to get a job—the chance to be trained on that job, to be promoted on that job, and be paid on that job on the basis of his performance without being discriminated against because he is colored.

It is the utmost folly to say and incredible to believe the Negro would want to destroy the way of life of those who seemed threatened. Theirs is a wonderful way to live. All the Negro seeks is the opportunity to participate and share in, to improve and enjoy that way of life. And we shall gain that objective for I am convinced that there is a great reservoir of decency and justice and good will all over America. In the South as well as North. In the Middle West as well as on the Pacific coast. Among the most eloquent voices in the land today calling for racial justice and equal opportunity are two southerners—the former Governor of North Carolina, Luther Hodges, and the former Governor of Florida, Leroy Collins.

Let us speak of the challenge to forge the alliance.

The struggle of the Negro for the past hundred years has developed many survival techniques. This happens in any minority group that survives. Survival requires an effective leadership. There has been a mark of genius in the leadership of Negro America. It has been a leadership competent in planning, capable in developing and executing strategy, skilled in timing and sensing the climate of opinion and the public pulse. It has been articulate, persuasive and forceful, and at the same time, restrained and disciplined. It has been the keeper of the Nation's conscience.

At this juncture in our history and in the needs of humanity, we have an imperative to which to respond: The force, thrust and competence of the Negro's revolt for freedom and equality must expand to embrace the legitimate democratic aspirations of other disadvantaged, dispossessed, disinherited, exploited and persecuted groups in our society.

The Negroes of America, leadership and masses alike, must see their crusade in its true perspective, and must see the identification of their goals and objectives, with those of other groups in our Nation and our world society who are similarly oppressed and underprivileged. We must join cause with them and let them know of our concern and work for their uplift at the same time that we work for our own salvation.

Our efforts to push back poverty from the doors of black sharecroppers in Alabama and Mississippi is the same poverty that blights the life of the white family in the hills of the Appalachian Mountains.

Our efforts to escape the segregated schools of inferior educational programs and facilities in the ghettoes of New York and Chicago, are the self-same ghettoes, segregated schools and inferior education from which the disadvantaged Puerto Ricans in New York and Chicago seek to escape.

The assaults upon human dignity and the violations of human decency which Negroes rightly abhor and to which they object in Alabama, Mississippi, New York, and New Jersey, are the same indignities, the same indecencies to which the American Indians are subjected and about which they complain in Minnesota and North and South Dakota and wherever they are found.

And I could go on and on. We are not the only group in America beset with prejudice and discrimination. Catholics, Jews, Mexican-Americans, Japanese-Americans, the Orientals on the Pacific coast, labor in the textile mills of North and South Carolina, the migratory workers are also among the dispossessed and the disinherited.

And I say to you, we must denounce anti-Semitism and anti-Catholicism and all the other antis in our society with the same vitality and force as we denounce anti-Negro attitudes and conduct, patterns and practices. Not only must we denounce the hate campaigns directed at Negroes and other minority groups, but we must also condemn and repudiate those Negroes who are now infected with the virus of hate. Of course the squalor and filth of Harlem tenements, the frustrations and hopelessness that accompany unemployment, and all the other social ills of segregation and discrimination create revulsion within—but these conditions do not justify hating those you consider perpetrators of the crimes of injustice. The emergence of hate groups, and anti-white gangs among Negroes is deplorable and contrary to the moral values of our society, which we seek to have observed and obeyed. Negro Americans cannot by their silence allow the small group of purveyors of hate and murder believe their antisocial behavior is either condoned, approved, or appreciated. Rather let it be known we deem it reprehensible.

If you accept the challenge to forge the alliance you should recognize and all should know that the goals and objectives which Negroes are seeking in the 1960's are consistent with the high ideals of our Judaeo-Christian religion, of Western civilization itself, of the creed and promises of American democracy. And when viewed in perspective and in balance the black revolt is really only a part of a larger social revolution that significantly involves the whole social order. It should and must be made clear that as Negroes achieve their rights and equal opportunities, other sectors and parts of our society also advance. The advance is neither singular, nor isolated.

Every inch and step forward to freedom and equality by American Negroes is an inch and step forward for all Americans.

Every inch and step forward for the poverty-stricken black sharecroppers in Alabama is an inch and forward step for the poor white man in the Appalachian Mountains of Pennsylvania.

Every Negro in Louisiana, Alabama, and Mississippi who acquires the right to register and exercises the right to vote is thereby strengthening the democratic political process.

Every time the barriers of segregation and discrimination are lowered in education, employment, and housing, our whole Nation, black and white alike, move closer to the realization of the American dream. Every step forward, every gain, every advance made by the Negro is an advance for all Americans and all Americans will benefit.

Therefore, in urging you to accept the challenge to forge the alliance, I am in effect urging you to join together with all people to work for the improvement of conditions not alone for Negroes, or Indians, or Jews, or Puerto Ricans, or the poor whites of the mountains, but for improving the conditions for the entire family of man. In this way, we help evolve and construct the great society of which President Johnson speaks. Only Friday, President Lyndon Baines Johnson, at the University of Michigan, said:

"A great society—one of challenge constantly revered, beckoning us toward a destiny where the meaning of our lives matches the marvelous products of our labor." (Lyndon B. Johnson.)

Finally, I speak to you on the challenge of a sense of mission.

You young graduates are the beneficiaries of a great tradition, a valuable legacy. Richard Allen was a man of deep conviction and with him it was not sufficient that his body was free. His soul and spirit also had to be free. Nor was he content to see the plight of his fellow man without being moved, being sensitive, and wanting to do something constructive about it. Richard Allen had a sense of mission. When he left St. George's Church in 1787, it was a sense of mission that led him to found the Free African Society, a social welfare-social uplift organization, and later to found the A.M.E. Church.

A sense of mission requires having that knowledge that your work, your life's endeavor, is a special work and to your life has been added a special purpose. It goes beyond that. There is a spiritual quality infused in it. There is zeal, the crusader's spirit and a strong commitment to do the job at all costs.

Your education imposes a special responsibility upon you. You must relate yourself and your talents to the needs of the masses of people. And that you are "called" to help the poor, encourage the weary and inspire the discouraged. And you say to yourself: This is my duty; my obligation. Herein lies the challenge of a sense of mission. It is not the arrogance of an attitude of noblesse oblige. Rather, it is the heeding of the injunction: I am my brother's keeper.

A sense of mission is mightily concerned with the spiritual and moral values.

Since Korea, or maybe even since the end of World War II, the great emphasis placed on the material aspects of our culture has produced a flaunting disregard of basic and fundamental values of our society.

Education and our schools and colleges have not acted to come to grips with this excess and imbalance of emphasis and direction. Our society and, until recently, our college students, products of this social milieux, have been obsessed with such attitudes and concerns as comfort and complacency, success and security. In our world of travail, complexity, kaleidoscopic change, there is no place for complacency. To be sure to be comfortable is desirable, to succeed a worthy goal, and security a desired status, but these objectives must not be our first concerns, our highest priorities.

Let us this day, both young and old alike, pledge ourselves to giving a high priority to social sensitivity, social concern and commitment.

SENSITIVITY

A sensitivity to the ills of our society, the plight of our fellow men, the injustices, deprivations and needs of all people.

CONCERN

A deep and abiding concern based on our awareness about and sensitivity to these problems must stay with and live with us.

COMMITMENT

A personal commitment of ourselves to work intelligently, unceasingly and courageously to bring about the realization of the ideals and promises of our democratic society.

[From the State, Columbia, S.C., May 31, 1964]

SOUND COUNSEL

Sound advice for a reasonable, realistic and nonviolent advancement of their own cause was given Negroes in the commencement address at Allen University.

Quoting the placards which say "Freedom Now," Judge L. Howard Bennett, the speaker, and himself a Negro said: "But this freedom cannot be obtained instantaneously. The energy devoted to violent demonstrations covers up the reasons the demonstrations are being held."

Judge Bennett, now an assistant Secretary of Defense and a native of Charleston, did not deprecate the movement for Negro rights; he only suggested an understanding of the fact that violent demonstrations are not the avenue to instantaneous change. They are no more than "futile exercises in calisthenics," he said.

It was advice on method, without reflection on purpose.

This points up once more the recklessness and premeditated civil disobedience fostered by the errant top Negro leadership. Judge Bennett apparently would have none of it. He would recommend a more effective communication of Negro objectives.

"The idea is that at home and abroad the Negroes want to take away the jobs and civil rights of and opportunities of white Americans," he said. "But that is not so. The Negro does not want to change the American way of life. The Negro wants only an equal share of it. He wants to participate and wants to make as much contribution to the American way of life as anyone else."

These should be calming words on waters made tortuous by the tactics of the revolutionary leadership. They point the way to long-range progress achieved through understanding and good will. They should make sense not only to Negroes but to white individuals and organizations which have endorsed the instrument of the demonstration and which Judge Bennett condemns as a disservice to his race's cause.

NEED FOR ADEQUATE LOCAL AIR SERVICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Minnesota is only one among many States concerned about the need for better airline service in the smaller cities and towns who have invested millions for certificated airports and terminal buildings.

Only 540 of the thousands of airports in the United States are certificated on the scheduled routes of the trunk and local airlines. Many of these smaller airports are getting only one or two flights daily. More than 100 communities stand to lose their service altogether by pending cases in the Civil Aeronautics Board to discontinue under the "use it or lose it"

rule or to consolidate service for a group of cities at a single airport.

Recently a number of communities involved in this problem have joined together to establish the Local Airline Service Action Committee—LASAC. This committee is requesting the CAB to permit no additional discontinuances until the Congress has investigated this problem thoroughly and established new policy guidelines. Alternative solutions such as the use of the so-called third level airlines to service these smaller communities should be investigated before any final decisions are reached on these pending cases.

I am fully sympathetic to the need for adequate airline service in these smaller cities and towns since adequate air service is practically essential if these communities are to maintain growing economies and to attract new industry and population. To make it manifestly clear, I am unalterably opposed to the present policy. I think it is uneconomic. I think it is unwise. I think it is retrogressive. It denies an opportunity for the smaller communities to grow.

The American Association of Airport Executives recently adopted a resolution concerning this important problem. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION 64–3

Whereas many communities in need of airline service (1) are not receiving service, or (2) have lost or suffered reduction in service, or (3) face the prospect of a loss or reduction of service if regulatory and airline policies and activities continue their present trend; and

Whereas many of these communities are becoming more dependent upon air transportation for their total transportation needs; and

Whereas it appears that these communities acting individually lack the resources to solve the problems or combat the present trend of reduction in service; and

Whereas the economy of these communities cannot be maintained or expanded to their fullest potential without adequate air service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Association of Airport Executives, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to investigate the level of certificated airline service to communities other than existing trunk airline points in order to determine whether the philosophy and intent of Congress with respect to such service is being achieved; and be it further

Resolved, That upon completion of such a review, the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to adopt a resolution or legislation expressing the sense of Congress in regard to said airline service; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be requested to urge the Civil Aeronautics Board to maintain no less than the current level of service to medium and small communities pending the review and action by the Congress herein requested; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of the resolution be sent to the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.; the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.; the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.; the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.; the chairman of the Commerce Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.; the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation, Commerce Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.; and the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C.

TRANSSHIPMENT OF AMERICAN WHEAT BY RUSSIA TO CUBA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call attention to a news release just issued by the Public Affairs Officer of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The national VFW commander, Joseph J. Lombardo, of Brooklyn, N.Y., today called for a suspension of all U.S. wheat shipments to the Soviet Union, pending an investigation of reports that our wheat is being transshipped to Cuba.

I endorse and support this highly constructive position of the national commander of the VFW and the VFW organization nationally.

We are all aware of the reports relayed back into this country that Americans have witnessed the unloading of American wheat designed for Russia, and its reloading on Soviet ships to be transported to Cuba, thereby placing the United States in the direct position of supporting, encouraging, and fortifying the Communist government of Cuba.

I also join National Commander Lombardo in his request that the Government and the White House make a full and clear report to the American public immediately as to the exact status of what occurred in this connection in Russia.

What we have now, of course, is merely the word relayed back by persons on the American ship. This may or may not be an exaggeration of the facts. Whether it is an exaggeration of the facts, or whether it is, indeed, an accurate description of what has taken place, I believe that the American people are entitled to know precisely, and completely, a full and frank report on all the facts.

It is not news to Senators to realize that I was in strong opposition to the whole concept of selling our American wheat behind the Iron Curtain, for cash or for credit.

I then said that I was perfectly confident that some of that American wheat would find its way out of Russia after we had shipped it in—to other countries, which she was trying to subdue or other countries which she was trying to control under her domination.

To me, this is rather largely a question of semantics, as to whether what actually happened was the transshipment of American wheat in Russia from an American ship to a Soviet ship so that our wheat goes to Russia and from Russia back to Cuba, or whether in fact our American wheat was unloaded in Russia and a similar amount of replacement Russian wheat was then put in a Russian ship to go to Cuba.

Either way, the fact that we are supplying the needed wheat which Russia desires from our American bins, gives her the supply she requires, to enable her to ship wheat to countries which she is trying to support in her effort to destroy freedom in America.

Either way, our shipment of American wheat to Russia gives her an opportunity either to use those precise grains of wheat or replacement wheat to build up the power of the Communist countries in this world to wage war against the United States. Either way freedom is weakened, the possibility of war is heightened, and America is injured.

To use the "pretty" language of the State Department, Mr. President, any way we look at it the shipment of American wheat to Communist countries which have vowed to destroy us has to be a "counterproductive" policy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the entire news release published by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

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

SUSPEND WHEAT SHIPMENTS TO RUSSIA

(News release from the office of director, national security and foreign affairs, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Washington, D.C.)

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 21.—The national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, of Brooklyn, N.Y., today called for a suspension of U.S. wheat shipments to the Soviet Union pending investigation of reports that our wheat is being transshipped to Cuba.

Explaining the VFW's position, Commander Lombardo said, "According to press stories, the captain and first mate of a U.S. ship report that U.S. wheat is being unloaded at a Russian Black Sea port and reloaded aboard a ship bound for Cuba. This is a direct violation of the terms under which the wheat sale was made to the Kremlin."

"It would appear, therefore," Commander Lombardo continued, "two vital issues are involved: First, the Soviet Union breaking its agreement with the United States, and two, the use of U.S. wheat as a means of strengthening the Castro Communist regime in Cuba. If this is happening, then the United States finds itself in the strange position of building up a regime dedicated to our own destruction."

"The VFW urges," Commander Lombardo added, "that an immediate and vigorous investigation be undertaken by the appropriate agencies of the U.S. Government to ascertain the correctness of these reports of the Kremlin sending U.S. wheat to Cuba. The VFW also urges that pending the completion of such investigation, U.S. wheat shipments should be completely suspended. If such reported doubledealing by the Soviet Union is correct, U.S. interests will have been protected by suspending such shipments immediately." Continuing, Commander Lombardo explained, "the investigation should not be confined to the matter of transshipment of U.S. grain to Cuba alone. If transshipment of our wheat to any Communist nation has taken place, it is, also, in violation of the wheat sale agreement, and would also justify termination of the arrangement."

Concluding, Commander Lombardo stated, "This entire episode of a U.S. merchant ship being shot at and boarded in international waters, together with the U.S. captain's report of transshipped wheat to Red Cuba,

demonstrates clearly the background of hypocrisy, ingratitude, and apparent outright breach of faith on the part of the Kremlin. But, of course, we should have learned long ago that we shouldn't be surprised by any of these actions by the Soviet Union."

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I, too, have noted the furor about the wheat supposedly being transshipped from Russia to Cuba, wheat that we had shipped to Russia originally.

The only evidence we have, of course, is the word of the captain of that ship; and, like many others, I believe that we should look into the situation to see if it is true.

It does not seem possible that the Russians would be so foolish as to transship wheat from Russia to Cuba, when Russia can buy all the wheat it wishes from Canada and ship it to Cuba by a much shorter route. Last year, it purchased over $500 million worth of wheat from Canada. It could transship this to Cuba, which is much closer.

There is also no restrictions whatever on the purchase of wheat by Cuba from Canada.

But, why all this furor about the sale of wheat to Russia, when 2 years ago our sales of tallow to Russia and its satellites reached an alltime high?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the exact figures on the amount of increased shipments of tallow to Communist nations—which have reached large proportion. Tallow is one of the chief ingredients of ammunition.

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

MEMO TO SENATOR YOUNG FROM FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural exports to Russia and other East European Communist nations, including Yugoslavia, rose from $163,225,000 in 1959 to $358,054,000 in 1963. This represents an increase of almost 119 percent. Omitting exports to Yugoslavia, the increase amounted to about 285 percent, rising from $61,217,000 in 1959 to $175,022,000 in 1963. The following discussion will omit exports to Yugoslavia entirely.

Trade with this group of nations has, during this period, involved Russia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Latvia. Poland has taken most of the exports from this country, receiving over 99 percent of the total in 1959 and over 42 percent of all U.S. agricultural exports to these nations in 1963. These dollar totals do not include the large wheat sales concluded late in 1963.

Wheat and other grains, mainly soybeans, flaxseed, and corn, have contributed the major amount of these exports over the 5-year period. These items accounted for 48 percent of the total value in 1959 and 36 percent of the 1963 amount.

Major items shipped to Russia included substantial amounts of tallow in 1961, 1962, and 1963. This amount did decline from 197,437,000 pounds in 1961 to 33,400,000 pounds in 1963. Cattle hides, live animals and, in 1963, agricultural seeds provided the bulk of the balance of our agricultural exports to Russia. Prior to 1961, there was no shipment of these commodities to Russia. This was also the case with all of these nations except Poland and Hungary.

WYOMING STATEHOOD

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on July 10, a day on which the Senate met in a notably brief session, Wyoming observed the 74th anniversary of the act which created it as a State in the year 1890.

It was my privilege last year to speak on Wyoming's proud past and brilliant future and also to invite attention to certain members of the press, who were conducting "an unprecedented and well planned campaign of vilification and defamation aimed at painting my State as something manipulated by external forces of some extremist bent." I am relieved that there exists no need for such a statement on this occasion.

It is indicative of the meteoric pace of recent history that the State which was created from a wilderness 74 years ago, and which still has the second smallest population in the Nation, is a participant in the space sciences and research.

For the past 2 years, Fremont County, Wyo., has hosted a Space Age Conference and Exposition which has drawn science-conscious people not only from Wyoming's outlying areas but also from surrounding States as well. The first conference featured exhibits and speakers on the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The theme of this year's conference, highlighted by a June 4 address by Air Force Chief of Staff, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, was focused upon the space program of the U.S. Air Force.

Few people realize that Wyoming has the Nation's first operational squadron of intercontinental ballistics missiles. As General LeMay pointed out, Wyoming is also in the forefront of the Air Force's atomic power reactor program. An air defense radar site near Sundance, Wyo., houses the first atomic reactor used by the Air Force. The facility was installed in September of 1961.

At the conclusion of my remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the address by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay at the Wyoming Space Age Conference and Exposition at Riverton, June 4.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, Wyoming enjoys the truly commendable ambivalence of retaining its historic spirit of independence and stalwartness, while at the same time striving with its every sinew for full participation in the science and technology of the space age before which lie vast uncharted reaches of knowledge and experience.

Nowhere can the quest of man for knowledge be better observed than at the University of Wyoming at Laramie, where extensive experiments are underway in a wide range of highly sophisticated projects.

The University of Wyoming ranks among the top 10 percent of American universities, and as a former president of that institution's board of trustees, I can say, without undue immodesty, that the products of that university are among the best educated men and women in the world.

As an aside, I should like to note that the territorial Governor who became Wyoming's first State Governor, Francis E. Warren, received his appointment from then President Benjamin Harrison. That Chief Executive's grandson, William Henry Harrison, is now serving Wyoming with distinction in his fourth term, as our single Member of the House of Representatives.

As the last frontier of the Old West, Wyoming looks with anticipation on the years that lie ahead. We combine a proud heritage, an optimistic future, and confidence in the strength of the American way to remain the land of opportunity—the Equality State.

EXHIBIT 1

ADDRESS BY GEN. CURTIS E. LEMAY, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. AIR FORCE, AT THE WYOMING SPACE AGE CONFERENCE AND EXPOSITION, RIVERTON, WYO., JUNE 4, 1964

Senator SIMPSON, Governor Hansen, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a very great pleasure for me to be in Wyoming today to visit your Space Age Conference and Exposition and talk with you about the Air Force's space program.

It is far easier these days to ask intelligent questions about space than it is to give authoritative answers. Though we know a great deal about space, we can easily identify areas of ignorance that are larger than our areas of knowledge.

Our limited knowledge, however, does not keep us as a nation from believing strongly that our space program will benefit this country—and mankind—in very large measure. There is something about the mystery of space that holds a promise for man.

The people of this region have obviously been caught up in the excitement of that promise. And in the pioneer spirit of your forefathers, you have sensed that this Nation is embarking on an epic exploration. You have set about the job of associating yourself with this adventure. And you have done it on your own. This kind of ambitious enterprise is in the best tradition of our country, and I admire your initiative and farsightedness.

It is, I think, worthy of note that Wyoming already has a claim to being in the vanguard of the Air Force's aerospace activities. It was at Francis E. Warren Air Force Base near Cheyenne that the first squadron of intercontinental ballistic missiles became operational in August of 1960. That base now supports two ICBM wings.

Wyoming is also in the forefront of the Air Force's atomic power reactor program. At an air defense radar site atop a 6,000-foot mountain near Sundance, the Air Force installed its first atomic reactor in September 1961. Today this reactor is not only supplying electrical power, it is also supplying steam heat for the buildings as a generous byproduct.

With this beginning and judging from the ambition you are showing in this exposition, I'm sure we can expect to see substantial contributions from Wyoming to future space programs.

The Air Force space program is part of a broad national effort to advance and protect our interests in this challenging environment.

This national effort to get into space has been justified on four counts: (1) Scientific progress, (2) national prestige, (3) commercial advantage, and (4) national defense.

Early in the days of the space age, the United States went on record as advocating that this new medium should be reserved for peaceful purposes. Our Government introduced a resolution to this end in the

General Assembly of the United Nations in December of 1961. The resolution as approved by the U.N., indorsed the U.S. position, but confirmed at the same time the inalienable right of all nations to self-defense in all mediums; land, sea, air, and—if necessary—space.

Conscious of the world's concern about space, but also mindful of the aggressive tendencies of some nations, the late President Kennedy reminded us as follows, and I quote:

"Space science, like nuclear science and all technology, has no conscience of its own. Whether it will become a force for good or ill depends on man, and only if the United States occupies a position of preeminence can we help decide whether this new ocean will be a sea of peace or a new, terrifying theater of war." End of quote.

This Nation's military space program, therefore, is not in conflict with our national policy of reserving space for peaceful purposes. It is designed to help carry out that policy. It is not enough for us just to wish or to resolve. Paradoxical as it may sound, we must be prepared to use force, if necessary, to prevent space from being dominated by an aggressor—if we are to insure its use for peaceful purposes.

In order for you to gain some insight into the space activities of the Air Force, I would like first to cover briefly the background of our program, and then indicate for you a probable path for future developments.

To place our space program in some degree of perspective, I would like to remind you that it was just 10 years ago this summer that we organized an all-out program to build intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The development of these missiles was our first major step toward space.

Then in September of 1959 in an effort to consolidate defense space activities, Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy assigned to the Air Force the responsibility for the development, production, and launching of all military space boosters. In March 1961, Secretary of Defense McNamara issued a follow-on directive adding the responsibility for research and development of all future military space programs and projects. These directives comprise our Air Force space charter.

Air Force space plans establish as a first broad objective the development of systems which can operate on an effective and economical basis within the near-earth environment.

We have already developed our first group of such space systems. These are unmanned satellites, and today they are performing a number of passive military missions, including communications, navigation and weather surveillance.

These satellites have proved that in many respects space systems can do certain jobs better than those which are ground-based or airborne.

We now conceive of a second group of systems which would make it possible for us to carry out certain defense activities in near space.

We believe a genuine defense capability in this environment will call for three things: a detection and tracking system; a means of inspecting unidentified objects; and a means of disabling those that prove hostile—if this should be necessary in the national interest.

To meet these requirements, we already have in operation a space detection and tracking system. And work is continuing on a satellite inspector project to develop equipment and techniques for inspecting objects in space.

On the matter of disabling hostile space vehicles, we are currently considering alternative means of solving this vital problem.

We feel that a major factor in the problems yet to be solved is the determination of the appropriate role of man in space operations.

Scientific information from research and development is urgently needed in this area. To date, we have learned that manned flight for a period up to several days is feasible without complex provisions for artificial gravity. And from the flights of the X–15, we have gained some valuable information on man's ability to maneuver on the fringes of space. Clearly, however, this knowledge must be expanded and refined if we are to plan wisely for more extensive military space operations.

The planners of NASA's manned lunar program also need information about man's ability to survive and work in space. NASA's two-man orbiting vehicle, Gemini, is designed to help supply this information. It is one of the building blocks in their program to land a man on the moon. Because of the overlap of interests, the Department of Defense and NASA drew up an agreement for cooperating on the Gemini project.

As a result of this agreement, the Air Force is now tying in its very important manned orbiting laboratory—or MOL—program with the Gemini project. In fact, the joint plan calls for the physical coupling of the MOL to a Gemini capsule, so that they can be fired into orbit together. The idea is for a two-man crew to start out in the Gemini capsule, and after being injected into orbit, to move into the trailing laboratory. Upon completing their experiments, they will return to the Gemini, detach it from the laboratory, and return to earth. The laboratory will remain in orbit.

We hope to learn the answers to several specific questions from experiments with the manned orbiting laboratory. For example:

How is man affected by extended periods in orbit?

Will his faculties work well in such an environment?

Which faculties might be impaired, to what degree, and how soon?

Or, can a man in a weightless environment maintain good physical condition through exercise?

In addition to finding out the answers to such physiological questions, we will also be determining how well man can operate certain types of equipment in performing military functions.

The answers to these questions will help us to tie down the answer to the big question—how useful is man going to be in space?

Not until that question is answered, thoroughly and scientifically, can we say with confidence what will be the course of U.S. military activities in that medium. If the manned orbiting laboratory can give us some of the answers to man's proper role in military space operations, then the program will have to rank as one of the most important military space undertakings of the decade.

To give you some feel for the extensiveness of this experiment, the MOL itself is planned to be a cylinder with a volume of about 1,500 cubic feet, roughly the size of an ordinary one-car garage. It's "shirt sleeve environment" will make it possible for its crew to work on their military and scientific experiments for as long as 30 days.

We hope to put several of these laboratories into orbit. We are also making it possible for replacement crews to enter these orbiting laboratories to carry out new experiments or finish old ones.

What military spacecraft will look like in the days beyond the MOL is as yet hard to define. We anticipate, however, that they will be able to maneuver, rendezvous, inspect, transfer men and materials—and if necessary disable hostile vehicles. With these capabilities they will be able to perform a variety of military missions.

However, we face several serious problems when we attempt to design a military space system. First, we must weigh seriously its relative merits against a comparable ground-based or airborne system. The same technological progress that is showing us ways of building space systems is also showing us ways of improving those which are ground-based or airborne. Our designers must, therefore, avoid the temptation of wanting to do things in space, simply because it is more challenging or more glamorous to do so.

Second, we face the problem of the early obsolescence of space systems. If we rush to build a system with the first promise of science, we run the risk of development costs which could make it too expensive. If, however, we continue to wait for more promising discoveries, we may place the Nation in a second-best position to an ambitious competitor. Our investment in space research and development, therefore, helps us to pace ourselves and to avoid the dual mistakes of making a premature commitment or overlooking a promising opportunity.

Finally, an overriding consideration in space programs is cost. These programs are very expensive. In fact, cost is a pacing factor because, as always, our resources have limitations. We in the Air Force are very conscious of our responsibility for the careful management of these resources.

If one takes a historical view of our space progress, he might say that today we are where we were in aviation 50 years ago. We've come a long way in that 50 years. And I think the history of that half century of aviation tells us clearly that in the years ahead we will make phenomenal progress in space.

With man in space, my instinctive belief is that the rate of progress will accelerate. I have learned that when you put a man at the controls of an airplane, he comes up with a lot of new ideas on how to accomplish his mission better. For some reason, these ideas just don't come to his mind until he gets those controls in his own hands. In our limited space flights to date, we have already benefited from man's presence in the capsule. And yet what we have learned thus far is but a fraction of what we will glean from man's participation in the manned orbiting laboratory, the Gemini program, and the Apollo flights to the moon.

I am reminded of my conviction in this regard by something I look at every day. In my office in the Pentagon is a large trophy case. It contains a collection of very interesting items. One of them is the first pair of Air Force wings carried into space. They were worn by Maj. Gus Grissom on his suborbital flight of July 20, 1961. I'm sure that when Major Grissom pinned on his first pair of pilot's wings in 1951, he never imagined that just 10 years later he would be at the controls of a Mercury space capsule called *Liberty Bell VII*. NASA recently named Major Grissom to be one of the two astronauts to be placed into orbit this year in the first shot in the Gemini series. I'm sure that he and the other astronauts will be bringing back many new ideas on how to better accomplish our scientific and military missions in space.

Undoubtedly, there are people here today who question whether this region of Wyoming has a future in the national space program. My feeling is this. From what I have seen and heard, there are people here who like to take the controls in their own hands and steer their own course. I am convinced that when a community thus accepts full responsibility for its own destiny, it starts tapping the full resource of its imagination and initiative.

Therefore, I believe the people of this region are operating on the right formula for success and that you do have a future

in the national space program. We welcome your participation in this great endeavor. Thank you.

SALUTE TO NEBRASKA AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is with great pride that I commend a group of National Guardsmen who through their patriotism and personal dedication to duty have brought distinguished honor to themselves and to the State of Nebraska. Maj. Gen. Lyle C. Welch, adjutant general of the Nebraska National Guard, recently announced that the 155th Fighter Group of the Nebraska Air National Guard has scored a "grand slam" by winning not only the Spaatz Trophy as the outstanding National Guard tactical flying unit for 1963, but also the Winston P. Wilson Trophy for year-round excellence in the performance of all-weather aid defense missions and the Air Force Association's Outstanding Unit Trophy.

The 750 present-day minutemen in the organization commanded by Col. Fred H. Bailey, Jr., of Lincoln, Nebr., who through their personal sacrifice make a significant contribution to the preparedness of our country, deserve the warmest praise. These men, however, would be the first to point out that the primary business of the Air Guard is not to win prizes. Their efforts have been directed to insuring that our country is defended by a flying, fighting, Ready Reserve. This these Nebraskans have done in an exemplary manner.

The Spaatz Trophy, named for Gen. Carl Spaatz, former Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, is the highest award offered to National Guard flying units. The selection criteria for this annual trophy include not only tactical proficiency, but technical, administrative and logistical capacity as well. The 155th Fighter Group demonstrated its capability in these areas in the highest degree. Colonel Bailey's group has been among the winners in the Spaatz competition for 3 consecutive years, having taken third place last year and second place in 1962.

The Winston P. Wilson Trophy is awarded annually to the outstanding Air National Guard all-weather fighter unit. This is the 3d year in a row that the 155th has won this trophy, an unprecedented demonstration of excellence in the hazardous and difficult all-weather fighter operation. In completing their "grand slam," the 155th also swept the Air Force Association Outstanding Unit Trophy, awarded each year to the outstanding Air National Guard tactical flying unit.

Mr. President, I express the appreciation not only of the citizens of Nebraska but also of all Americans to the men of this outstanding unit, and to all of their brothers in arms serving in the National Guard throughout the country.

Congratulations are due, also, to General Welch and his headquarters staff, particularly Gen. John Campbell, for their distinguished leadership which has made the fine record of the Nebraska Air National Guard possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news account of the awards from the Lincoln Journal, together with an editorial salute from that newspaper.

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

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Journal, July 2, 1964]

HIGH-FLYING AIR GUARD

Many Nebraskans might not regard the Spaatz Trophy in the same class as an Orange Bowl championship.

But among State Air Guard outfits across the country, the Spaatz Trophy is the ultimate—the world's series, Kentucky Derby, and National Open all wrapped up in one. It is presented each year to the Nation's outstanding Air National Guard tactical flying unit.

This year the coveted award was captured by the Nebraska Air National Guard, the 155th Fighter Group. Not only that, the Nebraska flyers also won the Air Force Association Outstanding Unit Trophy and the Winston P. Wilson Trophy.

The business of the Air Guard is not just to win prizes, of course; it is to provide the country with a flying, fighting Reserve. This the Nebraskans are doing in an exemplary manner.

For their grand slam of awards, Nebraskans can salute with pride Gen. Lyle Welch and his high-flying Air Guard.

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Journal, July 1, 1964]

AIR UNIT HONORED—GUARD GETS TOP TROPHY

The 750-man 155th Fighter Group of the Nebraska Air National Guard has won the Spaatz Trophy as the outstanding Guard tactical flying unit for 1963.

The fighter group also captured for the third consecutive year the Winston P. Wilson Trophy for year-round excellence in the performance of all-weather air defense mission, and the Air Force Association Outstanding Unit Trophy, which it has won 4 of the last 5 years.

Announcement of the awards was made by Maj. Gen. Lyle C. Welch, State adjutant general. He termed the recognition a "tremendous achievement."

The 155th Fighter Group utilized F-86L fighter aircraft. It has been assigned for the past 2 years to the Air Defense Command.

Welch said the tropies marked a "grand slam" for the Nebraska Air National Guard. He said it was the first time Nebraska has won the Spaatz Award, which is based on flying safety records, proficiency in firing basic weapons, reaction time during alert periods, and other criteria.

The Wilson Award is based on tactical, technical, administrative, and logistical efficiency.

MRS. HASEBROOCK, GFWC PRESIDENT, CHARTS "THE ROAD AHEAD"

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on June 26, I expressed the pride all Nebraskans feel in having one of our most distinguished citizens, Mrs. William Hasebroock, of West Point, Nebr., elected to the presidency of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

I have now obtained a copy of the splendid inaugural address delivered by Mrs. Hasebroock as she assumed her duties. Appropriately titled "The Road Ahead," it outlines the work to be carried out during the next 2 years, including an exciting new project, the establishment of a Congressional Medal of Honor Grove at the American Freedom Center at Valley Forge, a living memorial to each of the 3,000 recipients of this Nation's highest military honor.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mrs. Hasebroock's inaugural address be printed in the RECORD, as a reminder of the responsible and creative work carried on by the 11 million members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in 50 States and 54 foreign countries.

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

THE ROAD AHEAD

(Inaugural address by Mrs. William H. Hasebroock, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs, June 11, 1964)

This is a moment of mixed emotions—of humility and happiness, of gratitude for your trust, of prayerful hope for the inspiration and strength to serve you well. It is a sobering moment, for now with your mantle of leadership resting on my shoulders, there is remembrance of the illustrious records written by the capable women who have worn it before. It is also a reminder of the awesome challenge to maintain the foundations they have laid while progressing ahead to meet the new challenges of today and the emerging opportunities of tomorrow.

There rises in recall the helping hands, the guidance, the encouragement that smoothed and straightened the trail through the years to this new role. My gratitude for your confidence and support flows to everyone here tonight. I only wish it were possible by some electronic miracle to flash my appreciation to every member of our federation, wherever they may be.

To some I owe an indebtedness that can never be repaid in full measure. I extend my sincerest, heartfelt appreciation and thanks:

To the members of the Nebraska Federation for their loyal support and the opportunity to serve as their State president,

To Mrs. Hiram Cole Houghton whose dynamic leadership was a source of inspiration during my term as Nebraska president and whose support gave me the courage to lift my sights,

To Mrs. Oscar Ahlgren who opened the door for a forward step in wider service as her music chairman,

To Mrs. Theodore S. Chapman who entrusted her public affairs program to my chairmanship,

To Mrs. R. I. C. Prout who opened another avenue in the leadership of her fine arts program,

To Miss Chloe Gifford whose devotion to the federation cemented my determination to strive for still greater service,

To Mrs. E. Lee Ozbirn whose steadfastness in pursuit of our goals widened my horizons,

And to Mrs. Dexter Otis Arnold whose lofty standards and stellar achievements spurred me to ceaseless preparations to follow in her footsteps.

Mrs. Arnold's dynamic leadership to "strengthen the arm of liberty" has gathered such momentum that it will serve as a firm foundation for programs to cap my theme for 1964–66 which will be the federation's "diamond jubilee of service for freedom and growth." We shall march onward in a continuing program to serve the cause of freedom.

From the inception of the federation until today, each administration has faced the challenges of its times, but throughout the years there has been the common denominator of service. We have been innovators

because of our insights, motivators because of belief in our ideals, and doers because of our tenacity in serving a cause. Our works are a compendium of social progress in our country, and I truly believe that our achievements have bettered the world in which we live.

Most electrifying of all to me, as I stand face to face with you tonight, is what you—the organization—represent. The General Federation of Women's Clubs is the largest, perhaps the most powerful and influential force of organized human energy. But, it is more than that—it is one of the most constructive and persuasive moral forces operating in the world today.

This introduces and renews my concept of the profound responsibility I am assuming—a responsibility that you, at the same time—must and will assume.

Our mandate today is clear. We must become still more knowledgeable in the many fields necessary to discharge our role as citizens in a free world, foster continued progress, and build on our heritage of freedom. To accomplish this goal we shall give special emphasis to those existing study programs which not only enrich the minds of our members but provide the tools for active citizenship.

Because all of us as moral and responsible women are concerned with the mounting evidence of the deterioration of the moral fiber of our people, we plan to establish a new family living division of the homelife department. This new study program is rooted in our belief that the character of our people is the catalyst which turns our other strengths into power for freedom.

When legislation is required to serve freedom's causes, we shall make our voices heard at every level of Government, and particularly when we can better the legal, social, economic and political status of women. We shall spur our members to informed participation in the affairs of the political parties of their choice, and especially in the exercise of their vote. We have the womanpower in this organization to raise the voting participation of women to a level commensurate with our numerical strength. It's a challenge, but we can do it.

The junior clubs will have a special project of their own. They have elected to supply funds for schools in rural areas of Mexico. These schools will be built of earthen blocks and include classrooms as well as kitchen and dining room facilities plus living quarters for teachers. I commend the juniors' foresight and pledge them my support and cooperation. With their bright vision we can help them build to take our places.

These neighbors of ours to the south, who will be served by our juniors' program, are Americans too, as are our neighbors still farther south, the Latin Americans. This is an interpretive challenge that we must face. Our pervading belief in what we Americans are, can and must be translated almost as a gospel, and spread from our shores to other lands—to other American lands, first, and then throughout the world.

In a new endeavor, I seek your cooperation to welcome 80 German women, mostly homemakers, into your homes next fall so they may become better acquainted with us, our way of life and our community activities. This is a worthy project proposed by the State Department and the German magazine, Fur Sie, and offers us the rewards of better understanding and fellowship with women like ourselves from another land.

The time is propitious, it seems, for a comprehensive drive to increase and extend our membership. No other organization in the United States has such a diversified membership, nor such a wide range of program—and if I may say with pride—such prestige to attract women from all walks of life who seek an opportunity for friendship, self-improvement, widened horizons and valid voluntary service. As our membership grows, so does our influence for the common good.

In keeping with the federation's belief that travel is a passport to understanding, there will be two tours during my administration. As part of our American conservation program we propose to visit New England to renew our appreciation of the American heritage left us by the patriots in that historic area, and where we also can gain inspiration to strengthen our personal responsibility for preserving our American way of life.

Following the General Federation's Board meeting in Washington, we will depart Washington September 18, visit Independence Hall in Philadelphia, ride up the Hudson River, visit Hyde Park and West Point, and continue into the New England States to Portland Springs, Maine, where we spend a day at the New England Conference. Returning, we will visit Boston, then end the tour in New York City. Pamphlets giving details are available here at the convention and also will be sent to all clubs.

Following the 1965 general federation convention in New Orleans there will be a tour to Europe with our international conference in Athens, Greece, as the highlight. The itinerary includes Lisbon, Madrid, Florence, Naples, Capri, Venice—and after Athens—Cairo, Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, with a final stop in London before returning to the United States. Full details of this later European tour will be mailed to you shortly.

It is my hope that the 16,000 clubs in the general federation will give especial emphasis during the next 2 years to three projects—one continuing, one revised, and one entirely new endeavor.

Please consider my plea for even greater support of the Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation. This is the one organization devoted exclusively to finding the cause and cure for a painful disease now afflicting more than 12 million Americans—3 out of every 4 of them a woman. To implement the drive for increased backing of this worthy cause, there will be fundraising breakfasts in November when we will focus especial attention on this project.

Secondly, we submit for renewed emphasis your support of a CARE project to help the needy in seven countries to help themselves. We propose providing vocational tools and equipment for use in job training to such needy in Iran, Turkey, Egypt, Gaza, Greece, Israel, and Jordan. Plows, shovels, rakes, metalworking equipment, mechanics' tools, sewing machines will be supplied in a program that aims toward self-sufficiency of the individual. The ultimate goal, of course, serves us and the cause of freedom, for, by providing the needy in other lands with the means to earn their own basic needs and a chance to gain their dignity as individuals, we set their sights on freedom and the benefits of a form of government that respects the rights of the individual.

Thirdly, the heroism of the liberty-loving men who have manned the ramparts of freedom from Bunker Hill to Vietnam inspires our third, and perhaps our most important new project. All of us are familiar with the splendid work of the Freedoms Foundation under the leadership of its chairman, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, and its president, Dr. Kenneth D. Wells.

In cooperation with the Freedoms Foundation we propose sponsorship of a Congressional Medal of Honor Grove at the American Freedom Center at Valley Forge to memorialize those valiant men who distinguished themselves by conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity.

The grove encompasses 52 acres amid streams and hills hallowed by Revolutionary War patriots. Living trees will be marked in perpetuity with the names of 3,000 Congressional Medal of Honor recipients. A section will be reserved for each of the 50 States, for Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

A central building will house the records of their heroic deeds and the historical documentation of other military decorations. The grove will contain formal gardens dedicated to America's heroes and winding paths to lead visitors to the 50 separate memorial areas.

Please pause for a moment to consider the word hero. How few in this country really understand this word or the fact that the contribution of our Nation's heroes underscores our freedom long after their medals have begun to gather tarnish.

We mean to give definition to our heroes, to measure them as they should be measured, and to give them lasting recognition through the Congressional Medal of Honor Grove.

Tonight I ask you to join in efforts to bring the Congressional Medal of Honor Grove into reality. Contributions totaling $150,000 will be required to clear the 52-acre site and to construct the central building for the memorial. This project is not only a tribute to our country's heroes; it is a tribute to the families who stood by while their valiant men went forth to fight for the preservation of freedom. I sincerely commend the memorial to you.

As we near our diamond jubilee of service for freedom and growth, we're both introspective and forward looking. It would require not one, but many volumes to encompass our achievements—those tangible monuments of our volunteer service and the intangible riches which we have brought to our members and to others.

Looking forward to the road ahead, I am reminded of a magnificent demonstration of the power of individuals when they work together. This is a familiar matchlighting ceremony that takes place during the annual Music Festival each year in Soldiers Field in Chicago.

At the close of the ceremony, the stadium is darkened. Every light is extinguished. Then after a moment's pause, a voice calls forth in the darkness—one, two, three, strike—and the tiny flares from 60,000 matches struck by 60,000 cooperating individuals blaze a magnificent oval of light against the black of the night.

May we not light our matches together in the months ahead to the end that our diamond jubilee of service for freedom and growth is capped by more and broader service than we've ever before envisioned?

And now, because I know so well that there is a power greater than man that guides, enriches, and sustains us, I beseech His blessing, and I close my message with my daily prayer and praise to our Lord.

The "Lord's Prayer" by Albert Hay Mollotte was sung by the president.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has performed outstanding service in dealing with the realities of postwar foreign policy problems ever since he began his Senate service in 1949, and especially since he became a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in 1953. His efforts in the areas of East-West relations, arms control, the United Nations, and foreign assistance are worthy of the highest praise. I know of no Member of the Congress who has worked harder for enlightened foreign policy objectives, or who has made a greater effort to educate himself about the multiplicity of foreign dilemmas which confront our Nation. In addition to his highly developed knowledge of domestic problems, the

senior Senator from Minnesota is a true foreign policy expert.

Since the beginning of the Kennedy administration in 1961, Senator HUMPHREY has given his full support to the Alliance for Progress and has continually worked to help President Kennedy and President Johnson focus the attention of the Nation upon the great importance of Latin America in the formulation of our foreign policy. As Senator HUMPHREY has often reminded us, we cannot afford to let our national attention be distracted by every minor foreign policy crisis in every part of the world. America must continue to expend a major portion of the energies and resources it has to use in the foreign policy area in meeting the long-range problems of Latin America.

One of Senator HUMPHREY'S most recent statements on this subject was an article entitled "U.S. Policy in Latin America," which appeared in the July issue of Foreign Affairs. In this article, Senator HUMPHREY reemphasizes the importance of Latin America, points out the interests, ideas, and institutions we have in common with our southern neighbors, and makes several constructive suggestions on how to better implement U.S. policy in Latin America. He notes that a combination of aid, better trade terms, and increased private investment are all needed to secure Latin America's development; no single method will suffice to increase economic productivity. Senator HUMPHREY cogently argues the need to give a more multilateral character to our Latin American aid program and to encourage other prosperous countries to provide economic aid to this area—objectives with which I heartily concur.

Mr. President, I commend this excellent article to the Members of Congress, to every foreign policy adviser in the executive branch, and to every American citizen who is interested in seeing that our Nation has an enlightened foreign policy. I ask unanimous consent to have this article by Senator HUMPHREY, entitled "U.S. Policy in Latin America," printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. POLICY IN LATIN AMERICA

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

In any analysis of U.S. policy in Latin America, the first question which should be considered is: What priority is attached to Latin America in the whole spectrum of our foreign-policy considerations? Once the relative importance or unimportance of hemispheric problems is established, one can then move on to consider the question of basic U.S. policy in Latin America. Having delineated the fundamental lines of policy, one can consider finally the effective means of implementing it. On these three questions I shall focus my discussion.

On numerous occasions President Kennedy indicated the priority he placed on Latin America in the total spectrum of foreign-policy considerations by describing it as "the most critical area in the world." But two decades of constant preoccupation with Europe and Asia have left an imbalance in our global commitments that has not yet been wholly rectified. Although the United States must continue to be concerned with developments in many parts of the world, it is no longer either necessary or possible for the United States to become deeply involved in every area of the world and to undertake the massive political, military, and economic commitments that such involvement entails. The breakup of the bipolar world of the postwar era and the emergence of independent centers of power in the non-Communist world should in the decade ahead allow the United States greater freedom to concentrate its resources in areas of primary concern to our national interest.

Europe remains of crucial importance in our foreign policy considerations and will retain this status for the foreseeable future. But while the internal political, social, and economic patterns of Europe are well determined by now, this is not the case with Latin America. The future structure of society and the external policy of Latin nations remain unanswered questions. Marxism as a guide to social development is a spent force in most European countries, but it remains a lively alternative in Latin America today. The example of Cuba suggests both the immediacy of the Marxist threat to U.S. interests and the nature of the problems which we face when Marxism is accepted as a guide to the development of a Latin American society.

The obvious geopolitical factors of proximity, size, and population make the Latin American Continent of particular importance to us. Central and South America form a land mass over twice the size of the United States and larger than non-Communist Asia. The combined present population of 200 million is likely to approximate 450 to 500 million by the year 2000.

Unlike Asia, Latin America enjoys a balance between population and land and at the same time is rich in natural resources. Aside from Europe, Canada and Japan, it is both the largest market for American exports and the principal source of many raw materials imported by the United States. It is the recipient of the largest capital investment, presently totaling over $8 billion. Trade with Latin America totaled over $6.6 billion in 1963, amounting to over three-fourths of our total trade with the southern half of the world. With imports of $3.4 billion in 1963, the United States remains by far the most important market for Latin American exports.

These economic and physical data only begin to indicate the importance of Latin America to the United States. A common European inheritance has left in the Americas, North and South, a widespread belief in constitutional government, in political democracy, and a belief in the dignity of the individual resulting from a common Judaeo-Christian tradition. In short, the United States and Latin America, though different in many ways, share a political, religious and cultural tradition that is "western" both in origin and content.

In the bipolar world of the past two decades both the United States and Latin America faced a common threat of Communist imperialism directed from the Soviet Union. With the breakup of the bipolar world and the emergence of at least four centers of power—the United States, the Soviet Union, Western Europe, and mainland China—the position of the Western Hemisphere in world power relationships is changing. East-West relationships have been modified, while the future pattern of North-South relationships is not yet settled.

The emergence of a powerful Western Europe—likely to pursue a more independent foreign policy—makes hemispheric cooperation more urgent if the nations of this hemisphere are not only to solve their immediate internal problems but to play a proper role in world affairs in future decades. Although the decade of the 1960's is a crucial one for the United States and Latin America, the development of our hemispheric policy should look two or three decades ahead. We must keep in mind not only the political, economic, and social problems that confront Latin America in the 1960's but also the position of the Western Hemisphere in the international relations of the 1980's and 1990's. If the hemisphere remains united, it can, with a population of 900 million people by the year 2000 and a level of economic development that its resources indicate is possible, play a major role in shaping the world of future decades, regardless of events in Asia, Europe, or the Soviet Union. But neither unity within Latin America itself nor unity within the hemisphere is guaranteed. Our policy should be designed to discourage intrahemispheric rivalry which would Balkanize the continent, as well as to prevent Communist subversion which would divide the hemisphere into an endless struggle between Communist and non-Communist states.

Our concept of hemispheric unity should not be defined in any exclusive sense that would actively discourage a greater Western European contribution to the social, economic and cultural development of Latin America. Indeed, we should actively encourage Europe to expand its involvement in Latin America, both in terms of long-term development assistance and expansion of existing cultural and educational programs. But we cannot view with equanimity the separation of Latin America from the United States and Europe in favor of an exclusive association or identification with the "third world." Latin countries will and should continue to be different from both the United States and Europe, but they need not see their own future destiny in terms of the non-Western southern half of the world just because they share with the societies of Asia and Africa a less developed status.

Although President Kennedy altered the priority which we attach to Latin American problems, it remains for his successors fully to translate that priority within the machinery of the U.S. Government. In one of his first official decisions, President Johnson acted to end the division of authority that had hampered policy implementation and to upgrade the status of top officials responsible for our relations with Latin America. This upgrading must continue and should eventually result in the establishment of an Under Secretary post in the State Department and high-ranking positions in our defense, intelligence and information agencies as well. When we see the Secretary of State or Defense directly involved in the problems of U.S. relations with Brazil or Argentina and an Assistant Secretary of State being dispatched to deal with a problem in southeast Asia, we shall then be able to conclude that the day-to-day operations of the Government reflect the set of priorities enunciated by President Kennedy in describing Latin America as "the most critical area in the world."

II

Turning now to policy within the hemisphere, it remains my belief that the basis of our policy for Latin America should be the Alliance for Progress as originally conceived by President Kennedy and agreed to by the 20 American Republics in the Charter of Punta del Este. The aim of the Alliance is summarized in the Declaration of the Peoples of the Americas which precedes the Charter: "to unite in a common effort to bring our people accelerated economic progress and broader social justice within the framework of personal dignity and personal liberty." This objective is to be implemented through systematic social and economic programs designed to abolish the shocking economic and social inequality, between privileged and impoverished, between glittering capitals and festering slums, between booming industrial regions and primitive

rural areas. The Alliance is designed to be a peaceful alternative to violent revolution in meeting the challenge of an unjust socio-economic order.

In discussing the Alliance, I am making several assumptions which cannot be spelled out in a brief article: (1) that "Latin America" is not a homogeneous unit, but a continent of widely diversified peoples, sharply varied economies and both highly advanced and grossly undeveloped regions; (2) that we recognize the differences between individual countries and adjust our policies accordingly; and (3) that the actions of Latin American countries are far more important than those of the United States in accomplishing the goals of the Alliance for Progress.

In recent months, questions have arisen both in this country and in Latin America about the validity of the original conception of the Alliance and about the strength of the U.S. commitment to it. Today we are told by some that the great mistake of Alliance officials was in arousing hopes and expectations that could not be fulfilled. We are told that what is needed are fewer statements about the philosophy of the Alliance, the ideology of the Alliance, fewer broad-gaged political doctrines and more hard-headed pragmatic emphasis on economic lending programs. Such an appraisal reflects a misunderstanding of current conditions and trends in Latin America. It reflects a misunderstanding of what President Kennedy had in mind in launching the Alliance for Progress.

It was recognized from the beginning that the success of the grand strategy for cooperation with Latin America, the Alliance for Progress, depended on more than economic development. It was realized that for the policy to succeed, the Alliance must have a political content and an ideological substance, in addition to a strong program of economic development. It must come to symbolize the hopes and aspirations of both the elite groups and the masses of Latin American people. It must have a mystique all its own, capable of inspiring a following.

President Kennedy himself was the symbol of the Alliance, the symbol of the hope and imagination which is needed. He realized that though Latin America faces grave economic problems, these must be seen within a broader political context. It is not just a matter of satisfying physical needs and raising material standards of living. What is more important is the problem of inspiring hope, of commanding the intellectual and emotional allegiance of those who will shape the society—both the elite groups and the popular classes. He realized that the hopes and expectations aroused could not all be satisfied in the immediate future—nor need they be. What can be accomplished in a material sense in a very limited period of time will always fall short of expectations. This should not discourage us. What is important is that we be prepared to give some evidence that progress is being made, that material betterment is on the way, and that there is sound reason for believing that the unmet material problems of society will be solved in the future. This means of course that we must have both short-range socially oriented projects to give visible evidence of immediate progress, and long-range development projects which are essential to improving the condition of the society. I believe that President Johnson shares this view. His speech of May 11 to the Latin American ambassadors clearly indicates that he understands that mere pragmatic economic programs are not enough, that the Alliance is political and social as well as economic in nature.

Much of the premature pessimism that has been expressed about the Alliance results therefore from a misunderstanding of its original concept, from an underestimation of the magnitude of the task and from mistaken analogies based on European experience under the Marshall plan.

Today we should be well aware that nostalgic recollection of the dramatic success of the Marshall plan in restoring economic and social vitality to the war-ravaged, but highly advanced, modern societies of Western Europe does little to illuminate the path to speedy economic and social development in underdeveloped areas of Latin America. The reform and modification of social and economic traditions that have persisted for two centuries are not going to be accomplished in 2 years—and probably not in a decade.

In view of the criticism leveled at the Alliance, the persistence of political instability in many countries and the ever-present Communist threat in others, some will be tempted to abandon the original emphasis of the Alliance on radical economic and social reform. Some will be tempted to return to less venturesome, more conventional goals, to place less emphasis on reform and more on working with the established groups to minimize political instability. Indeed, there are those who believe we should abandon our identification of the Alliance with "peaceful revolution," with rapid reform of the economic and social structure of Latin American societies. I believe this would be a grave mistake.

Although the observation that Latin America is in the midst of a political, economic and social revolution has become a commonplace, it is true. Only a few decades ago it could be said that the fatalism of most Latin Americans was well expressed in the remark of the late 19th-century Chilean President Barros Lucco: "There are only two kinds of problems facing society: those which get solved by themselves—and those which defy solution." Today, however, in most Latin American nations there is not only a burning awareness of the enormous human cost of perpetuating a status quo which exploits the many for the benefit of the few, but also a well-developed consciousness that the status quo can be changed, that radical improvement in the condition and status of the mass of the people can be achieved through deliberate, systematic political action. For the deprived mass of the people, the status quo is no longer a burden to be patiently borne, but an incubus to be cast off. Is it appropriate to define Alliance policy as favoring social "revolution"—or should this word be avoided in favor of "evolution" or some other expression? "Evolution," if carefully examined, proves to be inadequate, for it implies an unconscious, nondeliberate change that is slow and gradual. What is required is conscious, rapid change in the socio-economic structure, a process that can correctly and precisely be called a revolution. If used not as a slogan but in its precise sense, the policy of peaceful social and economic revolution is a correct characterization of Alliance policy. We should not hesitate to identify ourselves with it in Latin America, just as President Johnson associated himself with it in his "war on poverty" throughout the world when he recently remarked: "If a peaceful revolution in these areas is impossible, a violent revolution is inevitable."

In the revolutionary atmosphere which does exist in a number of important Latin American countries, ideological factors are often as important as straight economic programs. I am impressed, for example, with the fact that the governments which achieved the greatest political stability and economic progress in the last decade were the strongly ideological democratic parties led by Betancourt, José Figueres and Muñoz Marín. I am impressed, too, by the fact that the two fastest-growing political movements in the larger countries of South America today are the two most intensely ideological movements—the Marxist and the Christian Democratic.

Both of these are flourishing, particularly among the younger groups. We should not forget that half of the population of Latin America today is under 18. In a discussion of the present situation in Latin America with a distinguished Latin American, Dr. Rafael Caldera of the COPEI Party in Venezuela, we agreed that one reason why his party and other Christian Democratic parties in South America are flourishing today among the impatient, idealistic younger groups is that they offer an ideological alternative to Marxism, an integrated approach to the political, economic and social problems of society. I know that we pragmatic North Americans find it difficult to understand why a Latin American considers the philosophy and ideology of a party as important as the specific practical measures it recommends. We are only now coming to realize that the ideological basis of communism—not its economic critique—is its principal attraction for students and educated groups in Latin America. It is for that reason that communism captures the university before the slum.

If the social and economic objectives of the Alliance are to be achieved, we must lend our strong support to those governments and those political parties which are really committed to the Alliance program, which are committed to modifying the antiquated economic and social structure of society. Although there is and will continue to be a wide variety of parties and governments, we are most likely to see the aims of the Alliance realized and our own interests served if we strongly support reformist governments like those of Romulo Betancourt in Venezuela and Belaúnde Terry in Peru, reformist political parties like those that provided leadership in the Caribbean area during the past two decades, and the Christian Democratic parties that are rapidly emerging as a major political force in South America.

III

It would be a mistake to interpret the Alliance program exclusively in terms of a social and economic revolution and to ignore the equally important aim of building political democracy and constitutional government. As the first U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, Ambassador Teodoro Moscoso, once remarked, "Free countries do not develop on bread alone." The quest for first-class citizenship, the growth of representative political institutions, and the accomplishment of economic and social reform within the framework of constitutional government are an essential part of the Alliance, as President Johnson emphasized once again in his speech of May 11. And the indispensable ingredient for successfully achieving both the socioeconomic and the political goals of the Alliance is political leadership. If there has been one preëminent disappointment about the Alliance in its first 3 years, it is the failure of many Latin American countries to come forth with able, responsible political leaders who are capable of mobilizing support for Alliance programs, of building political institutions and administrative structures which are able to sustain and implement the basic modifications of society that are needed. We have seen a number of cases where constitutional government has been interrupted, sometimes because an elected government proved to be incompetent; in other cases because fragile constitutional structures and political institutions were unable to withstand the assault of nonconstitutional groups—usually led by the military—intent on seizing power. It is this situation that has confronted our policymakers with one of the most sensitive policy dilemmas of the past 3 years.

How does the United States deal with governments that have come to power through nonconstitutional means? We of course can-

not determine the type of governments that take office in Latin American countries. We have no choice but to work with many governments. But we should distinguish between constitutional governments pursuing progressive policies and those which shoot their way to power. We may not be able to prevent the emergence of juntas, but we can and should distinguish between dictators and democrats. In those instances when we must temporarily deal with nonconstitutional governments, we should use all our levers of influence to restore constitutional government at the earliest possible time.

The problem confronting us is made even more difficult when a constitutional government is overthrown in order to meet an acknowledged Communist threat or to uproot Communist infiltration that has progressed under the protection of democratic institutions. This should not be a pretext for circumvention of constitutional procedures or for maintaining military juntas in power in violation of the constitution. In those extraordinary situations, certainly we should be reluctant to embrace a new government before waiting to discover whether purges, military decrees, censorship, revocation of political rights and mass arrests represent a momentary aberration or a permanent characteristic of the regime. Similarly, pledges of economic assistance under the Alliance for Progress should naturally await evidence that the new government will meet the standards for economic assistance specified in the Alliance Charter.

In dealing with these situations we should always keep in mind the results of our policy of embracing "anti-Communist" military dictators during much of the 1950's—results dramatically illustrated when an American Vice President was nearly mobbed in Caracas in 1958.

The use of anticommunism as a deceptive slogan in the past should not blind us to the true nature of the Communist threat in this hemisphere today. This threat is real and must be met if hemispheric unity, political democracy and socioeconomic progress are to be achieved.

The record of Venezuelan President Romulo Betancourt merits attention in this regard because it reveals rare insight into the nature of the Communist threat in the Western Hemisphere. In confronting the Communist problem, he has kept in mind the distinction between the three salient strands of the Communist threat in Latin America: first, the ideological strain which was discussed earlier; second, the appeal of the Communist economic model as a solution to the economic needs of impoverished people; third, the attempt of a Communist regime—Cuba, for example—and Communist groups within Latin American countries to subvert non-Communist governments through armed attack, internal terror and sabotage, through propaganda or through quiet infiltration and popular-front movements.

One cannot meet the appeal of the second with solutions appropriate only for the third. The economic threat cannot be met by military solutions, but rather by programs which fall under the Alliance—effective mobilization of resources and accomplishment of reforms by local governments, combined with U.S. help in the form of loans, food for peace, the Peace Corps and technical assistance. The security problem cannot be met alone by these economic programs, but requires measures which are primarily paramilitary, political, and propagandistic.

One should not concede that the face of the Communist threat in Latin America is always the same. It is not. The approach and tactics of Communist parties vary from country to country. In Brazil, Communist infiltration from the top by a government tolerant of Communist-oriented groups posed a quite different problem from that in Venezuela. Different again is the situation in Chile, where a Communist-Socialist coalition seeks power through regular elections to be held later this year. Methods of combating Communist infiltration must be adapted to the situation.

Subversion from abroad remains a major aspect of the Communist threat to many Latin American countries, particularly those in the Caribbean—and the principal source of this subversion continues to be Castro's Cuba. The case of Venezuela is a good illustration. For Venezuela today, as for many other Latin American neighbors, the Castro government in Cuba is not a nuisance to be ignored but a menace to be eliminated. Communist subversion from Cuba is not a "myth" to be exposed but an ever-present reality to be faced.

The report issued in February of this year by the Organization of American States makes it indisputably clear that Cuba has smuggled arms to terrorists in Venezuela. There is now photographic evidence of the plan and plot to subvert the Betancourt government at the time of the election last December.

What should the U.S. position be in such cases? Our national policy should be one of clear, unequivocal support for taking the necessary steps to cut off arms shipments from Cuba to Venezuela or any other Latin American nation. Cuba must not be permitted to be an arsenal for terrorism, revolution, and chaos. Instead of merely worrying about governments of friendly countries being able to stay in power and resist violence, we should choke off the source of that violence.

I believe that we should wholeheartedly support the position of the Venezuelan Government in the OAS, where it has requested joint sanctions against Cuba. I hope that the required action can be accomplished within the framework of the OAS. But if it cannot, this should not mean that we will permit friendly governments like that in Venezuela to remain defenseless because of the inaction of its neighbors. The existing machinery of the OAS should not be permitted to impede the successful handling of problems of this sort.

There may be instances where it is actually preferable to take bilateral action to meet a Communist threat rather than require the participation or approval of all members of the OAS. An effective response to Communist subversion does not always require that all Latin American governments publicly and officially take a strong positive position. Undue pressure to do so may sometimes be counterproductive, by weakening the political position of a government which is fundamentally anti-Communist but whose freedom of action is restricted by a delicate balance of internal political force. The machinery of the OAS should be sufficiently flexible to permit bilateral action as well as multilateral action where it may be required.

I do not favor a military invasion of Cuba. Even less do I favor so great a preoccupation with Cuba that all other hemispheric issues are ignored. But so long as the stated purpose of the Castro régime is to export its Communist revolution, it will remain a threat to many Latin American governments. So long as it remains a threat to them, it remains much more than a nuisance to the United States. For our own interests are inextricably bound up with those of our neighbors in the hemisphere.

IV

In implementing the policy outlined above it should be understood that methods must vary from country to country, that U.S. action in implementing the Alliance for Progress is dependent upon the actions of Latin American countries. For the immediate future I would mention several lines of action which might be effective in realizing our objectives. If rapid progress is to be made in achieving the social and economic objectives of the Alliance for Progress, it will require in the next decade both greater mobilization of resources by Latin American governments and a larger infusion of external resources. These external resources will come chiefly from three sources: (1) aid from foreign governments, and international lending agencies; (2) trade; and (3) foreign private investment.

All three of these are essential to most Latin American countries and will continue to be for the foreseeable future. In the face of continued congressional criticism of foreign aid and disappointment abroad with the volume of aid and the conditions attached to it, there has been a tendency to disparage foreign aid; Latin Americans look to trade and North Americans to private investment as a substitute.

Trade brings into a country needed foreign exchange, but it carries with it no guarantee that the foreign exchange will be used for purposes having a high priority in the development of an economy or society. The exchange usually goes to a relatively few people in the commercial sector and, in the absence of effective progressive tax systems or exchange controls, can be spent on luxury items or sent abroad to foreign banks. Foreign aid not only brings in needed capital but capital that can be easily channeled into those projects and those sectors of society deemed of crucial importance.

Foreign private investment—as many previously skeptical Latin Americans have now learned after experimenting with swollen, inefficient state business corporations—is absolutely essential both to increase the productivity of a country and to develop an efficient industrial and agricultural sector. With the strong encouragement of the U.S. Government—for example, through investment guarantees and tax credits—American business can continue to provide leadership in building a strong private sector in Latin American countries. But it is a mistake to claim too much for private investment, to ignore the necessity of expending large sums on the economic and social infrastructure (highways, ports, dams, schools, and health systems) which can be financed only by public funds.

All three—aid, trade, and private investment—are essential to social and economic progress in Latin America. In my view, we in the United States do not allocate the amount of resources to Latin America required to do the job that needs to be done. Although Latin American countries may be less capable of absorbing large amounts of capital than were the European countries under the Marshall plan, it is nevertheless true that our contribution to the Alliance for Progress is pitifully small compared to the billions of dollars—mostly in grants, not loans—that we poured into Europe after the Second World War. In line with the priority which we should assign to Latin America in our global policy considerations, our aid to this area should be substantially increased for the rest of the decade.

There is no reason, however, why the increased aid to Latin America should come exclusively from the United States. It should be recognized that the European contribution to Latin America need not be limited to respecting embargoes on trade with Cuba. European countries—together with other countries like Japan and Canada that conduct substantial trade with the area—should be strongly encouraged to contribute to the infusion of capital that is required, and on terms that are favorable. This assistance should represent private investment as well as Government aid.

Trade may not be a panacea for the problems of Latin America, but it now seems clear

that we must give greater attention to developing trade within this hemisphere. The terms of trade for Latin American countries have remained unstable. Although commodity prices have shot upward during the past year, it is unclear whether this is a temporary improvement or a long-range trend. Trade among Latin American countries has not flourished, with the exception of the recently established Central American Common Market. Our exports to Latin America have leveled off, and it is clear that we shall face increasing competition there with Europe and Japan.

It is too early to say exactly what regional mechanisms should be used to bring about increased trade between the United States and Latin America, to promote competition and stable trade relations within the hemisphere. The brief experience of the Central American Common Market indicates what can be achieved in a limited area if individual countries are willing to look beyond their borders. The experience with LAFTA—Latin American Free Trade Area—thus far is less promising. Certainly, one of the problems which should be given early consideration by the newly created Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress and by the Inter-American Development Bank is the possibility of giving greater impetus to the regional movement in the LAFTA countries. The Inter-American Development Bank has begun to finance the acceleration of regional trade within LAFTA, and its efforts should be supplemented.

As for the United States, I believe that we must soon undertake an intensive review of our hemispheric trade policy. Trade is essential to the economic prosperity of the hemisphere and we should give careful consideration to the possibility of developing a more cohesive trading area, which would not only bring economic advantages but would also promote the political unity of the hemisphere.

The next step in promoting a hemispheric trade zone might be to lend our strong support to the development of LAFTA in the same way that we gave our backing to the Common Market in Europe and to the Central American Common Market. We should promote the creation of new exports and the expansion of existing exports by supplementing the funds now available for this purpose from the IDB. We should participate in planning LAFTA's development and encourage American business to do likewise. Once LAFTA has made significant progress, we can then consider what new trade relationships should be developed between the LAFTA area and the United States and Canada.

In the future, decisions on questions of basic importance to the development of the Alliance for Progress, such as those on aid and trade, should naturally be made through the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress. Just as the U.S. Government has improved its machinery for handling hemispheric affairs, so the members of the Alliance have created a mechanism to facilitate truly multilateral decision-making on hemispheric problems. But this new organ can succeed only to the extent that it has the strong support of the nations of the hemisphere, especially the United States. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has indicated the strong congressional sentiment in favor of multilateralism, thereby giving the executive branch the freedom it needs to assist in acceleration of the trend from unilateral to multilateral decision-making under the Alliance for Progress.

In pursuing the political objectives of the Alliance for Progress—both the positive aim of inspiring a commitment to constitutional government and democratic institutions and the negative objective of thwarting Communist expansion—we would do well to divert more attention and resources to programs in the educational, ideological, cultural, and propaganda fields. We should expand programs aimed both at the elite and at the popular classes. According to the best information available to me, approximately 3,000 Brazilians were brought to the United States during the past 10 years under our various educational and cultural exchange programs. If we really appreciated the revolutionary atmosphere in Latin America today and understood the nature of the Communist appeal to younger people who will become the elite of their societies, we would raise this figure to 3,000 per year.

Similarly we should use all possible leverage to encourage Latin American governments to expend the resources needed to wipe out illiteracy among the mass of the people. Where the determination exists, illiteracy can be effectively eliminated in a brief period, a fact that has been proven by the Castro government in Cuba. Of the many reasons which could be advanced in support of crash programs to end illiteracy, I will cite only three: First, active popular participation in political life under a democratic government is impossible if half the population cannot read and write. Second, historically no society that has succeeded in abolishing illiteracy has remain poor for long. Third, the balanced population growth rate that will be necessary in the future is not likely to be accomplished while half the population remains illiterate.

In our efforts to cooperate with Latin Americans in realizing the objectives of the Alliance, we should be aware of the renaissance of one of the traditional institutions found in all Latin American societies—the Roman Catholic Church. One of the most encouraging trends of the past decade has been the new awakening on the part of church leaders to the shocking social and economic problems of the continent, and the new determination to meet those problems now through fundamental reforms.

Today in Chile, Panama, Venezuela, Brazil, Argentina and Colombia members of the hierarchy are actively pushing the reforms stipulated under the Alliance Charter. Whereas formerly the active espousal of progressive social and economic policies was largely confined to religious orders like the Maryknoll priests or to isolated pastors, today they are supported by occupants of metropolitan sees. The farsighted social and economic philosophy of the late Pope John's social encyclicals Mater et Magistra and Pacem in Terris is being strongly pushed by the Vatican. Men who once would have been "promoted" to mountain parishes for their advanced views are now being appointed bishops and cardinals.

The church's role is important not only in promoting economic and social reform, but also in building free societies and encouraging hemispheric unity. The building of a just economic and social order requires the rapid modification—sometimes the destruction—of old institutions. In a revolutionary era, the temptation is great for the state to absorb total responsibility in the social and economic order, to eliminate all institutions which it cannot directly control itself, to create an atomized society. History teaches us—and the recent example of Cuba reminds us once again—that it is the atomized society that is easy prey for totalitarian government. In one of the best capsule definitions of totalitarian government, Hannah Arendt once defined it as the elimination of all subgroups between the individual and the state. During the next decade, when revolutionary change will be the order of the day in many countries, there may be times when a brake is needed on the action of the state if social pluralism and individual political liberty are to be preserved. In some Latin American countries, it may be the church that will be called upon to play that role.

Finally, the Catholic Church—together with Roman law and the Spanish language—is one of the principal unifying forces in this vast continent. In an age of rampant nationalism, the common bond which the church provides may have a powerful impact in overcoming the separatist tendencies of the age and in achieving hemispheric unity.

In conclusion, I would emphasize that quite apart from the specific programs which we may support in implementing our policy in Latin America—programs of aid, trade, private investment, education, or propaganda—what is equally important is our success in solving our own preeminent social problem—achieving equality for the Negro—and our attitude toward our fellow citizens in the hemisphere. In a continent where the large majority of people are nonwhite, a continent that includes societies like Brazil which have developed a harmonious multiracial society, it is hard to exaggerate the importance which people attach to our efforts to extend the benefits of modern civilization to the Negro minority in the United States, just as Latin American countries are striving to make them available to the majority of their own people.

President Kennedy is revered for opening up a new era in relations between the United States and Latin America, not primarily because he promised material assistance, but because he conveyed an understanding and respect for Latin American people, for their culture, and many of their traditions. He did not regard Latin American people as inferior or expect them to see the solution to their own problems in blind imitation of the United States. It is this attitude of understanding and respect that must permeate not only our leadership, but our entire society. This will not be easy to accomplish—as most adults in this country were educated in schools where the overwhelming majority of textbooks and reference books either ignored Latin America or reflected a condescending attitude toward Latin Americans. Written chiefly by authors sympathetic to a northern European cultural inheritance, which historically has been fundamentally unsympathetic to Latin culture, these books have been all too important an influence in shaping the attitude of generations of Americans. Change in popular attitudes comes slowly. A full appreciation of the importance of Latin America will come only when our educational system begins to reflect the priority stated by President Kennedy when he described Latin America as the most critical area in the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. I appreciate them.

POLICE MISHANDLING OF CUBAN REFUGEE DEMONSTRATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I believe that all of us were sickened and dismayed by the photographs in this morning's papers which showed Cuban refugees, who had come to Washington to demonstrate for the freedom of their country being pushed around and chased by our mounted police. Here were people whose objectives accorded with the expressed policy of the United States, and who were by every standard entitled to our sympathy and consideration. And yet they were treated like enemies or subversives rather than like friends.

Whatever the reason for the clash between the Cuban refugees and the Washington police force, I consider yesterday's events to be most unfortunate because they could only have served to create the impression that Washington is unsympathetic to the anti-Castro refugees and what they stand for. I

know that this is not the case. But sometimes the impression created by the clumsy handling of a situation such as this can count for more than the actual facts.

Inevitably, there are conflicting accounts about what happened.

Originally, I had planned to attend the demonstration in front of the Lincoln Memorial by way of manifesting my personal sympathy with the objectives of the demonstration. Because it proved impossible for me to break away from my Senate work, I sent along an aid to represent me and to greet the large delegation from Connecticut on my behalf.

My assistant, who was on the scene at the time of the disturbance, was informed by refugee leaders that the trouble began when the police ruled that they could not approach within 500 feet of the Pan American Building premises. To some of the refugees this restriction appeared arbitrary and intolerable. They had come to Washington from faraway points for the purpose of letting the delegates to the meeting of the OAS know how strongly they felt about the Castro tyranny and for the purpose of urging the OAS to take affirmative action for the liberation of Cuba. They knew, because they have seen these photographs in their newspapers, that pacificists and Communists and American Nazi Party members are permitted to demonstrate right up against the railings that surround the White House grounds. They felt—and I believe quite rightly—that they should be permitted to stage their own demonstration at least within sight of the Pan American Building and the OAS delegates. When they were denied permission to do so, some of them attempted to break through the police lines.

Anyone who has been in Washington during the last few years knows that such demonstrations go on all the time. I am not suggesting that they should go on, but I think that there should be an evenhanded rule about all demonstrations. I cannot understand the policy that lets the Communists and the Nazis demonstrate on the sidewalks in front of the White House and tries to put our friends, the Cuban refugees—5,000 of them—about two blocks away from the Pan American Building.

At this point, the police apparently decided to break up the demonstration completely. There is no evidence that the police actually used their clubs on the refugees. But all accounts are agreed that mounted police, and police on motorcycles and on foot, charged into the crowd swinging their clubs demonstratively.

The Baltimore Sun reported that when the first group of refugees attempted to force their way to the Pan American Building, a squad of mounted police charged into the demonstrators at full gallop, rather than pressing their horses against them. According to the Sun, the horses bowled the demonstrators over like tenpins, and one woman was cut by a flying hoof.

The Washington Post reported that all told some 45 refugees were injured. My assistant informed me that the police continued to pursue the demonstrators far to the rear of the Navy Building, several hundred yards away from the Pan American Building.

The Washington police force has earned an enviable reputation for its ability to handle demonstrations of all hues without incident. In dealing with Nazis and Communists as well as with democratic critics of various Government policies, they have displayed restraint and tact and understanding. It is most unfortunate that their reputation for dealing with crowds should have suffered its first major lapse in dealing with the refugees from Communist Cuba.

I have heard that the police were under rigid instructions to keep the demonstrators more than 500 feet away from the Pan-American Building. There is, it is true, a District of Columbia statute that empowers the police to take such action. But this is a statute that has in the past been very flexibly interpreted. After all, as I have said, hardly a week goes by without some kind of demonstration on the sidewalks of Pennsylvania Avenue only a few feet removed from the White House grounds.

In the case of yesterday's demonstration in particular, I think the police should have been guided by flexibility rather than rigidity. The demonstrators were not there to assault the OAS. They simply wanted the delegates to the OAS to see them. I am certain that they would have been satisfied if the police had permitted them to demonstrate in the park across from the Pan-American Building. Unfortunately, this was not done. The result was the distressing photographs and stories which appeared in this morning's newspapers.

I feel that the Washington police, by this action, have tarnished their reputation for tact and restraint in the handling of demonstrators. I do not know whether this was due to bungling at police level or to orders from a higher level. But it is a sorry situation when people who come to Washington to demonstrate for the freedom of Cuba are pushed around in this manner.

I am asking the Washington Police Department and the Cuban refugee leaders for their respective accounts of yesterday's events. I am also asking the State Department whether it issued any instructions relative to the handling of yesterday's demonstration. If the evidence indicates the need for further clarification, I intend to ask for a formal investigation for the purpose of establishing the facts.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2642) to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that such additional staff members as the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may find necessary to have present in the Chamber may be authorized to have the privilege of the floor during consideration of the bill (S. 2642).

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

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I am privileged to bring before the Senate the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and to urge its approval.

Today in America we are confronted by a strange paradox: We have serious poverty in the midst of plenty.

As a nation, our standard of living has never been higher. Our personal income, gross national product, and employment have never been higher. Total unemployment and the cost of living, in the face of a rapidly increasing population, have held the line.

Yet, as we go behind the glittering showcase of our booming national economy and probe beneath the sense of well-being and even complacency enjoyed by so many Americans, we find a disturbing situation.

We find millions of Americans whose economic, educational, and social conditions are such that they can only be classed as poverty stricken.

These are the hidden Americans.

There was a time in our Nation's history when the wealthy were the hidden Americans—purposely isolated in their walled estates, country clubs, and a closed society from the great majority of our citizens.

But as our standard of living has increased—as more and more persons are able to enjoy the pleasures of leisure and of material comfort that higher income and living standards provide—such artificial barriers have tumbled.

And as the general standard of living has increased, those at the bottom of the economic scale have tended to become the hidden Americans.

They are hidden in the welter of statistics which show our employment and economy at the highest levels in history.

They are hidden because they have exhausted their unemployment compensation and are no longer counted in that category.

They are hidden on the farms and in rural areas where more than 4 million families struggle along on less than $250 a month.

They are hidden in the slums of the cities, carefully screened off from the business and residential areas.

They are hidden because too much of America does not want to see them.

But they are there.

They are born, they live, they try, and too often they die in the same circumstances of abject poverty into which they were born.

It is this condition of poverty—poverty in the midst of plenty—that the legislation now before us is intended to attack.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, proposed by President Johnson and now spelled out in S. 2642 as approved by your committee, is not a welfare program.

It is not a program of handouts aimed at merely helping people to continue to exist.

It is a program whose goal is to help permanently correct the conditions under which poverty lives and breeds.

There is, of course, more to poverty than starvation and squalid slums.

There is the poverty of low income, the poverty of underemployment, and the poverty of being an older worker whose abilities have been bypassed by technological advances.

There is the poverty of despair, as the individual sees little or no chance of improving his circumstances in his lifetime. He walks on a treadmill of hopelessness and passes on this heritage of hopelessness to his children.

Through this legislation we intend to replace this feeling of no hope with new hope.

We intend to help people break out of the disastrous rut dug by their environment.

The rewards will be great.

In addition to helping to lift individuals and their families from the personal degradation and desperation of poverty, we will be strengthening our national economy.

As President Johnson said in his message to the Congress on this program:

> If we can raise the average earnings of 10 million among the poor by only $1,000 we will have added $14 billion a year to our national output. In addition we can make important reductions in public assistance payments which now cost us $4 billion a year, and in the large costs of fighting crime and delinquency, disease and hunger.

No one pretends that this legislation before us will fully solve the problems of poverty.

But it is a start. However, as President Johnson pointed out, it is more than a beginning. It is a commitment that this Nation will use its resources to achieve victory over this enemy.

S. 2642 proposes programs which, during the first year of the war on poverty, will expand opportunities for young men and women to gain the education, skills, and experience they must have to become full participants in our society and stable parents in years to come; stimulate our communities to initiate local action programs to attack the roots of poverty; help rural families now destitute to increase their income through a program of small capital grants and loans; provide a sounder base for the rehabilitation of poor areas of our great cities by expanding small business activities; provide special programs for undereducated adults and migratory agricultural workers; encourage more States to use public assistance as an instrument for helping families lift themselves out of poverty; recruit and train volunteers who will help carry out the war on poverty.

Just as space and other imaginative programs pay hidden dividends, so the war on poverty will pay immediate monetary returns.

The visible cost of not adopting this program, in terms of direct public assistance payments alone, is $5 billion per year.

In addition to these direct payments, the indirect costs of poverty to this country which show up in juvenile delinquency, crime, health hazards, and higher police and fire protection take billions more.

This bill adopts a coordinated approach because poverty has multiple causes:

Title I of the bill concentrates on problems of youth, and especially on the problem of the youth trying to get the skills with which he can find a decent job.

Title II concentrates on poor communities and will stimulate and help them to undertake, through the efforts of local government and organizations and local people, concrete programs to attack local causes of poverty, whether they be inadequate education, poor health care, dilapidated housing, or insufficient family services.

Title III of the bill concentrates on rural families, where the most destitute of the Nation's poor are found.

Title IV concentrates on small business, which is so essential to employment opportunities in parts of our great cities.

Title V concentrates on helping the public assistance recipient, and other needy persons, develop new skills which will make them employable.

Under title I are three youth programs designed to create new opportunities and to expand the existing opportunities for young people to obtain work, education, and training.

Part A of title I authorizes the establishment of a Job Corps to prepare young men and women for the responsibilities of citizenship and employment.

The Job Corps is designed to serve the needs of hundreds of thousands of rural and urban young Americans who are out of school and out of work or who are employed in dead-end jobs.

The Job Corps will seek to enroll those young persons, age 16 through 21, for whom the best prescription is a change in surroundings and associations.

Individuals who have not been graduated from an accredited high school may be enrolled only when further attendance in any regular academic vocational or training program is impractical.

To those who volunteer and are selected, the Job Corps will offer a rewarding opportunity for education, vocational training, useful work, recreation and physical training, and other appropriate activities welded into a carefully designed program.

Enrollees in the Job Corps will live in either conservation or training centers in rural or urban areas.

Both will be residential.

The conservation centers of approximately 100 to 200 volunteers each will offer a healthy out-of-doors life where the discipline of work and new skills will be learned, while our Nation's parks, forests, and other natural resources are improved.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What will the annual cost per enrollee in the Job Corps be?

Mr. MCNAMARA. The figures for the total cost of the bill are on each Senator's desk. I shall come to finances later in the speech, if the Senator will allow me to continue. We have the figures. I shall be glad to give the Senator the figures later.

The training centers will be larger, and many will use excess Government facilities.

Voluntary leadership on the part of enrollees in the Volunteers in Service to America—VISTA—program will play an important role in Job Corps centers.

The work-training programs in title I, part B, are designed to give employed young men and women aged 16 to 21—including both those in school and those out of school—a chance to break out of poverty.

It would provide them with an opportunity to work and to give them a training experience not now available to them in private employment or under any existing Federal program.

It is anticipated that the administration of this part will give particular attention to work programs which will enable young people to maintain regular high school attendance or return to high school if they have already dropped out.

The work offered young men and women in this program will increase their employability by enabling them to acquire new work habits on a job.

Attention will also be given to counseling during, and job placement after, the work training period.

Programs under the training scheme can only be sponsored by State or local public agencies or by private nonprofit agencies.

The kinds of jobs on which the young people will work are varied.

They may work in occupations for which there is a greatly increased demand in the public and the private nonprofit sectors, such as auto mechanics, office workers, draftsmen trainees, cook's assistants, nurse's aids, and hospital orderlies.

They may also be employed in occupations related to the development of recreation facilities, the conservation of natural resources and neighborhood improvement projects.

All of the jobs will provide important services and should be designed to increase the employability of the youth.

In no instances will the youth thus employed replace others already now employed.

College work-study programs authorized under title I, part C, are designed to provide basic financial assistance through part-time employment for the able but needy college student, or potential college student.

The Director will coordinate these programs with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Execution of the programs will be the responsibility of the participating institution of higher learning.

Many more able students from poor families would be able to enter any complete college, if they could depend on part-time work during the college year, and full-time employment during vacation periods to supplement limited loan or scholarship support from the college or university itself.

Under authorizations proposed in this part, part-time and vacationtime work opportunities would be provided for more than 140,000 students from low-income families per year.

Federal funds will be distributed among States according to a three-factor formula: the full-time college enrollment—the number of high school graduates—and number of children 18 years and under from families with incomes under $3,000 per year in each State as compared with the national total.

Each participating institution will be encouraged to develop two types of employment opportunities: on-campus employment in a wide variety of occupations, and off-campus employment under agreement with public or nonprofit organizations.

In this way the college can help meet the financial needs of the student, the student gains valuable work experience, and the community gains talented and highly motivated student assistance in a variety of service jobs.

In addition to being enrolled or accepted for enrollment in an institution of higher education, the student must come from a low-income family and be in need of financial assistance.

S. 2642 recognizes that the war against poverty, while a national effort, must be carried out through action in the community.

Title II emphasizes the role of the local organization in developing, as well as conducting, the action program.

This legislation sees the role of the Federal Government as providing counsel and help, upon request of local community organizations.

It is based on the belief that local citizens know and understand their communities best, and that sustained and vigorous leadership can only come from them.

Because of the diverse nature of the poverty problem in widespread communities, as much flexibility as possible will be left to community civic and local organizations.

A basic criterion, however, is that the programs receiving Federal support must not treat the poverty condition symptomatically, but must attack the root of the problem in a way that promises a final solution.

The organizations engaged in these community action projects may be public or nonprofit private agencies, or a combination of the two.

Participation by the widest range of community organizations will be encouraged, provided, of course, that the programs they offer are available without discrimination throughout the community.

Settlement houses, citizens' associations, YMCA's and YWCA's, parents' organizations, labor unions, chambers of commerce, and similar organizations are examples.

The second part of title II is a basic education program for adults, which provides for grants to States to provide literacy and other elemental training.

Title III, part A, holds out to the 1,500,000 impoverished American families living on farms, the opportunity to qualify for grants up to $1,500 for the acquisition or improvement of property that would enhance their earning ability.

Loans up to $2,500 are authorized for rural families' aid in financing nonagricultural enterprises that supplement their farming income.

The Director is also empowered to provide assistance to nonprofit corporations, to acquire lands to be reconstituted into family farms, and may make loans to low-income family cooperatives.

Part B of this title establishes a program of assistance to migrant farm laborers and their families, proffering benefits in housing, sanitation, education and child day care.

Title III is to be administered by the Department of Agriculture.

Under title IV, which would be administered by the Small Business Administration, the Director would be authorized to make, participate in or guarantee loans to $25,000 for small businesses, with emphasis upon loans to assist business which would employ the long-term unemployed.

Terms would be more liberal than those normally offered by the Small Business Administration.

Title V will authorize the Director to transfer to the Health, Education, and Welfare Department funds to finance experimental, pilot or demonstration projects leading to programs providing constructive work experience or training for unemployed fathers and the needy.

The Director is authorized under title VI to recruit, select, and train volunteers to take part in the war on poverty.

This program, to be called Volunteers in Service to America, or VISTA, will provide workers for the Job Corps, community action, and work-training programs.

Finding its origin in the Peace Corps which has attracted thousands of competent volunteer workers, VISTA will play a major part in the war on poverty.

Volunteers will participate as aids, teachers, counselors, and advisers.

They will assist in carrying out other Government programs on Indian reservations and in the Trust Territories.

And they can be assigned on request to State and local agencies working on problems of poverty.

VISTA recruits would receive $50 per month, in addition to living, travel, clothing and leave allowances.

Volunteers will normally enroll for a 1-year term with an opportunity to reenroll for a second year.

The volunteers will not be assigned to duties in any State without the consent of the Governor.

The legislation I have described is a realistic approach to the war on poverty.

These are feasible programs, because they have been planned with the help of businessmen, educators, social workers, and labor leaders.

Five Cabinet officers have given their assistance.

The goals set for this first year are realistic, down-to-earth appraisals of what can be done effectively and efficiently.

By adopting the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, we will affirm that it is the policy of the United States to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty.

We will help open to everyone the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity.

Mr. President, in answer to the question of the Senator from Ohio the estimated cost of each enrollee in the job corps in the first year is $4,700. However, the figure of $4,700 a year creates an erroneous impression, in that it includes the initial capital investment cost for the first year of approximately $65 million, all of which cannot logically and realistically be charged against the training program for the first year. This will be the original investment, and naturally it will carry through for years to come.

I yield the floor.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the so-called poverty bill.

Rather than pretend that this is reasonable legislation, or legislation which merits the attention and consideration of the Senate, an issue upon which reasonable men may disagree and debate, I believe I must call the measure what it is; namely, a politically oriented grab bag. I do not believe it was well considered. I think it was hastily drawn. It is composed of many visionary programs, plans, and projects which I do not believe are practical.

I do not believe that the bill is addressed to the real problem.

There are a few facts to which I believe we should call attention. I intend to read most of the minority views into the RECORD today, because Senators have not had adequate time to study or consider what has come out of the committee, or to consider the minority position.

Of course, nobody is in favor of poverty. We can all say we are against poverty. Just as we are for motherhood and Sunday school, we are opposed to sin and opposed to poverty. We can all agree on that and achieve a degree of unanimity in the Senate that does not exist on most issues.

This term can also be used emotionally for political purposes. In the present instance, the war on poverty has become election demagoguery. Dozens of Presidents and Congresses have been dealing with this subject for years. We are not merely discussing poverty. We know that poverty has been with us for a long time. Thousands of local and State civic and charitable organizations are already in the fight with billions of dollars. America already spends $66,500 million a year for welfare and education programs on the Federal, State, and local levels. That is more than 66 times the amount now suddenly sought by President Johnson in this election year.

The only thing that will serve the purpose in the long run is the creation of new jobs within the framework of our private enterprise system. It occurs to me that if the administration really wanted to do something to alleviate poverty, it would make sure that the private enterprise system operated in a healthy climate; and that it was not hamstrung by Government regulation, confiscatory taxation, and oppressive rules and regulations. If the free enterprise system were allowed to work, it would go a long way toward mitigating and ameliorating poverty in the United States.

In the final analysis, the only effective way to attack poverty is to create jobs. The only way to create jobs is to restore the confidence of the businessmen of the country in the Government of the United States. In short, we must create a favorable political climate for expanded investment of private capital. This would result in the creation of new productivity, new jobs, and higher levels of consumption, which again constitute a stimulant to the production of more new jobs.

So if we would really let the free enterprise system work, rather than use business as a whipping boy and scapegoat, we could really do something to eliminate poverty.

It has been noted by Assistant Secretary of Labor Daniel P. Moynihan that welfare rots people. People who are accustomed to being on the dole, who are accustomed to being dependent on the Federal Government to help them, often become indolent and lazy and do not seek work.

We know that many people are impoverished because of circumstances over which they have absolutely no control. Toward those people we are sympathetic. We must provide assistance where genuine need exists.

But in some areas that are referred to as impoverished areas, or depressed areas, areas where poverty exists, businessmen have found it difficult to persuade people to accept employment. They have sometimes found that as many as three generations of a family are on the dole. So very often the Government actually encourages poverty with its programs.

The bill before the Senate is not calculated to get at the problem, but would actually compound the problem and make it worse. It would have the effect of building in poverty in some areas. For example, the bill seeks to keep alive small, unprofitable agricultural operations. That seems to me to be the height of folly. What ought to be done is to move steadily, as we have historically, toward other, more efficient methods of production, and toward the elimination of small, unprofitable operations. In that way, the people will prosper more. In reality, that would be a continuation of the industrial and economic revolution of the past century, which is a historical trend that we should not try to reverse. If we do, we do not do anything to elevate the conditions of mankind in this country, but rather hold them back.

The most objectionable aspect, or at least a major objectionable aspect, of President Johnson's plan is the creation of a Federal poverty czar, who would have absolute authority to use public funds and waste public funds for political purposes. I see great danger in that. We are asked to create an agency that could use funds and programs for political purposes. Some protection should be provided, as is done in the many welfare functions that are administered by various agencies of the government. When a czar is created, possessing all discretionary authority, and perhaps having the power to intrude into the affairs of the departments and agencies, it is quite obvious that a politically oriented agency has been established in the Executive Office.

Under the so-called poverty bill, State and local governments would be bypassed. Many of the President's specific requests under the poverty umbrella are certainly old, discredited programs resurrected from the depression era. They have come forth in the President's proposal with new dress and new personality, but would cost infinitely more than did the programs of the 1930's.

Under title I, the youth program, it is proposed to establish a job corps. Why not be honest and call it what it is? It is merely a renaming of the old Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's. That is precisely what it is. It is a plan to establish camps in the country or centers in the cities. It is called a vocational training conservation camp. Actually, it is the old CCC all over again, with one difference: It has gone coeducational. It is now proposed to include girls as well as boys in the program. So, perhaps in pursuance of the Civil Rights Act, there will not be discrimination because of sex.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am sure the able Senator from Texas did not mean to imply, while speaking on the matter of the re-creation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, that if a program had merit for boys, it also had merit for girls. There is a problem differential that should be recognized.

Mr. TOWER. I am not sure that I understand the thrust of the Senator's question. I was not complaining of coeducation. I was pointing out that there is a difference between the 1964 program and the program of the thirties.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, would the Senator from Texas object to a program that would embrace the methodology of the Civilian Conservation Corps being extended to girls as well as to boys?

Mr. TOWER. Yes. I object to the entire program. However, if it is being extended to boys, I think it should be extended to girls. I think they should have as much access to programs of this type as do the young men. I do not criticize that aspect of it. I merely point out that that makes it somewhat different from the program of the thirties.

Mr. RANDOLPH. However, the very fact of change is the most important element in our world of change.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator from Texas has three daughters and no sons. If the Senator from Texas is defeated in 1966, he might well come within the purview of the benefits offered by the aid-to-poverty bill. Therefore, I am glad to include ladies as well as gentlemen.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from West Virginia is not as young as the Senator from Texas. Therefore, my two sons are older than the daughters of the Senator from Texas. But if they were of comparable age, we might have them meet on a happier occasion.

I was facetious to a degree in the other matter, although not wholly so. I agree that if a program is good, and if it is a workable program, it should embrace boys as well as girls. We believe that this program could do just that. What concerned me was the disparagement of the Civilian Conservation Corps, which was created by Congress in the thirties.

As one of those in the Congress at that time who supported the creation of the original Civilian Conservation Corps, I believe it was one of the most beneficial programs ever enacted for the building of boys into better men and more worthwhile citizens.

I talked briefly and informally a few minutes ago with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. We served together in the House. He supported the Civilian Conservation Corps, as I did. We find that sometimes we need to have new answers to old problems. But sometimes we also can answer these new problems with an old instrumentality. So, at least in part, the idea of the Civilian Conservation Corps is one which is as applicable in 1964 as it was in the 1930's.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator is taking a highly conservative view of this measure when he suggests the use of old solutions for new problems. That is what some of us have been advocating for some time. We are glad to have the Senator from West Virginia join our ranks.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I was referring to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is of course able to take care of himself. He would not mind my speaking on this subject in his absence from the floor.

I disagree—in good humor, but vigorously—with the premise of the Senator from Texas that if there is embodied in the present proposal the re-creation in part of the Civilian Conservation Corps that it would be legislation not in the public interest. I consider the provisions of the bill relating to our youth to be definitely in the public interest. This is not conservatism. It is a recognition of modern need and a requirement of our time.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I do not think it is necessary to debate the effectiveness of the Civilian Conservation Corps program of the thirties. We are looking at the problem that we consider exists in the sixties, some 30 years later. I would note that in the thirties, the country was suffering from a massive depression. It was not merely a matter of a pocket of poverty that we were dealing with, or pockets of poverty. We were dealing with a nation that had economically gone into a precipitous decline. There was vast unemployment. Private industry was not able to accommodate the vast number of unemployed. Perhaps the solutions that are available to us now were not available at that time.

It is proposed to place 100,000 young people in this young program in the second year of the program. We would train them to be conservationists. I do not know what percentage would receive vocational training and what percentage would receive conservation training. But if a substantial number are supposed to receive conservation training, we shall have more conservationists than we can

use. We already have many trained conservationists. Private companies, like the big lumbering companies, have been working on conservation. Both the Federal and State governments have been active in the field of conservation.

There is not the need for conservation now that there was then. Nor is there the need for this kind of training or program.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I believe it is important that the RECORD reflect that in the 86th Congress the Senate passed such a bill. Again in the 88th Congress, in 1963, this body also approved a Youth Conservation Corps bill. On two occasions within recent years, including 1963, the Senate expressed its support of the program which was presented by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] with numerous other Senators as cosponsors, including the Senator from West Virginia. I believe that this phase of the proposed legislation has majority support within the membership of this body. It is not a narrowly partisan support, but is broadly based, just as the program in the 1930's had support. Even today we can find evidences of the work on the projects which were brought into being at that time. They still exist and benefit the communities, the States and the Nation as a whole.

The junior Senator from Texas has referred to the number of vocational education students that would be among the enrollees and the number of conservationists that might come from the enrollees. I believe we can agree that the nature of education or training necessary would be based upon the types of young men and young women involved. In some instances, because of the lower levels of educational experience, the vocational education program would not be as easily adaptable. I believe that this program would have to be subject to consultations. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, through its Subcommittee on Labor, in discussions in which the able Senator from Texas was a participant, brought out the fact that we cannot have a rigidity in the type of courses and training in all regions—in one particular area or camp as against another.

Mr. TOWER. I sympathize with what the Senator from West Virginia has said. The fact remains that we still do not know how the discretion would be exercised. We still do not know to what extent the proposal would be employed as a conservation program or a vocational training program, or to what extent the people involved would be trainable.

The following provision appears in title I:

> No person shall be accepted for enrollment in the corps unless the local school authorities have concluded that further school attendance by such person in any regular academic, vocational, or training program, is not practicable.

What would we do? Would we not say that if the public school authorities conclude that a person is untrainable and should receive no further participation in one of the vocational training programs, he would be taken out and put into one of the programs proposed in the bill? That seems to be a little stupid to begin with.

Many school authorities would use the program as an opportunity to get rid of some highly undesirable students. They would put them into the corps.

Furthermore, if the students generally are trainable, what on earth would the Federal Government do with them? Is it implied that we have some superknowledge about teaching methods in the field of vocational training to the extent that we can devise much better vocational programs than the public schools can?

In effect are we not saying that such students are untrainable by the public schools, but are not untrainable on our part, because the Federal Government in its infinite wisdom, knowledge, ability, and omniscience can accomplish anything in the world? All we have to do is to throw some Federal money at the problem and immediately it is supposed to go away.

There was a graphic admission of the bill's worthlessness by Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz when he referred to the 1963 youth employment bill, which is contained substantially in title I of the proposed legislation.

Referring to the job corps he said:

> There is no suggestion that this training program will qualify one of the enrollees for a skilled occupation. That we should * * * completely.

If we are not going to qualify the people involved for an occupation, if we are not going to develop some skills, what are we to do? We would authorize a public works program to clean up the woods and parks, or something like that. I do not know the reason behind it. We already have a program for that purpose. It provides only temporary employment. The bill provides for a 2-year term, except that at the discretion of the director it can be continued longer.

So it appears to me to be pretty useless.

I should like to read into the RECORD a very good commentary on the study and analysis of the bill by the American Enterprise Institute:

> Among basic adverse criticisms of the youth programs are those, directed particularly to the proposed away-from-home work and training camps, which in substance raise questions as to the degree of effectiveness of short-term efforts to impart basic education, vocational training, and a sense of social responsibility to youths, while removed to a strange environment, who to a large degree are persons on whom the long-established educational and other institutions of society have failed.
>
> A specialist in child development is quoted as saying, with respect to the proposed Job Corps camps: "If we have learned anything in the scientific studies of human behavior during the last 50 years, it is that you cannot teach citizenship and social responsibility while removing a person from the society in which he is to become responsible." [1]
>
> A superintendent of city schools, in a statement to the House Committee on Education and Labor, notes that most youths taken into the youth camps will need to be prepared for jobs in cities and therefore "it would seem to me more desirable and much more efficient per dollar spent to emphasize the work-training programs in urban centers." [2]
>
> Doubt is expressed as to the reality of a youth Job Corps program which involves operating expenses of some $4,700 annually per enrollee, plus substantial camp construction and guidance center costs, when these cost levels are compared with normal costs of vocational training or the securing of a college education.[3]
>
> The vocational training aspects of the youth programs are described by varied critics as duplicatory of the expanded programs under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, authorizing appropriations of $118.5 million for fiscal 1965 and up to $225 million annually after fiscal 1966, and under the Manpower Development and Training Act, which was amended in 1963 to authorize $407 million for fiscal 1965 and to include the training of youths 16 years of age or older.
>
> Questions are raised as to whether the attractiveness of camp life and pay from service in the Job Corps might not in fact encourage rather than discourage school dropouts on the part of some youths.
>
> It is noted that the bill contains no restriction in this respect, although the establishment of restrictions would be within the authority of the Director.
>
> Apprehension is expressed as to discplinary problems that may be encountered in youth conservation camps and training centers.
>
> Some critics question the wisdom of inviting a feeling, on the part of youths involved in any of the three youth programs, of dependence on the Federal Government.

I depart from the text at that point to say that I think this is an extremely pertinent point. Young people are being taught to be dependent on Uncle Sam. I suppose that would prepare them for more vote-catching "gimmicks" that might be offered to them later on when they become of voting age.

To continue the quotation:

> The question here is whether the effect will be a strengthening or a weakening of self-reliance.
>
> A question also may be raised, some critics feel, as to whether it is sound public policy to leave to the discretion of a single Federal administrator the determination as to what types of private nonprofit organizations may utilize the services of youths through an arrangement under which up to 90 percent of the wages would be paid with Federal funds. Such a question, under terms of the bill, would be applicable to both the community work-training programs for youths

[1] Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner, of Cornell University, as quoted in Charles Bartlett column of the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Apr. 9, 1964.

[2] Samuel Miller Brownell, superintendent of public schools in Detroit, Mich., Apr. 24, 1964.

[3] This is the substance of a criticism (except for the specific cost figure) in minority views in a report by the House Committee on Education and Labor, Apr. 8, 1963, on the bill (H.R. 5131) to create a Youth Conservation Corps.

and the employment program for college students.

Analysts of the economic opportunity bill note that it contains no provisions with respect to marital status of an enrollee, or parental consent for enrollment, in the Job Corps for youths.

That is a very pertinent observation by the American Enterprise Institute. I point out also—the statistics having just been brought to me—that some 183,000 people left the CCC back in the 1934–41 period for disciplinary reasons. Others left by desertion, numbering 330,000, and for physical disability, 55,000. So perhaps the CCC was not always as beautiful as some people are inclined to think it was.

The Job Corps being proposed would cost $190 million the first year for some 40,000 enrollees. It would cost about $5,000 each. That is seven times the average per pupil cost in public schools in America.

By the way, that is more per person than it costs to send a student to Harvard or Yale, or any of the other fine Ivy League institutions. It seems to me to be quite an expensive amount per student.

The bill charts a new and unjustified course of government responsibility, in general, and for the Federal Government's role, in particular. The bill proposes more Federal bureaucracies whose officials would permeate, I believe, virtually every aspect of civil responsibility, public and private.

The first casualty of the war on poverty, as manifested by the bill, would be the preemption of jurisdiction of local control and representative government. I visualize the bill as the opening wedge for putting the Federal Government into existing local and State programs at all levels.

We should not create a new tax-consuming bureaucracy. Instead, we should create jobs by not having Federal Government interference with, and harassment of, private initiative, investment, and responsibility.

Never in our history, I believe, have catchy slogans created new jobs. However, that is exactly what would be attempted to be done in this case—to create slogans based on some of the New Deal programs.

Mr. President, jobs are created by investments by private individuals which create goods and services needed in the economy.

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

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The distinguished Senator mentioned the Civilian Conservation Corps and the young men who, for one reason or another, did not complete their training. The record will indicate that 83 percent of the enrollees did complete their work and training and that more than 3 million young men were benefited by the program to which reference has been made. Is that not a fact? We both have the same table.

Mr. TOWER. Yes, but the number of those who left the service because of desertion and for disciplinary reasons, taken together, totaled 513,000; those who left to accept employment numbered 448,000. So more left for disciplinary reasons and because of plain desertion than left for employment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The vast majority were discharged through normal channels. Those of us who remember the Corps at that time will remember that it was operated along the lines of the military to a degree. It was more rigid in format than is contemplated in the present proposed legislation. I am not saying that was good or bad at the moment, but the military aspect was stressed then. It is not stressed in the pending proposal.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, permit me to say that I had not read the bill in full until a few hours ago, but I have found opportunity to do so this morning. I want to say, after reading the bill, that I have come to the conclusion that it is a political bill. I can understand, however, the desire of the President to create an image for himself between now and election day, even at the expense of blurring the image of some of his predecessors. Whether this bill passes or not it is likely to help President Johnson in his quest for reelection.

Does this bill provide a handout? The answer to that question is, Yes, it provides a handout to the poor people of America, and probably would not have been approved by Capt. John Smith or any of those who believe that poor people's misfortunes are the results of their own misdoings. But compared to other handouts, this bill is not even a flea bite. It is nothing compared to the handouts being given to the big business interests of the United States every day and every year.

It is nothing at all compared to the depletion allowance which is given to the oil and gas industry.

It is nothing at all compared to the tax benefits which are given to the public utilities of this country.

It is almost nothing at all compared to the benefits which, as a government, we bestow upon investment bankers who have invested billions of dollars in the foreign field, much of which is under guarantee so that they cannot lose.

This is a small handout compared to that which the shipping industries have received over the years.

It is an infinitesimal handout compared to what some of those who get big Government contracts enjoy, with the cost-plus arrangements, et cetera, amounting to billions of dollars a year.

It is not a very large handout compared to that which the publications of this country, many of whom will oppose this bill with all the vigor at their command, receive in the form of reduced postage rates.

It is terribly small compared to the $11 billion benefits which were bestowed largely upon the well-to-do people of this country by the tax bill of 1964 and which will not be shared by any of those who qualify under this so-called poverty program.

And it is not much more than the recent handout which was given late last spring to the cotton mills of this country in the form of a subsidy for cotton which they purchase.

Whom will this bill help? As I read the bill, it seems to me it will help the boy or girl who had to leave high school because, for one reason or another, he could not complete the course, perhaps because of illness in the family, perhaps because of moving from place to place, or perhaps because the parents were out of work.

It will help those who lost their jobs because they could not keep up with the march of technology in the areas where they might have been located, such as our mining industry. It will help the dependent children of America, who certainly cannot be accused of being responsible for the conditions in which they find themselves.

It will help rural families who have lost their income or have no way of making a respectable living.

The question arises, Are these poor people a threat to the successful business interests of America or to the liberty of our people? I contend that they are not. I should like to know why a handout to a billion dollar industry is a great boon to America, while a handout to a poor family in need is a menace to our liberty.

I expect, as the debate continues, to receive answers to those questions.

Undoubtedly this bill can be made better and I shall vote for any amendments that are offered to the bill which I think would improve it.

In my opinion, regardless of the political implications, it is only fair to give consideration and help to the people who are most in need.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the bill. We are called upon to vote for a bill to authorize an appropriation of $962.5 million and to start a program which could annually cost that much or more every year, primarily because of the name it carries and the purposes it seeks to achieve, rather than upon testimony that the measure is actually needed and is soundly conceived.

I quote the words of Professor Emeritus Harley L. Lutz, of Princeton University, whom I recall with great pleasure from the period when I worked with taxes and tariffs on the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

"War on Poverty" is a slogan that can reasonably be expected to yield considerable political mileage. No one is in favor of poverty and criticism of a program purporting to deal with it is as risky, politically, as being in favor of sin or against motherhood.

Yet the odds are heavily against complete elimination of poverty by any kind or degree of Government action. The dramatic announcement of the slogan may carry for some the implication that theretofore pov-

erty had been tolerated but that little serious thought or effort had been given to its amelioration.

The fact is that the whole history of economic progress is a record of the struggle against poverty in the sense of a scarcity or deficiency of goods in relation to needs. Everything that has been done to increase production, from the most primitive tools and implements to today's enormous complex of machines, materials, technology, and skills has broadened and strengthened the drive to minimize scarcity.

Mr. President, I heard the statement made a few days ago that the gross national product—a hocus-pocus term which economists use to indicate what we are producing, even though it is a very imperfect yardstick—has reached an alltime high in excess of $600 billion, and that the national income is approaching an alltime high of $500 billion.

In this period of our greatest prosperity, we are asked to embark upon a new type of spending which eventually could pyramid into an annual cost of $2 or $3 billion. There is no ceiling on what the program could ultimately cost.

My statement that we are asked to vote for a slogan rather than on the basis of full information, is substantiated by the following statement in the minority views of Senators GOLDWATER and TOWER:

1. The bill includes some seven titles, nine separate programs, and establishes a new bureaucratic apparatus; its scope is so vast that it could affect virtually every section, community, and person in the country.

2. Despite the scope of the bill's programs and its length, only two witnesses were presented by the administration to make its case.

3. R. Sargent Shriver, the proposed "poverty czar," read a statement one page long as his presentation in behalf of the bill; he then spent portions of 3 different days answering questions. This exercise, which barely scratches the surface of the problems and implications contained in the proposal, was reported in 91 pages of the hearings, only a few more than the bill itself.

4. Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, the other administration witness, was able to conclude his testimony within approximately 15 minutes.

5. The hearings on the bill lasted only 4 days.

6. The Select Subcommittee on Poverty met once in executive session and reported the bill to the full committee within 2 hours; the full committee also held a single executive session which resulted in the bill being hurried on to the Senate Calendar. Thus, from the close of the hearings on June 24, 1964, to the full committee's action on July 7, 1964, less than 12 days were allowed the committee members for study of this long and complex bill.

As to the statement concerning the inadequacy of the hearings, all Members of the Senate know that the report on the bill was not filed in the Senate until yesterday, and copies of that report, covering 133 pages, were not available to Senators until about 11 o'clock this morning.

I fully approve of the prospect held out to the Senate by our splendid and beloved majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] last Monday of sine die adjournment of Congress prior to the convening of the Democratic National Convention on August 24. I also am definitely of the opinion that we can conclude action on all the pending appropriation bills before that date. It does not follow, however, that we should rush through the Senate, without adequate study and without adequate debate, a vast new spending scheme to broaden and, in some instances, duplicate existing welfare and welfare-type programs on which we are already spending in excess of $44 billion a year. And, last but not least, without any scientific definition of the type of poverty which should be the peculiar concern of the Federal Government, we are asked to commit ourselves to specific programs which may merely increase the national debt without materially raising the standard of living of any specific income group.

Mr. President, hearings on a similar bill were recently conducted in the House. At that time, a witness for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce gave a thoughtful analysis of what was in the House bill and the reasons why the chamber of commerce objected to it. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD excerpts from the statement of that witness.

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

CURRENT GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS TO MINIMIZE POVERTY

A remarkable aspect of the election year "war on poverty" is the extent to which those, who, in 1 month, developed the "battle plan" appear to have ignored existing laws and programs that would enable them to get at the problem of poverty more quickly and more effectively than would the programs contemplated under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics Bulletin for November 1963, we already are spending in excess of $44 billion a year on welfare and welfare-type programs. And Congress last year authorized substantial expansions of many of those programs, not to mention several new ones.

The scope and magnitude of these programs were also spelled out in last week's issue of a leading news magazine, under the appropriate heading, "There's Already a War on Poverty."

Secretary Celebrezze of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, admitted during his recent testimony that 42 current Government programs "have a direct application to poverty."

And now the Congress is asked to create still another agency; to authorize still more programs of highly questionable value; to leave all such programs under the direction of existing agencies but to give the Economic Opportunity Administrator virtually unlimited powers to coordinate their activities.

Time does not permit discussion of all of these Federal programs, but I want to mention three that, if properly modified, can be of greatest value in any effective antipoverty campaign.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING IN RELATION TO POVERTY

Except for older or retired people, the minimizing of poverty generally requires the opportunity and motivation for further education or training. How such opportunity and motivation can and should be provided, and the further conditions through which such education or training may successfully reduce poverty, are the subjects which we wish now to discuss.

Continued education and training are the primary means envisioned in many of the programs proposed in H.R. 10440 to correct or prevent poverty. Changing conditions of employability and the motivation to seek higher standards of living both depend upon improved effectiveness in our schools, public and private, including a "second chance" for youths or adults who dropped out before acquiring the skills needed for employment, or perhaps even the literacy prerequisite to such training. While many of the unemployed are not living in poverty, and many families said to be poverty stricken include employed persons, the fact remains that unemployability is a part of any description of poverty.

The decision to stimulate the States and their communities better to provide training opportunities has caused the Congress to enact many major laws during the last decade. In addition to the hundreds of thousands of youth and adults already receiving training through apprenticeship programs, on-the-job training and vocational education under the George-Barden Act, new vocational education opportunities have been provided under the area vocational schools established by the National Defense Education Act; training was authorized for the unemployed in depressed areas under sections 16 and 17 of the Area Redevelopment Act; training was provided in the Juvenile Delinquency Act; training for workers in industries injured by tariff concessions was provided in the Trade Expansion Act; and a huge program of training and retraining was authorized by the Manpower Development and Training Act.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

Most recently, the Manpower Development and Training Act has been extended and expanded to provide for training, with subsistence, for youths aged 17 and over. The act as amended delays until 1966 even any requirement that the States match Federal funds. It adds 20 weeks of allowances for trainees lacking "basic education" and allows such education to be provided before determining occupation objectives. Trainees are now able to work 20 hours without loss of training allowances, and up to $4 million can be used as relocation expenses "to increase the mobility of unemployed workers."

I cite here briefly the increases in the Manpower Development and Training Act provisions to document the availability of both basic education and training programs to those now unemployed, including young people only recently entering—or seeking to enter—the labor force. Insofar as poverty is due to involuntary unemployment, the Congress has already provided for the counseling, basic education, training and experiments in relocation of people who desire such services, and has provided subsistence for them during this period wherever needed.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

A second major law directed at the alleviation and prevention of poverty due to lack of training was enacted in the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Programs authorized in this act—the scope of which have been tremendously expanded—have not been implemented by the States and their communities. Even so, it cannot be questioned that youth falling within any definition of poverty are intended to be the recipients of the broadened training envisioned. The opening section says the act's purpose is "to develop new programs of vocational education, and to provide part-time employment for youths who need the earnings from such employment to continue their vocational training on a full-time basis, so that persons of all ages in all communities of the State—those in high school, those who have completed or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market, those who have already entered the

labor market but need to upgrade their skills or learn new ones, and those with special educational handicaps—will have ready access to vocational training or retraining which is of high quality, which is realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment, and which is suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit from such training."

In addition, the act provides for new work-study programs, with Federal compensation for such work, and "residential vocational schools" for youths age 15 to 21 with all expenses paid. These programs are specifically directed toward "needy" youth, especially "youths who have dropped out of school or are unemployed."

What we wish to emphasize here is that insofar as the Congress can or should provide opportunities for the counseling and training of the poverty stricken, it already has taken action. In fact, the Federal and State agencies designated to implement the Manpower Development and Training Act and the new Vocational Act have only begun to promulgate the provisions for expanding these programs. The Advisory Committee on Vocational Education, which must approve the new, broader State plans and the new regulations under which the State vocational programs will operate, has not even been appointed. The State directors of Vocational Education have met as recently as this weekend (April 8 to 10) to review and clarify the many new functions and the variety of training offerings within the scope of the new vocational education programs.

In fact, the expansion of the prerogatives of vocational education may become confused with those of the Manpower Development and Training Act because both provide new opportunities for out-of-school youth, as well as unemployed or underemployed adults, for counseling and training. How can the Congress then seriously consider compounding the potential confusion in these expanding programs by proposing still other training programs to be administered by the same executive agencies and for which the same youth and adults would be eligible?

Why would not the youth who might volunteer for a "job corps" be better advised to take advantage of either the Manpower Development and Training Act or vocational education opportunities? How would the "residential centers" of the "job corps" differ from the residential vocational schools envisioned in the Vocational Act, once established? Why should the work-study courses of the Vocational Act under HEW be duplicated by work-training programs under the proposed Office of Economic Opportunity?

Along with these expanding programs under both the Manpower Development and Training Act and Vocational Act, the Committee should be aware of the vast expansion of State and local effort in vocational-technical education already underway in many States without any Federal stimulation.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1962

A third law that can be useful to get at the problem of poverty in metropolitan areas is the 1962 amendments to the Social Security Act.

Under those amendments, any State can now initiate, at the community level, work relief and training projects for those adults receiving assistance under the aid-to-dependent-children program. In fact, it is under those amendments that the city of Chicago now has in operation programs for basic skills (literacy) and vocational training for such adults, and that the city of Los Angeles is planning such training programs.

Similarly, the experimentation authorized under section 1115 of the Social Security Act and now being carried on in seven eastern counties of Kentucky, illustrates the type of demonstration or pilot projects which should be undertaken in other States under this authority. This is especially true of those States which have experienced an extensive rise in the relief load under the ADC program. Our point here is to stress the availability, now, of these tools of Federal-State action to solve the problems of poverty.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, Senators will recall that in April 1963, the Senate voted for a Youth Training Corps. That was nothing but the old Civilian Conservation Corps program of depression days. I was a Member of the House when the CCC proposal was made. It was really necessary then to provide employment and some means of distributing income to people, primarily in the cities. We did not have then anything approaching the welfare programs that exist today. That was at the time of the worst depression in our history. I supported that program. But I wish to make one or two comments about it.

We found that the training was a futility. The superintendents of those camps were mostly Army officers. When I learned that the boys would not take advantage of the educational training that was offered, I proposed that they be given some military training. What a howl went up all over the United States. It was said that I wanted to draft the sons of the poor people to fight wars for the rich men, and all that kind of tommyrot. I anticipated that they were going to be drafted, and I wanted to make them a little better prepared for what was coming, since they had not demonstrated the brains, the ambition, or the willingness to take any kind of civilian educational training.

After the camps were closed, we tried to evaluate the benefits the youth received from them. We know what the camps cost. They cost $402,220,869.06. That was based upon depression prices. The head of the old CCC received a salary of $10,000. Last year it was proposed to start the head of the youth employment agency at a salary of $20,000, and, under the new pay bill, the director of the proposed Job Corps, probably would receive as much as $25,000. Everything will be double or treble in cost.

We know what the old CCC barracks cost. They cost millions of dollars. The barracks to be constructed under the proposed program will be three times as expensive.

In the days of the CCC, the camps were segregated. The new camps will not be segregated. That means, of course, that in the South, at least, there will be what will amount to segregated camps, because only one type of citizen will attend.

Another difference is that girls will be admitted. The bill does not state whether the girls will be segragated or not segregated. But they will be included in the program; they were not included in the program of the 1930's.

Mr. President, this is the old CCC idea which was adopted as a means of providing some income during our greatest depression. Now, when we are spending in excess of $44 billion for numerous welfare programs, we are asked to begin a similar program on a far more expensive basis, and to call it the Job Corps to provide education, vocational training, and work experience. Under the previous program schools were conducted at night, but the boys would not attend. We did not get work worth 50 cents on the dollar out of those boys, and they were of the better type than we can expect in this new program. The proposed new camps would be filled with school dropouts, juvenile criminals, and whatnot. We would get no worthwhile work out of them. We would not get in return 10 percent of what will be spent on them in the new camps.

In the old days, too, access roads and fire roads were needed in the national forests and national parks. Over and above all else, recreational areas were needed.

I well recall the fall of 1934, when President Roosevelt decided to dedicate the first Civilian Conservation Corps camp in the Blue Ridge Mountains. It was Camp Roosevelt, at Big Meadows. Senator BYRD and I met the President at Harrisonburg. As we drove up Swift Run Gap and got the beautiful view of the Shenandoah Valley, which so entranced Governor Spottswood and the Knights of the Golden Horseshow almost 200 years ago, I said, "Mr. President is that not beautiful scenery?"

He said, "Yes, but you have no lakes."

"Oh," I said, "that is true; but we can get some lakes."

He said, "You need them."

So when I saw the head of the CCC movement, I said, "The President said we ought to have some lakes."

He replied, "If you will find a site, we will build some lakes."

It did not take me long to find a site. It was at Sherando, in Augusta County. At Sherando, the CCC built the first recreational lake that it built anywhere in the United States.

When the CCC camps were ended because of the war, I prevailed upon the Soil Conservation Service to continue the lake and pond program. Thousands of ponds have been developed from that program.

But that was a much different situation from that which confronts us now. We do not need any more recreational lakes or ponds. Most of the urgent needs for access and fire roads and trails in our national parks and forests have been fulfilled. We would be hard put to find useful employment for the trainees.

This is another reminder for Members of Congress before a start is made on this expensive program: We cannot get manual labor from a man and train him for technical work at the same time. We must do one or the other. They cannot be combined. We shall be given many rosy pictures of how it is proposed to take school dropouts, boys with poor brains, or boys with no ambition at all, who could have gotten an education, but would not take it, and pay big money to them. But will they be trained for anything? They certainly will not. Yet we shall be committed to a program similar to one that existed in the days of the depression.

We did not end the CCC camps during the previous depression until we had to enact a law drafting men for military service.

I and all others who know how those camps were then operated know only too well that when we spend millions of dollars in building new barracks for CCC-type camps for a new Job Corps, we shall not use them for only 1 year and then discontinue the program.

When the Senate passed S. 1, the Youth Employment Act in April 1963, I spoke briefly against that bill which is similar to the first two parts of title I in the pending bill.

Last year's bill went over to the House. The House would not pass it and has not passed it yet; but we are asked to include it in this package bill. As Professor Laski said, Who would dare vote against poverty? Who is against mother love? Who is for sin?

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the brief remarks I made on the floor of the Senate in April of last year against S. 1. That was to have been the first great bill, but it has not passed the House yet. But, in a modified form, it is in this bill.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR ROBERTSON

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, while the $60 million proposed in the pending bill to start a replica of the CCC camps of the depression thirties is apparently a very modest undertaking, no one should delude himself that a program of this character can be any more easily stopped than the program of 1935 which was not ended until war spending and the draft forced Congress to abandon the CCC camps. Instead of the program being less expensive than it was during the depression my personal belief is that it could easily be three times as expensive. For instance, both the Census Bureau and the Army are agreed that the current cost of building a barracks is 300 percent higher than it was during the depression years. And the pending bill recognizes the inflation that has occurred during the last 25 years when it provides a starting salary of $20,000 a year for the Director of the YCC as against $10,000 for the Director of the CCC in the bill of 1937.

I have previously pointed out that even to house the 15,000 men contemplated by title I of the bill would cost not less than $75 million. My colleagues may be interested to know what was spent on barracks for the old CCC camps. The General Accounting Office informs me that the total under the general heading of shelter was $69,877,649.13. And if to that is added what, of course, will have to be added to the new camps if established, equipment, supplies and materials, structures and parts, and land, the total for what might be termed capital outlays for the old CCC program was $402,220,869.06. When we add to that the money paid to the enrollees and the contributions made to their dependents, we find that in 8½ years the Government spent on the old CCC camps $2,328 million. Therefore, I feel safe in asserting that if we start this program and Government witnesses have testified that they are figuring the per-man cost on the basis of amortizing the capital outlay over a period of 20 years we could easily be starting a program that will ultimately cost over $6 billion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, that bill authorized only $60 million for CCC camps. It did not include women. This bill includes women. It starts with $190 million for a Job Corps. Think of it. Only $60 million was involved last year, and the House would not pass it. But now we have increased the amount to $190 million for this one program—the total proposed for youth programs is $412.5 million and $962.5 million for the whole bill. We are committing ourselves to something that eventually will run into hundreds of millions of dollars in the time of our greatest prosperity. It will be borrowed money.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I have not finished my study of the bill. Did the Senator from Virginia say it was an open-end authorization with no ceiling on it?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is my impression. I do not know of anyone on the committee who knows everything that is in the bill. It is a long bill. We did not even get to it until 11 o'clock this morning, but the distinguished Senator from Texas is on the committee, and I quoted from his minority views.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield at that point?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. For the first year, the bill contains an authorization of $962.5 million—almost $1 billion. This, admittedly, is only the first round. This is only "a foot in the door." We expect the administration to be back with hat in hand asking for a billion dollars more before it is over.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The original program was to start with $4 billion, a billion of it to be for this year. Now the $4 billion has been dropped, but it is proposed to start with nearly a billion dollars. We established a precedent; and we shall have all these people who will get jobs to train dropouts.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield at that point?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. In answer to the question raised by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], there is a breakdown on each Senator's desk of the $962.5 million. If the Senator does not have a copy at hand, I have one for him.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McNAMARA. This details and spells out what is in the report which each Senator has on his desk.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, there is, naturally, opposition to the bill, but I should like to point out again what I pointed out in my opening remarks, that there is a great need to do something about the impoverished people in our country—and there are millions of them.

Both proponents and opponents agree that we are in a period of great prosperity for almost everyone in the country; but the "almost" is the important thing which this bill seeks to do something about.

As I stated in my opening remarks, poverty is now being passed on from one generation to another, so that we have inherited poverty, and inherited lack of opportunity, which brings about more and more poverty.

The bill is designed to do something about that, to break the chain of passing on poverty from one generation to the next.

The charge is made that the program is expensive. Of ccurse, it is expensive, but we must not overlook the fact that if we can retrain, reeducate, or provide further education for people who now lack an education and make of them productive citizens, we shall have created a double benefit to the Nation, because it will take people off the welfare rolls and put them into productive employment, where they will become taxpayers the same as the rest of us. This is no small part of the program.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield at that point?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. How does the Senator propose to establish the estimated amount of money which will be needed, when the administration itself does not have the least idea of the number of poverty units in the United States?

I point out to the Senator from Michigan that the Democrats have never been able to nail down the precise figure regarding the number of Americans living in poverty.

In January 1964, as the Senator well knows, President Johnson's National Policy Committee on pockets of poverty said that 20 million Americans went to bed hungry every night. In that same month, President Johnson himself said that there were 5 million Americans who were not enjoying the pleasures of economic prosperity.

On September 8, 1960, the then Senator John F. Kennedy declared during his campaign that 5 million Americans were living in poverty. The figure had increased to 8 million in Democratic pronouncements up through November of 1960.

The most widely publicized Democratic estimate of poverty, however, was the President's figure of 17 million Americans; and even that relatively modest figure constitutes a rather sad commentary on 3 years of Democratic administration. There was an increase from 17 million to 35 million poverty units in this great Nation in 3 years of government by the Democrats.

The figure is rather significant when we consider the bill which embodies the philosophy of those who have doubled poverty in America in 3 short years. How does the Senator know how much money is needed when the administration does not even know the amount of poverty units in the United States?

Mr. McNAMARA. So far as I am concerned, as the chairman of the subcommittee, I point out that figures were quoted at various times by various people. When they talked about 5 million people going to bed hungry, and 20 million people living in poverty, they were using two different yardsticks.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the Senator know which yardstick was used as to the amount of income each unit had?

Mr. McNAMARA. I do not have that figure, but so far as this bill is concerned, the yardstick used is one under which people earn below $3,000 a year. The purpose of the bill is to help those people. The incomes of other people, at various times, vary from year to year and from area to area. But the bill seeks to help those who receive less than $3,000 a year. We do not look upon poor people strictly as "poverty units." We look upon them as people. If the Senator is referring to people, we shall try to answer the Senator in terms of people.

Mr. SIMPSON. That is administration language. It is not my language.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I shall conclude in a moment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that minor and purely typographical errors be corrected as indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

Page 81, line 7: Delete the word "Sate" and insert in lieu thereof the word "State".

Page 83, line 23: Between the words "loans" and "under", insert the word "made".

Page 88, line 10: Delete the word "authorized", and insert in lieu thereof the word "authorize".

Page 100, line 10: Delete the word "adjustment" and insert in lieu thereof the word "adjustments".

Page 102, line 11:

Between the letters "(c)," and "(d)", insert the word "and".

Mr. McNAMARA. Now I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I was temporarily absent from the Chamber when the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] was addressing himself with some heat to what he believes to be the failure of the CCC program. I am informed that he suggested that because the House had failed to act on two Youth Conservation Corps measures which the Senate had passed, this indicated a lack of understanding, appreciation, and support for the idea of a Youth Conservation Corps.

Sometimes it is good to look at the record. I believe that the Senator from Virginia would not feel aggrieved if I were to point out the fact that we were both Members of the House in 1937. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and I then voted for a 3-year extension of the civilian conservation program which had been created in 1933.

If the Civilian Conservation Corps had been a washout, if it had been a failure, I doubt if the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] would have voted in 1937 for a continuation of the program for a period of 3 years.

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

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. I point out that the Senator from Virginia admitted that he voted for the House-approved measure years ago. But he stated that he was misguided and that the measure turned out to his dissatisfaction.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am very sorry. I was not in the Chamber at the time. I wish to modify my remarks. In no wise do I speak in disparagement of the position taken by my cherished friend from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

I pointed out earlier that numerous Senators, both Democrats and Republicans, including Senator DIRKSEN, Senator ROBERTSON, and others who voted for the Civilian Conservation Corps then, may not believe it is a good program now. I believe it should be enacted into law. I supported it in 1933 and 1937 and I support it in 1964.

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

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the discussion of the Jobs Corps section, section 1 of the Economic Opportunity Act. This is almost identical to the Youth Employment Act, containing the Youth Conservation Corps, which passed the Senate last year.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] have pointed out the great success of the Civilian Conservation Corps in the depression years. The able Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] pointed out that this was an old solution to a new problem. I would say it is a continuing problem, not a new problem. When old solutions are effective, there is no need to abandon them. They are like old medications that continue to be effective. One does not abandon them. There are many such instances in the lives of people and in the lives of nations. The Youth Conservation Corps or the Job Corps today has the support of many of the finest organizations of the country.

The National Association of Chiefs of Police—which I believe was referred to earlier today by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]—deals day in and day out with the problems of idleness, and with the problems of delinquency that result from idleness and frustration—problems of delinquent behavior, not only in juveniles, but in adults. That association has unqualifiedly and enthusiastically, time after time, endorsed the Job Corps program or the Youth Conservation Corps.

One can make fun of the proposal or make light of it if one wishes to do so. But if the Youth Conservation Corps did nothing more than take care of the forests, the streams, and the lakes and conserve some of the resources of this Nation, it would be a wise investment for this Nation to make.

The Job Corps is not merely for the conservation of the forests, the waters, and the land. It is also for the conservation of the human body, the human mind, and the human soul. It also has something to do with the conservation of good neighborhoods, the building of such neighborhoods, and the building of good social institutions in our urban centers. It also has something to do with the training of young people in work habits.

One of the great needs today in America is to give young people before the age of 21 the opportunity to develop work habits as a result of direct experience.

It is very difficult for a young man 16 or 17 years of age to get a job. Senators may say that the program is not very good. In the meantime, another 100,000 or 200,000 young men between the ages of 17 and 21 become unemployed each year. They become school dropouts or find themselves unable to adjust to the industrialized, urbanized society that is growing at a rapid rate.

One can simplify these things all he wishes; millions of people are leaving rural America and going to the big cities. Some rural families come to the big cities with 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 children. They are not adjusted to urban life.

In fact, most urbanites are not adjusted to urban life. Most people are not adjusted to living on asphalt or concrete. So urban life becomes a problem. That is what we are seeing all over America.

I wonder today why the Senate, which is considered to be—at least, among ourselves—a group of wise and prudent men, has not been able to see what is happening to America. This is not the America of the thirties. It is not the America of the forties, or of the fifties.

When I arrived in the Senate, the population of the country was 150 million. Since 1949, an additional 44 million Americans are in the United States. This has occurred in a period of less than 16 years.

The population projection shows that by the year 1980 in an area from Boston to Norfolk, there will be 90 million people in one continuous city. It also shows that the rural population will be halved. Many people who come from the rural areas will be inexperienced in industrialized pursuits, employment, production, or urbanized living. It is in those areas and groups that the problems arise.

The Youth Conservation Corps is not an answer to the total problem. There are no longer total answers to total problems. We must live with these problems and work with them. There never has been a quick, easy answer to any problem or to any project of such dimension.

A measure which has passed this body twice and which has a record of success in the most difficult years in our history, is the sort of measure that deserves support.

It said that there is a provision in the bill that a person must be referred to the corps. One cannot get a position in the job corps unless the school authorities say that he can no longer find satisfaction of his needs in the academic or vocational education program of the school system. There is a reason for that provision. I think it could just as well have been left out, but there is reason for it.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I should like to read the provision to which the Senator refers. It is as follows:

> No person shall be accepted for enrollment in the Corps unless the local school authorities have concluded that further school attendance by such person in any regular academic, vocational, or training program, is not practicable.

That provision would seem to imply that we would take people who are untrainable, people whom the school authorities fail to train in the regular vocational training programs, and try to train them in the proposed program. I wonder if we could be any more successful.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe I can be helpful to the Senator. The Senator from Texas is a former educator, as I am also.

I conducted a vocational education training program in my State which involved 40,000 people. I conducted an adult education program in my State for 2 years that had more than 70,000 people in it.

The reason for the provision to which we have referred is that there should be no inducement in the bill for young people who ought to be in school and who can profit by being in school to leave school.

I am surprised that some Senators do not know that sometimes the educational program in a particular community does not fit all the needs of a particular child. That is one of the reasons why there are private schools. That is one of the reasons for counseling. That is one of the reasons for community services.

Mr. President, if the schools met every vocational, social, and academic need of every young man and young woman, there would be no reason to have anything else. But there are plenty of schools today that do not meet those needs.

As a former educator of a sort—and I claim no great expertise in that field—but as one who has spent a good deal of his time with young people and as a teacher, I assert that the school systems of America can well examine their curriculums. They can well examine their teaching programs to see whether or not we are doing the things in school that are needed to be done in order to train Americans for the 1960's, the 1970's, and the years to come.

For example, people have said that young people should attend school for 9 months. Why? Because that is the way grandfather did it. Why? Because the boys and girls were needed in rural America on the farms during the summer months.

Today many people say that perhaps the school year ought to be 10 months. Many today say that perhaps the whole period of education ought to be related in terms of patterns of family life. For example, large numbers of industrial workers get their vacation periods during the winter, and not the summer.

I do not know what the answers to those questions are, but I know one thing: Today children do not have exactly the same opportunities that they had 50 years ago. I do not say that they are better or worse. I say that the school program of today frequently does not meet the needs of each and every individual child. The good educator is the one who understands that.

We do not wish a program that would act as an inducement or an enticement to young men or young women to leave school when the school meets the needs of the child or young person.

I have seen young men in my college classrooms who would have been better off if they had not been there.

I have seen them studying the fine arts and the humanities, when they should have been in vocational or technical training.

Mr. President, what the program attempts to do is to face the facts which the Senator from Texas and other Senators know. What are those facts? Last year 1 million young people were school dropouts and were unemployed.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I concede that our educational system does not completely meet the needs of every student. As a former educator, I had many young people in my classrooms who should have been apprenticed in industry or who should have gone into vocational training. They were not prepared to do college work. They did not have the ability to do it.

I have admired the British system, which channels students off into two different directions after they reach a certain age and are tested. Some are sent to grammar school; others are sent to vocational training centers or to be apprenticed in industry. I wish we had a similar system in our country. I believe that our educational system has been geared to mediocrity.

We ought to find the way to gear our educational system to the needs of the students and their intellectual and mental capabilities. But I do not believe that the proposed $412 million youth job corps program and the other work and related programs will solve this admittedly great problem.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I wish to make it clear that I have a high regard and respect for the Senator from Texas, not only as a Senator, but also as an educator. I know of his excellent record. Educators, like Senators, sometimes disagree as to the best methods. They even disagree on the textbooks and reading material that ought to be used.

It seems to me that one of the apparent needs today is to find gainful and useful work for young people that private industry does not wish to provide for many reasons. Frequently summer work is undesirable for an employer. He must readjust his entire work force. Today employers are not like they were back in grandfather's time. In many places employees now have a union shop. Employers are required to pay fringe benefits. A good deal more bookkeeping is involved than was required of Humphrey's drugstore 60 years ago.

There is a need for the program, not because of any theory, but because of the fact that the streets of America, even in areas where there is no violence, are crowded with young men and women walking around aimlessly, not knowing what to do.

If someone has a better program than the one proposed, well and good.

I have been in local government. I was mayor of a great city. I found that when a man can be put to work and given some training, he becomes a better citizen.

But apparently it is easier to build jails and reformatories than it is to give young men an opportunity to make something out of their lives.

Having been a youth worker, I am proud to say, a Scoutmaster, and one who has worked with young men for a long time, I have found very few young men who are really bad if they are given an opportunity.

What is the job corps program for? It will not make doctors of them. It might make Senators of them. But it will not make accountants or professional people.

First, the program would provide a young person with something to do that is not merely make believe or make work.

Most of us are parents. Most Senators in this body who are 40 years of age know that when they, as boys or girls, were asked to do something, there was a reason for it. It was necessary either to contribute to the family income or to do chores around the home or work in a business or shop. What do we do today? Mothers and fathers spend half their time puzzling about what they are going to do with Johnny now that he is out of school. Shall they send him to camp or see if he can get a paper route, in order to keep him busy? Young people want to do something.

One of the reasons why the Peace Corps has been one of the finest programs of this Government is that it gives young people an opportunity to do something worthwhile. The proposed Job Corps will be effective when a young man sees that the work he is doing is needed by his country; when he finds out he can get part-time work with the Government or in a nonprofit organization and contribute to the welfare of his community and his Nation; when he can work in a community park or do something that is worthwhile.

We talk about cost. I remind Senators that many times as much is spent in a low-income or slum community as is spent in a high-income, fully employed community. The most extravagant and costly community in the country today is the slum or low-income community. I speak from facts when I say that the fire department is sent into a low-income community far more frequently than it is sent into a high-income community. The police department is sent into a low-income or slum community much more frequently than into a high-income community. The social welfare costs for a low-income area are many times as high as for a high-income district. The only people who can afford the slums are the rich.

As a former mayor of the city of Minneapolis, I can say that the wealthy

and the propertied people have to be taxed to maintain the slums and unemployed young people. What this country needs is young people at work. I think young people ought to start out in life knowing that if they are to receive help from their Government or their family or their neighborhood or their community, they must earn it. If that is old-time politics or economics, so be it. I think it is good politics, good economics, and good sense.

I suppose there will be a few loafers and freeloaders. They are found in any community.

Under the bill, the program will involve 40,000 the first year and 100,000 the next year. If these American youths are given a chance to be hired and put in jobs in the Job Corps, 40,000 the first year of the ages between 16 and 21, and 100,000 the next year, it will be the wisest thing ever done. Then, under part 2, the work training program, agreements will be entered into with States and local governments to pay a part of the cost of full- or part-time employment to enable the young men between 16 and 21 to continue or resume their education or increase their employability. We will be making another wise move to try to give our young men and women the training incentive they need at this stage of life.

I shall not take more time now except to say that we hear speech after speech on the floor about riots and disorder. I have heard for a long time, as a parent, as a public official, as one interested in youth work, that young people today are terrible. I have heard lectures and sermons. I have heard it said that they steal hubcaps. They have nothing else to do.

I have heard that they steal and that they engage in vandalism. I do not condone it, but I remind Senators that there was a time when we stole, or "snitched" apples from a grocery store. When we did it, it generally meant that we did not have much to do. One of the remedies generally applied was the switch. Generally we were put to work.

I am glad to say that the present program is being advocated by a President who understands what it is to work.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. In Texas we did not mess around with anything as small as apples. We stole watermelons.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator had a little experience with that. I was probably the best in my county. The watermelons were not as big as those in Texas, but we did the best we could considering what we had.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I can tell the Senator why the situation has deteriorated in the last 40 years. It is because we do not have the time-honored institutions known as the woodpile and the woodshed. The woodpile kept the boy from getting out of work, and the woodshed provided a place for punishment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Nowadays we have charcoal briquettes and the barbecue, and the work consists of putting the charcoal briquettes into the barbecue pit. Another form of activity is trying out the 360-horsepower car on the highways.

I appeal to some of my conservative colleagues to apply the time-honored, tried, true, and tested old solutions to the continuing old problems. I have the feeling that if we do so we shall make a great contribution not only to the wealth of the country in an attack upon poverty, but, more importantly, an attack upon frustration and hopelessness, which will be of great benefit to the people.

I intend to discuss this bill in greater detail tomorrow. It is a good bill which merits the overwhelming support of the Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest and pleasure to my colleague from Minnesota, who is always so picturesque and interesting in his remarks.

I regret to state, as a Member who sat on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, that I wish I could say that this bill will do all the things that all of us would like to see done. But it will not. Under $1 billion is provided for in this bill. It is not going to be able to do much in any of the respects that we all want. It is not going to make all the work we would like to see for the boys and girls. It will neither restore the woodshed nor furnish the charcoal briquettes. It will do one thing, however, in terms of the purposefulness of a piece of legislation. It will direct the national conscience and attention to the existence of poverty and to the fact that we have every reason—moral and in policy—to deal with it on a concerted national basis, considering our affluence as a people. This the bill will do, and that is why I am for it. But, Mr. President, there is much to be done about it, and I hope in the course of our debate that we will do things that need to be done.

Let us remember that dealing with the question of poverty has always been considered a local job, and it is a fact that literally billions are being spent on this problem very wisely by private philanthropic agencies as well as agencies at all levels of government.

Let us also remember that the Federal Government is engaged in many programs directed toward approximately the same objective. Those programs include a wide latitude of State-Federal grants-in-aid programs involving services for children, welfare, old age, medical assistance for the aged, aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, aid to the totally and permanently disabled, all of which involve billions of dollars of Federal moneys.

Indeed, as shown on pages 76 and 77 of the committee's report, there are listed programs totaling $31,811,345,000 which the Federal Government is expending on antipoverty programs.

A good many of them could be discounted and it would still leave many billions of dollars.

The importance of this bill is that for the first time it charges the national responsibility and national conscience with a concerted war on poverty. That is all to the good. I believe all Americans will have to join in this war. It is a war that will take years to win and will require good organization.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. It was my impression that when Congress enacted the Full Employment Act it made a moral, political, and legal commitment with respect to employment opportunities. Therefore, although I expect to vote for the bill, small as it is, I do not believe it represents any particular innovation in principle.

Mr. JAVITS. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. That is the burden of what I am trying to do. I thought that we should have a realistic understanding of what we are doing. I am now coming to my next point, which is exactly consonant with what the Senator from Tennessee has suggested. In other words, the means are very important. It is important that the war on poverty be organized in such a way that it can go on over a period of years effectively and efficiently with the use of relatively limited resources—because we realize that the resources are very limited.

I believe the biggest deficiency in the bill is the lack of coordination between the Federal Government and other elements of our society which are working on this problem.

A great amount of work is being done in the private sector, as well as in the public sector. The great danger exists that there will be an administrative overlap and duplication, and that money and effort will be rather aimlessly spent.

That is the central core of the problem with which we must deal.

I approve of dedicating the National Government to this struggle and to the winning of it, just as I approved of the principle of dedicating the National Government to the war on unemployment, which represented the pledge of the Full Employment Act.

The idea which seems to prevail among those who brought the bill to us is, in my judgment, somewhat worrisome. I shall propose an amendment in a moment, and I shall discuss it. The amendment is designed to deal with this problem.

Those who brought the bill to us in all good will—and I do not question their sincerity—felt that the thing to do was to jump into the local community, and in a spectacular fashion deal with and cure large pockets of poverty and bring back a great number of school dropouts, and in that way have an important and major effect upon the country.

It seems to me, with all due respect, that while this course involves pyrotechnics and perhaps is good for politics, it is not particularly fruitful for those whom the program would help, and is not a sober proposal with respect to what could be done in mobilizing for the war. We are really mobilizing for war.

A good many amendments have been added to the bill, and I am happy to say that they were added. They buttress what we are doing in establishing an

organization which is capable of waging effective war on poverty and coordinating everything that is being done now, and utilizing the resources in key places where it is necessary to strengthen the best of what is being done.

However, I find one serious deficiency in the bill. The first point that I referred to is covered by amendments which now require close integration between this program and private and local governmental agencies.

The program does not as yet tie in adequately with the States, in the sense that the Director of the program, as the program now stands, is authorized to proceed directly in each community or even directly with private philanthropic and welfare organizations, and is not required to endeavor to develop the program through the agencies of the States which are willing to develop it in a way satisfactory to the Director of the program.

I believe that is a great mistake. I shall offer an amendment to deal with that problem. I point out, in order to show the way in which the problem came to us, that even in the youth camp program, which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has been discussing, there was not taken into account the fact that many States—my own State of New York, the State of California, and the State of Michigan, for example—already have youth camps in operation exactly of the kind proposed to be authorized in the bill. It would be much more economical for the Federal Government and a great deal more efficient if State camps were expanded, and if the Director were able to enter into agreements with States to accept some of the young people that he wants to send to those camps and put them in the existing State camps. These camps would be expanded in order to meet the capacity requirements.

It was only after we went into this phase of the discussion that an amendment was accepted, which is now incorporated in section 107 of the bill, to that effect.

The amendment which I shall propose—and I intend to call it up in due course—is designed to deal with the fundamental program of organizing effectively and efficiently for the assault on poverty, and of enlisting the States as far as they wish to be enlisted. Thus, the whole program would not revolve around the Director in Washington, who, under the bill, would be permitted to go into any State and operate with any municipal or county subdivision or with any private agency in that State on a Washington-within-the-State basis.

My amendment provides that he shall use his best efforts to develop State plans in carrying out the major titles of the bill, and shall utilize State agencies and facilities, whenever and wherever practicable, either at the initiation of the programs or in the course thereof. He is also authorized to pay the expenses the State agencies incur in performing this function and to render technical assistance to help them get ready to perform those functions.

Boiled down, this means that the antipoverty program may be started in any State without the consent of that State, if the Director feels that that is what he wishes to do; but the State is to have an opportunity to take it over if it shows itself able to do it and the Director of the program finds that it is a practicable arrangement.

If a State claims that it is ready to take over the program, and makes a showing that it is able to handle it, the burden of proof will shift to the Director of the program to show that he has a reason why he cannot or should not turn it over to the State. This means a whole operation under a particular title in a proper way and not on individual applications.

In addition, there is nothing in my amendment which would prevent the Director from moving into a particular State or subdivision of the State or in dealing with a private agency within a State, before the State has an opportunity to assert its desire to operate the program. It may assert that desire at a later time than when the program is initiated. The program would go right ahead in the meantime.

Hence, both purposes are served. The States will conduct the program within their own borders in every case in which they can do so practically, the Administrator must show that when a State says it can and he says it cannot the State really cannot do it and the program is not held up by State operation as a condition precedent.

But the Administrator is in no way inhibited. There is no condition precedent to his going into any State and beginning work under this program. He knows that nothing can be held up, nothing can be delayed, nothing can be thwarted in the way of active work which he feels he must do.

As one goes through the bill, it is expressly contemplated in almost every part of the bill that there shall be State plans. If there are to be State plans, then a State ought to have a right to run those plans, if it can. I have even provided that if it can, it shall be within the judgment of the Administrator. But it is a fact that the Administrator will have to account to the State and to the President if he claims it is not practical, and a State claims that it is.

The requirement for State programs or State plans occurs in every section of the bill: the work training plan, section 113 (a); the work study program, section 126; title II, which relates to community action, contains a provision for allotment by States, which is section 203(a); section 209(a), which relates to action even within a State, as between urban and rural communities. There, too, State plans are contemplated. Section 210 is to the same effect. Section 311, with relation to migrant agricultural workers, calls for State plans. Section 603(a), as to the domestic Peace Corps, calls for State plans.

Throughout the bill, the idea of State plans is frequently advanced. But it is not coupled with an opportunity—I emphasize the word "opportunity"—for State administration, if the State is able to do it, and without in any way impeding the beginning of the program or preventing the Administrator from moving into an area where the program is to be carried out in order to fulfill the most urgent needs of the country as quickly as possible.

Where there is a program whose resources are essentially seed money, essentially coordinating money, essentially money devoted to the dedication of the national purpose, the war on poverty, rather than being able to mount a complete antipoverty program itself—which it is clearly admitted the bill cannot do—it seems to me that in those instances the States must really take part in the program in an important way. I believe the bill does not provide for that. My amendment would do it in a way which would not incur the argument that it would delay, frustrate, or stop anything at any time, when the States are fully introduced into the administration of the program.

The leading welfare programs financed by the Federal Government, together with the States, are State administered.

That applies to the Kerr-Mills medical care for the aged; old age assistance; aid to dependent children; maternal child health service; crippled children's service; child welfare service; aid to the blind; aid to the disabled; unemployment compensation; the various programs for migratory labor; social security; and the public assistance programs. All of these programs are State administered.

It seems to me that what we should seek to do with this program, within its ambit of what it is capable of doing, is to give it the most competent organization, so that it may proceed with the best possible effect.

There is grave danger that if the administration of the program and its supervision are concentrated on the national level alone, it will break down through the sheer inability of the bureaucracy to give it the supervision which it requires, and that it will break down through the sheer lack of selectivity which comes from trying to look at the whole United States in the mass from right here in Washington. It will break down by too much of the burden of supervision, throwing it upon local and private agencies, without a State intermediary, and therefore becoming an uncoordinated program without reference to its basic, central purpose.

It is very much to the interest of the program itself that it should have, where practicable—and that is the only thing I provide—a firm, fundamental State base. This will be very good for the success of the program and very good for those in the country who would benefit from it.

The argument is made against this amendment that it will place the burden of proof on the Administrator; that he will have to demonstrate, where he refuses to turn anything over to a State, although the State is asking for it, that it is impracticable on the part of the State. This is a burden which, in the interest of the efficiency of the program, the Administrator should bear. This is

no different from many Federal-State programs which cannot be started in a State unless the consent of the State and the State administration has been obtained.

It is a little difficult to see how this program could be pursued in a State which was really hostile to it, or where the State government was really hostile to it.

Therefore, I believe that in opposing the amendment, those who testified before us, including the prospective Administrator, Mr. Shriver, were really tilting at windmills. Nonetheless, I believe the Senate has to face its responsibility as to how it wants the program to be run. It is a new program in the sense that it is a coordinated attack on poverty on the national level. We ought to realize that such a coordinated attack, designed to arouse the national conscience, can be extremely helpful by providing at all levels of government, as well as at the level of private initiative, a program which will be most helpful and coordinated.

Therefore to bypass the States would be a great mistake. I know it will not be possible to get every State in a position where it will assume this responsibility; but we also know that many States will. For example, I am sure that my own State of New York will, and that it will be of tremendous benefit to the program.

I do not argue that politics at the National level is nonexistent, or politics at the State level. Naturally, there will be some political considerations in any program which is operated through the Public Treasury. The important thing is that in matters of welfare, so far as it is humanly possible to get them down to a more local level than Washington, there is a greater degree of responsiveness and of local initiative than in the amorphous community which is Washington.

As a practical matter, no national administration is likely to be defeated on an issue which arises under a program of this character, unless it is of some unusual magnitude and public interest. But a State administration could easily be defeated on an issue which arises under a program of exactly this type, or it could be elected on such a basis. That is all to the good, rather than the bad.

So in summary, this is a very desirable national move. I do not see it as curing poverty in the United States. It is the beginning of a war which we hope to win, and which I think we have a good chance to win, a war which we ought to approach on a national basis.

But in order to do what we wish to do, in order to realize our objective, we must take precaution to see that the program is closely knit, well put together, well administered. This can be best obtained by having administration, where at all possible, at the State level, followed at the local levels of government.

Mr. President, I am much interested to learn that editorial opinion upon this subject has generally adopted the ideas which I have just laid before the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the leading editorial in the New York Times of July 21, entitled "Debate Over Poverty," which carries out every concept that I have just advanced to the Senate, may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEBATE OVER POVERTY

Senate conservatives led by BARRY M. GOLDWATER are mustering their forces for a counterattack against the administration's request for $962.5 million to conduct its war on poverty. Senator GOLDWATER and his comrade in arms, Senator JOHN G. TOWER, of Texas, served notice of their opposition by voting against the antipoverty program in the Labor Committee, and they will now carry their fight against "handouts" and the "institutionalization of poverty" to the Senate floor.

The administration's antipoverty bill has its shortcomings, but Mr. GOLDWATER'S criticisms do not make sense. Handouts are conspicuously absent in the proposed Job Corps, which will give basic education and work experience to teenagers, and in the work-study program, which will enable promising youngsters to go to college. The specter of increasing Federal control cannot be reconciled with the program's emphasis on community action, with Government aid specifically channeled and distributed by local groups. These projects will account for most of the funds being sought by the administration.

Far from being wasteful or overly ambitious, the antipoverty program is, we believe, too small and too limited to cope effectively with the problem. The whole idea of opening up opportunities to get people off relief and out of the rut of poverty calls for much greater stress on education and expansion of other needed public services. The program will also demand greater imagination in exploring techniques that can furnish work training and education to those who are deficient in discipline and skills.

The administration's plan represents the bare beginning of an assault against poverty. It is essential to make an initial commitment to eradicate the tangled and stubborn roots that have kept so many people from sharing in the Nation's prosperity. The debate will serve little purpose if the Republicans simply seek to oppose the administration's program. Debate will be meaningful, however, if it focuses on the flaws—the lack of any statistical criteria to evaluate projects, the gaps in education and training, the duplication of effort—that will handicap the antipoverty campaign. Even more important, the war on poverty depends on unity between Federal, local and private bodies, and avoidance of narrowly partisan discord.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I have listened with interest to the discussion of the distinguished Senator from New York in regard to the operation of the pending legislation as it affects States.

As a former Governor of a State, I am concerned about the proposals in this particular piece of proposed legislation, for while there are indications in it that the States will be consulted, I do not find any specific language which ties it into State operations. Therefore, I was wondering what suggestion the Senator from New York might have which would tie this into a State program which is not in the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to read the amendment which I propose to call up to this particular bill, which is as follows:

In carrying out the provisions of parts B and C of title I, part A of title II, and part B of title III,—

Those are the major money operatives parts of the bill—

the Director shall establish procedures which shall facilitate effective participation of the States in programs assisted under such parts. In pursuance thereof he shall use his best efforts to develop State plans to carry out the provisions of such parts and shall utilize State agencies and facilities in the administration of such parts whenever and wherever practicable, either at the initiation of programs under such parts or in the course thereof. Procedures established by the Director shall include provision for the referral of applications for assistance under such parts to the Governor of each State affected, or his designee, for such comments as he may deem appropriate in cases not otherwise provided for in this subsection.

(b) The Director is authorized to make grants to or to contract with States and appropriate State agencies for the payment of the expenses of such agencies in performing their functions under subsection (a) hereof, and for the purpose of providing technical assistance to State and local government agencies in developing, conducting, and administering programs under the parts of this Act listed in subsection (a).

What that does, if the Senator will allow me to explain it to him for a moment, is to chart a middle course between those who would have us prohibit the program from entering a State unless that State agrees and takes it over, and those who would have us agree that the Administrator shall conduct it from Washington, enlisting the States only as he might consider desirable. The middle ground is that we put the burden of proof upon the Director that if State A, for example, says, "We are ready to take over," and the Director says, "No, you are not," when he comes around for money or authority, he will have to account to us, or to the President. The bill calls for it. But the burden of proof will be on him, if he denies State A the right to take over a program when it says it is ready to take it over. On the other hand, it would not prevent him from going to State A and operating there under the program, until such time as the State says that it is ready to take it over.

That is the middle ground I have tried to chart.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. As I stated, I have not read the hearings. I am not familiar with the complete import of the language. I know the purpose and intent of the proposed legislation. But, under the bill, what would be the position of the Governor of a State? Would he have any authority whatever unless the Director of the particular agency or program wished to consult him?

Mr. JAVITS. He would have no authority to take over one of these programs unless the Director wished to turn it over to him, unless an amendment such as mine is adopted. The only

mandate on the Director is contained in section 209(a) of the bill, on page 71. If the Senator will turn to it, it will help him understand what is in the bill. I shall read it, because it is really the only language in the bill on the subject:

The Director shall establish procedures which will facilitate effective participation of the States in community action programs.

That is the major money expenditure part of the bill, which involves about a third of the bill in money expenditure—

Such procedures shall include provision for the referral of applications for assistance under this part to the Governor of each State affected, or his designee, for such comments as he may deem appropriate.

(b) The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, appropriate State agencies for the payment of the expenses of such agencies in providing technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering community action programs.

That is what is in the bill now. We had proposed to change that by inserting a section containing everything it contains plus requirements, the mandate on the Director's program, to turn over programs for State operation on the request of a State when the Director considers the State administration to be practicable.

Mr. CARLSON. As I mentioned earlier, many of us have worked with, cooperated with, and taken complete action on Federal-State programs.

As a former Governor of a State, who was an elected official of the people, it seems to me that in passing this proposed legislation, we should be certain that the Governor of a State is not bypassed, because, after all, he has a great personal and official interest in a program which would be in behalf of the people who are in need of aid in his State—the poverty program, if I may use those words.

It seems to me that the Senator from New York has made a suggestion which has great merit.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator. Let me tell him that others are probably seeking to substitute for my amendment an absolute condition precedent for State administration. I would oppose such a provision in what I consider to be an antipoverty program. I believe that the middle ground of letting the Director go in, but requiring him to show cause, as it were, why he should not turn the program over to a State on the request of a State, is the best plan to keep away from the argument that poor people will not be helped because of the obduracy of some State. At the same time, it would not deny to a State the opportunity to take over a program if it is fully able to take it over effectively.

Mr. CARLSON. If the Senator from New York will permit me, I would agree with him in that latter statement, but I assure the Senator from New York that there are many States that would be willing to cooperate effectively in a program of this type.

Mr. JAVITS. The amendment I have proposed would result in a large part of this program being under State administration in a relatively short period of time. As always happens in these programs, the States take over slowly when there is not much enthusiasm for a program. In this case, they could move as fast as 1 year. Most of the States which took over the program which was offered to them have moved within 1 year.

PRESIDENT OF NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE OPPOSED TO INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate an article which appeared in the July 6, 1964, issue of the New York Times indicating the strong opposition of Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, to H.R. 8000, the interest equalization tax bill.

Mr. Funston bases his opposition on the grounds that the measure would be ineffective as a remedy for our balance-of-payments problem and that it would discriminate against stocks.

As positive alternatives to the tax proposal he proposes two excellent alternatives: Full implementation by the Congress and the administration of the recommendations of the Presidential Task Force on the Balance of Payments—otherwise known as the Fowler Committee—and, if it becomes necessary, a voluntary capital issues committee.

As my colleagues know, I am opposed to the proposed tax. I do not believe that it would work, or that there is continued justification for the measure. Should a new balance-of-payments emergency arise in the future a much more effective approach would be needed. A capital issues committee, would, in my view, and in the view of a great many members of the financial community, do the job with far greater effectiveness.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article, as well as my July 2 statement before the Senate Finance Committee on H.R. 8000, may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times, July 6, 1964]

FUNSTON JOINS THOSE OPPOSING INTEREST-EQUALIZATION TAX BILL

(By Vartanig G. Vartan)

Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, has joined the parade of people asking Congress to reject the interest-equalization tax bill. The proposed tax, which already has cleared the House, would be levied on foreign securities purchased by Americans from foreigners.

The graduated tax scale runs up 15 percent. The bill is being pushed by the Johnson administration.

Mr. Funston made known the views of the big board over the weekend in a statement filed with the Senate Finance Committee. The committee completed public hearings last week on the legislation.

An exchange spokesman said that Mr. Funston, who did not appear in person in Washington, was on the west coast last week on a business and vacation trip.

TWO OBJECTIONS

Mr. Funston opposed the tax on two chief points. He said it would be ineffective as a remedy for the balance-of-payments deficit and also that it would discriminate against stocks.

In place of the proposed bill, he urged Congress and the administration to give full support to recommendations in the Presidential task force report on the balance of payments.

And, if necessary, Mr. Funston said, a voluntary capital issues committee could be set up to screen capital issues coming to the U.S. market from abroad.

In his statement, he scored the tax bill for being "out of step with the trend toward international cooperation, inconsistent with other U.S. policies in the international field, and alien to our own history of promoting free capital movement."

AIMED AT DEFICIT

The idea behind the proposed legislation is that by cutting down on the sales of foreign stocks and bonds in the U.S. market, it would reduce the payments deficit. This is the gap between the amount of funds flowing out of the country and amount returning.

The bill would levy a tax during the period from July 19, 1963, to December 31, 1965. One impact of the proposal already has been to lower the market prices of many foreign securities in this country and to curtail substantial trading in these issues.

"The tax should not be passed, even as a temporary measure," the exchange president said.

"Passage would offer only limited relief to our balance-of-payments position, while imposing restrictions on U.S. capital at a time when we are encouraging others to open their capital markets to foreigners."

"Enactment of this tax," he added, "will serve as a precedent for any country to justify imposing or continuing restrictions on capital flows, and raise questions about U.S. intentions in the whole payments area."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAVITS

I appreciate the opportunity to testify before this committee in opposition to H.R. 8000, the interest equalization tax bill, a measure which is of particular interest to me and to the New York financial community, and which has a critical bearing on the national economy.

Let me make it clear that I feel this measure is nothing more than a new kind of protective tariff which when enacted will not only be incapable of doing the job it is designed to do, but which can have a deleterious effect on the role of the United States as the financial center of the world. I also agree with the conclusions of many experts that there is no present emergency, and that there are alternatives better able to reduce our imbalance of international payments if any emergency arose. Of these alternatives, I believe that the creation of a capital issues committee, under the guidance of the Treasury, would be most effective.

Since the President's balance-of-payments message last July, I have repeatedly addressed myself to this subject. I would now like to summarize my position on the bill:

1. I believe that the tax is a new protective tariff designed to limit the importation of foreign securities. Viewed from the opposite point of view it is a duty on exports of private capital for investment abroad. This is a significant departure from our traditional policies regarding the free flow of capital and our postwar multilateral approach. As significant, in fact, as would be a return to high protective tariffs on U.S. imports regarding our commitment to liberalize world trade. We would be setting a very bad example to the other countries of

the Western World which we have urged to reduce their international trade barriers and to maintain, as much as possible, the highly desirable goal of freer flowing capital and exchange of goods and services between friendly countries.

2. This tax would be an exchange control of limited capacity. It would be a tax specifically designed to control and restrict. It would delegate to the President discretionary powers of application and exemption.

3. As indicated in Secretary Dillon's letter to me of May 28, 1963, an increase in U.S. long-term interest rates—which would be the effect of the proposed tax on foreign investors—would not achieve the basic objective of this measure. The Secretary stated: "even if long-term interest rates rose above those in Europe and Japan, we would expect foreign governments and corporations, particularly those needing relatively large amounts of money, to resort to the highly developed U.S. market."

Even after a 1-percent increase in the interest cost to foreign borrowers in the U.S. market it will still be cheaper, or as cheap, to borrow here as in most European countries. Underwriting costs in Europe, for example, are considerably higher than in the United States so that even with the tax, borrowing in the United States may be more attractive than borrowing elsewhere.

Furthermore, a decrease in U.S. capital supplied to foreign markets will result in an increase in demand for foreign capital and a pressure for higher interest rates abroad. While the interest rate spread between the United States and Europe initially would be reduced by about one percentage point under the bill, the spread probably would return to approximately its pretax size after the offsetting increase in foreign rates that would likely result.

4. Still valid today are the sentiments expressed in a September 1, 1963 New York Times editorial: "The tax is difficult to reconcile with President Kennedy's assertions that the present tax structure must be simplified and trade barriers reduced. The addition of the tax would complicate the tax structure and would establish a tariff on capital, putting into effect a two price system for funds. And despite the administration's claims that the tax will not interfere with the workings of the free market, it is clearly a form of control."

5. The exemptions provided for in the bill exclude from the tax the major areas of capital outflow, taxing only a relatively insignificant total of transactions—about 10 percent of total private U.S. capital exports according to careful estimates of the Association of Stock Exchange Firms. These would include the purchase of foreign stocks and the purchase of new foreign bonds (other than Canadian, which are exempt) where the borrower is precluded from obtaining the funds from a bank. Since most lending abroad—and for the most part foreign bonds—are purchased by U.S. institutional investors such as banks, insurance companies and the like, the net effect is to permit banks to lend money abroad tax free, but to deny to the other institutional investors the same right. The foreign borrower is "funneled" into the bank loan route. Interestingly, U.S. bank loans to foreigners have increased since the tax was proposed. Preliminary Treasury, Commerce and FRB figures indicate that commercial bank loans to foreigners have more than tripled: from approximately $400 million in 1962 to $1.28 billion in 1963. I might also add that direct investments which are exempt from the tax, have exceeded the net outflow caused by new securities in every year since 1960, including 1963 and the first quarter of 1964. The bill also provides exemption from the tax on original or new issues where the President determines that it is required for the stability of the international monetary system. This loophole could severely limit its effect on the U.S. balance of payments, which is already weakened by numerous exemptions.

6. The tax would be inequitable because it would penalize the small investor who would be subject to the tax on the purchase of a few shares or a few bonds of a foreign corporation, while a large company, or a wealthy individual could purchase tax free a substantial interest in the same foreign corporation. The bill exempts from the tax purchases involving 10 percent or more of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock of the foreign corporation.

7. The tax might very well worsen our balance-of-payments position Dr. Lawrence Krause, of the Brookings Institution, has noted that "you must always distinguish between improving the balance of payments and stopping a capital flow. These are not identical. You may deter some capital flow and you pay for it in lower exports or some other feedback in the balance of payments." The program to tax American capital investments abroad thus may offset the benefits to efforts to increase U.S. exports.

8. Nearly every witness before this committee and the House Ways and Means Committee who was questioned about the interest equalization tax proposal either opposed it or supported it only with the greatest reluctance. Even its advocates have admitted that it would not be desirable as a permanent measure, yet experience suggests that such "temporary taxes" often become permanent.

In spite of this general lack of enthusiasm, the administration continues to press for its approval with the unconvincing argument that if the bill does not pass, foreigners will feel that the United States is not serious about eliminating its balance-of-payments deficit. In fact, rejection of this tax will strengthen the confidence of foreigners in the strength of our adherence to basic and oft-stated principles of a national policy of free and open world markets for goods and capital.

The proposed tax would erect an artificial wall to the free flow of private capital with longrun effects that would be damaging to both our domestic economy and our foreign economic policy. The New York Times commented editorially on July 24, 1963: "This measure is inconsistent with the position of the United States as the world's banker and with the long-standing objective of lowering barriers to trade and capital movements. Instead, it suggests that we are regressing toward direct controls over capital, which led to the breakdown of international finance a generation ago."

9. The persistent deficit in our balance of payments is not attributable to private investment abroad. As the Brookings Institution recent report on the balance of payments pointed out, receipts of dividends and interest on U.S. investment abroad have consistently exceeded new outflows of U.S. capital to foreign countries, with the exception of the 1957–58 period. The Brookings study said that, although earnings primarily reflect investments made in previous years, recent new U.S. investments abroad already seem to be contributing to higher return flows to the United States.

In his message of July 18, 1963, introducing the proposed interest equalization tax, the late President Kennedy pointed out that total U.S. foreign investments amounted to an estimated $72 billion, including approximately $12 billion of relatively low-yield loans extended to foreign governments by the U.S. Government and such agencies as the Export-Import Bank. Of the remaining $60 billion, the so-called "direct investments" account for approximately $47 billion, while "portfolio investments" are estimated at roughly $12.5 billion. Total 1963 income enjoyed by the United States on account of foreign investments was estimated by the President at $4.3 billion, which is the largest income item on the U.S. balance of payments.

It is, therefore, not surprising that so much criticism is directed at the proposed legislation. While few can argue against the need for effective measures designed to create equilibrium in our balance of payments, many are appalled at the thought that the interest equalization tax is directed against the one type of capital export which contributes more toward a future equilibrium than any segment of our economy.

I would now like to comment briefly about developments here in this country and abroad since last July which I believe call for a reappraisal of the need for the bill at this time.

Since the introduction of this measure there have been several important developments which already have and will continue to have in the future a favorable impact on our balance of payments.

The condition of economic growth in Europe and the relatively slow growth in the United States has been reversed. By the time H.R. 8000 was proposed in July 1963, both the U.S. economy and the U.S. securities markets were outstripping their oversea counterparts. Growing labor cost produced by a shortage of workers and increasing production costs and spiraling prices have produced the familiar profits squeeze in Europe and have slowed growth. American investors also have been taking a much harder look at European companies. Recent financial difficulties experienced by Machines Bull in France and Olivetti in Italy have led to wide concern about the thin capitalization of many foreign companies.

European capital markets have expanded their internal lending activities significantly in recent years, even prior to the introduction of the proposed tax. This is a conclusion reached by a Treasury study entitled, "A Description and Analysis of Certain European Capital Markets," prepared for the Joint Economic Committee in connection with its study last year on the U.S. balance of payments. This expansion has already resulted in increased markets for foreign securities in Europe. According to Secretary Dillon's testimony Monday, sales of foreign securities in European capital markets increased from $200 million during the first half of 1963 to $600 million during the same period in 1964. This expansion has made possible the financing of projects from domestic sources previously financed with capital obtained in the United States.

Since the passage of the tax cut early this year, our investment climate has improved and investment for plant equipment has increased substantially. Such investments were 3 percent higher during the first quarter of 1964 than had been anticipated as late as December 1963. The total of such investments for 1964 is expected to reach $43.9 billion, 10 percent above the fourth quarter of 1963, and 12 percent above 1963 as a whole. In striking comparison, the actual increase in capital spending between 1962 and 1963 was only 5 percent (increasing from $37 to $39 billion). The improved investment climate created by the tax cut has attracted U.S. investment which would have otherwise been invested abroad and may attract additional foreign investment to the United States.

Another factor that must be considered is the substantial expansion of our exports. Between 1962 and 1963, U.S. merchandise exports increased by $1.4 billion, from $20.6 billion to $21.9 billion compared with an increase of $566 million between 1961 and 1962. During the first quarter of this year, our exports were running at an annual rate of over $24 billion, 21 percent higher than in the first quarter of 1963. It is not very likely that this increase will be sustained throughout the year; nevertheless, such factors as the stability of prices in the United States

and continued inflation in Europe and more effective export promotion techniques will be of assistance in maintaining our exports at a high level. On the other hand just such a factor as this interest equalization tax could put a real damper on it.

We must also take into consideration that in contrast to preceding years the gold outflow has declined substantially in 1963—our gold stock declined by $460 million as compared with $900 million in 1962—and during April 1964 our gold stock has actually increased by $178 million.

The most regrettable aspect of this measure is that it is another piecemeal attempt to deal with a problem which is much more fundamental; that is, the inadequacy of the international monetary system. This system was created in the immediate post-World War II period at a time when the major changes which have taken place in the subsequent 16 years were not foreseen. The modernization of that system requires a new look at the adjustment process inherent in the present system and at the manner in which international credit is created by the system. Today it takes years to eliminate major international imbalances unless they are corrected by measures which hamper economic growth and world trade. There is a need for the development of a more flexible adjustment process—in the area of prices, wages, fiscal and monetary policies, interest rates—which permits the speedy restoration of balance-of-payments equilibrium without placing excessive penalties on one or another member of the system. There is also a need to provide for adequate international credit to permit a rapid expansion of international trade and financial transactions.

Today, New York is the preeminent financial market of the world. This is of great economic and political importance. We displaced London as the world's financial center because of the World Wars and the ensuing limitations that Great Britain had to impose upon its capital markets.

If we can help it—and we can—we should not lose our present preeminence to Paris, London, Zurich or any other financial center.

This bill, coming on the heels of the April 27 report issued by the Fowler Committee—the Presidential Task Force on the Balance of Payments—which suggests effective approaches to our balance-of-payments problem on the basis of cooperative steps by government and private enterprise, may very well confuse our friends overseas. On the one hand, we put barriers in the way of U.S. citizens purchasing foreign securities, while on the other, we propose to persuade foreigners to buy more U.S. securities.

What about alternatives? Of the several alternatives proposed I would recommend to the committee's attention two possible approaches contained in two amendments I introduced yesterday:

(1) To give to the President, in lieu of the interest equilization tax, standby authority to bring into existence a capital issues committee to regulate the outflow of new securities; (2) should the committee decide to favor the present bill, it should be amended to exempt from the tax any new debt or equity issue of a foreign issuer or obligor if not more than 25 percent of the principal amount of bonds or number of shares of the aggregate issue sold are sold to U.S. persons. In addition the Secretary of the Treasury would have discretionary authority to increase or decrease the specified percentage applicable to all issues from time to time, in accordance with the Treasury's view on the U.S. balance of payments.

I am opposed to the tax in its present form. I do not believe that present circumstances call for it. Should a new balance-of-payments emergency arise, however, the Congress should give the President effective authority to deal with this situation. A capital issues committee, composed of representatives of the financial community under the guidance of the Treasury or Federal Reserve Board, could effectively limit the sale of foreign security issues to U.S. citizens, residents, or to domestic corporations, or other entities, public or private.

There is precedent for this amendment in section 708 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, which resulted in the formation of the Voluntary Credit Restraints Committee during the Korean war period.

There are several advantages to this approach. Such a committee would only be established for the duration of an emergency and could be dismantled at will. That would not be the case with the tax, which would remain in effect at least until the end of 1965 whether needed or not and a law would have to be passed to abolish it beforehand.

Finally and very importantly, whereas the interest equalization tax is new and untried—no one has had any experience with it in actual operation—a capital issues committee is a tried and true operation, which has not only been used in this country, but in Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and France as well. It is known and trusted in Western Europe. The Swiss National Bank and the central banks of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and France exercise reviewing authority over foreign security issues either alone or jointly with private financial institutions. Therefore, the proposal for a capital issues committee is not a new one. I may add that it has the support of respected members of the financial community in the United States, including the Association of Stock Exchange Firms.

The second alternative is based on a proposal made by Nathaniel Samuels of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., of New York, and chairman of the Foreign Investment Committee of the Investment Bankers Association of America. I believe this proposal has a great deal of merit which would make possible the tax-free entry into the U.S. capital market of at least a certain percentage of new foreign security issues, thereby enabling the U.S. capital market to retain its preeminent position as the world financial center.

In summary, my position is that the proposed bill is not now necessary, and even if an emergency arose, it would be unequal to the task assigned to it. I also believe that there are alternatives available that would be more effective in correcting our imbalance in international payments if a new emergency arose.

SENATOR AIKEN'S SPEECH AT REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION NOMINATING SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH FOR PRESIDENT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] at the Republican National Convention, nominated for the Presidency one of the most outstanding Members of this body, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH.

I ask unanimous consent to have his nominating speech printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. Chairman and delegates, I intend to nominate for President one of the most capable persons I have ever known and one with whom I have been associated in public service for 24 years.

I don't like to start a nominating speech with a confession, but the circumstances are compelling.

In introducing my candidate, I find myself in a most peculiar position; I am severely restricted in what I can offer for your support.

I can't promise you a Cabinet job, an Ambassador's appointment—or even a shot at a nice Government contract.

I can't even offer you cigars or chewing gum.

For a while, it looked real promising. I thought I could at least invite you all out for coffee because I knew my candidate was having checks and $10 and $1 bills and pennies sent her from most every State in the Union. Pennies came from schoolchildren—and dollars from low-income people who couldn't afford it. Then there were some beautiful checks in three and four figures from real important business people.

The outlook looked as rosy as a Pacific sunset.

You and I were going to have a wonderful time here in San Francisco.

Then do you know what happened?

Do you know what my candidate pulled on me?

She took every big check—every little check—every $10 bill—every $1 bill and every penny and sent them straight back to where they came from. My candidate wants the nomination solely on her record and her qualifications for the job. And that's why I can't offer you any candy or cigars or chewing gum or even ask you all out for a cup of coffee.

The only thing in the world left for me to offer you for your support is the best managed government the United States ever had—a government headed by the best qualified person you ever voted for.

Before setting forth the qualifications of the candidate I shall shortly present to you, let it be distinctly understood that I am concerned solely with the nomination of one who is best qualified for the job and who can bring victory to our party in November.

I am not making this nomination for the purpose of embarrassing any other candidate.

I intend to support the nominee of this convention next November.

What do we have a President for?

Certainly not to do just those things which you and I as individuals would like to have done.

Certainly not to run this country exactly as he or she would like to run it.

If that is the way we feel, we should promptly scrap our Constitution and become a monarchy.

Until we reach that state of political depravity, however, the President of the United States will be required to perform the duties of the office as set forth by our Constitution and to administer laws and carry out programs as laid down by the Congress.

In carrying out programs and administering laws as determined by the Congress, the President will necessarily use the great powers which originally were vested in the Congress but which have long since been delegated to the executive branch.

There are some Republicans who still insist that Congress rescind these delegations of authority.

Let us not kid ourselves, however. The next President, whether Republican or Democrat, and regardless of race, creed, color or sex, is not going to recommend that Congress rescind the powers that have been delegated to the White House over the past century.

In view of this situation, it is far more important to elect a person of integrity and ability to the Presidency—one who owes allegiance to no special interests—either domestic or foreign—one who will conscientiously perform the duties of the office as prescribed by the Constitution—than it is to

elect one on the premise that he or she may agree with our particular viewpoints.

I have definite ideas as to the qualifications our candidate for President should have. I say unequivocally that the candidate I will propose most nearly meets that criteria.

1. A President should have integrity. Whether dealing with foreign nations or the folks at home, integrity is a priceless asset. My candidate stands ace high in this respect.

2. A President should have ability. Good intentions alone are not enough. We don't want the floors of the White House paved with good intentions.

If my candidate does not have ability, then the 44 universities and colleges that have awarded her degrees based solely on merit have been wrong.

3. A President should have had wide experience in government.

Well, if 24 years' experience on the roughest, toughest, committees of the Congress—Defense, Space, Appropriations, Government Operations and Rules don't qualify my candidate then the other candidates whose names are being submitted to you cannot possibly be qualified for none of them can approach her record.

4. A President should have courage—courage to stand for the right when it may not be popular to do so—courage to stand for decency in the conduct of public affairs—courage to stand alone if necessary against formidable odds.

Does my candidate have this kind of courage?

I can refer you to several high ranking officers of the U.S. Armed Forces who have learned from experience that she is ably qualified in this respect.

As a sincere testimonial to her courage the Reserve Officers Association has recently designated her as "Minute Man of the Year"—the first time that this great honor has ever been conferred upon a person of her sex.

5. A President should have commonsense.

My candidate stands par excellence in this respect.

Time and again I have watched her keep her head "when all about her were losing theirs" and blaming it on everyone but themselves.

She wants to get things done that ought to be done—and she wants them done right.

She does not panic when things don't go to suit her. She just keeps on headed for her goal—which at this moment is the Republican nomination for the Presidency.

We need a candidate that does not panic in a crisis, not even a campaign crisis.

Nor should we support a candidate just because we are partial to any particular industry either at home or abroad. We don't want an industry in the White House. We want a living, capable, conscientious human being.

We want to nominate and elect a President who will promote the interests of our Nation both at home and abroad with impartial consideration for all.

We want a candidate who enjoys the confidence of people in all walks of life.

The one I shall nominate has demonstrated time and again that she "can walk with kings nor lose the common touch."

She never forgets her own people and the glare of glory has never turned her head.

The record majorities which the people of her home State have given her with each passing election are eloquent testimony to this trait of her character.

Her conduct during this campaign has been rather unusual. She has not neglected her work in the Senate to chase down delegates to this convention. The job she was elected to do has come first.

Running solely on her record and her qualifications for the office, she has spent no money for advertising—has hired no paid workers—has made no promises—and will have nothing to do with the wheeling and dealing—the trading and raiding practices which I understand have sometimes been used in political campaigns.

I now ask you two questions:

Do you want the United States to have good government? If you do—then vote for the candidate best qualified to give good government.

Do you want to win the November election? If you do—then vote for the candidate who enjoys the confidence and respect of all people and who can get the votes necessary to win.

I am now proud to nominate that candidate—Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH of the State of Maine.

CONSTRUCTION AT CERTAIN MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10300) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report, and in connection therewith I have a brief statement to make.

The report was signed by all conferees on the part of the House and the Senate and has been agreed to by the House.

In regard to the net money figures in the bill, the sum total agreed to in conference is $1,534,994,000, which is only $13,162,000 above the amount granted by the Senate and $55,672,000 below the amount of the House-passed bill, for a net reduction of about $316 million below the amount requested.

Of the 80 points of difference between the Senate and the House versions of the bill, the House receded on 67 and the remainder were settled with little difficulty, as can be seen from the relatively small increase over the amount granted by the Senate.

There were no major changes made in the Senate-passed bill by the conferees. The Senate conferees receded only on those items where additional evidence seemed to indicate the projects were sound and to the advantage of the Government. This slight increase consists almost entirely of projects at six locations; namely, two academic facilities for the Army, two relocation projects which will permit a savings to the Government, an aircraft rework hangar, and three operational items at Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico.

There is one language provision that I wish to mention, and that is section 605 of the general provisions. This is an annual provision that has been carried in the bill for several years and requires that contracts for construction provided for in the bill be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy. This year the House modified the language to require this work to be divided between these two construction agencies on an equal basis when practicable. The Senate Committee did not consider this to be a practical amendment and deleted it. Principally involved is the construction for the Air Force, of which 70 percent is now performed by the Corps of Engineers and 30 percent by the Bureau of Yards and Docks. The Engineers have more offices located throughout the interior of the country than the Bureau of Yards and Docks, the latter being generally located along the coast. Thus, the Corps of Engineers is generally more strategically located to handle the work of the Air Force. Had the House language prevailed, it would have required, at least in theory, an increase in personnel for the Bureau of Yards and Docks and perhaps the opening of additional offices, with a comparable reduction in the Corps of Engineers. The House conferees insisted, however, that some addition to the annual language of section 605 was necessary to establish a more competitive spirit between the two construction agencies and to secure the most economical cost to the Government. Therefore the conferees agreed on compromise language which in effect permits the department or agency requiring such construction to select either of the construction agencies, as long as such selections will not result in any increased cost to the United States. The Senate conferees agreed with the understanding that the legislative history be established through the report of the managers, that this provision and the compromise language would not be so interpreted as to require the Department to disregard standards of economy and efficiency for the purpose of achieving statistical equality, and with a further understanding that the Office of the Secretary of Defense will prescribe the standards and the manner in which they will be applied.

Mr. President, I am confident the results achieved are sound and that the construction needs of the military and the defense agencies have been adequately provided for in fiscal year 1965.

I move the adoption of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2642) to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in 1946 Congress declared:

It is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy * * * to coordinate and use all its plans, functions and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

These words are from the policy statement of the Employment Act of 1946. Today, we are considering the most important public welfare proposal to come before Congress in the 18 years since the passage of the Employment Act. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is a logical extension of the 1946 legislation.

With the enactment of this bill it will be "the policy of the United States to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty in this Nation by opening to everyone the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity. It is the purpose of this act to strengthen, supplement, and coordinate efforts in furtherance of that policy." The above quotation is from "Findings and Declaration of Purpose," section 1, Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The Council of Economic Advisers defines poverty as the inability to satisfy minimum needs. Using income of $3,000 as a standard for a 4-person family and applying this to 1962 data, they find 20 percent of all families living in poverty. Three thousand dollars a year for a 4-person family would average $750 a year per person. The Council recognizes that a case could be made for setting the overall income limit either higher or lower than $3,000, thereby changing the statistical measure of the size of the problem.

But the analysis of the sources of poverty—

The Council rightly suggests—

would remain substantially unchanged.

The Council report goes on to point out:

No measure of poverty as simple as the one used here, would be suitable for determining eligibility for particular benefits or participation in particular programs. Nevertheless, it provides a valid benchmark for assessing the dimensions of the task of eliminating poverty, setting the broad goals of policy, and measuring our past and future progress toward their achievement.

Mr. President, the above quotation is from the Council of Economic Advisers' statements.

The sum of $3,000 provides a weekly income of less than $60 for a family of four. Assuming that one-third of this income is spent on food, amounting to $5 per person per week, $2,000 remains. With a minimum of $800 to be spent on housing—whether for rent or for mortgage payments—heat and utilities, only $1,200 is left—less than $25 a week—to be spent for remaining essentials: clothing, transportation, school supplies and books, home furnishings and supplies, medical care, recreation, and insurance. The sum of $3,000 is obviously not too long a yardstick with which to measure the extent of poverty when we consider that that is the yardstick that the Council of Economic Advisers selected for a family of four.

There are cold facts indeed, Mr. President, and they are disturbing. But they are not nearly so distressing as the stories of the individual human being who exist behind the figures. One may quarrel if he must with the sources of the statistics, or with the $3,000 boundary for a family of four. But those who are critical cannot dispute the plight of the economically depressed. Those without adequate economic opportunity may be one-fifth or they may—as some critics have claimed—comprise one-tenth of our Nation. It makes no difference. We cannot in all true honesty deny the fact of their existence, and we must commit ourselves to recognizing that there is a human being behind every statistic.

Although as a nation we have been making progress in increasing economic opportunity, our rate of progress appears to be slowing down. From 1947 to 1956 the number of economically depressed families decreased from 11.9 million to 9.9 million, or from 32 percent to 23 percent of all families. But for the period from 1957 through 1962 the number decreased to 20 percent, a drop of just 3 percent, or in other words to 9.3 million families, a drop of only 600,000 families.

The Council of Economic Advisers points out that "even if poverty should decline at the relatively more rapid rate of the 1947–56 period, there would still be 10 percent of the Nation's families in poverty in 1980. And, if the decline in poverty proceeded at the slower rate achieved from 1957 on, 13 percent of our families would still have incomes under $3,000 in 1980." We cannot in good conscience leave the further elimination of inadequate economic opportunity to the general progress of the economy when we have ample resources to attack poverty more directly. With a gross national product of over $625 billion, we are the richest Nation and the richest people who have ever existed in the history of the earth.

For most of the economic history of the United States, low incomes were a characteristic of a considerable part of the population. In the last few decades low incomes have increasingly become the province of certain groups.

First. The following are the low-income groups: In 1962, families headed by individuals 65 years of age and over made up only 14 percent of all families but comprised 34 percent of low-income families.

Second. Families headed by a person with 8 years of education or less were only 35 percent of all families, but comprised 61 percent of low-income families.

Third. Families headed by females were only 10 percent of all families, but made up 25 percent of low-income families—the widow struggling to support her children.

Fourth. Nonwhite families were only 10 percent of the population while totaling 22 percent of the low-income group.

Fifth. Rural families comprised 29 percent of all families, but made up 48 percent of low-income families.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have table 1 printed at this point in the RECORD. This table contains statistics on the five categories just mentioned.

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

TABLE 1.—*Selected characteristics of all families and of poor families, 1962*

Selected characteristics	Number of families (millions)		Percent of total	
	All families	Poor families	All families	Poor families
Total	47.0	9.3	100	100
Age of head:				
14 to 24 years	2.5	.8	5	8
25 to 54 years	30.4	3.9	65	42
55 to 64 years	7.3	1.4	16	15
65 years and over	6.8	3.2	14	34
Education of head: [1]				
8 years or less	16.3	6.0	35	61
9 to 11 years	8.6	1.7	19	17
12 years	12.2	1.5	26	15
More than 12 years	9.3	.7	20	7
Sex of head:				
Male	42.3	7.0	90	75
Female	4.7	2.3	10	25
Labor force status of head: [2]				
Not in civilian labor force	8.4	4.1	18	44
Employed	36.9	4.6	78	49
Unemployed	1.7	.6	4	6
Color of family:				
White	42.4	7.3	90	78
Nonwhite	4.6	2.0	10	22
Children under 18 years of age in family:				
None	18.8	4.9	40	52
1 to 3	22.7	3.3	48	36
4 or more	5.5	1.1	12	11
Earners in family:				
None	3.8	2.8	8	30
1	21.1	4.3	45	46
2 or more	22.1	2.2	47	23
Regional location of family: [3] [4]				
Northeast	11.5	1.6	25	17
North central	13.1	2.3	29	25
South	13.5	4.3	30	47
West	7.0	1.0	16	11
Residence of family: [4] [5]				
Rural farm	3.3	1.5	7	16
Rural nonfarm	9.9	2.7	22	30
Urban	31.9	5.0	71	54

[1] Based on 1961 income (1962 prices).
[2] Labor force status relates to survey week of March 1963.
[3] Based on 1960 residence and 1959 income (1962 prices).
[4] Data are from 1960 census and are therefore not strictly comparable with the other data shown in this table, which are derived from Current Population Reports.
[5] Based on 1959 residence and 1959 income (1962 prices).

NOTE.—Data relate to families and exclude unrelated individuals. Poor families are defined as all families with total money income of less than $3,000.

Sources: Department of Commerce and Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a study sponsored by the National Policy Committee on Pockets of Poverty concludes:

The greater concentration of the population with poverty-linked characteristics at

the low-income levels of 1960 appears due to the fact that persons that moved out of low levels of income between 1948 and 1960 were predominantly those without those social and demographic characteristics which have been found to be associated with a high risk of poverty.

This describes, in other words, those families that are described in the categories mentioned above.

The legislation that we are dealing with now is the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. I think that is a far better name for the act than the Antipoverty Act. The bill is intended to create economic opportunities. It is not created for the purpose of handing out a dole. It is for the purpose of creating opportunities so that people might have the means, through jobs, education, and capital to be employed and help themselves.

Mr. President, in fighting a war one of the most important things is to identify your targets. In the planning of the war on poverty this principle was adhered to. Today's economically depressed are readily identifiable. The Economic Opportunity Act is designed to make a massive frontal attack on all the diverse causes of inadequate opportunity.

There are five main categories. The Economic Opportunity Act is intended to increase the economic opportunities of these individuals who have little chance for advancement under existing conditions, regardless of the fact that we are now in a period of high prosperity.

This legislation deals first of all with the problems of low income among our young people. If current trends continue, in 5 years we will have almost a million and a half unemployed youths between the ages of 16 and 21. These young people, unskilled and unemployed, will face a rather dismal future unless action is taken to give them a chance for developing the skills necessary to make them employable.

This bill authorizes a Job Corps consisting of rural conservation camps and urban training centers for young men and women aged 16 to 21. The programs of the camps and training centers will be flexible, adaptable to the needs of those participating, and adaptable to the needs of our changing economy. Basic education, outdoor work experience, and vocational training will be provided.

Second, a work-training program will offer useful work in public service jobs.

The third part of the attack on poverty in connection with youth without adequate education is a college work-study program which will enable many able but needy students to complete their college education.

Mr. President, half of the top 30 percent of high school graduates in America never go through the doors of a college because their families lack the means to send them there. The bill authorizes $412,500,000 for these three youth programs during fiscal year 1965.

To me that is really the heart of the program, because the way to end poverty is to train children in their youth. We should train the vast number of school dropouts, the untrained, and the unemployed and unemployable children that we are talking about, to earn a living. We should give them the necessary skills to hold a job, and they will hold it. Then we will not have decades and decades of poverty in the same family.

Acknowledging the wisdom of attacking economic and social problems on the local level whenever possible, the bill authorizes $340 million for financing community action and adult education programs to aid communities, cities, towns, counties, and States in carrying forward their own programs to upgrade the lives of the people and give them work in jobs, educational opportunities, and to improve their economic level and their participation in the full life of our Nation.

Low interest loans will be made to small businessmen for establishing and strengthening small business concerns, with particular emphasis on providing jobs for the long-term unemployed. Unemployed people with families to support are especially hard hit, and these individuals will receive assistance in getting back on their feet through work experience programs.

Mr. President, all of these programs were conceived through a realistic appraisal of the needs of our society in an industrial age, and, I might add, in an age of automation, an age of computers, an age in which many able-bodied Americans are being thrown out of jobs every year through automation. The emphasis throughout the bill is on education, training, and jobs which will enable people to help themselves.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS TO COMBAT POVERTY IN RURAL AREAS

Mr. President, during the 1950's we became aware of a unique kind of economic problem existing in some rural areas: inadequate incomes that did not seem to be affected by the general growth of the economy or by a decade of relatively favorable prices for farm commodities.

According to the last census median incomes of urban families were $6,166; by comparison, median incomes of rural farm and rural nonfarm families were $3,228 and $4,756, respectively.

The Department of Agriculture draws the following profile of the rural poor in the United States:

Nearly half the low income families in the United States are in the rural areas. The proportion of low income families is nearly twice as great in the country as in the city. One in every three rural families has a cash income under $3,000 a year.

The low income families living in rural areas experience conditions that are the virtual antithesis of the American way of life. They live in substandard, often unsanitary homes, suffer from inadequate diets, go without adequate medical care, have access to far less education and training than the rest of the community, and participate little in the benefits and pleasures of modern American society.

Sixty-six percent of the 1.2 million farmworker families and unrelated individuals with a substantial dependence on agriculture live on incomes inadequate to satisfy minimum needs. The hired farmworker and his family are beset by low wage rates and a short average duration of work. The average farmworker received about 88 cents an hour in 1963, compared with an average hourly wage rate in manufacturing industries of $2.46.

Mr. President, the chief problem associated with the inadequate incomes of rural people is unemployment and underemployment. Several recently enacted programs—the Vocational Education Act, the Manpower Development and Retraining Act, and the rural areas development program—are already in operation and are making headway in dealing with rural unemployment.

Several titles of this bill are directed at rural youth, to give the children of rural families with inadequate incomes the opportunity to be educated and trained, which so many of them today do not have. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has said:

The educational enrichment programs that are contemplated under title II and the Job Corps, the work-training program, and the work-study program authorized under title I will be of enormous value in bringing new opportunity to rural children who will never get that opportunity otherwise. They will make the American ideal of equal opportunity come alive for families for whom that phrase has been a mockery.

THE BOXED-IN FAMILIES

There is one group which has not been mentioned yet, Mr. President. They have not yet been mentioned, but at long last they are not being overlooked. Of the group, Secretary Freeman has said:

We estimate that about 1 million of the 1.5 million farmers in the low-income group have no future anywhere but on the farm because of their lack of education, their lack of skill or experience in anything but farming, or their age, or a physical handicap, or a combination of these make them unlikely candidates for retraining or for success in city life. These young people can be retrained, and many of them may have to leave their home communities. But the 1 million farmers are "boxed-in." The only opportunity for a better living for them is right where they are—on their farms.

Mr. President, in recent years we have heard some people say that the small substandard farmer should leave his farm since it is uneconomical. I point out that those 1 million farmers cannot leave their farms for anything except to get in a breadline in a city. They should not be forced off their farms. They can be self-sustaining there.

Statistics for 1960 compiled by the Census Bureau indicate that of the 1,583,000 rural low-income families living on farms, 343,000 are headed by people 65 or over; 505,000 are headed by people 45 to 64 with less than 8 years of school, and 152,000 by people 25 to 44 with less than 8 years of school.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table with detailed statistics as to those families.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Age-education charac'eristics of the heads of rural poverty families: Limited mobility and mobility potential groups

[In thousands]

Group and age-education characteristics	Number with rural nonfarm residence	Number with rural farm residence
1. Total (all ages)	2,852	1,583.0
2. Limited mobility (subtotal)	1,750	1,000.0
Likely to remain in local area:		
(a) Heads 25 to 44 years of age, mostly with 8th grade education or less	[1] 186	[2] 152.0
(b) Heads 45 to 64 years of age, mostly with 8th grade education or less	[1] 750	[2] 505.0
(c) Heads 65 years or older	814	343.0
3. Mobility potential group (subtotal)	1,102	583.0
(a) Heads under 25 years of age:		
Completed 8th grade or less	69	24.5
More than 8th grade education	129	24.5
(b) Heads 25 to 44 years of age	[1] 627	[2] 300.0
(c) Heads 45 to 64 years of age, mostly with more than 8th grade education	[1] 187	[2] 196.0
(d) Heads 65 years or older	90	38.0

[1] Estimates based on following: (a) 70.2 percent of all heads of rural nonfarm families, aged 25–64 and 83.2 percent of corresponding heads aged 65 years or over had 8 years schooling or less; (b) an estimated 80 percent of heads 45 to 64 years had completed 8 years schooling or less; (c) a judgment on the relative importance of age, education, sex, location of residence, race, family composition, level of assets, health and other poverty-linked factors on the relative mobility and employment potential of rural families.

[2] Estimates based on following: (a) 69.2 percent of all heads of rural farm families, aged 25 to 64 and 82.5 percent of corresponding heads aged 65 years and over had 8 years schooling or less; (b) an estimated 80 percent of heads 45 to 64 years had completed 8 years schooling or less; (c) a judgment on the relative importance of age, education, sex, location of residence, race, family composition, level of assets, health and other poverty-linked factors on the relative mobility and employment potential of rural families.

Source: Adapted from U.S. Census of Population, 1960.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, these people already own farms, and they know how to operate them. They are found in the low income group because they lack resources, and the vicious cycle of inadequate production keeps them from accumulating resources. They produce little; they therefore earn little. They thus have little or nothing to invest in developing their farms. And having no debt-paying ability, they are presently ineligible for loans from the Farmers Home Administration, which must make the loan only when the debt paying ability exists.

Title III provides a package of grants and loans to low income farm families, the purpose being to break into this vicious cycle and give these families a boost so that by the combination of a small injection of capital and their own hard work they may at least be able to pull themselves up to the subsistence level.

Grants of up to $1,500 and loans up to $2,500 could be used to buy feed, seed, fertilizer, livestock, poultry, fencing, various kinds of equipment, and additional land.

To be eligible for a capital grant, the applicant must: First, be the operator of not larger than a family farm; second, demonstrate character, industry, and intent to utilize the grant to raise his level of living permanently; third, be unable to maintain a satisfactory level of income but have reasonable prospects, with the assistance of a grant or a loan-grant combination, of raising his income sufficiently to improve his living standard; and, fourth, be unable to obtain credit for the desired purposes elsewhere.

The capital grants will be administered through the Farmers Home Administration, whose county supervisors serve all rural areas in the United States. The size of the grant will be the amount of money required for the needed improvements which cannot be financed through a loan while maintaining a minimal standard of living. In other words, as large a percentage of the improvements as possible will be financed through loans. Grants will only be made when absolutely necessary.

Under the proposed program, it is envisioned that capital grants would be made to 45,000 farm families. The average grant is expected to be $500. The Farmers Home Administration will provide intensive farm and home management assistance, so that through the combination of grants, loans, and management assistance the low income farm families can hope to increase their earnings and their standard of living substantially over a relatively short period of time.

This program is justified on two grounds: First, it is the only way to get the families back on their feet. Second, the alternative is far more costly. If these families are forced off of the land and go to the cities, relief payments will soon exceed the maximum that families can be granted under this bill—$1,500.

Public assistance in the United States now totals $4.6 billion a year, and has been rising at the rate of one-third billion dollars per year. Families of the type we are dealing with here, forced off the land, account for a large part of the problem. The small grants will prove far cheaper in the long run than relief payment. It is cheaper and better to buy a farm family a cow than to buy milk in bottles, day after day, for the children of that family in the city.

Fears have been expressed in some quarters that this section of the bill will add to the output of food and fiber already in surplus. These fears are groundless, Mr. President. Small farmers on marginal and subsistence units produce well under 1 percent of the total national production of commodities in surplus. They produce mostly crops which are not in surplus. Most of the production resulting from financing under the antipoverty program will be used on their own farms or sold in local neighborhood and area markets.

FAMILY FARM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. President, speculative buying of farmland has been pushing the price of farmland up at the rate of 3 percent a year. Last year 34 percent of all sales of farmland went to nonfarmers. The Nation's 100,000 largest farms now control one-fourth of all farmland.

The Nation's economically weakest farm families are unable to compete in the race for this fundamental agricultural resource. They can in some instances get loans to cover the normal value of the land, but they cannot raise enough to cover the inflated, or market value of the land.

To cope with this situation, section 303 would authorize loans and grants to State and local, public and private nonprofit corporations to enable them to purchase and resell farmland to low-income family farmers. They would buy at the going market rate. They would sell at the normal or appraised value of the land. No Federal agency would be authorized to purchase and hold farmland, although capitalization of the local corporations would be mainly, but not entirely, through Federal loans.

The fallacious argument has been made that section 303 loans and grants will encourage the formation of farm units too small and inefficient for modern-day farming. The truth is that most purchases under this section will be additions to already existing farms, to make those farms more efficient and to increase the family's potential for earning a living. In those instances where large tracts of land are subdivided into family farms, Farmers Home Administration supervisors will assist the local corporations in determining efficiently sized units so that a practical and economically sound operation will be insured.

The majority of farm purchases under this section will be made through Farmers Home Administration loans. These loans will not be made unless the agency's local supervisor is assured that the loan applicant has the background, training, and ability to operate a farm efficiently and economically.

Finally, Mr. President, section 303 authorizes loans to local cooperative associations furnishing essential processing, purchasing, or marketing services, supplies, or facilities predominantly to low-income rural families. Though most in need of cooperatives, low-income rural people are in the least favorable position to organize and support such organizations. Loans under section 303 will provide financing in the crucial early stages of the development of the cooperatives.

The sum of $35 million for fiscal 1965 is authorized for the foregoing sections of title III.

Part B of title III authorizes $15 million for the development and implementation of programs of housing, sanitation, day care of children, and education for migrant agricultural workers.

AMERICA'S SHIFTING FRONTIER

Mr. President, the history of the American Nation can be seen as the relentless, continual pushing back of one frontier after another. The first frontier which we faced was geographical. From small beginnings as a cluster of States along the Atlantic seaboard we spanned a vast continent, and by 1890, although some free land was still available, America's first frontier had ended. By 1893, a young professor from the University of Wisconsin, Frederick Jackson Turner, in an epochal paper, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History," could conclude:

> Now, four centuries after the discovery of America, at the end of a hundred years of life under the Constitution, the frontier has gone, and with its going has closed the first period of American history.

Unknown at the time perhaps, the second period of American history had already begun, and indeed had been largely instrumental in bringing about the disappearance of land as the frontier. The great "Iron Horse," the railroad, at the same time that it enabled Americans to settle a vast land, provided the vital force that brought into being and impelled the development of American industry.

Thus, we entered upon the second period of American history: the frontier of economic development and growth. Today we are still pushing back this second frontier; indeed it is a frontier which may well be limitless. The nature of this frontier, however, has changed from what it was in the early days when the will to work and a strong back, or a fertile imagination and a great deal of energy were all that one needed to get ahead. Today the American economy has grown through the periods of childhood and adolescence into the age of maturity. Energy and imagination are still important, but to these old virtues have been added the modern requirements of education and training.

The American dream has ever been "America, the land of equal opportunity." The American reality of the economically lowest one-fifth of our population is something else again, when these citizens are denied access to the routes out of their depressed States.

Escape from poverty has always required resources of one kind or another. During the era of America's first frontier, the resource was free land. I am not aware that there was any outcry at the time that giving away land by the millions and millions of acres would destroy the incentive to get ahead, or weaken initiative, or undermine belief in the democratic way of life.

Today the resource has shifted from an abundance of free land to an abundant productive capacity. And again, just as with land, the Federal Government bears the responsibility of providing access to the abundance. Carl Sandburg expressed all these thoughts in words far better than mine, as he wrote:

> When they told those who had no money, "Save your money"—
>
> Those who had no money flashed back—
>
> Would you ask those with nothing to eat to eat less?

Mr. President, escape from poverty today means following the road of education and training and jobs. I see no reason for restricting the capacity of this road at a time when we have the ability to turn it from a narrow, unsure path into a broad highway.

As we declare war on poverty, we dedicate ourselves to the blasting away of these last remaining barriers to the economic advancement of the economically lowest one-fifth of our Nation. We work toward the day when every American born will come into a world in which he has the opportunity to rise as high and progress as far as his abilities will carry him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that various statistical tables and materials may be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

TABLE 1.—*Money income of families, 1947 and 1950–62*

Year	Median money income of all families (1962 prices)		Percent of families with money income	
	Dollars	Index, 1947=100	Less than $3,000 (1962 prices)	Less than $2,000 (1962 prices)
1947	4,117	100	32	18
1950	4,188	102	32	19
1951	4,328	105	29	17
1952	4,442	108	28	17
1953	4,809	117	26	16
1954	4,705	114	28	17
1955	5,004	122	25	15
1956	5,337	130	23	14
1957	5,333	130	23	14
1958	5,329	129	23	14
1959	5,631	137	22	13
1960	5,759	140	21	13
1961	5,820	141	21	13
1962	5,956	145	20	12

Sources: Department of Commerce and Council of Economic Advisers.

TABLE 2.—*Proportion of rural families having net family income of less than $2,000, northeastern Texas*

Nonfarm	48.6
All farms	50.3
Commercial farm	65.6

TABLE 3.—*Specified characteristics of family heads, rural families with net money incomes below $2,000, northeastern Texas*

All heads 65 years of age and over	39
Females under 65 years	4
Males under 65 years:	
With physical handicap	21
Less than 5 years' schooling and no physical handicap	7
No limitations noted	29

Source for tables 2 and 3: Buis T. Inman and John H. Southern, "Opportunities for Economic Development in Low Production Farm Areas," Agriculture Information Bulletin No. 234 (Washington, USDA, November 1960), table 10, p. 20.

FACTS AND FALLACIES ABOUT ASSISTANCE TO THE FARM POOR UNDER TITLE III (PT. A), ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

SECTION 302—GRANTS TO LOW-INCOME FARM FAMILIES

Fallacy: Grants will be used to hold families in poverty on small farms when the breadwinners of these families should transfer into another occupation elsewhere.

Fact: Section 302 is designed to improve the income-earning capacity of farm families the heads of which are too old, uneducated or handicapped in other ways to shift to another full-time occupation. More than 500,000 farm families in this "boxed in" group presently are ineligible for loans from Farmers Home Administration[1] because their earning capacity is so limited they have no debt-paying ability. Section 302 is aimed at raising the earnings of these families. Unless rehabilitated in place they will either continue in a deteriorating farming situation or move to towns and cities, where they almost inevitably will add to welfare rolls.

Fallacy: The grants are too small to finance efficient farming operations.

Fact: Grants under section 302 are not designed to capitalize commercial farming ventures. They will instead provide small amounts of seed capital to enable poor farmers to begin improving the operation and the income-earning capacity of their farms. Grants will finance such items as livestock, simple farm tools and equipment, seed, fertilizer, and small amounts of farmland. Wherever practical a grant will be combined with a small Farmers Home Administration loan.

Fallacy: Grants or loan-grant combinations for farming purposes will enable presently unproductive farmers to increase their output of food and fiber already in surplus.

Fact: Poor farmers on marginal and subsistence units produce well under 1 percent of the total national production of commodities in surplus. Most of the production resulting from financing under the anti-poverty program will be used on their own farms or sold in local neighborhood and area markets.

Fallacy: Grants and loans to finance nonfarm enterprises will encourage more competition for existing small businesses in an area.

Fact: Before making capital available for a nonfarm enterprise, the Farmers Home Administration supervisor will determine that the applicant is capable of operating the enterprise and it will provide goods or services needed in the community and not now being supplied by others.

Fallacy: Grants will be substituted for loans although the latter would be more appropriate and more in keeping with the interest of the farmer and the public.

Fact: A grant will be provided only to make up the difference between the amount of capital an applicant requires to reach certain practical goals and the amount that cannot be provided through the resources he has, plus credit available. All applicants will be required to meet their financing needs through loans, insofar as this is possible.

Fallacy: A farm family receiving a grant can spend it as they please, regardless of the farm improvement plan drawn up by the Farmers Home Administration.

Fact: Grant funds will be deposited in a joint grantee-Farmers Home Administration account and the local supervisor of the agency will not approve any withdrawal unless it is for a specific purpose related to the farm and home development plan.

Fallacy: The majority of low-income farm families receiving grants will not have the managerial ability to make productive use of the funds.

Fact: Families receiving a grant or grant-loan combination will be provided with in-

---

[1] Farmers Home Administration is a USDA agency which provides supplementary credit plus management assistance for family farmers. This agency will administer title III (pt. A) under delegation from the Director, Office of Economic Opportunity.

tensive supervision in the management of their farm and financial resources. This supervision will be the responsibility of local Farmers Home Administration offices. The objective is not only to improve a family's income but also to upgrade their earning potential and ability to manage resources available.

Fallacy: Equipment and other items purchased with a grant may be sold by a farmer, who will then use the money as he pleases.

Fact: All grantees will be required to sign a legally binding agreement with the Government that prevents such a practice.

SECTION 303—LOANS AND GRANTS TO HELP POTENTIALLY SUCCESSFUL FARM FAMILIES BECOME FARMOWNERS OR ENLARGE THEIR FARMS

Fallacy: The land purchase scheme is like the farm resettlement program of the 1930's, which was a failure.

Fact: Activities authorized under section 303 are in no way similar to the resettlement program of the 1930's. Under section 303 the Office of Economic Opportunity Director is authorized to assist State and local nonprofit corporations in buying available farmland and reselling this land to family farmers at a price that reflects the potential of the land for farming, rather than its speculative market value. Section 303 is simply a method of extending the present highly successful farm ownership loan program of the Farmers Home Administration to the very lowest income group of family farmers.

Fallacy: Section 303 authorizes "communistic" cooperative or corporate farming ventures involving entire communities of farm families.

Fact: It authorizes nothing of the kind. Farmers will acquire land under the program as private buyers and thereby become landowners as in any private transaction. Where an estate is bought by a corporation, subdivided, developed, and resold in family farm units, purchasers of these units will then have full ownership and control.

Fallacy: The Federal Government is authorized to purchase large amounts of farmland and retain title to this land.

Fact: No Federal agency, present or future, is authorized to purchase and hold farmland under section 303. The land would be purchased by State and local nonprofit corporations as a private transaction through normal land market channels and resold to family farmers in the same manner. Capitalization of the local corporations would be mainly, but not entirely, through Federal loans.

Fallacy: Section 303 enables the Government to take over large farms and ranches, subdivide them and resell the smaller units to farmers selected by local Federal officials.

Fact: No Federal agency is authorized to purchase land, nor will any corporation participating in the land purchase program under section 303 have condemnation rights of any kind. Land purchased will be that available on the market. It will be bought and sold as a private transaction.

Fallacy: Section 303 loans and grants will encourage the formation of farm units too small and inefficient for modern-day farming.

Fact: Most land purchases made under this program will be in the form of small parcels that will be added to existing farm units to increase the family's potential for making a living. In those instances where a large amount of land is subdivided into individual farm family units, Farmers Home Administration supervisors will assist officers of the corporation to determine appropriate size units, given local farming conditions and requirements. Since Farmers Home Administration will finance most families buying units from corporations through its regular real estate loan program, the agency will be able to assure a practical and economically sound operation.

Fallacy: The land purchase plan will enable farmers who have been failures all their lives to obtain a new farm that they are incapable of handling.

Fact: The majority of families who purchase land from the corporations either to add to their existing farming units or to obtain an entire farm will utilize Farmers Home Administration real estate loans for financing. A loan will not be approved unless and until the agency's local supervisor is assured that the applicant has the background, training, and potential to utilize the new resources to operate efficiently and economically.

Fallacy: Section 303 authorizes a "collectivist" type of farming program.

Fact: The exact opposite is true. It will increase the number of family farmers who own, operate, and manage their own places.

Fallacy: A farmer purchasing a unit or additional farmland from one of the local corporations at the normal value of the land can then resell the land at its market price, thus reaping a windfall profit.

Fact: The language of section 303 specifically denies a purchaser this opportunity.

SECTION 304—LOANS TO COOPERATIVES

Fallacy: Banks for cooperatives under the Farm Credit System already are authorized to extend financing to cooperatives.

Fact: In general, credit from the banks for cooperatives is made available only to cooperatives in which the membership have or are able to make a significant equity investment. The banks do not normally make loans to small local cooperatives made up of poor farmers when financing such cooperatives would involve a necessarily large risk.

Fallacy: Section 304 permits financing of cooperative manufacturing establishments producing an unlimited range of products and of cooperative farms.

Fact: Loans are not authorized for cooperatives of this kind.

Fallacy: Loans will be made available to cooperatives made up of farmers and other rural people not in the poverty group.

Fact: The language of section 304 specifically states that the cooperatives financed must be made up "predominantly" of low-income rural people.

Fallacy: If banks for cooperatives or other available credit sources are not willing to risk capital on the cooperative to be financed, the Government should not do so either. By definition, new cooperatives financed under section 304 will be small, unable to afford adequate management and have little membership equity.

Fact: Three provisions minimize the risk. (1) Farmers Home Administration will provide continuing and intensive technical and management guidance in the early stages of the cooperatives being financed. (2) Most cooperatives financed will include some rural families who can make a significant equity contribution. (3) Grants and loans will be available from Farmers Home Administration to individual low-income farm families to buy equity shares in cooperatives, thus providing an additional source of financing.

Fallacy: Grant provisions of title III if administered by Farmers Home Administration will pervert the aims and operations of this agency's successful program which provides supplementary credit for farm families.

Fact: On the contrary, the grant provisions by building debt-paying ability will enable Farmers Home Administration to reach thousands of the poorest farming families who presently are ineligible for loans from the agency. That these families presently cannot utilize Farmers Home Administration programs of supervised credit is a serious weakness in the agency's program and has often been calamitous for the families concerned, who have no other source of aid.

Fallacy: Title III, part A, gives the Director of the Economic Opportunity Office dictatorial control of U.S. agriculture.

Fact: The title is limited to assistance for the farm poor, who produce less than 1 percent of total U.S. farm products by volume and value, market even less and control scarcely any of the resources required for modern commercial farming. Participation in programs authorized by the title will be strictly voluntary. The Director will have no authority whatsoever to compel any individual or family to apply for a grant or loan, seek to purchase land from a nonprofit corporation financed by him, organize or join a cooperative receiving a loan or participate in any other fashion.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, title V of the pending Economic Opportunities Act will provide a vital and progressive tool to upgrade both our human and material resources. It can be a constructive way to bring together otherwise idle manpower and jobs going undone. At the same time, and perhaps more importantly, it can give many of the present jobless the necessary skills to make them competitive in today's labor market and assist them toward full-time employment.

The Social Security Act was amended 2 years ago to provide for community work and training programs tied into the aid to dependent children program. The ADC program was modified to permit payment of benefits to needy families where the father was unemployed. Of the 18 States, including West Virginia, which have extended their aid to families with dependent children programs to include families with unemployed parents, 13 either have in operation or in the planning stage, community work and training programs with a substantial emphasis on the training component.

What has been the experience with these programs? Basically, they have brought to light an overwhelming desire on the part of unemployed people not only to go back to work, but to further their education—to improve themselves and to come off the assistance lists.

An example in one eastern community, a group of unemployed men receiving family welfare aid went to work on a community project on a more or less full-time basis. Then, formal training was developed to prepare them for regular jobs. The men refused to leave their work to pursue the training. They preferred on their own initiative, to continue working full time and to attend school at night. This, I think, indicates two points: First, people prefer to work for what they receive; and second, people will persevere to secure the advantage of educational opportunities offered to them.

In the poverty areas of Appalachia, similar eagerness for work and education can be found when the opportunities are made available. Latent talent is uncovered. Formerly unemployed men now hold their heads a little higher because they are working; they start shaving regularly again; they put their children back in school; they and their families start eating better and their health improves. In short, they are coming back into the mainstream of society where they belong.

And in some areas where the bitter fog of economic depression rests most heavily, you can note a change in the entire community when work and training opportunities become available to the large number of unemployed. The town spruces up; long-neglected streets are repaired; public buildings are painted, alleys are cleared and a longtime accumulation of rubbish is carted away.

One county official in West Virginia, writing of his experience with the community work and training program, said:

I have been in this county 34 years and have always been impressed by the fact that, given proper incentive and opportunity, the mountain people want to work. In my opinion, these men who have been without employment so long are gaining self-respect and are getting deep satisfaction out of making the county more beautiful and in working for the money they receive.

A mayor of a community also in West Virginia wrote:

These men (unemployed fathers) have been used on a number of projects which the city could not have undertaken except through this program. They have built rock walls, graded our new parking lot, replaced a security fence around the city park which had been washed out by the 1963 floods, replaced guardrail posts, cleaned catch basins in our sewer system, and other projects too numerous to mention. The men themselves certainly have benefited in a material way as well as restoring their self-respect regarding work.

The same response is repeated in community after community. The unemployed are helped, both in the form of cash grants and because they again have the opportunity to do useful work.

Now, what will title V do? Primarily it will effectively expand these work experience programs designed to help unemployed fathers and others secure and retain employment or attain or retain capability for self-support. To do this, title V will provide an additional $150 million to communities specifically for this purpose. Translated in terms of people, this means at least 130,000 persons could receive work experience and training during the 1964–65 fiscal year if this measure is approved. The impact of helping these 130,000 workers would result in direct benefits to almost 700,000 persons who comprise their families.

These 700,000 people for the most part, are in families hardest hit by long-term unemployment. The 130,000 people who will receive work experience and training are probably the most unskilled or underskilled in our Nation today. Few have a high school education. Many cannot even read or write. And most of them are not now receiving help from the federally aided public assistance programs.

They are, Mr. President, those Americans with the odds stacked against them in trying to reenter the mainstream of American economic life. Title V of the Economic Opportunities Act can shorten those odds. Title V can salvage this large human resource.

The positive benefits of providing work and training opportunities to this needy group are valid. We are committed, I believe, to the idea that the opportunity to earn a living should be available to all. Disagreement, when it comes, centers around how the opportunities should be made available; the most effective means of doing so, and similar questions.

I submit that our experience with community work and training since 1962 qualifies such an approach as being effective, efficient, and economical. It does place unemployed people back on the payrolls. It does upgrade the working skills of a portion of our labor force. It does result in greater self-respect among those who are dependent and points the way toward financial independence. And it does pay the additional benefit of physically improving many of our communities that otherwise, because of their financial status, would be unable to enter into such improvements.

The most impressive testimony to the effectiveness of the work and training approach is among the unemployed themselves. The eagerness with which they will substitute useful work for idleness when offered a choice; the enthusiasm with which they grasp at educational opportunities; and the efforts and energy they are willing to devote to improving themselves—all of these facts make it difficult to withhold the opportunity work experience and training can provide.

Title V provides a way to harness the eagerness, the enthusiasm, and the energy of the unemployed to achieve concrete results such as full-time employment, higher pay checks because of better training, and the all-round betterment of our fellow citizens and our communities.

No single phase of the welfare operation today receives more favorable public response than the community work and training program. Here we see a constructive effort to reduce people's dependency on welfare aid. Here also the public can witness welfare recipients as sincere and industrious people when given an opportunity for gainful labor. Here our citizens recognize a shift from the unending dole of public money to a rehabilitative move toward self-support.

IF THE WAR ON POVERTY IS TO BE WON AN EXTENSION OF THE ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM IS NEEDED AT ONCE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I strongly support President Johnson's declaration of war against poverty and the program he has recommended for enactment by the Congress to begin to fight that war.

The war on poverty presented under the title of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, will have to be fought on many fronts and the program proposed by President Johnson rightly has many facets. It will increase the employability of many young men and women by providing them with education, vocational training, and useful work experience through a Job Corps.

It will provide for the mobilization of resources in urban and rural communities through community action programs.

It allows for badly needed special programs aimed at particularly destitute rural areas and will make possible grants and loans, the establishment of family farm development corporations, support for cooperative associations, and will permit new programs in the areas of housing, sanitation, education, and day care of children.

It will strengthen small business concerns by means of loans.

It will make possible the expansion of opportunities for constructive work experience and other needed training by financing experimental, pilot, and demonstration projects.

In short, the program is an admirable beginning, but the truth is that, by itself, it is simply not enough.

The number of poor in Amercia today is estimated at between 20 million—the rockbottom estimate—and 90 million—the high estimate. In dealing with such numbers, it is obvious that a total solution will be found only through a major campaign. The present bill calls for an authorization of $962,500,000. One publication, Newsweek magazine, suggests the danger of this becoming a mere "band aid program" substantial enough to do little more than scratch the surface of the poverty problem. The same periodical, in its February 17 issue, quoted the sociologist, Michael Harrington, author of "The Other America," as claiming:

The many figures that are being talked about are utterly unrealistic in view of the goals authorized * * * New York could absorb that much [$500 million] just on the problem of the Negro. One billion wouldn't cover any one point of the programs Kennedy originated.

Dr. John Kenneth Galbraith, one of our Nation's leading economists, has firmly advocated many of the measures for which the poverty bill provides—training and retraining, youth employment counseling, assistance to new industries, and so on. But he has also noted:

This must be honest effort and not pilot projects which are a modern device for stimulating action without spending money. Poverty can be made to disappear. It won't be accomplished simply by stepping up the growth rate any more than it will be accomplished by incantation or ritualistic washing of the feet. Growth is only for those who can take advantage of it.

President Johnson's tax cut is an example of legislation designed to provide needed stimulus to our economy. It goes hand in hand with the poverty bill. Yet such a respected economist as Dr. Leon Keyserling feels that this is not enough and that further measures will be required:

You can't get rid of poverty, you can't expedite economic growth, you can't reduce unemployment by regressive budgetary policy, a tight-money policy, a nonspending policy and a regressive redistribution of the national income through the tax mechanism.

I am pleased that Dr. Keyserling and I are of the same mind on this subject.

President Johnson himself, in a May 4, 1964 press conference, has indicated the nature of the further steps which are necessary:

The time has come for Labor and Government and business to agree that we are now going to achieve—and keep—full employment; and if all that we do with the help of the private sector cannot employ all our

people, the Government will have to do for people what private enterprise fails to do—we will step up our program of public works.

But why wait?

An accelerated program of public works is precisely what is now needed to round out the administration's poverty program. There is no longer any question but that unemployment is a major thread in the pattern of Poverty U.S.A. People who are to participate in the economy must have a chance for jobs, and we must place a good deal of emphasis upon providing these jobs now and not merely in the future. The accelerated public works program has proved itself to be one of the fastest means of creating such jobs. Indeed, Dr. Galbraith supports such a program by his advocacy of expenditure in the public sector—the kind of investment in public works, urban renewal, and other construction as is provided in the accelerated public works legislation.

Gunnar Myrdal, the well-known Swedish sociologist and author of "An American Dilemma," has called for a giant public works program as a major weapon in the elimination of poverty. In the February 8, 1964, issue of the New Republic, Dr. Myrdal asserted:

> What America needs is a Marshall plan to eradicate poverty in the Nation. This is a moral imperative. The unemployed, the underemployed, and the now unemployables are also America's biggest wastage of economic resources. The poor represent a suppressed demand which needs to be released to support a steady rapid growth of American production. The goals of social justice and economic progress thus are compatible. A rapid steady economic growth is impossible without mobilizing the productive power of the poor and clothing their unfilled needs with effective demand. The existence of mass poverty in the midst of plenty is a heavy drag on the entire economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Myrdal's provocative article "The War on Poverty" be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, an extension of the accelerated public works program through approval of the additional $900 million provided for in S. 1856—a bill introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, Mr. MCNAMARA, reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works, and now on the Senate Calendar awaiting action—would answer Mr. Myrdal's call and would be an essential concommitant to the poverty bill.

The original accelerated public works bill, passed during the Kennedy administration, authorized $900 million of which $880 million was ultimately appropriated. These funds ran dry well over a year ago, leaving $717 million of worthwhile projects which could now be providing desperately needed jobs if funds were available. Six hundred and fifteen grant-in-aid applications for $128.4 million in accelerated public works funds are now pending in the chronically depressed Appalachia region, are also pending in my own economically distressed State of Alaska. Poverty in these areas—as well as in other regions in all parts of the country—can be diminished almost immediately through APW. The U.S. Department of Labor estimates that when the program becomes fully operative later this year, it will provide jobs for 10 percent of the currently unemployed.

The original Accelerated Public Works Act—S. 2965—was reported to the Senate from the Senate Public Works Committee on April 26, 1962. At that time I filed separate views in which I recounted that in the committee markup on the bill I predicted that the amount proposed—$900 million—was far too little in the light of the demonstrated needs and the large size of our unemployment problem. As a matter of fact, I had suggested in the committee that the least we could do is increase the amount authorized to the amount which we provided for some of our foreign aid programs. I suggested the amount of $2,645 million—the amount authorized for the Development Loan Fund for fiscal year 1963, for development grants, for supporting assistance, and for the President's contingency fund.

In the interest of speedy approval of the accelerated public works program, I did not—2 years ago—press my amendment.

I did, however, predict that the sum would not be sufficient to make a serious dent in our problem of the chronic unemployed. I regret that my prophesy has proved correct.

I stated then:

> In my humble opinion, no situation is more tragic than that of men and women unemployed who wish to work and cannot find it. No situation is more paradoxical than that this wealthiest country on earth, which has poured out $100 billion in the last decade and a half to help foreign countries, and proposes to spend even greater sums in the future for the same purpose, cannot meet its primary obligation to its own people.

The accelerated public works program has proved its worth. It has helped build highways, sewer facilities, treatment plants, water facilities, and a host of other worthy and needed projects. It has reached into villages and counties across the Nation to give work to men and women who desperately needed it.

But the amount authorized was not enough.

Accordingly, in March 1963, I introduced S. 1121 on behalf of myself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Morse, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Yarborough. This bill would have carried out the provisions of the amendment I had previously discussed in the Public Works Committee. It raised the amount authorized for accelerated public works to $2.645 billion.

The constitutional convention of the AFL–CIO has unanimously given its support to an extension of the Accelerated Public Works Act. Indeed, because it realizes that the public works program is one of the surest methods of creating additional jobs, the convention called for an additional authorization of $2 billion—$500 million more than S. 1856. This would mean a total of $4 billion in construction projects—when State and local matching funds are included. According to U.S. Department of Labor studies, this $4 billion outlay would directly create about 400,000 jobs in on-site construction and in the production and distribution of building materials and equipment. As these funds are spent by working people and businesses, another 200,000 to 400,000 jobs would be created indirectly.

The American Hospital Association claims a backlog of unmet construction for the modernization and replacement of older and outmoded hospital facilities, and the last study of this need developed a national figure of $3.2 billion.

The need for useful public works is there—clearly demonstrated.

The chronically unemployed are still with us—clearly demonstrated.

The means to help these unemployed and to meet the growing need for useful public works is at hand in S. 1856, now pending on the Senate Calendar. The additional amount of $900 million is not as large as the amount I proposed in my bill S. 1121 but it is at least an additional amount which can be used immediately to put unemployed men and women to work usefully.

Let us not be content with the enactment of the poverty program as proposed in the bill now before us without realizing that the adoption of the additional authorization for the accelerated public works program as proposed in S. 1856 is equally vital.

In making this proposal I am not unmindful of the great need in my own State of Alaska both in terms of unmet wants in useful public works and of chronically unemployed people. Our Indian villages can sorely use the help which would be made available under the poverty bill. But they are just as desperately in need of public works projects which could be provided under the terms of the accelerated public works program.

I called the attention of Sargent Shriver, who has made a brilliant success of the Peace Corps and who has been appointed by President Johnson to take command also of the war on poverty, to Alaska's great needs. He replied that it would be included. But he needs more tools, more money, more machinery for creating jobs than the present program provides. The accelerated public works program would go far toward supplying the now-missing ingredients. Without it or its equivalent, the war on poverty would be lost.

It is also widely recognized that the poor are sick more often than average Americans. Squalor and inefficient sanitation facilities are always conducive to disease, which, in turn, is an integral and reinforcing part of the poverty cycle itself.

A physically unhealthy America is a poor America.

The accelerated public works program, with its emphasis on construction of sewer and water facilities, hospitals, and with its attempts to alleviate community obsolescence, is vital in improving the health of the poor. In a larger sense, the program is important because it lifts the morale of impoverished Americans

and provides a permanent base for new employment.

It is my firm belief that extension of the accelerated public works program is immediately necessary in order to make the war on poverty a vital and effective force in American life.

That belief of mine is not new. I voiced it on the floor of the Senate more than 16 months ago—and, indeed, in committee 11 months earlier—when I introduced my bill for a resumption on an adequate scale of the accelerated public works program. I headed my remarks with the plea that we "try to do as much for the folks at home as for those abroad."

This plea again assumes pertinence when in a few days the Senate will be asked to approve an authorization of more than $3 billion for foreign aid. I repeat my often-reiterated conviction that we should at least give equality to the needs of the American people; indeed, they should have priority.

In connection with my introduction of the accelerated public works legislation, I inserted some correspondence with the Governors of States, showing their support of an activity in connection with the accelerated public works program in their States. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks and exhibits which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 19, 1963, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

LET US TRY TO DO AS MUCH FOR THE FOLKS AT HOME AS FOR THOSE ABROAD; LET US GET THE U.S. ECONOMY MOVING; LET US TACKLE OUR MOUNTING UNEMPLOYMENT REALISTICALLY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks and that the bill lie at the desk until the close of business on March 28 so as to give those of my colleagues who wish to do so an opportunity to cosponsor this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; will lie at the desk as requested; and, without objection, will be printed as requested.

(See exhibit I.)

The bill (S. 1121) to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Accelerated Public Works Act (Public Law 87-658) introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I believe that my introduction of this bill will not come as a surprise.

On April 25, 1962, when S. 2965 was reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works, of which I am a member, I filed separate views in which I clearly predicted that the sum authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of the bill—$900 million—was insufficient to do the job.

Mr. President, I wish I could stand here today and admit that my prediction was wrong—that the amount authorized to be appropriated had been sufficient—and that the serious pockets of chronic unemployment throughout the Nation had been eradicated or significantly decreased.

Eleven months ago, in my separate views, I stated:

"However, the amount is, in my opinion, hardly sufficient to meet the economic strain now being experienced in certain areas of the Nation."

At that time, I referred to my proposed amendment to raise the amount authorized to be appropriated to less than half the amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance—namely $2,645 million.

I stated at that time, Mr. President:

"In my humble opinion, no situation is more tragic than that of men and women unemployed who wish to work and cannot find it. In my humble opinion, no situation is more paradoxical than that this wealthiest country on earth, which has poured out $100 billion in the last decade and a half to help foreign countries, and proposes to spend even greater sums in the future for the same purpose, cannot meet its primary obligation to its own people.

"I am merely proposing, by this amendment, to offer a fraction for the relief of economic distress and the creation of employment for our fellow Americans of what we have been doing or are asked to do—and will doubtless continue to do—in far larger measure for inhabitants of 100 foreign countries."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my separate views to S. 2965 be printed in full at the conclusion of these remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit II.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it may be that my suggested amendment focused attention on the insufficiency of the amount authorized to be appropriated and was instrumental in increasing that amount from $600 million to $900 million. But even that amount has not proven to be sufficient.

On March 7, the Department of Labor reported that the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate in February increased to 6.1 percent of the civilian labor force. This was up from 5.8 percent in January, despite the fact that customarily there is little change in the unemployment rate from January to February. The February 1962 rate was 5.6 percent.

This means, Mr. President, that in February 1963, 4,918,000—nearly 5 million—men and women were seeking employment and could not find it.

This continued chronic unemployment cannot be permitted to endure. The time has come for a massive effort to make taxpayers out of these tax consumers. They seek work. Let us give them work.

I said last year it was no time for half measures.

It is even less a time for half measures this year.

Consider, Mr. President, what continued unemployment does to a man and his family. Continued want and deprivation do not reaffirm a man's faith in the strength of our economic system.

And yet, Mr. President, that system is strong—as strong as it ever was. Our problem is to take sufficiently energetic steps at the correct time. Let us not do too little too late.

I cannot help but feel, Mr. President, that we did just that last year. Who can say what the results would now be if, last year, we had authorized the appropriation of three times the amount authorized under the accelerated public works program? How many of the nearly 5 million unemployed today would now be gainfully employed? How many of this nearly 5 million unemployed would today be taxpayers instead of tax consumers? How many of the families of these men and women would today have been able to hold their heads high and say that their fathers or mothers were gainfully employed and they were not dependent on handouts?

Mr. President, we will not be able to meet a serious unemployment problem with half measures, or with quarter measures. We tried it last year and it did not work.

Now one of the arguments advanced last year against my proposal to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the accelerated public works measure was that the States could not possibly spend all that money.

In an effort to prove this argument fallacious, I wrote all the States having areas of chronic unemployment asking how much could be spent on worthwhile public works projects.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alaska may have 5 more minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, when I reported to the Senate on May 17, 1962, on the responses received up to that date—only 12 States—fewer than one-fourth of the total number—indicated that they could use $1,566 million.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my remarks on that date and some of the exhibits inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at that time, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit III.)

Mr. GRUENING. I stated at that time:

"The question which each and every one of us must ask himself is this: Am I prepared to give to the unemployed of the depressed areas of Gadsden, Ala.; Anchorage, Alaska; Camden, Ark.; Modesto, Calif.; Bristol, Conn.; Carrollton, Ga.; Cairo-Metropolis, Ill.; Evansville, Ind.; Pittsburg, Kans.; Paducah, Ky.; Hammond, La.; Biddeford-Sanford, Maine; Cumberland, Md.; Lowell, Mass.; Detroit, Mich.; Duluth, Minn.; Washington, Mo.; Butte, Mont.; Atlantic City, N.J.; Schenectady, N.Y.; Fayetteville, N.C.; Portsmouth-Chillicothe, Ohio; Muskogee, Okla.; Altoona, Pa.; Providence, R.I.; Conway, S.C.; Greenville, Tenn.; Laredo, Tex.; Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Va.; Aberdeen, Wash.; Charleston, W. Va.; and La Crosse, Wis., the same opportunity that has been given to the unemployed in Sudan to work on a highway construction project involving 1.8 million American dollars, or the unemployed in Yemen to work on a highway construction project involving 3 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Republic of China to work on the Ku-Kwan hydroelectric project involving 2.5 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Philippines to work on a port facilities and harbor improvement project involving 3.2 million American dollars?

"For myself the answer is abundantly clear. If I am expected to take care of the unemployed abroad with American dollars, then I can do no less than take care of the unemployed here at home first and just as adequately."

I am again today addressing to the Governors of all the States having serious pockets of chronic unemployment, a letter requesting the information as to the public works projects ready to go upon which unemployed men and women can be put to work.

At the appropriate time, I shall report to the Senate Committee on Public Works and to the Senate the results of this inquiry.

But I have no doubt at all that we shall find that there can be spent on useful, needed public works projects, throughout the land, more than the sum of $2,645 million which I propose to authorize to be appro-

priated for the accelerated public works program. In view of the $900 million already authorized, this is only an increase of $1,745 million.

As a matter of fact, the Honorable William L. Batt, Jr., Administrator, Area Redevelopment Administration, at a press conference on February 8, 1963, stated that at the end of January, the backlog of applications for funds for projects expected to meet program standards was $1,069 million. In addition, new projects were coming in at the rate of $300 million every month or $3,600 million per year.

It is not, therefore, a question of whether the money can be well spent in putting American unemployed men and women to work. The worthy projects exist. The necessary projects exist.

The question is: Are we willing to make the effort to get America rolling—to give America the shot in the arm it needs to get it rolling—to make an all-out effort to stimulate the American economy at the level required to drastically reduce these pockets of chronic unemployment?

For myself, I can only see an affirmative answer.

For myself, I can say only that when one considers what we are doing in the way of assisting the economies of countries abroad, there can be no question about our doing at least as much here at home for our own unemployed—for our chronically unemployed.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, excerpts from Mr. Batt's press conference and a list of unemployed percentages.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit IV.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my amendment expresses the amount authorized as the equivalent authorized to be appropriated for the following economic foreign aid purposes:

	Million
Sec. 202: Development loan fund	$1,500
Sec. 212: Development grants	380
Sec. 402: Supporting assistance	465
S53. 451(a): Contingency fund	300
Total	2,645

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr .President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for an additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have drafted my amendment in this fashion, rather than expressing the sum in figures, because I desire to call attention to the fact that we are granting this same sum—and indeed more in various other ways—to aid the economies of foreign countries—to reduce the unemployment problem in foreign countries—and that we literally cannot afford to continue to do that unless we do at least as much for the unemployed here at home.

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

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to commend the Senator on his initiative, and I wish to assure the Senator that a number of his colleagues, as he well knows, have joined in reexamining the entire accelerated public works program. The President has submitted a supplemental request of $500 million under last year's authorization, which is sorely needed. In fact, the local communities have set aside by bond issue the necessary funds for local community cooperation, as prescribed by law. I am convinced that we could well use a substantially larger sum of money, at least double what we did last year, for the accelerated public works program, to meet the necessities of existing projects which are already funded and already prepared and already designed by the local jurisdictions.

I assure the Senator that he will have my cooperation. I know that I can expect from him the same kind of cooperation, as we meet together shortly to get at the new program of accelerated public works.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. No Member of the Senate has been more concerned about the unemployment problem,this tragic situation which is not a mere statistic but affects the lives and happiness and welfare of millions of Americans, or has shown more concern about getting the economy moving again, than the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota.

EXHIBIT I

A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Accelerated Public Works Act (Public Law 87–658)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 87–658 (76 Stat. 541), approved September 14, 1962, is hereby amended by striking out the words "the sums of $900,000,000" in section 3(b), thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 402, and 451(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended."

EXHIBIT II

SEPARATE VIEWS OF MR. GRUENING

I voted to report favorably S. 2965 providing for both a standby program of public works and an immediate program of public works for which an appropriation of $600 million was authorized.

It is my belief that much more than the authorized $600 million is needed and could usefully be used to put the unemployed back to work.

In a statement distributed to the members of the Public Works Committee, I stated:

"On March 27, 1962, the able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, introduced an amendment to S. 2965, a bill to provide standby authority to accelerate public works programs of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies. The amendment would authorize the appropriation of $600 million for an immediate public works program.

"I commend the Senator from New Mexico for his foresight in submitting such an amendment.

"However, the amount is, in my opinion, hardly sufficient to meet the economic strain now being experienced in certain areas of the Nation.

"Accordingly, I now offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, raising the amount authorized to be appropriated for a program of immediate public works to the same amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance.

"It does seem to me that we should be willing to spend at least as much at home to take care of our own economically distressed areas as we are willing to spend abroad for aiding foreign economically distressed areas.

"My amendment does not, I admit, do equal justice as between foreign and domestic programs. Under the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, only one appropriation is authorized, namely, the sum of $600 million. Under my amendment, the limit of this one-time appropriation would be raised to the limit authorized in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the Development Loan Fund (sec. 202), the development grants and technical cooperation (sec. 212), supporting assistance (sec. 402), and contingency fund (sec. 451). Under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1962 and the 4 succeeding fiscal years the total sum of $7.5 billion. My proposal is much more modest. In setting the limit to the amount that would be authorized for our immediate public works program, I have used only the figure of $1.5 billion—the amount authorized for the fiscal year 1963 only.

"My amendment would increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the immediate public works program to $2,645 million, computed as follows:

	Millions
"Sec. 201—Development Loan Fund	$1,500
Sec. 212—Development grants	380
Sec. 401—Supporting assistance	465
Sec. 451—Contingency fund	300
Total	2,645

"In proposing this increase in the amount authorized to be appropriated, I have used only the authorizations contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. I have not considered the amounts of U.S. funds made available abroad through such lending agencies as the World Bank, Export-Import Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, etc. Billions of American dollars have been and are being channeled abroad through these agencies. In many cases, the so-called loans are not loans at all but grants.

"In my humble opinion, no situation is more tragic than that of men and women unemployed who wish to work and cannot find it. In my humble opinion, no situation is more paradoxical than that this wealthiest country on earth, which has poured out $100 billion in the last decade and a half to help foreign countries, and proposes to spend even greater sums in the future for the same purpose, cannot meet its primary obligation to its own people.

"I am merely proposing, by this amendment, to offer a fraction for the relief of economic distress and the creation of employment for our fellow Americans of what we have been doing or are asked to do—and will doubtless continue to do—in far larger measure for inhabitants of 100 foreign countries.

"My amendment is as follows:

" 'On page 2, line 24, delete the words "the sum of $600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended".'

"In order to insure prompt action on this vitally needed measure by the Senate, I did not press my amendment in committee but must reserve my position on the amount authorized for an immediate program of public works when this bill is considered in the Senate."

EXHIBIT III

LET US JUST ONCE DO AT LEAST HALF AS MUCH FOR THE FOLKS AT HOME AS FOR THOSE IN FOREIGN LANDS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to S. 2965—the emergency public works bill—which it is my intention to call up at the appropriate time.

The amendment is simple.

It raises the amounts authorized to be appropriated for emergency public works from $600 million to "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202—for the fiscal year 1963—212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961." Those are the exact words of my proposed amendment. However, in order that my colleagues may have the amendment before them in customary form, I ask unanimous

consent that my amendment be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have previously served notice of my intention to offer this amendment in my individual views in the committee's report on S. 2965. I ask unanimous consent that those views be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my amendment seeks only to place our domestic program for alleviating unemployment in a position of equality with what we are doing abroad. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, even if my amendment is adopted—and I sincerely trust that it will be—there still will not be equality.

The amendment which I propose would raise the maximum authorized to be appropriated for the program of emergency public works from $600 million to $2,645 million computed as follows:

Sec. 202—Development Loan Fund (for fiscal year 1963 only)	$1,500,000,000
Sec. 212—Development grants	380,000,000
Sec. 401—Supporting assistance	465,000,000
Sec. 451—Contingency fund	300,000,000
Total	2,645,000,000

Actually the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, authorizes the appropriation of much more than $2,645 million for foreign economic aid. Actually, for the 5 fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1963, section 202 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 authorizes the appropriation of $1,500 million for each of these fiscal years or a total of $7,500 million for the five.

Thus, even with the adoption of my amendment, there would be authorized to be appropriated for this "one shot" program of emergency public works to help our own unemployed only about one-third of the amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic aid under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

I wish to make it crystal clear that my amendment does not affect or apply to the standby provisions of S. 2965. Actually, it can be said that my amendment moves up the $2 billion authorized for a program of standby public works to the emergency program and says in effect that emergency intended to be met by the standby program is upon us now.

And, considering the all too many pockets of depression of the United States, that is by no means an exaggeration.

We cannot accurately judge the human misery stalking our land by looking at the overall rate of unemployment.

During the week ending April 28, 1962, insured unemployment in Nome, Alaska, was 33.5 percent. It was no comfort to the unemployed worker in Nome to know that the national rate of insured unemployment during the same week was 4.3 percent.

The unemployed worker in Fairbanks—insured unemployment rate 17.9 percent—could derive little comfort from the fact that the Congress was talking about standby public works when things get worse.

How much worse must it get, Mr. President, before the Congress acts to relieve to the extent possible unemployment in the numerous pockets throughout the Nation?

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks a table, prepared by my office, of unemployment in Alaska for the week ending April 28, 1962. These figures have been derived from the Labor Market Bulletin issued by the Alaska Department of Labor.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this is no time to stand by. This is a time for bold, decisive action. In my opinion, nothing can be more heartrending than a man—a husband and a father—who cannot find work to support himself and family even though, week after week after week, he trudges wearily from door to door seeking such work. It is distressing for single men with no family responsibilities.

Dr. Kenneth Galbraith has written an excellent book entitled "Our Affluent Society" showing that more people in the United States are now living at a higher standard than ever before. I agree with the picture he has drawn in his book and I am happy that it is so.

But in rejoicing at the greater affluence of more and more of our people, let us not overlook the almost one-fourth of our Nation who are living in abject poverty without hope for the future or for their children's future unless prompt and intelligent measures are taken at once. The plight of these 40 million Americans is graphically pictured in a recent book by Mr. Michael Harrington, entitled "The Other America," published by Macmillan Co. this year. I commend it highly to my colleagues for it brings to our attention forcefully the need for immediate action—and action on a scale commensurate with the size of the problem.

As long as this problem exists for some 40 million Americans it is our inescapable duty to face it and to eliminate it as far as it is humanly possible. Our obligation to these Americans, in my judgment, supersedes aid for impoverished people in other lands. Moreover we shall be able to help these people in foreign countries all the better if we raise our own living standards and put an end to the costly wastes of chronic unemployment.

In this—the richest of all lands—such a situation cannot and should not be tolerated.

Nor should we meet an emergency situation with halfway measures. We should not delude the people of the Nation. We must bring to bear on a solution of this problem all the resources that are needed. To do less is little better than doing nothing at all. To do less would be to disappoint millions of unemployed men and women throughout the country who are looking to Congress for action now.

According to the report from the Area Redevelopment Agency of the Department of Commerce as of May 1, 1962, 933 areas in the United States are designated as eligible to take part in the area redevelopment program. These are divided as follows: 148 urban-industrial areas; 735 rural and small labor markets; and 50 Indian reservations.

These areas have a population of 34.7 million people and a labor force of 13.2 million. Of the latter 1.4 million are unemployed. Thus these areas have 19 percent of the Nation's population and 19 percent of the Nation's labor force, but they have 31 percent of the unemployed of the country.

Now what is proposed to meet the persistent high rate of unemployment of these 933 areas throughout the Nation?

It is proposed in S. 2965 to authorize the appropriation of $2 billion for a program of public works on a standby basis, usable only if the total unemployment in the Nation rises to a predetermined figure. In addition, it is proposed to authorize the appropriation of an additional $600 million for an emergency, immediate public works program. This sum averages about $600 for each man and woman unemployed in these designated areas, assuming the entire amount is spent on wages, which, of course, will not be the case.

My amendment would quadruple that sum.

That quadrupled sum would be much more realistic considering the magnitude and the urgency of the problem.

I wish to make it absolutely clear that my proposal would not take a single penny from the foreign aid program. It merely uses the particular wording to point up the fact that we would be spending on this one-shot, emergency program here at home far less than we are spending abroad for economic aid.

The foreign aid program would continue as now authorized and the money appropriated for that program would remain intact, if Congress approves.

I know that the question will be raised: Can the sum you propose to spend on public works within 27 months actually be spent by the States economically and efficiently within that period of time.

It should be raised, and answered, because I do not want to propose anything here that would lead to wasteful expenditure of Federal funds. I know that none of my colleagues want to do so either.

But I do know that along with me many of my colleagues are concerned that we do enough to meet the problems of persistent unemployment in the 933 designated areas throughout the country.

In order to obtain the answer, I wired the Governors of the 50 States of the Nation and asked them the question and asked them to be specific in their replies. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my telegram to the Governors of the States be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have to date received replies from the Governors of only 12 States who have indicated that they are ready to go with public works projects totaling $1.6 billion.

I also ask unanimous consent that the detailed replies received from the Governors of these States be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, let no one here delude himself.

We shall either spend this $2,645 million on constructive investments in the future economic strength of the United States—in schools, hospitals, roads, sewer and water works, dams, airports and the like—or we shall spend that and much more in the next 27 months and in the years to come in unemployment compensation and in welfare payments, and suffer the loss of tax revenue which fuller employment will generate.

We cannot long neglect our own resources—human and natural—while building the resources of foreign nations. At stake is not our willingness to continue to aid the less developed countries: at stake is our ability to continue without at the same time renewing our own strength.

We can renew that strength by a program of public investments of the magnitude which I propose by my amendment.

In the years 1955–61, we have granted to foreign nations for foreign economic aid projects of exactly the same type as would be constructed under my amendment millions upon millions of American dollars.

Can we afford to do less for our own people at a time when many of the areas of our Nation are so hard pressed?

Can we afford to do less for the unemployed of the United States when we are doing so much for the unemployed and others abroad?

As one reads about the flight of capital from Latin America one cannot but compare the lack of faith of the rich of those nations

with the abiding faith of our unemployed who are willing to pitch in and work but lack only the opportunity to work.

I ask, Mr. President, for an additional $2 billion to give our own citizens the same chance that we have given and are giving to the citizens of other lands.

The question which each and every one of us must ask himself is this: Am I prepared to give to the unemployed of the depressed areas of Gadsden, Ala.; Anchorage, Alaska; Camden, Ark.; Modesto, Calif.; Bristol, Conn.; Carrollton, Ga.; Cairo-Metropolis, Ill.; Evansville, Ind.; Pittsburg, Kans.; Paducah, Ky.; Hammond, La.; Biddeford-Sanford, Maine; Cumberland, Md.; Lowell, Mass.; Detroit, Mich.; Duluth, Minn.; Washington, Mo.; Butte, Mont.; Atlantic City, N.J.; Schenectady, N.Y.; Fayetteville, N.C.; Portsmouth-Chillicothe, Ohio; Muskogee, Okla.; Altoona, Pa.; Providence, R.I.; Conway, S.C.; Greenville, Tenn.; Laredo, Tex.; Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Va.; Aberdeen, Wash.; Charleston, W. Va.; and La Crosse, Wis., and the same opportunity that has been given to the unemployed in Sudan to work on a highway construction project involving 1.8 million American dollars, or the unemployed in Yemen to work on a highway construction project involving 3 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Republic of China to work on the Ku-Kwan hydroelectric project involving 2.5 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Philippines to work on a port facilities and harbor improvement project involving 3.2 million American dollars.

For myself, Mr. President, the answer is abundantly clear. If I am expected to take care of the unemployed abroad with American dollars then I can do no less than take care of the unemployed here at home first and just as adequately.

Mr. President, to date I have received replies from Governors of the following States giving the amounts which they could use for public works which could be completed in 27 months:

State:	*Amount*
Alabama	$50,500,000
Alaska	64,184,400
California	183,000,000
Colorado	20,926,000
Connecticut	28,545,000
Hawaii	24,111,912
Maryland	92,590,000
Michigan	639,000,000
Nevada	4,968,000
Ohio	329,259,645
Washington	40,000,000
West Virginia	89,155,950

It is obvious from even this response that in all the States at least four times the amount of funds which I propose could be spent on useful public works projects to relieve unemployment in areas of chronic unemployment.

My proposal is really a very modest one considering the need.

EXHIBIT 1

On page 10, line 2, and on page 11, line 1, delete the words "the sum of $600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended'.

EXHIBIT 2

SEPARATE VIEWS OF MR. GRUENING

I voted to report favorably S. 2965 providing for both a standby program of public works and an immediate program of public works for which an appropriation of $600 million was authorized.

It is my belief that much more than the authorized $600 million is needed and could usefully be used to put the unemployed back to work.

In a statement distributed to the members of the Public Works Committee, I stated:

"On March 27, 1962, the able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, introduced an amendment to S. 2965, a bill to provide standby authority to accelerate public works program of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies. The amendment would authorize the appropriation of $600 million for an immediate public works program.

"I commend the Senator from New Mexico for his foresight in submitting such an amendment.

"However, the amount is, in my opinion, hardly sufficient to meet the economic strain now being experienced in certain areas of the Nation.

"Accordingly, I now offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, raising the amount authorized to be appropriated for a program of immediate public works to the same amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance.

"It does seem to me that we should be willing to spend at least as much at home to take care of our own economically distressed areas as we are willing to spend abroad for aiding foreign economically distressed areas.

"My amendment does not, I admit, do equal justice as between foreign and domestic programs. Under the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, only one appropriation is authorized; namely, the sum of $600 million. Under my amendment, the limit of this one-time appropriation would be raised to the limit authorized in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the Development Loan Fund (sec. 202), the development grants and technical cooperation (sec. 212), supporting assistance (sec. 402), and contingency fund (sec. 451). Under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1962 and the 4 succeeding fiscal years the total sum of $7.5 billion. My proposal is much more modest. In setting the limit to the amount that would be authorized for our immediate public works program, I have used only the figure of $1.5 billion—the amount authorized for the fiscal year 1963 only.

"My amendment would increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the immediate public works program to $2,645 million, computed as follows:

"Sec. 202—Development Loan Fund	$1,500,000,000
Sec. 212—Development grants	380,000,000
Sec. 401—Supporting assistance	$465,000,000
Sec. 451—Contingency fund	300,000,000
Total	2,645,000,000

"In proposing this increase in the amount authorized to be appropriated, I have used only the authorizations contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. I have not considered the amounts of U.S. funds made available abroad through such lending agencies as the World Bank, Export-Import Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, etc. Billions of American dollars have been and are being channeled abroad through these agencies. In many cases, the so-called loans are not loans at all but grants.

"In my humble opinion, no situation is more tragic than that of men and women unemployed who wish to work and cannot find it. In my humble opinion, no situation is more paradoxical than that this wealthiest country on earth, which has poured out $100 billion in the last decade and a half to help foreign countries, and proposes to spend even greater sums in the future for the same purpose, cannot meet its primary obligation to its own people.

"I am merely proposing, by this amendment, to offer a fraction for the relief of economic distress and the creation of employment for our fellow Americans of what we have been doing or are asked to do—and will doubtless continue to do—in far larger measure for inhabitants of 100 foreign countries.

"My amendment is as follows:

" 'On page 2, line 24, delete the words "the sum of $600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended".'

"In order to insure prompt action on this vitally needed measure by the Senate, I did not press my amendment in committee but must reserve my position on the amount authorized for an immediate program of public works when this bill is considered in the Senate.

"ERNEST GRUENING."

EXHIBIT 3

Private industry insured unemployment rates by administrative area and industry

By administrative area	This week (Apr. 28, 1962)		Last week (Apr. 21, 1962)		Year ago (Apr. 29, 1961)	
	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]
State	5,322	16.2	5,699	17.4	6,500	19.9
Anchorage	3,005	16.7	3,198	17.8	3,315	18.4
Fairbanks	1,220	17.9	1,322	19.3	1,664	27.6
Juneau	282	10.5	294	10.9	328	11.5
Ketchikan	276	10.3	302	11.3	500	15.9
Nome	177	33.5	201	38.0	207	33.3
Petersburg	274	34.7	297	37.6	312	40.9
Sitka	88	7.2	85	7.0	165	13.8

By industry	This week (Apr. 28, 1962)		Last week (Apr. 21, 1962)		Year ago (Apr. 29, 1961)	
	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]
Total	5,322	16.2	5,699	17.4	5,600	19.9
Mining	201	17.4	257	22.3	310	27.6
Construction	2,044	45.0	2,238	49.3	2,706	46.6
Manufacturing	1,035	19.7	985	18.8	1,232	21.5
Transportation and utilities	462	6.6	542	7.7	502	8.3
Trade	503	6.2	571	7.0	627	8.3
Finance	56	3.7	51	3.4	80	5.7
Service and other	1,021	19.8	1,055	20.5	1,043	21.0

[1] Insured unemployment rate.

EXHIBIT 4

APRIL 18, 1962.

Senate Public Works Committee today reported emergency public works bill authorizing appropriations of $600 million for one-shot effort for public works projects in economically distressed areas. As member of committee, I expressed concern that sum authorized was totally inadequate to meet Nation's needs. Would appreciate your writing me as soon as possible giving me as much information as possible concerning public works projects in economically distressed areas of your State which could be completed in 27 months, giving estimated costs and man-hours of work which would be provided.

EXHIBIT 5

STATE OF ALASKA,
Juneau, May 2, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We have gathered the following information from the Alaska Department of Public Works.

Of the approximately $388,812,748 listed as capital improvement needs for the next 6 years, approximately $99 million would be paid for by the State of Alaska, exclusive of any Federal moneys made available under Federal grant-in-aid programs. A summary of this $388,812,748 program is set forth on page 8 of the attached document, "A Capital Improvement Program for the State of Alaska, 1962–68." Projects which are to be financed in whole or part from State or local funds are summarized on pages 11 through 17.

As you can see, we have a considerable inventory of buildings, structures and improvements that should be built. We do not have a great many projects ready to be advertised at this time, but we should be able to add to the list fairly quickly providing that we can obtain Housing and Home Finance Agency advances for advance planning and providing that the various bonding proposals pass. With the incentive provided by a public works act, such as S. 2965, the State could prepare a number of the more uncomplicated projects, such as classroom additions to State-operated schools, small State-operated schools for contract, and make application for Housing and Home Finance Agency planning advances and grants for the more extensive projects. Actually, we are now working on a number of applications for HHFA advances and grants for the planning and design of a number of State-operated schools and various facilities at the University of Alaska.

Accordingly, the following list of projects which are designed, are being designed, or will be designed in next year, very substantially understates our ability to utilize S. 2965 in carrying out the purpose of that act. In this connection, I should note that the capital improvement program is a conservative document. In preparing the capital improvement program many needed projects were deleted to hold the program within the State's ability to finance.

The projects which probably most nearly qualify for immediate consideration under a standby public works act are:

1. The International Airport Terminal buildings projects at Anchorage and Fairbanks, representing a value of $3.8 million and $1.8 million, respectively, are fully complete and ready for bidding.

2. Projects which are now in the planning stage with design completion anticipated before August of this year are Salcha Elementary School ($160,000), Eagle River School addition ($288,000) Soldotna School addition ($183,000), and Glen Allen refrigeration and foundation ($55,000). Funds for these projects have been provided under the 1962–63 State education budget. The total for these schools is $686,000.

3. At present, three applications are being prepared for submittal to the Housing and Home Finance Agency for an "advance for public works planning." If approved, funds would be available to complete architectural-engineering design for the Ninilchik School addition ($400,000), the Metlakatla Elementary School ($600,000), and the Fort Yukon School addition ($260,000). Approximately 5 months will be required before these projects would be "set to go." The total for these schools is $1,260,000.

4. The following schools might be ready for contract this year if the $5 million bond issue for State operated schools passes:

Ambler School	$55,000
Eagle River (further classroom addition)	52,000
Delta Junction	516,000
Homer	554,000
Tanana	252,000
North Kenai	554,000
Sterling	150,000
Chugiak High School	1,200,000
McGrath	78,000
Brown's Ct	160,000
Fortuna Ledge	78,000
Total	3,649,000

NOTE.—The legislature appropriated $75,000 for planning and design for Chugiak High School. Some preliminary work has already been done on this project.

5. The vocational school at Nome, although funded under a $1,500,000 general obligation bond authorization, is another project which could qualify. Final plans could be completed within 5 months.

6. If the $7,200,000 bonding program for the University of Alaska passes, money will be available for the construction of an addition to the engineering and physical sciences building, a biological sciences and renewable resources building, completion of the university's new heating plant, and other related facilities.

7. Invitations to bid on the construction of fire and crash stations at the Anchorage and Fairbanks International Airports, approximately $180,000 each, will be advertised this June.

8. A $160,000 addition to the Miner and Minerals Building in Anchorage may be erected in the 1963 construction season.

9. Proposed water and harbors projects scheduled for the 1962 and 1963 construction seasons which are not yet under contract are:

Angoon, docks	$50,000
Cordova, floats	50,000
Craig, dock	40,000
Douglas, floats	45,000
Homer, floats	65,000
Hydaburg, dock	25,000
Hyder, float	7,500
Klawock, dock approach	40,000
Kodiak, floats	30,000
Ninilchik, floats	23,000
Seldovia, floats	65,000
Seward, floats	46,000
Valdez, floats	38,000
Wrangell, floats	31,000
Total	555,500

NOTE.—Considerable work has been done on some of the foregoing projects or is now underway. Since this work is already contracted out, it is not reflected in the above estimated cost figures. Other projects which are now under under contract are also not reflected.

10. The following bush airfields are programed for construction in the 1962 and 1963 construction seasons:

New Stuyahok	$15,000
Alitak	50,000
Anvik	15,000
Buckland	10,000
Chevak	15,000
Circle City	7,500
Egegik	20,000
False Pass	10,000
Goodnews	10,000
Holikachuk	15,000
Kasaan	5,000
Koliganek	10,000
Koyukuk	15,000
McCarthy	49,000
Metlakatla	5,000
Nulato	25,000
Ouzinkie	30,000
Pilot Point	15,000
Quinhagak	5,000
Russian Mission	15,000
Shakeluk	7,400
Shungnak	10,000
Stebbins-St. Michael	10,000
Tanunak	15,000
Togiak	10,000
Total	393,900

I have omitted mention of projects planned for our annual $37 to $40 million Federal aid highway program and the Federal aid airport program. I gather that these programs will not be affected by the proposed standby public works act.

If I can supplement any of this information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

GARY THURLOW,
Executive Assistant.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *May 7, 1962.*

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

In reply to your telegram of April 18, it is estimated that the State of California could initiate and accelerate $183 million in public works projects and complete them within a period of 27 months. These projects would utilize an estimated 18 million man-hours of labor at the jobsite.

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor of California.

OLYMPIA, WASH., *May 2, 1962.*

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Review of public works of our State indicates that nearly $400 million would be needed for the completion of the total public works projects contemplated in the next 3 to 4 years in economically distressed areas when limited to projects believed to have a completion date within a 27-month period. The total would amount approximately to $40 million. This latter figure would represent specific items such as buildings, utilities, etc. The larger figure given would include such items as dam completion, the canal possibility, atomic generation of electric power, and steam generation coal plants.

ALBERT D. ROSELLINI,
Governor of Washington.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Carson City, April 27, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Public Works Committee
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am happy to supply the information you requested in your recent telegram regarding the emergency public works bill.

The accompanying data, compiled by our department of highways, relates to roadway

construction contemplated or underway in the counties of Lincoln and Mineral, the two Nevada counties officially recognized by the Federal Government as depressed under the area redevelopment program.

I trust the enclosed data provides you with the information you desire. If I can be of any further service, please let me know.

Cordially,

GRANT SAWYER,
Governor.

Road contracts to be completed within approximately the next 27 months, Lincoln and Mineral Counties, Nev.

	Estimated construction cost	Estimated man-hours
Lincoln County:		
Project S-544(10) U.S. 93 from 14 miles southeast to 1 mile north of Alamo (15 miles)	$1,600,000	150,000
Project S-544(9) U.S. 93 from 14 miles to 22 miles southeast of Alamo (8 miles)	700,000	63,000
Project F-008-1(3) SR 25, from 2d St. to 6th St. in Panaca (0.5 mile)	70,000	7,000
Subtotal	2,370,000	220,000
Mineral County:		
Project F-004-1(3) U.S. 6 from 8.6 miles east of California-Nevada State line to 3.5 miles east of Basalt (6.7 miles) (construction underway)	948,000	86,000
Project F-004-1(4) U.S. 6 from California-Nevada State line to 8.6 miles east (8.6 miles) (construction underway)	1,100,000	99,000
Project S-525(1) FAS 525 from Nevada-Scheelite mine north to U.S. 50 (19.1 miles) (25 percent of this project in Mineral County)	550,000	52,000
Subtotal	2,598,000	237,000
Grand total	4,968,000	457,000

STATE OF COLORADO,
Denver, April 27, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: In response to your telegram of April 18, we are enclosing a list of public works projects in Colorado redevelopment areas that reportedly could be initiated and completed in 27 months subject to availability of funds.

This information was accumulated through contact with various city and county officials and State agencies.

We are not entirely familiar with the criteria for eligibility to participate under the terms of the proposed legislation or with the legislative definition of public works. We have not, therefore, attempted to evaluate whether or not all of the listed projects could qualify for assistance under the proposed legislation.

We were not able to obtain an assessment of the man-hours of work which would be provided by the projects as engineering studies are not available in connection with most of the proposals.

Very truly yours,

STEVE MCNICHOLS.

List of public works projects in redevelopment areas that could be initiated and completed in 27 months if funds were available as reported by various city and county officials and projects listed by the game and fish department

Area		Description	Estimated cost
County	City		
Alamosa		Water service to East Alamosa	$250,000
		Community youth center	200,000
		Addition to county courthouse	150,000
		Storm sewer and curb and gutter for East Alamosa	50,000
		Dike and river work on Rio Grande through city of Alamosa	50,000
		Total	700,000
	Alamosa	Paving city streets	386,000
		Extending airport runway	40,000
		New water well, mains, and extensions	100,000
		Enlarge sewer lagoons	50,000
		Storm sewer, South Alamosa	60,000
		Sanitary sewer system; new major trunkline	330,000
		Total	966,000
		Total, Alamosa County	1,666,000
Clear Creek		Georgetown Reservoir	360,000
	Idaho Springs	Shortwave communication system for city and county	8,000
		City street paving	75,000
		Sewage disposal plant	20,000
		Total	103,000
	Georgetown	Sewage disposal plant and collection system	100,000
		Develop Georgetown Lake as recreational area	225,000
		Rebuild water distribution system	100,000
		Total	425,000
		Total, Clear Creek County	888,000
Conejos		No county projects reported	
	Antonito	75 low-cost dwellings for transient workers	400,000
		Waterline	60,000
		Sewer system	180,000
		Total	640,000
	La Jara	No projects reported	
		Total, Conejos County	640,000
Costilla		County courthouse and jail	225,000
		County shops	100,000
		Fort Garland community building	35,000
		Hospital addition	50,000
		San Luis Water and Sanitation District sewage system	(1)
		Total	410,000
	Blanca	Water and sanitation system	(1)
		Total, Costilla County	410,000
Gilpin		Improvement, Corona Pass Rd	225,000
	Blackhawk	Water system and sewage disposal plant	75,000
	Central City	Water system and sewage disposal plant	100,000
		Recreational development, park, etc	25,000
		Total	125,000
		Total, Gilpin County	425,000

See footnote at end of table.

List of public works projects in redevelopment areas that could be initiated and completed in 27 months if funds were available as reported by various city and county officials and projects listed by the game and fish department—Continued

Area		Description	Estimated cost
County	City		
Huerfano		County courthouse and jail	$1,000,000
		Surfacing country roads to ski and other scenic areas	239,000
		Acquisition and devlopment of irrigation system for development of recreational facilities for Huerfano-Cucharas area.	3,000,000
		Waterfowl development	110,000
		Total	4,349,000
	La Veta	Expansion of sewer collection system and disposal plant	40,000
		Water filter plant	65,000
		Total	105,000
	Walsenburg	Sewage disposal plant	158,000
		Street paving, curbs, gutters, and storm sewer system	500,000
		Rebuilding and extending waterlines	100,000
		Purchase and install watermeters	108,000
		Extension of sewerlines	42,000
		Rebuilding electric distribution system and expanding electric production facilities	1,500,000
		City park recreational area	50,000
		Mine museum	18,000
		Senior high school	750,000
		Total	3,226,000
		Total, Huerfano County	7,680,000
Las Animas		Grade and pave Cucharas Pass for 12 miles	1,000,000
		Construction of 2-mile connecting roads between 2 State highways	40,000
		Recreational development at fairgrounds	50,000
		Pave connecting road from Aguilar to Highway 111	200,000
		Develop mountain recreation area	100,000
		Enlargement of North Lake	100,000
		Enlargement of Monument Lake	200,000
		Alkali Creek Reservoir	100,000
		New road construction, North Fork, Purgatoire River	50,000
		Total	1,840,000
	Aguilar	Filter plant and water distribution system	200,000
	Cokerdale	Pave streets	50,000
		Water distribution and storage	300,000
		Total	350,000
	Trinidad	New sewage lines and disposal plant	627,000
		Animas St. Bridge over Purgatoire River	230,000
		Rebuild water distribution system and water storage facilities	2,230,000
		Curb and gutter and paving	1,500,000
		Garbage, refuse, and disposal	40,000
		Police and fire building	200,000
		Development of Monument Lake Recreational Area	2,000,000
		Total	6,827,000
		Total, Las Animas County	9,217,000
		Grand total	20,926,000

[1] No estimate.

THE STATE OF OHIO,
Columbus, April 27, 1962.

The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Mr. E. S. Preston, director of highways, has estimated that in the 20 counties which have been declared as distressed areas, that his department could have the capacity to develop plans and complete $250 million worth of highway construction projects in the next 27 months. There is now under construction in the same area 102 miles of highways estimated to cost $79,797,000. He further estimates that the $250 million highway construction program would generate 28 million man-hours of work.

This area, I think, will be benefited immeasurably by the improvement of the highway situation which I think contributes very largely to the chronic depression that exists. If it is difficult to move man and materials into a community, then this community does not lend itself to industrial or economic development. Other programs can be of assistance, but there is no program that can be more helpful and is as basic as is the improvement of the manner of transportation.

I have asked our director of public works to also report on the necessities of this area with reference to public works generally and, as soon as those figures are available, we will make them available to you.

With all best personal wishes to you, I am,

Sincerely,

MICHAEL V. DISALLE,
Governor.

Ohio Department of Natural Resources—Public works projects for economic distressed areas in Ohio

Project	Description	County	Total cost	Labor, man-hours	Department's priority	Annual economic benefits	Remarks
Ohio Brush Creek Reservoir	Recreation and water supply	Adams	$3,530,700	321,920	3	$3,000,000	Construction plans needed.
Brush Creek and Shawnee State Forests.	Timber stand improvement, roads and trails, structures.	do	442,060	268,350	1	(1)	
Trimble water system	Village distribution system	Athens	60,000	4,081	1	5,000	Plans complete.
Strouds Run State Park development	Buildings, water and sewer, camping, swimming beach, roads and parking docks and ramps, reforestation.	do	600,000	50,000	3	50,000	Estimate 10,000 annual increase park attendance. Dow Lake in this park is an attraction which far exceeds facilities available.
Waterloo, Gifford, and Athens Park State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails, structures	do	74,011	45,260	1	(1)	
Belmont Lake	Road relocation	Belmont	205,000	17,083	1		Plans complete.
Barkcamp State Park	Buildings, water and sewer, roads and parking, docks and ramps, reforestation, camping, picnic areas.	do	700,000	58,000	3	500,000	New park with lake ready for filling except for road relocation. Would serve transient trade using Interstate 70.

See footnote at end of table.

Ohio Department of Natural Resources—Public works projects for economic distressed areas in Ohio—Continued

Project	Description	County	Total cost	Labor, man-hours	Department's priority	Annual economic benefits	Remarks
White Oak Reservoir	Recreation and water supply	Brown	3,106,784	121,872	3	1,500,000	Construction plans needed.
Stonelick State Park development	Camping area	Clermont	250,000	20,833	1	150,000	Construction plans complete.
Salt Fork Reservoir	Water supply and recreation	Guernsey	2,157,600	206,757	1	4,000,000	Construction plans complete. Includes road relocation and land needed.
Hocking State Park development	Camping area	Hocking	257,000	21,417	1	100,000	Plans complete.
Hocking and Tar Hollow State Forests	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	244,215	138,650	1	(1)	
Richland Furnace State Forest	do	Jackson	426,000	252,000	1	(1)	
Dean State Forest	TSI, roads and trails	Lawrence	48,500	30,000	1	(1)	
Forked Run State Park development	Camping area	Meigs	70,000	5,833	1	50,000	Do.
	Buildings, roads and parking, reforestation.	do	75,000	6,000	3		
Shade River State Forest	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	94,825	41,370	1	(1)	
Burr Oak State Park development	Camping area	Morgan	110,000	9,167	1	75,000	Do.
Wolf Run Reservoir	Water supply and recreation	Noble	577,830	48,153	2	500,000	Need construction plans.
Pike State Forest	TSI, roads and trails structures	Pike	416,800	243,900	1	(1)	
Ross County Lake	Recreation	Ross	400,000	25,000	1	50,000	Feasibility report being completed.
Scioto Trail and Tar Hollow State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	526,600	329,300	1	(1)	
Shawnee Recreational Area	Construct 3 impoundments and reconstruct another for recreation.	Scioto	506,933	42,245	2	150,000	Need construction plans.
Shawnee and Brush Creek State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	1,322,400	813,900	1	(1)	
Lake Hope State Park development	Camping area	Vinton	86,000	7,167	1	150,000	Plans complete.
	Cabins, water and sewer, swimming pool, roads, and parking.	do	1,300,000	108,000	3	320,000	Estimate of 64,000 annual increase in park attendance.
Wheelabout Reservoir	Recreational impoundment	do	130,000	6,667	2	150,000	Construction plans needed.
Zaleski and Tar Hollow State Forests	TSI, roads and trails, structures	do	533,343	320,225	1	(1)	
Muskingum River locks and dams	Repairs to locks and dams 1 to 8, inclusive, for recreation and commerce.	Washington	677,870	56,489	1	233,000	Construction plans needed. Preliminary design on No. 6 completed.
	Fishermen's access and boat ramps at 8 lock and dam pools.	do	20,000	2,000	1	48,000	These facilities would accommodate 16,000 fishermen per year.
Total			18,855,645	3,582,369			

[1] The improvement of the timber stands on State forests will not result in immediate financial returns to the community except for the wages paid to local workers; however, ample benefits will be enjoyed in future years. Timber stand improvement includes tree planting, pruning crop trees, thinning dense stands, and removal of cull trees and vines. The increase in value to the remaining stand will result from more rapid growth and higher quality timber. Under Ohio conditions, this improvement will often double the volume of wood produced. The cutting and fabricating of the raw materials will support local industries and attract new users of wood to these dependable sources of supply. Recreational benefits will accrue also. Wild land under intensive forest management produces maximum populations of wildlife.

OHIO

Project cost summary by counties

Adams	$136,050
Athens	19,280,700
Belmont	989,630
Brown	114,080
Clermont	61,050
Gallia	7,597,360
Guernsey	3,268,563
Highland	19,080
Hocking	1,460,860
Jackson	19,080
Lawrence	101,360
Meigs	536,360
Monroe	19,080
Morgan	903,360
Noble	229,080
Pike	81,080
Portage	17,517,223
Ross	137,080
Scioto	2,580,360
Vinton	972,050
Washington	557,510
Southeast Ohio	3,823,709
Total	60,404,705

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
Lansing, April 19, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: The Senate Public Works Committee's approval of President Kennedy's $2.6 billion public works program to combat unemployment is encouraging. With 268,000 workers, 9.2 percent of our labor force, currently unemployed in our State, we feel the need of this legislation is eminent.

You ask for information concerning Michigan's ability to participate in the $600 million immediate effect provision of the program.

We currently have 53 areas in our State that qualify under this legislation as area that we are ready to embark upon capital redevelopment or eligible labor surplus areas.

In an analysis I recently conducted, I found improvement programs totaling $639 million that would provide approximately 60,000 man-years of employment. These figures were developed only from those projects in Michigan that can meet the limitations of the $600 million proposal. They constitute, if anything, an understatement of the volume of activity that could be started in Michigan without delay.

While we have not projected our figures to a period longer than 12 months, it is our belief that the backlog of public works projects that could be initiated at the present time in Michigan would certainly absorb any extension of the time and financial limits of the program.

Concerning the time duration of the project, I urged the House Public Works Committee to grant a flexible time limit for project duration. Due to weather conditions in Michigan, a limit of 12 months would prohibit the initiation of some public works projects that might otherwise qualify.

My statement to the House Committee on Public Works contains a detailed breakdown of the type of projects we could initiate in Michigan. I am enclosing a copy of this statement for your information.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. SWAINSON,
Governor.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, April 26, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: The following is a list of public works projects as requested in your telegram of April 18:

Ansonia area:	
Ansonia-Derby flood control project	$6,000,000
Street and road reclassification project	250,000
Sewage disposal plant	1,000,000
Ansonia area—Continued	
Additional recreational facilities	$100,000
Reconstruction of Route 34 in Derby from 3d St. to A St.	200,000
Reconstruction of 0.2 mile of Route 115 and railroad underpass, Maple Street to Broad St., town of Seymour	1,000,000
Reconstruction of 1.5 miles of Route 115 in Derby and Ansonia from Route 34 to Colburn St	800,000
Bristol area:	
City hall (Bristol)	$1,630,000
Civic center (Bristol)	450,000
Fire station (Bristol)	250,000
City streets (Bristol)	2,000,000
Sewage treatment plant (Bristol)	2,535,000
Airport (town of Plymouth)	500,000
Industrial park (town of Plymouth)	500,000
Construction of truck climbing lane on Route 69, Bristol	205,000
Widening approximately 1 mile of Route 6, Bristol, in Jerome Ave. vicinity	250,000
Extension of truck climbing lane on Route 6 in Plymouth from end of 1962 construction to vicinity of Todd Hollow Rd	100,000
Correcting sight line on Route 6, in Plymouth, in the vicinity of Orchard and Kellogg Sts	150,000
Sewer treatment plant and pumping station (Killingly)	800,000
Town dump and incinerator (Killingly and Putnam jointly)	700,000
Downtown renewal project (Killingly)	3,000,000
Town roads drainage and repair (Killingly)	100,000
Sewage facilities and disposal (Plainfield)	500,000
Recreational project	150,000

Bristol area—Continued	
Correction of sight line on Route 169 1 mile south of Brooklyn town line	$75,000
Reconstruction of 1.2 miles of Route 171 from Thompson town line to Quinebaug River	400,000
Reconstruction of 2.6 miles of Route 169 in Pomfret and Woodstock from Route 44 to Route 171	700,000
Reconstruction of Maple Street, Killingly, from Route 6 to Route 101	375,000
Reconstruction of Route 12 south of Route 6 underpass	200,000
Reconstruction of Route 12 in Putnam and Thompson from 300 feet south of Route 12 to 0.5 mile north of Route 193	4,500,000
Resurfacing of Main Street, Killingly	100,000

The estimated cost of the above-listed projects is $28,545,000 including $19,865,000 in local projects and $8,680,000 in State highway department projects.

Sincerely,

JOHN DEMPSEY,
Governor.

STATE OF MARYLAND,
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
Annapolis, Md., April 25, 1962.

The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Governor Tawes has asked me to reply to your telegram of April 18 regarding possible public works projects in persistent labor surplus areas of Maryland.

To date we have been able to learn of 23 projects in such areas whose total cost is estimated at approximately $92,590,000. It is estimated that total man-hours would exceed 15,600,000.

The single most expensive project would be the relocation of U.S. Route 40 as a 4-lane highway for a distance of 112 miles from Hancock, Md., to Washington County, Pa. This would traverse five labor surplus counties. The estimated construction cost for the entire highway, exclusive of right-of-way acquisition, is $84,400,000 providing an estimated 15,275,000 man-hours of work.

The most critical Allegany County project is the construction of a new Pinto Bridge and improvement of the road from the bridge to U.S. 220. The existing bridge is wholly inadequate for the movement of employees to and from the Allegany Ballistics Laboratory and efficient delivery of some materials to the plant. The estimated cost for this project is $1 million involving 100,000 man-hours.

There are at least four projects in Washington County including the proposed North-East Highway at a cost of $400,000 and 75,000 man-hours. A new water transmission main from Williamsport to Hagerstown would cost $1,450,000. There is no estimate of the number of man-hours. A project involving sewer system extensions in Hagerstown and other Washington County towns would cost $3,500,000. Again there is no estimate of man-hours. Sewer and water main extensions and highway improvements to a proposed industrial park would cost $670,000. The number of man-hours is unknown at this time. The total cost of these Washington County projects is $6,020,000. Man-hours were computed for only one of the four projects; i.e., 75,000 man-hours.

Seventeen projects for the city of Cambridge in Dorchester County were proposed and a tabulation is enclosed. The total cost is $1,070,000 involving 196,800 man-hours.

We are also endeavoring to uncover other appropriate projects and will forward details next week.

I hope this information will be useful and please wire or phone if additional details are required.

Cordially,

ROBERT M. SPARKS,
Chief, Business and Industrial Development.

City of Cambridge, Md.—List of projects which could be completed in 27 months

No. and name of project	Approximate cost	Approximate labor-hours
1. Improvements to Race St.	$19,000	4,000
2. Streets and utilities, Plaza Park, part 1	18,500	4,000
3. Improvements to Maryland Ave.	12,000	3,200
4. Extension of Goodwill Ave.	13,500	3,500
5. Streets and utilities, Parkside subdivision	33,000	6,000
6. Sewage pumping station, Stone Boundary Development	20,000	3,800
7. Bozarth Farms area, drainage	33,000	6,000
8. Improvements to sewage system, Jimson Rd.	33,000	6,000
9. Repair shop and garage, public works department	9,000	2,400
10. Sewer, storm water separation, Fairmount Ave.	70,000	12,000
11. Improvements to Leonards Lane	80,000	14,000
12. Drainage improvements, Dorchester Ave.	24,000	4,300
13. Drainage improvements, Phillips Ave., Robbins St.	30,000	5,400
14. Sludge disposal units, sewage treatment plant	200,000	40,000
15. Improvements to water distribution system	340,000	58,000
16. Woods road to wire cloth intercepting sewer	100,000	18,000
17. New 1,000,000 gallons per day well	35,000	6,200
Total	1,070,000	196,800

STATE OF ALABAMA,
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS,
Montgomery, April 23, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: At the request of Governor Patterson, I am pleased to furnish the information requested in your telegram of April 18, 1962, regarding emergency public works which might be completed in Alabama in 27 months.

Both the State highway department and the State conservation department, which would be largely responsible for emergency public works, made estimates and plans sometime ago. Engineering has been completed and it is believed all projects could be commenced within 6 months.

The following estimates, in broad categories, cover proposed projects in those areas declared economically depressed:

County roads and bridges	$3,500,000
State highways	8,000,000
Interstate highways	20,000,000
Reforestation, water, and wildlife conservation, State parks, fire control	19,000,000
Total	50,500,000
Man-hours are estimated as:	
Highway and roads	3,000,000
Conservation projects	6,000,000
Total	9,000,000

The Governor is in agreement that the suggested authorization would be very inadequate, particularly, if such funds are allocated to the States on the usual pro rata basis.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH R. WILLIAMS,
Director of Industrial Relations.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
Charleston, May 3, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: This will acknowledge receipt of your telegram of April 18, 1962, concerning proposed public works projects in West Virginia.

I would first like to inform you of the situation with regard to public works projects in West Virginia and to give you some information relative to specific projects which could be accomplished under the proposed program.

At the present time, the State of West Virginia has a public works program based on the aid to dependent children of the unemployed program. We have elected to participate in this program with a stipulation that each recipient who receives assistance will work for that assistance. As of March 30, 12,600 men were employed under this program. As you know, this program is financed by both the Federal and State Governments on a matching basis, the State paying 30 percent of the cost and the Federal Government paying 70 percent.

One shortcoming of this program is that only individuals who are married with dependent children qualify. No employment is made available under this program for individuals who are not married or individuals who are married and have no children or whose children are grown.

Three million dollars in State funds have been appropriated for the coming fiscal year for emergency employment. I may, as chief executive, use these funds to match any Federal funds which may become available for the relief of unemployment. This, of course, means that should the aid to dependent children of the unemployed program be continued at the Federal level, these funds may be used for participation in that program.

It is my understanding that the public works plan proposed by President Kennedy will make Federal money available to various State and local governmental units on a 50–50 matching basis. I would like to strongly urge that consideration be given to a more favorable matching ratio in favor of State and local governments.

A program with a 90-percent Federal, 10-percent State matching ratio would provide employment for approximately 7,000 to 12,000 persons. As only $3 million are available in State funds for matching purposes, a 50–50 matching ratio would only provide employment for 1,500 to 2,400 persons. These figures assume expenditures for material and equipment of 20 to 50 percent.

Enclosed you will find proposed projects from our State departments of natural resources and from our State road commission. I would like to emphasize that these projects are only a sample of those projects which can be undertaken and completed within 27 months under this program and which would qualify under the rules and regulations of such program. It is anticipated that many projects at the community level, both county and municipal, would be submitted for accomplishment.

Again let me express my desire that Federal money be made available at less cost to the States.

I sincerely hope that this information meets your needs and that you will give every consideration possible to the suggestions which I have outlined. If I may assist you in any way or provide any additional information, do not hesitate to contact me at any time.

Yours truly,

W. W. BARRON,
Governor.

STATE OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, May 2, 1962.

The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING,
Senator from Alaska,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: This is in reply to your recent cablegram wherein you requested information on public works projects which could be completed during the next 27 months in our economically distressed area (Hawaii County). The attached tabulation gives information on gross construction costs by major types of functions and the estimated number of man-hours needed to complete the projects. These represent projects which are currently authorized or those for which authorization begins on July 1, 1962, for the new fiscal year. It is estimated that all of these will be completed during the 27-month time period you cited.

I have not seen a copy of the proposed emergency public works bill. Hence, it is not possible to say if all projects included in this tabulation would be eligible for financial assistance. As you know, highways and airports now receive Federal grants. Perhaps these projects would not be eligible for further aid. It would also be of value to know if such financial assistance would be in the form of interest-free loans or grants. The mechanics of the proposed bill may affect an area's willingness to participate in the program.

Hawaii's public works program for the coming fiscal year is the largest in our history. Part of the reason for this scale of State public works is to stabilize our employment situation. However, all of us recognize that public works construction alone will not solve our Nation's unemployment problem. Increased public works construction is only one tool of many that must be utilized to spur the growth of our economy. The Area Redevelopment Act and the program of retraining unemployed persons are examples of other actions that will help. Some areas will continue to suffer chronic unemployment until new economic activities are introduced. The private sector of the Nation's economy must maintain a vigorous growth if public efforts to solve unemployment are to be successful. Thus, any public works program should be accompanied by vigorous efforts to encourage and promote increased employment through new permanent job opportunities.

I hope this provides you with the information you need. However, if I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. QUINN,
Governor of Hawaii.

Authorized State public works located in economically distressed areas of the State of Hawaii (Hawaii County only)

I. Public works division (miscellaneous public buildings and the State's share of a sewage treatment plant):	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$1,351,412
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	122,184
II. Airports division:	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$3,500,000
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	320,000
III. Harbors division:	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$3,855,000
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	617,000
IV. Highways division:	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$14,427,500
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	1,978,000

Authorized State public works located in economically distressed areas of the State of Hawaii (Hawaii County only)—Continued

V. Land and natural resources department (land development, parks, water development, forestry, fish and game):	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$978,000
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	136,500
Total estimated construction costs	$24,111,912
Total estimated man-hours of work	3,173,684

EXHIBIT IV

PRESS CONFERENCE OF HON. WILLIAM L. BATT, JR., ADMINISTRATOR, AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BATT. Now in terms of numbers the area redevelopment areas comprise about 1,000 counties in the United States, and in terms of numbers again the blue areas or the areas that are in only for public works comprise only 100. But these are much bigger cities, by and large. There are about the same number in the blue areas as there are in all the red areas.

The arithmetic works out a little something like this—let me see if I can recall it. In the areas taken together, these red areas and the blue areas, we have about a third of the country's population, about a third of the country's labor force, and over half of the country's unemployment. They are, of course, the areas of longtime labor surplus, the ones we work with, the coal towns, the textile towns, the iron towns, the Great Lakes, the lumber towns, Pacific Northwest, Indian reservations in the Southwest, and the cotton textile towns in the Southeast. You know the economics of them.

Now over 2,900 projects representing $361 million of Federal funds and an estimated $125 million more of State and local funds—because you remember the communities have got to match this 50–50—$361 million of Federal funds and an estimated $125 million more of State and local funds are in various stages. Some are actually underway, some are being planned, some are just in the process of approval.

Approximately 580,000 man-months of direct employment will be generated by all these projects with the same number of man-months of additional employment based on the normal ratio of direct to indirect labor on public works projects.

Now of the total, Federal agencies are using $110 million of this total $361 million for direct Federal projects for such purposes as conservation work in our national forests and wildlife ranges, medical and sanitary facilities on Indian reservations, modernization and extension of small post offices, and other authorized public works.

That is about 30 percent of the funds that have been allocated to Federal agencies who do their own construction substantially. That, of course, is 100 percent Federal.

The agencies we are talking about are the Forest Service, the Agriculture Department, the Bureau of Indian Affairs of Interior, several others in Interior; Bureau of Reclamation, Corps of Engineers.

The largest, Paul, are Interior and Agriculture?

Mr. SOUTHWICK. Yes.

Mr. BATT. Now the larger share, the 70-percent share, $251 million, has been earmarked for State and local projects. You see, the Congress said to give priority to the stuff that comes out of the communities, and this has been committed for waterworks and water pollution control, for sewers, streets, hospitals, libraries, for police and fire stations, for public buildings, and many other types of needed community facilities for which communities put up matching funds.

About 50 percent of all the applications to CFA over here, Community Facilities Administration, are for sewer and water lines. I personally never realized how many communities didn't have any sewer lines or any water lines.

The response from local governments has been gratifyingly quick, demonstrating the strong desire of local communities to alleviate unemployment, and to get these public works built.

Our latest available figures, at the end of January, disclosed the following applications, expected to meet program standards, are on hand: Over in HHFA, CFA, $724 million. This is the backlog. This we haven't gotten to yet. HEW—and this is administered by the Public Health Service, waste treatment works $218 million, and hospitals $127 million, for a total backlog of $1,069 million.

And let me say parenthetically—this isn't in the printed statement—they are coming in at the rate of about $300 million every month.

Is that a fair statement, Paul?

The President is sending to Congress, sent to Congress yesterday a supplemental appropriation of $500 million to carry on this program. This sum was forecast in the 1964 budget recently transmitted to the Congress, and will exhaust the $900 million authorized in the accelerated Public Works Act.

It is clear, therefore, that there are already on hand more than enough applications for Federal and local projects to use up the funds authorized by the Congress for this program. Accordingly, the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are suspending the accelerated public works program except for those especially hard-hit areas which have already been allowed matching ratios in excess of 50 percent. This is a relative handful of areas, about 20 percent of the total, where the unemployment is so severe that Congress directed us to provide matching ratios higher than 50 percent, going up to a total of 75 percent.

While applications from all areas will continue to be accepted and dated as to time of receipt, they will receive no further processing unless they are located in the hardest hit areas referred to previously.

Status of APW projects approved, by type of project, as of Dec. 15, 1962

[Dollars in thousands]

State	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months on-site employment
Alabama	41	$4,254	7,028
Alaska	16	2,699	1,928
Arizona	15	2,935	4,192
Arkansas	60	1,274	2,542
California	62	6,916	8,732
Colorado	16	1,630	2,362
Connecticut	19	1,602	2,412
Delaware	2	93	223
Florida	25	3,099	5,407
Georgia	36	4,012	4,981
Hawaii	1	134	1,752
Idaho	37	2,367	2,645
Illinois	49	3,234	5,331
Indiana	25	1,758	3,413
Kansas	3	115	193
Kentucky	61	4,629	8,486
Louisiana	29	6,126	14,055
Maine	1	360	432
Maryland	3	158	583
Massachusetts	15	4,036	5,946
Michigan	111	15,814	20,952
Minnesota	41	4,196	6,230
Mississippi	27	2,302	5,611
Missouri	65	4,254	4,784
Montana	31	1,616	2,573
Nebraska	5	596	827
Nevada	2	200	276
New Hampshire	3	420	528

Status of APW projects approved, by type of project, as of Dec. 15, 1962—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

State	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months on-site employment
New Jersey	20	8,632	13,869
New Mexico	57	3,347	4,256
New York	28	6,284	7,130
North Carolina	46	3,032	5,370
North Dakota	2	275	528
Ohio	32	6,097	8,816
Oklahoma	23	3,430	7,944
Oregon	36	3,357	4,220
Pennsylvania	80	15,829	20,757
Rhode Island	6	2,786	2,196
South Carolina	20	1,400	1,524
South Dakota	3	650	1,104
Tennessee	32	5,538	14,112
Texas	27	2,627	4,808
Utah	34	1,211	1,746
Vermont	1	366	878
Virginia	11	100	209
Washington	46	4,144	3,281
West Virginia	56	6,017	5,365
Wisconsin	37	1,110	2,812
Wyoming	8	384	382
Puerto Rico	10	721	607
Grand total	1,416	158,166	236,338

Status of APW projects approved, by agency and bureau, as of Dec. 15, 1962

[Dollars in thousands]

Agency and bureau	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months on-site employment
Agriculture: Forest Service	741	$14,961	21,192
Army: Corps of Engineers	55	9,392	10,304
Commerce: Bureau of Public Roads	34	8,141	5,436
Health, Education, and Welfare: Public Health Service	181	40,004	56,951
Housing and Home Finance Agency: Community Facilities Administration	352	72,969	118,383
Interior:			
Bureau of Land Management	11	1,972	2,784
Bureau of Indian Affairs	19	5,701	9,984
National Park Service	10	1,736	5,310
Commercial Fisheries	1	380	540
Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	12	2,910	5,454
Total, Interior	53	12 699	24,072
Grand total	1,416	158,166	236,338

Status of APW projects approved, by type of area, as of Dec. 15, 1962

[Dollars in thousands]

Area	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months on-site employment
5(a)	340	$51,088	67,599
5(b)	809	49,771	76,607
5(br)	20	5,310	9,296
LS	247	51,997	82,836
Grand total	1,416	158,166	236,338

Status of APW projects approved by States as of Dec. 15, 1926

[Dollars in thousands]

Type	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months on-site employment
Construction and improvements:			
Hospital and health facilities	72	$21,639	31,598
Administrative building	47	12,627	19,774
All other buildings	44	5,340	6,914
Road and streets	261	20,965	24,171
Airports	5	1,374	2,448
Water, sewage facilities and other utilities	192	41,651	70,416
Waste treatment works	113	19,503	27,562
Recreational facilities	50	9,337	15,667
Water resources projects	15	3,355	3,626
Fish and wildlife facilities	9	2,180	4,662
All other construction	234	7,766	9,010
Repairs: All types of repairs	170	7,100	9,809
Conservation measures: All types of conservation	204	5,329	10,681
Grand total	1,416	158,166	236,338

EXHIBIT 1

[From New Republic, Feb. 8, 1964]

THE WAR ON POVERTY

(By Gunnar Myrdal)

Having to live with large pockets of poverty stricken people in their midst is not a new experience in the American Nation. Right from slavery the masses of Negroes formed such pockets, both in the rural South and in the cities South and North. Such pockets were also formed by other colored people who immigrated to work as laborers from Asia, Mexico, and Puerto Rico. Most American Indians in their reservations were also poor and isolated as they are today. There were also, as there are still, pockets of "poor whites," ordinarily of old American stock, who lived by themselves in abject poverty and cultural isolation.

I believe it is important to have in our minds this broad picture of the historical reality of American poverty as a background to the discussion of the problems facing us today. The regular, prosperous Americans have become accustomed to living with unassimilated groups of people in their midst, about whom they know in a distant and general way that they are very poor. The fact that in earlier times they themselves lived under the risk of being thrown out of work and losing their livelihood, if only temporarily, made it easier for them to feel unconcerned about the people who more permanently were enclosed in the pockets of poverty. Otherwise, the existence of all this poverty in the midst of progressive America stood out in blunt contradiction to the inherited and cherished American ideals of liberty and equal opportunity, as these ideals increasingly had been interpreted, particularly since Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal.

Automation and other changes are all the time decreasing the demand for unskilled and uneducated labor. Standards are rising fast even in household and other menial work. Something like a caste line is drawn between the people in the urban and rural slums, and the majority of Americans who live in a virtual full-employment economy, even while the unemployment rate is rising and the growth rate of the economy is low. Except for a lower fringe, they experience a hitherto unknown security, for it is a tacit understanding in America, as in the rest of the Western World, that a recession will never again be permitted to develop into anything like the great depression. But there is an underclass of people in the poverty pockets who live an ever more precarious life and are increasingly excluded from any jobs worth having, or who do not find any jobs at all.

I want to stress one important political fact. This underclass has been, and is largely still, what I have been accustomed to call the world's least revolutionary proletariat. They do not organize themselves to press for their interests. The trade union movement comprises only about one-fourth of the workers, mostly its upper strata who in the main belong to the prosperous majority. To a relatively higher extent than normally they do not register and vote at elections—even apart from the large masses of Negroes in the South who are prevented from doing so.

In very recent times we have seen one important break of this empirical rule of the political apathy of the poor in America. I am, of course, referring to the rebellion of the Negroes in southern and northern cities. Without any doubt, this is a true mass movement—so much so that the Negro leaders in the upper and middle class have had to run very fast to remain in the lead, as have, on the other side of the fence, the administration and other whites responsible for American policy.

I am not at this time going into the question of how this movement, so exceptional to what has been the pattern of passivity on the part of the poor in America, has come about. But I should mention two things about which I am pretty sure. One is my belief that the outbreak of this rebellion just now is not unconnected with the high and, as a trend, rising rate of unemployment, which, as always, runs much higher—about double—for Negro workers than for whites. Another thing of which I am convinced is that this movement will not abate unless very substantial reforms are rapidly undertaken to improve the status in American society of its Negro citizens. I am optimistic enough to forecast that in the next 10 years the Negroes will get legal rights equal to the white majority, and that these will be enforced. What will still be needed are, in particular, social sanctions to defend the Negroes' equal opportunities to employment, against the resistance of trade unions more than employers and the business world, particularly big business. And even when all this is accomplished, the Negro masses will nevertheless continue to suffer all the lasting effects of the disabilities and disadvantages of their poverty, their slum existence and their previous exclusion from easy access to education and training for good jobs.

Indeed, it is easy to understand why some of the Negro leaders, and some white liberals, are now raising the demand for a new Marshall plan to make good the effects of the maltreatment in America of the Negroes from slavery and up till this day. Nevertheless, I am convinced that this demand for a discrimination in reverse, i.e., to the advantage of the Negroes, is misdirected. Nothing would with more certainty create hatred for Negroes among other poor groups in America, who have mostly been their bitterest enemies as they have been the only ones who have felt them as competitors. Moreover, special welfare policies for Negroes are not very practical. Negro housing cannot very well be improved except as part of a plan to improve the housing situation for poor people in general. The same is true of education. Special welfare policies in favor of the Negroes would strengthen their exclusion from the main stream of American life, while what the Negroes want is to have equal opportunities.

What America needs is a Marshall plan to eradicate poverty in the Nation. This is a moral imperative. The unemployed, the underemployed and the now unemployables are also America's biggest wastage of economic resources. The poor represent a suppressed demand which needs to be released to support a steady rapid growth of American production. The goals of social justice and economic progress thus are compatible. A rapid steady economic growth is impossible without mobilizing the productive power of the poor and clothing their unfilled needs with effective demand. The existence of mass poverty in the midst of plenty is a heavy drag on the entire economy.

The statistics on unemployment in America do not tell the whole story. Besides the 4 million unemployed there are the workers who are only part-time employed, those who have given up seeking work, and all the underemployed. It is an ominous fact that even the prolonged upturn in production from 1961 and onward has not implied a substantial decrease in the rate of unemployment. Nobody seems to expect that the continuation of the present boom will bring down unemployment to a level that could be considered even to approach full employment. And nobody assumes that there will not be a new recession, if not this year then the next. It is reasonable to expect that the unemployment rate will then reach a new high point. There are definite signs that the trend is rising.

For this there are explanations. I believe it is important to stress that none of the specific explanations put forward makes a rising trend of unemployment inevitable, or could by itself prevent the attainment of full employment. Only in conjunction with each other do these influences have the present disastrous result. If in the sixties exceptionally many young workers enter the labor market, this should not necessarily mean more unemployment. Production could expand rapidly enough to absorb them, and all the new workers could have been properly educated and trained so that they fitted the demand for labor as it has been changing. Long ago, Prof. Alvin Hansen and other economists, including myself, used to think that in rich countries, where capital is plentiful, a rapid population increase would rather act as a spur to expansion. It would stimulate the demand for new housing and all the goods and services accessory to housing, and for new schools, teachers, and productive capacity.

Likewise, automation should not by itself lead to unemployment if output expanded enough and the labor force were adjusted to fit the change in demand, caused by automation itself among other things. There are countries with full employment that have an equally rapid pace of automation. There, automation is viewed as driven forward by the scarcity of labor and as resulting in higher productivity of labor, higher earnings and a rising consumers' demand for products and services: in America, as a cause of unemployment.

OUR CHANGING SOCIETY

What type of society are we moving toward in the modern rich countries? A continually smaller part of our total labor force will be needed in agriculture, manufacturing industry, heavy transport, distribution of commodities, banking and insurance. If we could countervail Parkinson's law, which for various reasons is working with particular force in America, even many sectors of public service would demand less labor.

It is the serious lag in adjusting the education and training of our labor force to the needs of this new society which is the general cause of the situation where we have serious overemployment in some sectors of our economy, at the same time as there is an uncomfortably large and growing residue of structural unemployment and underemployment that cannot be eradicated by an expansion of our production that is feasible.

Against this background it is easy to establish the broad lines of the policies that we will have to apply in order to cure our economic ailments. Huge efforts will have to go into education and vocational training, not only on the higher levels but on the level of grade schools and high schools. Particularly will we have to lift the level of elementary education for the poor people in the urban and rural slums, who are not now getting an education that fits them to the labor market. We must at the same time undertake the retraining of the older workers who are continuously thrown out of jobs without having the abilities to find new ones in our changing society.

I see it as almost a fortunate thing that America has such vast slums in the big cities and smaller ones in the small cities; so many dwellings for poor people that are substandard; so many streets that need to be kept cleaner; such crying needs for improved transport. To train unskilled workers to do such jobs should be easier than to make them teachers or nurses.

INCREASED PUBLIC SPENDING

It should be stressed, however, that a primary condition for success is rapid and steady economic expansion of the national income. Without an increased demand for labor, no efforts for training and retraining workers on a mass scale can succeed. This is the important argument for the view that expanding the economy is the essential thing. Expansion is, in a sense, the necessary condition for any effort to readjust the supply of different types of labor to demand.

A common characteristic of all the reforms directed at raising the quality of the labor force and eradicating poverty in the midst of plenty is that the increased expenditure will be public expenditure. Even when poverty is gone, when there is little or no unemployment or underemployment, a relatively much larger part of the Nation's needs will have to be met by collective means. In the future society toward which we are moving, where our productive efforts will increasingly have to be devoted to the care of human beings, health, education, research and culture, and to making our local communities more effective instruments for living and working, public spending will be an ever larger part of total spending. This is because it is not very practical and economical, and in most cases not even possible, to rely on private enterprise for filling these types of demands.

This brings up the problem of balancing or not balancing the Federal budget. Large sections of the public and Congress hold, on this question, an opinion that has no support in economic theory and is not commonly held in other advanced countries: that, in principle, expenditures of the Federal budget should be balanced by taxation.

A recent experience from my own country, Sweden, must seem curiously upside down to Americans. In a situation of threatening overfull employment and inflationary pressure, the Swedish social democratic government, which has been in power almost a third of a century, felt that it needed to put on brakes, and decided to raise taxation to a level where, for a while, we actually had a balanced budget in the American sense. The political parties to the right of the party in power criticized the Government fiercely for overtaxing the citizens, and insinuated that this was a design to move our economy in a socialistic direction, by robbing the citizens and private business of the funds they needed. So differently can the problem of balancing the budget appear in two otherwise very similar countries. In fact, you have examples nearer at hand. When the railroads were built in America, the Federal Government favored the railroad companies in various ways, which occasionally broke the rule of balancing the budget.

The analogy that a nation must handle its purse strings with the same prudence as an individual is false. An individual is not in the position to borrow from himself. Moreover, if the implication is that the government should not borrow even for productive purposes, it is a rule which no private householder follows, or should follow, if he is wise and prudent. And we know that there has been a huge increase, both absolutely and relatively, of private borrowing by business as well as by consumers.

This does not mean that Congress should not carefully weigh each dollar that is spent and each dollar that is taken in by taxation or other means. But the weighing should be in terms of progress and welfare for the Nation. I can see no virtue in America having decreased its national debt in postwar years to half its size compared with the national income, while abstaining from undertaking a great number of public expenditures that would have been highly productive from a national point of view. America has been satisfied for a whole decade with a rate of growth of only a little more than 1 percent per head, and with unemployment rising to the present high level. In the interest of public enlightenment, I would wish my American colleagues to spend a little more of their time disseminating some simple truths about budget balancing and related issues. America cannot afford to remain the rich country that has the highest rate of unemployment, and the worst and biggest slums, and which is least generous in giving economic security to its old people, its children, its sick people, and its invalids.

THE PRINCIPLE OF PROTECTING EXISTING WATER USES AGAINST HAZARDS RAISED BY PROPOSED NEW PROJECTS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have heretofore spoken in the Senate, principally as reflected in my comments beginning at page 9098 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 25, 1964, on the need to maintain inviolate the historic rule of law that he who first puts water to beneficial use is protected in that use against those who attempt later diversions of water from the same river source. That principle, which has served the cause of constructive progress, particularly in the West, is now in jeopardy. Congress is being asked to turn its back on this principle.

The central Arizona project legislation, to be considered in executive session of the Subcommittee on Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs next Monday, presents the issue squarely.

Some would have Congress endanger existing projects for the benefit of the proposed one. Most reasonable people would, I think, prefer that Congress build the new one without destruction of the existing projects.

I am asking that California's existing Colorado River uses be protected to the extent of 4,400,000 acre-feet, rather than the 5,100,000 acre-feet we have been using for many, many years. That 700,000

acre-feet reduction has been ordained by nature and existing law. I object to any further reduction.

Arizona representatives, and some others, have now come forward with a proposal that California's uses to the extent of 4,400,000 acre-feet per year be protected for 25 years, but not beyond, as I have insisted. I studied this suggestion in good faith. I studied the facts presented at our recent hearings. My conclusion is that such a cutoff as is proposed is completely unacceptable not merely because of the ominous danger it poses to California. It is unacceptable because it continues the possibility of further litigation between the two States of Arizona and California. But, most important, this proposal would constitute a violation of the principle at stake. Such a breach is not in the interest of anyone. "Ask not for whom the bell tolls—it tolls for thee."

The same sentiments were recently very cogently given by the highest legal officer of my State, the Honorable Stanley Mosk, Attorney General of California. I ask that the text of his address recently delivered at Town Hall in Los Angeles, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Californians are not the only ones to see it as I do. Even the present Colorado River water users in Arizona agree—almost. The same is true of the Arizona Legislature, which not only spoke in limiting a 1961 appropriation, to which I referred in my April 25 remarks at page 9104 of the RECORD, but which also spoke more recently and even more forcefully in a 1962 statute also approved by their Governor.

I ask that there also be printed, at the conclusion of my remarks, certain correspondence and resolutions directed to our Reclamation Subcommittee by the Arizona Colorado River water users and, also, the text of the Arizona statute to which those Arizonans and I refer.

You will note that, while the principle is acknowledged and endorsed, the Arizona water users and the Arizona statute do not extend the principle to the protection of Californians—only Arizonans. I cannot understand this. I take the position that Americans on both sides of the river are entitled to equal treatment. I seek protection for existing projects in Arizona and Nevada as well as in California.

Yesterday the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to a bill, S. 1658, earlier introduced by the two distinguished Senators from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. GOLDWATER] to authorize the construction of the billion-dollar central Arizona project on the Colorado River, a project which would make a new demand on a dwindling water supply.

I have earlier offered an amendment to the bill of the distinguished Senators from Arizona, asking that they recognize the prior use of Colorado River waters in my State to the extent of 4,400,000 acre-feet; in other words, to recognize, to that extent, a prior right of a historic continuing use of water in the river. They have so far declined to do so, except now they have apparently agreed to a limited extent.

Every witness who testified before our subcommittee, at its hearings over the past several months, said that there would be no complete hazard to the people of southern California until some 25 years from now with the central Arizona project in operation. So you can see that it is no "compromise" for the people of Arizona and their representatives in Congress to now accept my amendment to the extent of only 25 years.

That is like selling a man a fire insurance policy on his house with a clause providing that when the house is built, the insurance policy shall lapse. How would my fellow American citizens who live in Arizona deal with the same problem? It is rather interesting.

I have before me a copy of a resolution of the Yuma County Irrigation Districts and Water Users Presidents Association, which points to the action of the Arizona Legislature in providing funds for a study of the central Arizona project, with the Arizonans then urging its approval by Congress. The legislature limited the investigation and studies to "only that quantity of water—from the Colorado River—which may be available for use in Arizona after the satisfaction of all existing water delivery contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and users in Arizona for the delivery of main-stream water."

The same principle is applied in the 1962 statute specifying the powers of the Arizona Interstate Stream Commission.

That means that the legislature of Arizona, representing the people, and asking Congress to authorize the central Arizona project, recognizes that the uses of Colorado River water now in existence in Arizona should be protected and be senior to any of the new uses from the proposed central Arizona project.

Mr. President, that is all I am asking for the people of my State. I have a right to ask that equal treatment be afforded the people of California and the people of Arizona.

The amendment offered by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr Moss] appears to be in the nature of a substitute bill. It recognizes the validity of protecting existing uses, but only to a degree. It would protect only those in California, not also in Arizona and Nevada as I would do. It is further deficient in that the protection given California's 4,400,000 acre-feet per year is only for a 25-year period.

But I hasten to point out that the principle for which I have been arguing has now been recognized in regard to the central Arizona project. Now, I ask, "If that principle is a good thing for 25 years, why is it not a good thing indefinitely?" I ask that Mr. Moss' amendment also be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I hope that my colleagues on the Reclamation Subcommittee, indeed, all Senators, will study these materials. I think they will agree with me that the vital, time-proven, beneficent principle for which I argue should be confirmed—not just temporarily and not just for some people but unequivocally and for all Americans.

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

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Los Angeles, July 16, 1964.

To the Senators and Representatives of California in the U.S. Congress:

I am taking the liberty of sending you the attached copy of a talk which I made on July 7, 1964, at Town Hall, Los Angeles, concerning legislation before the Congress with respect to California's Colorado River water rights and the various regional plans which are under consideration. Each such plan differs from the others in a number of significant respects. I have endeavored to resist assuming the role of engineer or economist in public discussions of the merits of these plans. However, as indicated in the speech, I feel strongly that regional planning cannot succeed unless based on the recognition of the priority of existing projects over water rights of future projects.

The announced amendment to be offered by Senator FRANK E. MOSS to S. 1658, which would guarantee California's existing projects 4.4 million acre-feet from the Colorado River for a period limited to 25 years, is not an adequate recognition of that principle.

The State of California defended the priority principle for 11 years in the U.S. Supreme Court. The Court referred that issue, without deciding it, to the Secretary of the Interior or to Congress. It is my strongly held view, not only as a Californian but as a citizen of the United States concerned with water resource development, that regional water resource planning must recognize as among the States the principle which 100 years of western experience has established within each of the Western States.

Sincerely,

STANLEY MOSK,
Attorney General.

CALIFORNIA'S WATER CRISIS—A TIME FOR DECISION

(Address by Attorney General Stanley Mosk, Town Hall, Los Angeles, July 7, 1964)

I hesitated for a long time to use the word "crisis" in the caption to this talk. "Crisis" is a scare word. Used with the word "water," it suggests a time of trouble when the reservoir has run dry, when there is nothing but sand or salt water in the bottom of the well, when crops wither and orchards die, when the desert reclaims its own.

That kind of tragedy has happened in parts of the United States. Even the fear that it may happen can blight a community's future. Therefore, I say emphatically that we do not now have anything like that kind of crisis; we shall not have that kind of crisis. We shall make the decisions and we shall pay the price—whatever price is necessary—to maintain our civilization.

Nevertheless, California's crisis—California's time for decision—is now. We cannot wait until the reservoir runs dry. We must use the time we have, wisely and resolutely.

The lesson for today is written in California history. In 1905, the people of Los Angeles voted their decision to go to the Owens Valley for water. Not until 8 years later did Owens Valley water first arrive. In 1923, William Mulholland made the first surveys for the Colorado River Aqueduct. The first Colorado River water flowed through that great aqueduct in 1941—18 years later. The Feather River project will bring water south of the Tehachapi Mountains about 1971. The California Legislature first acted with respect to that project in 1947. The time span will be about 25 years. Each new project grows more costly in both time and money. Money cannot buy time.

In one sense, today's problem is identical with the problem of our past. We must anticipate and prepare for the water needs of a growing population, growing not only in numbers, but growing in per capita needs.

For two reasons, however, today's problem is different from the problem Californians faced a generation ago. Today, as then, we must plan to meet expanding water needs. For the first time, however, we must replace sources of water which we are now using. One such source is the overdraft from ground water basins from which more water has been taken than nature can replace. Some of the basins have already been badly damaged; others are threatened with destruction. Another source to be replaced is the water only temporarily available from the Colorado River.

A second reason today's problem is more difficult is the failure of an essential part of our legal institutions. The great engineering works which serve our cities and farms would not have been built in the face of today's legal uncertainties. A first step in securing the new works which we so badly need is to repair the fabric of our essential water laws.

California's major and immediate problem is the Colorado, and I shall talk most about that problem. But the legal problems are substantially identical to problems elsewhere throughout the West and, to an increasing extent, throughout the country. Because the problem is not limited geographically, there is reason for the bright hope of finding a fair, honorable, and effective solution very soon.

In terms of quantities of water, the problem is easy to state. One-fifth of the State's developed water comes from the Colorado River. Our State water plan is premised on the proposition that 5.4 million acre-feet will be available from the Colorado River. (I assume everyone here knows an acre-foot is water sufficient to cover 1 acre of land 1 foot deep. Roughly, it equals 325,900 gallons.) However, we now know that under the Supreme Court's decision 4.4 million acre-feet is the most that we can expect from the permanent supply. In addition, we face the possibility that we may lose a million acre-feet out of that 4.4 million.

In terms of quantities of water, we should have two objectives: First, to replace the million acre-feet above 4.4 million which will not be available; and, second, to make sure California does not lose another million acre-feet out of the 4.4 quantity.

You have heard it said many times during the past year that California lost a million acre-feet as a result of the Supreme Court's decision in *Arizona* v. *California*. I am here to say again, as emphatically as I know how, that this is not so. Only a small part of the million acre-feet above the 4.4 quantity was lost because of anything to do with the Supreme Court decision. At the end of the trial California asked the special master for a decree for only 4.6 million acre-feet out of the permanent supply. That request was on the basis of 1957 water supply data. Data today would justify less than 4.6 million acre-feet because the dry years on the Colorado have continued since 1957. In any event, the loss from the decision, at most, was 200,000 acre-feet.

The decision has hastened the time when the temporarily available water will disappear, because it has stimulated demands for projects in other States. It has also awakened Californians to the fact that California projects planned in 1930's to use 5.4 million acre-feet were planned on the basis of an overoptimistic projection of water supply.

This is not to say that yielding up a part of the water we now use will not hurt. It will be painful. Under the California priorities, Metropolitan's Colorado River Aqueduct will be less than half supplied out of California's 4.4 million acre-feet. The balance of the 4.4 million belongs, under senior priorities, to the California agricultural districts. The agricultural districts must also cut back their use, since some of the water they now use is junior to Metropolitan's right.

California's 4.4 million acre-feet is a good 700,000 acre-feet less than we now use. This makes it imperative that we save the 4.4 million.

If California loses any part of that 4.4 million acre-feet, it will not be the result of the Supreme Court decision. It will be the result of action hereafter to be taken by the Secretary of the Interior or by Congress. I am sure that neither the Secretary nor the Congress will ever take that action if our people understand what is involved.

The story is simple. It involves the two major issues in *Arizona* v. *California*—one which the Court decided against California, and one which the Court left undecided.

First, the issue decided against California: The Court decided that the water which Arizona and Nevada use from their tributaries—like the Gila in Arizona and the Virgin River in Nevada—does not count against what those States are entitled to use from the main stream. Arizona and California divide equally the surplus water above 7.5 million acre-feet, but eliminating the tributaries reduces to the vanishing point the possibility of any such permanent surplus.

There is no question about it, we lost the tributary issue, and I have not recommended that we ask Congress to reverse that decision. There has been little disposition on the part of other Californians to do so.

The issue which the Court refused to decide is quite another matter. If there is 7.5 million acre-feet available, California receives 4.4, Arizona 2.8, and Nevada 0.3. But how are shortages to be allocated among the three States if less than 7.5 million acre-feet is available from the main river? The special master recommended that any supply of less than 7.5 million acre-feet should be prorated among the three States—44/75 to California, 28/75 to Arizona, 3/75 to Nevada. The Court unanimously rejected the master's proposal.

The Court also rejected, 5 to 3, California's proposal that the principles of prior appropriation should apply so that future projects rather than existing projects should bear the risk of shortage.

What everyone must constantly bear in mind is that the Court refused to decide the shortage issue. It held that allocation of shortages is up to the Secretary of the Interior, after he first satisfies what the decree calls "present perfected rights." These are defined as rights to the quantities of water actually put to use before congressional authorization of Hoover Dam in 1929, plus the rights of Indian reservations—most of the reservations being in Arizona. Determination of present perfected rights is now in progress.

The Court will review any allocation the Secretary makes for abuse of his discretion, but there are precious few controls on that discretion which the Secretary might abuse. The Secretary's power may be enlarged or it may be contracted by Congress.

The remarkable part of the decision cannot be stated in terms of which State gets how much water.

The remarkable part is the vast, unprecedented, uncontrolled, and uncontrollable power conferred on one man, the Secretary of the Interior. In dissent, Mr. Justice Douglas, who is the most knowledgeable member of the Court with respect to water rights, summed up the result like this: "Now one can receive his priority because he is the most worthy Democrat or Republican, as the case may be."

That sentence describes why I am confident that executive fiat as the basis of water rights will ultimately prove as unacceptable to Arizona, to Nevada, and to the rest of the country as it is to California. Law—not the caprice of any executive official, however wise and however fair he may try to be—must be the basis of water rights.

My feeling was not diminished on May 22 when the Secretary announced that all water users in Arizona, California, and Nevada would be required arbitrarily to cut their use of Lake Mead water by 10 percent. Five days earlier he had ordered the gates at Glen Canyon Reservoir to be closed in order to build up a power head at Lake Powell. Closing those gates was directly contrary to his solemnly promulgated regulations that he would not store water in Lake Powell if doing so required him to reduce the contents of Lake Mead below 14.5 million acre-feet. Lake Mead is now down to 13.5 million acre-feet and is still dropping. Happily, water users in all three States stood shoulder to shoulder in protest, though futilely to date.

In fairness to Secretary Udall, we should understand that he did not seek the power which the Supreme Court's decision thrust upon him. We also should know that he has been excoriated by his own people in Arizona because he opposed the bill introduced by Senators HAYDEN and GOLDWATER the day after the Supreme Court decision to build a separately authorized central Arizona protect. His action was the course of wisdom, for the Hayden-Goldwater bill said nothing about water rights; it would have led, if passed, to a probable frustration of hopes and plans in all the States. Nevertheless, the Secretary's opposition took high courage.

Secretary Udall resisted Arizona pressure for immediate passage of the Hayden-Goldwater bill and created a task force which formulated a regional water plan. He announced the first version of his plan last August and a second version last February. A major announced object of his plan was to avoid a water shortage in the three States which would require the Secretary to exercise the power the Supreme Court had given to him.

Californians, Arizonans, and all westerners are indebted to Stewart Udall for introducing a new regional dimension—a new vision—in water resource planning. Today there are three regional plans in public view: (1) Secretary Udall's plan; (2) a bill, S. 2760, drafted by Northcutt Ely and introduced by Senator KUCHEL and in the House by 11 California Representatives; and (3) a bill recently proposed but not yet introduced by Senator HAYDEN.

The plans differ in many significant respects, but they all share these important features:

(1) Authorization of the central Arizona project to divert 1.2 million acre-feet from the main Colorado to relieve ground water overdrafts in the Phoenix and Tucson areas.

(2) Authorization of Bridge and Marble Canyon reservoirs on the main river to generate power and to produce revenue both for the central Arizona project and for projects to relieve water shortages in the other States.

(3) Importation of additional water for the region in order to avoid shortages in the 7.5 million acre-feet of basic supply and to supply needs in addition to the 7.5 million acre-feet.

(4) Protection of the areas from which water may be exported to the Colorado River service area, so that water will later be available to those areas without increased costs.

The most controversial difference in these proposals relates to the protection of existing projects. Secretary Udall's proposal, like the others, would seek to avoid shortages in the 7.5 million acre-feet, and thereby avoid allocating shortages. But, unlike the others, the Udall plan would leave unaffected the Secretary's power to prorate, if shortages nevertheless occur.

On the other hand, Senator KUCHEL's bill incorporates the amendment which I drafted at the request of M. J. Dowd, chairman of the Colorado River Board of California, and which Senator KUCHEL first offered as an amendment to the Hayden-Goldwater bill for a central Arizona project. It would protect all existing projects in all three States against the demands of the future central Arizona project, California's protection, however, being limited to 4.4 million acre-feet. I have insisted that protection be contained in any regional plan.

Senator HAYDEN's new bill is a purported compromise, protecting California's existing projects only, and for a period of only 25 years or for a shorter time, if regional facilities to avoid shortages are earlier constructed.

I have paid sincere tribute to Secretary Udall's courage, his concept, and his inspiration. I deeply regret having to say that I find myself in disagreement with what he apparently regards as a fundamental part of his plan—its treatment of interstate water rights. He says, as I think anyone who has studied the problem must—that priority of appropriation should be recognized within each State. However, if water shortage occurs, he indicates he would invoke his power under the decree to prorate shortages as among the States.

I have studied what he has said on the subject. I thoroughly agree with the objective he holds to avoid shortages. I cannot understand the rational basis for arguing that, across State lines, shortages should be prorated; that in time of shortage two competing users on opposite banks of the river should be treated differently from two users on the same bank. That concept is inherently antagonistic to successful regional planning.

Senator HAYDEN's new proposal—a substitute for the original Hayden-Goldwater bill—is an improvement. I applaud Senator HAYDEN for what appears to be a sincere spirit of accommodation. Yet I am forced to say, quite bluntly, that if his 25-year protection of priorities is intended as a take-it-or-leave-it offer to California, I could not favor taking it.

Three reasons have been offered in support of this compromise. They are without merit:

The first is that California, assured of 4.4 million acre-feet, would lose interest in a regional plan. Arizona, with its much smaller congressional delegation, might suffer. This is not a realistic fear for the self-evident reason that 4.4 million acre-feet does not meet the needs of California. Again, I remind you that 4.4 million acre-feet in the river means less than a half-full aqueduct for metropolitan water district.

The second contention is that because there is not water for a central Arizona project plus California's 4.4 million acre-feet, we have a moral obligation to compromise.

I am not an engineer, and I shall leave it to the Lord to decide how much it will rain hereafter. Obviously, there is risk of shortage, or none of us would have reason to be concerned. However, I will tell you that if a choice must be made between existing projects and future projects, both justice and fairness favor the existing projects. We can assert this in good consicence not only as Californians served by existing projects, but as citizens of the United States defending a principle vitally important to our Nation. We should not compromise with our future.

The third reason asserted for the Hayden proposal is that our alleged unwillingness to compromise threatens to block California efforts to get Federal support for other much-needed projects. I suggest that California will get its full and fair share of Federal support for the projects it needs. These are not times for the "summer soldier and the sunshine patriot."

We persuaded the court to reject the special master's conclusion that shortages should be prorated after a vigorous and all-out fight, and not because our adversaries agreed with us. The concessions that Senator HAYDEN has made—to recognize California priorities for 25 years and to treat Bridge and Marble Canyon power revenues as a regional resource for California and Nevada as well as Arizona—were not secured by our request for charity. They are offered only because we have fought for the 4.4 protection. The implications are clear. Obviously, Senator HAYDEN's 25-year concession is not enough.

We respect the Senator when he speaks for Arizona; I am sure he will respect those of us on our side of the river when we speak for California.

Frankly, I am shocked at the suggestion I have heard that perhaps we should compromise the rights of California's Colorado River projects in order to gain Federal supprt for new Federal projects which our State needs. I doubt that any responsible statesman could make such a proposition. I regard it as a subject not appropriate even for discussion.

The pitfall we must avoid is a parochial approach to our problems. The Colorado River problem is potentially the problem of every river in the United States. Our problem must ultimately be resolved on principle, not on piecemeal expedients. All of us, of course, should be willing to discuss and consider every honorable solution, but the search always must be for a rule of law which provides both fairness and certainty essential to water planning.

What the Secretary can do on the Colorado, he can do in any State in the West. His powers on the Colorado rest, in significant part, on the general reclamation law.

To our sister States, this message is appropriate—an ancient gravestone epitaph:

"As I am now, so you soon must be;

"Prepare yourself to follow me."

The message is being received. In March, I went to Washington to testify in favor of Senator KUCHEL's bill, S. 1275, to protect State water rights. I listened again, and with renewed amazement, to lawyers for the U.S. Department of Justice declare that there are no rights in a navigable stream which they cannot take, without compensation, and in the name of the United States. I heard them declare, as they declared in the Fallbrook case in California, that the United States need not acquire, because it already owns, all the water appurtenant to the national forests from which most of the water in western rivers flows.

This is lawyer talk, and it takes a good long while to sink in. You have to realize that almost every stream large enough to float a rainbow trout is, by a legal fiction, navigable. Furthermore, you have to realize what the U.S. Department of Justice tried to do in Fallbrook. The Government had bought land at the mouth of the Santa Margarita for the Camp Pendleton Marine Base. Then it claimed it owns a water right for that base because the rain falls on national forests upstream and therefore the users of that water between the forests and the mouth of the river are merely trespassers.

Judge James Carter gave this theory an appropriate name, which probably would have immortalized the doctrine had he expressed it in legal Latin. However, he put it in plain English: "the bucket at the end of the stream." And he rejected it.

The Fallbrook case is now on appeal. Should the bucket theory prevail, the United States may place its mighty bucket at the mouth of almost any river in the land.

In the next Congress, if not in this one, I hope that Senator KUCHEL's S. 1275 will pass. It would not undo the decision in *Arizona* v. *California*.

But Congress must establish the principles on which the development of the water resources of our Nation can proceed. The problems are simple, and they are common to every part of the country.

Expanding water needs require vast projects planned and built at the cost of billions of dollars in money and many years of time. Neither rivers, river basins, nor water needs stop at State lines. Regional planning is a necessity to survival.

Regional planning is like any planning for projects to use water. Planning requires certainty of water rights; certainty of water rights must be based on law, not on the good will or the ill will of any Federal or State official. The body of law which the Western States have developed from experience in the last century must be the basis and the source of both law and principles in regional planning.

Great projects cannot be built in reliance upon lawful water rights, only to have doubts cast upon those priorities decades later because other projects have become desirable. The law must be settled once and for all.

This was the issue in *Arizona* v. *California*. The Supreme Court referred the issue to the legislative and administrative arena. If Californians are unified in purpose; if we can convince other States that firm establishment of basic principles of water law and development are essential to the future of the Nation, we shall prevail in Congress.

On the other hand, if expedience is allowed to dictate that under regional water planning shortages must fall equally on existing projects and on future projects, then everyone who depends on an existing project must become an opponent of regional planning, an opponent of progress.

That alternative is a continuing and deepening water crisis, leading to ultimate disaster.

YUMA MESA
IRRIGATION AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT,
Yuma, Ariz., May 28, 1964.

Re Senate bill 1658.
Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: The board of directors of the Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District requested that you be supplied with a copy of the statement of our president, Mr. E. E. Winebarger, submitted to the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in regard to Senate bill 1658, the central Arizona project.

Sincerely,

T. R. MEYER,
Manager, Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District.

YUMA MESA
IRRIGATION AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT,
Yuma, Ariz.

Re central Arizona project Senate bill 1658.
Hon. FRANK E. MOSS,
U.S. Senator, Chairman, Irrigation Reclamation Subcommittee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: We appreciate your timely response to our letter of April 28, 1964, pertaining to our request to testify before your committee on Senate bill 1658, a bill to authorize the central Arizona project. At your invitation I would, on behalf of our board of directors, like to submit the following comments for your committee's consideration on Senate bill 1658 and the central Arizona project.

The Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District is a political subdivision of the State

of Arizona and a part of the Gila project as reauthorized under Public Law 272 (61 Stat. 628) consisting of 19,970 acres served by diversionary works from the Colorado River. Our district is one of six irrigation entities in Arizona who have contracted with the Secretary of the Interior for permanent water service from the Colorado River pursuant to the Boulder Canyon Projects Act (45 Stat. 1057). So that you will have the complete picture regarding Colorado River water use, these other organizations are as follows:

(a) The Yuma County Water Users' Association which administers the valley division of the Yuma reclamation project. This project has approximately 52,000 irrigable acres.

(b) The North Gila Valley Irrigation District which administers a portion of the Gila project containing 6,231 authorized irrigable acres.

(c) The Unit B Irrigation and Drainage District which administers the Yuma auxiliary project containing 3,305 authorized irrigable acres.

(d) The Yuma Irrigation District which administers a portion of the Gila project containing 8,769 authorized irrigable acres.

(e) The Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District which administers the Wellton-Mohawk Division of the Gila project with 75,000 authorized irrigable acres.

In addition to the above irrigation uses, the city of Yuma has entered into a contract for permanent service with the Secretary of the Interior for domestic water from the Colorado River. There are also 14 Warren Act contracts for delivery from the works of the Gila project and 2 for the delivery of water from the Yuma auxiliary project. These contracts are made pursuant to the Warren Act of February 21, 1911 (36 Stat. 925). In addition to the Warren Act contracts, there are nine additional contracts with the Secretary of the Interior in the Yuma area for the delivery of water pursuant to the Miscellaneous Use Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 451). These latter contracts are primarily industrial and military uses.

All of the above contractees are situated within Yuma County and constitute the present and only contracts with the Secretary of the Interior for use of Colorado River in Arizona. The irrigation works in all of the above districts were constructed by the United States pursuant to the reclamation acts and most of the irrigation districts still have substantial repayment obligations to the Government, which extend up until 60 years. The cotton, produce, citrus, and other products grown in this area constitute an important part of the economy of not only Yuma County but of the State of Arizona as a whole.

Since this area is tied economically to the Colorado River and constitutes the present contractees with the Secretary, it is readily apparent that any upstream diversion of water will be of vital concern to these districts. Whereas we do not presume to speak for the other districts, since we are all substantially similarly situated, our comments would be equally applicable to the other irrigation districts and entities as well. However, the unanimous feelings of the respective districts is expressed in the joint resolution filed by these districts with the central Arizona project authority in February 1964, a copy of which is attached hereto and marked exhibit A.

From time to time over the past years and in the Arizona Legislature, the people of Yuma County have been concerned with the construction of the proposed central Arizona project. It has always been represented that the project would be constructed for use of that quantity of water available after the satisfaction of all existing uses in Arizona. The Arizona Legislature, in its appropriation bills for joint studies with the Bureau of Reclamation of the central Arizona project, has recognized this principal and has directly placed a limitation upon the use of such funds. Representative of such limitations and by way of illustrations is Arizona Senate bill No. 189, chapter 39, of March 17, 1961, pertinent portion of which is as follows:

"*Provided further*, That the contract with the Bureau of Reclamation shall provide that the investigations and studies shall be restricted to only that quantity of water which may be available for use in Arizona, after the satisfaction of all existing water delivery contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and users in Arizona for the delivery of main stream water, and that nothing shall be done thereunder which will impair existing rights in Arizona for the diversion and use of Colorado River water."

This same language is contained in further legislation concerning the powers of the Arizona Interstate Streams Corporation in Arizona House bill 107, chapter 109, approved March 23, 1962.

Against this background we would like to comment briefly on Senate bill 1658 as presently constituted. It is the unanimous feeling of our board that the present Senate bill 1658 does not provide adequate safeguards for existing projects in Arizona and would thus put existing projects in jeopardy in the future. We, therefore, urge that Senate bill 1658, or any substitution, be amended to provide for a limitation on use of project water to that amount remaining after present contracts with the Secretary of the Interior have been satisfied. We feel that such a limitation is necessary and vital to the continued solvency of our district for the following reasons:

(a) One of the salient facts from the recently concluded Arizona-California litigation was the erratic and insufficient flow of water of the Colorado River. By way of illustration, one study made from the evidence submitted to the master is attached to this letter as exhibit B. In accordance with this analysis, the net amounts available to Arizona for use in central Arizona is 750,000 acre-feet as opposed to the 1,200,000 acre-feet upon which project costs are calculated. We realize, of course, that there are other studies that demonstrate that by tighter river control, rechannelization and control of phreatophytes, additional waters might be generated. However, these quantities are theoretical and if these measures do not generate additional water, the construction of the project would start with a built-in shortage.

(b) The lands within the Yuma districts are directly obligated to repay the construction and operation and maintenance charges due the United States in the same manner that one would pay out a mortgage. This payment is not keyed in any way to the use of water and each acre within the district is responsible for the total obligation of the district, regardless of the availability of water. The repayment obligation of the central Arizona project, in contrast, is not imposed upon the lands within the proposed service area and the irrigation payout is primarily predicated upon the cash sales of water. Since the payout period and feasibility is dependent upon a large flow of water through the system, we feel that in times of shortage, the central Arizona project would be given priority and preferential treatment, for in the absence of such preferential treatment it could not meet its payment schedule.

(c) The central Arizona project, as contemplated, provides for a supplemental source of water to the central valleys of Arizona, the primary source of water for this area being the Salt, Verde, Aqua Fria, and Gila Rivers, supplemented by deep wells. In contrast, the Yuma area is wholly dependent upon the Colorado River as its primary source of water. A proration or cutback in time of shortage or otherwise in the Yuma area would be a cutback in its primary water supply and in our district an abandonment of citrus groves, whereas those lands under the central Arizona project could shift to their primary source which has and will be surface and pump water.

(d) The principle of protecting present users in a watershed against diversions outside of this watershed is not new and has been recognized by Congress in past legislation. Illustrative of such recognition is the Big Thompson project in Colorado (70 Stat. 105) and the New Malones project along the Stanislaus River (Public Law 87–874, title 2, Laws 87th Cong., 2d sess., 1962) which carefully protect existing users within the watershed from any projects taking water outside of that area.

(e) Further evidence of the condition of this river is reflected by the recent request of the Director of Bureau of Reclamation Region No. 3, Mr. A. B. West, wherein he requested all lower Colorado River contract users to accept a 10-percent cutback in irrigation and municipal water beginning May 15, 1964, in the face of existing shortages. Further evidence is contained in the Pacific Southwest water plan, January 1964, report, page 3, where the Secretary relates that by 1974 it is anticipated that the lower basin will be in a state of shortage.

For the foregoing reasons, we respectfully submit that the proposed central Arizona project legislation be amended so that existing investments, both private and governmental, in these projects be protected.

To assist the committee, we have prepared a proposed amendment to Senate bill 2658, attached hereto and marked exhibit C, which incorporates the language found in the New Malones Project Act above referred to which would spell out existing priorities. It is also our understanding that the Secretary of the Interior presented draft legislation dealing with the Southwest water plan during his testimony before your committee. We also have had an opportunity to examine this legislation and feel that it does not recognize the rights of existing users. To this end we have prepared an amendment to this legislation as well, which, for your information, is attached hereto and marked exhibit D.

We are, of course, aware of the claim by California that all of their 4.4 million acre-feet of water used by their projects should be protected before water is available to central Arizona. We are not in sympathy with this claim as it involves an interstate system of priorities and out of line with the recent Supreme Court decision. California, of course, within the State, recognizes priorities along the Colorado River, and the various water users within that State have so contracted to achieve this recognition.

The information contained in this letter has, from time to time, been presented to our congressional delegation and they are aware of the feeling of this area. I would like to reiterate again, however, that our board is in sympathy with the people of central Arizona and generally endorse the central Arizona project, provided, however, that the enabling legislation make the project subordinate to the reasonable satisfaction of all existing water delivery contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and users in Arizona.

Sincerely,

E. E. WINEBARGER,
President, Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District, Board of Directors.
ELDON PAULSON.
ELLIOT WAITS.

EXHIBIT A

RESOLUTION OF THE YUMA COUNTY IRRIGATION DISTRICTS AND WATER USERS PRESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Whereas following the determination by the U.S. Supreme Court of Arizona's entitlement to the waters of the Colorado River, there was introduced and is now pending in the Congress of the United States legislation providing for the construction and operation of the central Arizona project; and

Whereas the Arizona legislature, in providing funds for investigation and studies of the central Arizona project limited such investigation and studies to "only that quantity of water (from the Colorado River) which may be available for use in Arizona after the satisfaction of all existing water delivery contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and users in Arizona for the delivery of mainstream water," and

Whereas responsible State and local officials and others concerned with the promotion of the central Arizona project have at all times and in good faith stated that the construction and operation of the central Arizona project would in no way jeopardize the present or future rights of existing users of Colorado River water under their contracts; and

Whereas the construction and operation of the central Arizona project for the diversion into Arizona of Colorado River water to which this State is entitled, after satisfaction of the rights of existing legal users thereof, will be beneficial to the entire State of Arizona: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved:

1. That this organization does hereby endorse the central Arizona project and does lend its support to the same, *Provided, however,* That in the enactment of central Arizona project legislation, whether as an independent act or as part of any larger water plan or project, it be clearly defined and provided that such project will be constructed and operated at all times for the diversion and use of only that quantity of water available to the State of Arizona after satisfaction of all rights to Colorado River water pursuant to existing water delivery contracts between the Secretary of Interior and users in Arizona.

2. That this association stands ready at all times to discuss with responsible persons interested in and concerned with the passage of legislation for construction and operation of the central Arizona project means of implementing the above stated proviso.

Dated and adopted this —— day of February 1964.

YUMA COUNTY WATER USERS ASSOCIATION,
——— ———,
President.

YUMA IRRIGATION DISTRICT,
——— ———,
President.

UNIT B IRRIGATION & DRAINAGE DISTRICT,
——— ———,
President.

YUMA MESA IRRIGATION & DRAINAGE DISTRICT,
——— ———,
President.

WELLTON-MOHAWK IRRIGATION & DRAINAGE-DISTRICT,
——— ———,
President.

NORTH GILA VALLEY IRRIGATION DISTRICT,
——— ———,
President.

YUMA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
——— ———,
Chairman.

Concurred in:
THE CITY OF YUMA,
——— ———,
Mayor.

EXHIBIT B

[In acre-feet]

	Diversion	Return flow	Consumptive use
Yuma area	1,390,720	379,000	1,011,720
Colorado River Indians	662,831	331,630	331,201
Fort Mohave	96,416	48,208	48,208
Havasu Wildlife Range	41,939	5,839	36,000
Imperial Wildlife Range	15,400	7,400	8,000
City of Yuma	50,000	20,000	30,000
Cocopah, Yuma, and Chevehuevi Indian Reservations	53,789	16,000	37,789
Total	2,310,995	808,077	1,502,918

Water from Lees Ferry and pickup water:	
Lees Ferry	7,500,000
Gain below Lees Ferry:	
Virgin River	800,000
Bill Williams	40,000
Total	8,340,000
Losses—Evaporation and plant use and seepage:	
Lake Meade	800,000
Lake Mohave	155,000
Lake Havasu	140,000
Channels and lakes	500,000
Total	1,595,000
Amount of water in river for lower States	6,745,000
Mexican treaty	750,000
Total for Arizona, California, and Nevada	5,995,000
Arizona (2.8)	2,240,000
California (4.4)	3,520,000
Nevada (0.3)	235,000
Arizona	2,240,000
Deductions	1,502,919
Amount left to be granted to Arizona	737,082

NOTE.—The above figures show the amount of water still available for use in Arizona after deducting the amounts already contracted for and natural losses, where the riverflow is 15,000,000 acre-feet or less. When the riverflows are more than 15,000,000 acre-feet for the year Mexican treaty water is taken out of the surplus. When the surplus is sufficient to supply Mexico, Arizona would receive 2.8 of 750,000 or 267,000 acre-feet more or a total of 1,004,082 acre-feet per year over the already contracted and natural losses amounts. Taken from USGS records, the average riverflow for the year from 1948 to 1958, is 15,983,000 acre-feet.

EXHIBIT C

AMENDMENT TO S. 1658 TO AUTHORIZE, CONSTRUCT, OPERATE, AND MAINTAIN THE CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, ARIZONA-NEW MEXICO, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of furnishing supplemental irrigation water and municipal water supplies to the water-deficient areas of Arizona and western New Mexico, through direct diversion or exchange of water, generation and sale of electric energy, control floods, conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources, enhancement of recreation opportunities, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Interior acting pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the central Arizona project, Arizona-New Mexico. Before initiating any diversions of water from the Colorado River in connection with the operation of the central Arizona project, the Secretary shall determine the quantities of water required to satisfy all existing contracts in Arizona made pursuant to the Boulder Canyon Project Act, 45 Stat. 1057, for the delivery of mainstream water, and the diversions authorized hereunder shall at all times be subordinate to the quantities so determined. The principal works of the project shall consist of the Bridge Canyon Dam, reservoir and powerplant; Maxwell Dam, reservoir and power-pumping plant; Buttes Dam and Reservoir; Hooker Dam and Reservoir; Charleston Dam and Reservoir; Granite Reef aqueduct; Tucson aqueducts and pumping plants; Salt-Gila aqueduct; canals, electrical transmission facilities, and related water distribution and drainage works.

EXHIBIT D

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO JANUARY 14, 1964, DRAFT OF INITIAL SOUTHWEST WATER PLAN LEGISLATION

SEC. 3. INITIAL FEATURES.—In partial accomplishment of the initial plan, the Secretary shall:

(c) construct, operate, and maintain the central Arizona project consisting of the following principal works: Maxwell Dam, Reservoir, and pumping plant; Buttes Dam and Reservoir; Charleston Dam and Reservoir; Hooker Dam and Reservoir, New Mexico; Granite Reef aqueduct and pumping plants; Tucson aqueducts and pumping plants; Salt-Gila aqueduct; canals; powerplants and transmission facilities; water distribution and drainage facilities; and appurtenant works. The planning, construction, and operation of the central Arizona project shall at all times be subject to the condition that diversions shall be subordinate to the reasonable satisfaction of all existing water delivery contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and users in Arizona for the delivery of mainstream water. It shall be a condition of each contract under which water is provided under the project that there be in effect measures, adequate in the judgment of the Secretary, to control expansion of irrigation from aquifers affecting the contract service area. The Secretary is authorized to require as a condition in any contract under which water is provided under the project that the contractor agree to accept mainstream water in exchange for or in replacement of existing supplies from sources other than the mainstream but no such exchange of replacement water in excess of the costs that would have been incurred in connection with the continued use by the contractor of its existing supply, nor shall such exchange or replacement otherwise result in economic injury to the contractor.

[Ch. 109, Laws of Arizona]

HOUSE BILL 207

An act relating to the Arizona Interstate Stream Commission; conferring additional powers and duties upon the Arizona Interstate Stream Commission; providing for the employment of a State water engineer by the Arizona Interstate Stream Commission, and amending title 45, chapter 2, article 1, Arizona Revised Statutes, by adding sections 45–512 and 45–513

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona:

SECTION 1. Title 45, chapter 2, article 1, Arizona Revised Statutes, is amended by adding sections 45–512 and 45–513, to read:

"45–512. ADDITIONAL POWERS:

"A. The Arizona Interstate Stream Commission is hereby duly authorized, for and on behalf of the State of Arizona, to consult, advise and cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, as follows:

"1. In the exercise of any authority conferred upon the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of sections 4, 5, and 14 of the act commonly known as the Boulder Canyon Project Act (43 U.S.C. sec. 617–617t), as contemplated and provided in section 16 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

"2. In respect to the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to contract for the delivery of water of the main stream of the Colorado River for use within the State of Arizona.

"3. In respect to all powers and duties of the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of that certain contract between the

United States of America, acting by Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and the State of Arizona, acting by the Colorado River Commission, entered into on the 9th day of Februray, 1944, pursuant to chapter 46 of the 1939 session laws of Arizona, and approved by chapter 4 of the 1944 session laws of Arizona.

"4. In respect to the exercise by the Secretary of the Interior of any authority relative to the water of the Colorado River conferred upon the Secretary of the Interior by the provisions of any legislation enacted by the Congress of the United States of America.

"B. The powers and duties herein given the Arizona Interstate Stream Commission shall be limited and restricted to only that quantity of water which may be available for use in the State of Arizona, after the satisfaction of all existing contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and users in the State of Arizona for the delivery of water of the main stream of the Colorado River, and shall not extend to any such contracts, any amendments or supplements thereto, or to any Federal statute enacted before the effective date of this section pertaining to any Federal reclamation project within the State of Arizona constructed and using water of the main stream of the Colorado River before the effective date of this section. Nothing shall be done hereunder which will impair existing rights in the State of Arizona for the diversion and use of Colorado River water."

AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY MR. MOSS

Strike out everything after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That (a) this Act may be cited as the 'Lower Colorado River Basin Project Act'.

"(b) It is the object of this Act to provide a program for the further comprehensive development of the water resources of the Lower Colorado River Basin for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, controlling floods, improving navigation, providing delivery of the stored waters of the Colorado River for reclamation of lands, including supplemental water supplies, and for municipal and industrial purposes, providing for adequate water quality, providing for basic public outdoor recreation facilities, improvement of conditions for fish and wildlife and other beneficial uses, generation and sale of hydroelectric power as an incident of the foregoing purposes, conservation and beneficial utilization of the limited water supplies of the Lower Colorado River Basin, and the eventual provision of additional water for use in the Lower Colorado River Basin. It is the policy of the Congress that the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') shall continue to develop, after consultation with affected States and appropriate Federal agencies, a regional water plan, consistent with the provisions of this Act and with future authorizations, to serve as the framework under which projects, whether heretofore constructed in the Lower Colorado River Basin or herein and hereafter authorized, may be coordinated and constructed with proper timing. The term, 'the Lower Colorado River Basin,' as used herein shall mean the lower basin as defined in article II(g) of the Colorado River compact.

"SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States, to be known as the Lower Colorado River Basin development fund (hereinafter called the 'development fund'), which shall remain available until expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

"(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 4 of this Act shall be credited to the development fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury.

"(c) There shall also be credited to the development fund—

"(1) all revenues collected in connection with the operation of facilities herein and hereafter authorized in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, except entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees or charges and proceeds received from recreation concessioners, and

"(2) all revenues from the Boulder Canyon and Parker-Davis projects which, after completion of repayment requirements of the said Boulder Canyon and Parker-Davis projects, are: (A) surplus, as determined by the Secretary, to the operation, maintenance, and replacement requirements of those projects; (B) not needed for the purposes of the Colorado River development fund, established under subsection (d) of section 2 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 775); and (C) not needed to reimburse the Upper Colorado River Basin fund, established under section 5 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (Colorado River Storage Project Act) (70 Stat. 107), as provided in the Glen Canyon filling criteria (27 Fed. Reg. 6851) for any expenditures made from that fund to meet deficiencies in generation at Hoover Dam during the filling period of reservoirs of storage units of the Colorado River storage project.

"(d) All revenues collected and credited to the development fund pursuant to this Act shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the project, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation Acts; and (2) payments as required by subsection (e) of this section. Revenues credited to the development fund shall not be available for appropriation for construction of the works comprised within any unit of the project herein and hereafter authorized in furtherance of the purposes of this Act.

"(e) Revenues in the development fund in excess of the amount necessary to meet the requirements of clause (1) of subsection (d) of this section shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return—

"(1) the costs of each unit of the project or separable feature thereof, herein authorized, which are allocated to irrigation, commercial power, or municipal and industrial water supply, pursuant to this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years from the date of completion of each such unit or separable feature, exclusive of any development period authorized by law; and

"(2) interest (including interest during construction) on the unamortized balance of the investment in the commercial power and municipal and industrial water supply features of the project at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of subsection (f) of this section; and interest due shall be a first charge; and

"(3) to the extent that revenues are available in the development fund after making the payments required by clause (1) of subsection (d) and subparagraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, costs incurred for units hereafter authorized to provide (in any year in which insufficient Colorado River mainstream water is available for release, as determined by the Secretary, to satisfy consumptive uses in Arizona of two million eight hundred thousand acre-feet, in California of four million four hundred thousand acre-feet, and in Nevada of three hundred thousand acre-feet) water to make up such deficiencies at costs to the users that would have prevailed had mainstream Colorado River water been available for consumptive uses in the aforesaid amounts, such costs to be allocated among the purposes for which main stream Colorado River water is made available and to be returned within the period specified in subparagraph (1) of this subsection: *Provided, however,* That water made available by such units that is not needed to make up the foregoing deficiencies shall be disposed of by the Secretary at rates or for repayment determined in accordance with the provisions of law otherwise applicable to said units.

"(f) The interest rate applicable to those portions of the reimbursable costs of each unit of the project which are properly allocated to commercial power development and municipal and industrial water supply shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which the first advance is made for initiating construction of such unit, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from the date of issue.

"(g) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Congress annually for all operations financed by the development fund.

"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to—

"(1) Prepare estimates of the long-range water supply available for consumptive use in the Lower Colorado River Basin, of current water requirements in said basin, and of the rate of growth of water requirements therein to the year 2030.

"(2) Investigate alternative sources in the State of California and elsewhere as a means of supplying water to meet the current and anticipated water requirements in the Lower Colorado River Basin, and prepare preliminary plans to accomplish such purpose. In planning any works to import water into the Lower Colorado River Basin, the Secretary shall give due consideration to existing and future needs within the areas and States of origin of the imported water and the means of offsetting the additional costs of future projects within said areas and States of origin caused by the preemption of the lower cost water sources that otherwise would have benefited said areas and States of origin, including the use of the development fund for this purpose.

"(3) Investigate projects within the Lower Colorado River Basin, including projects on tributaries of the Colorado River, where undeveloped water supplies are available or can be made available by replacement or exchange.

"(4) (a) Investigate means of providing for prudent water conservation practices to permit maximum beneficial utilization of available water supplies.

"(b) The Secretary shall submit annually to the President and the Congress reports covering the investigations required by subsection (a) and, within five years from the effective date of this Act, the Secretary shall recommend to the President and the Congress projects and programs for authorization pursuant to paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (a) and shall submit feasibility reports on such projects and programs. Said recommendation and feasibility reports shall include projects designed to provide water of an adequate quality for the Lower Colorado River Basin to assist in meeting that basin's long-range needs and, in any event, sufficient to meet deficiencies between the quantities required to supply water for the annual consumptive use of two million eight hundred thousand acre-feet in Arizona, four million four hundred thousand acre-feet in California, and three hundred thousand acre-feet in Nevada and the quantities available in the main stream of the Colorado River for such uses as determined by the Secretary.

"SEC. 4. In order to initiate the Lower Colorado River Basin project, herein referred to as the 'project', and to further the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Lower Colorado River Basin the Secretary shall—

"(a) construct, operate, and maintain the main stream reservoir unit consisting of the Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon projects, including dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities and appurtenant works, and the Coconino and Paria River silt-detention reservoirs: *Provided,* That Bridge Canyon Dam shall be constructed so as to impound water at a normal surface elevation of one thousand eight hundred and sixty-six feet above mean sea level and that Marble Canyon Dam shall be constructed so as to impound water at a normal surface elevation of three thousand one hundred and forty feet above mean sea level. The Congress hereby declares that the construction of the Bridge Canyon Dam herein authorized is consistent with the Act of February 26, 1919 (40 Stat. 1175);

"(b) construct, operate, and maintain the central Arizona unit consisting of the following principal works: (1) a system of main conduits and canals, including a main canal and pumping plants (Granite Reef aqueduct and pumping plants) for diverting and carrying Colorado River water from Lake Havasu to Orme Dam (McDowell Dam) on the Salt River above Granite Reef diversion dam; (2) Orme Dam (McDowell Dam) Reservoir and power pumping plant; (3) Buttes Dam and Reservoir; (4) Hooker Dam and Reservoir; (5) Charleston Dam and Reservoir, (6) Tucson aqueducts and pumping plants; (7) Salt-Gila aqueduct; (8) canals, powerplants, and electrical transmission facilities; (9) related water distribution and drainage works; and (1) appurtenant works: *Provided,* That for a period of twenty-five years from the effective date of this Act, or until such time as there shall have been constructed such project or projects for supplying water in quantities at least sufficient to avoid the deficiencies of main stream Colorado River water hereafter described, whichever first occurs, in any year in which, as determined by the Secretary, there will be insufficient main stream Colorado River water to satisfy the consumptive use of two million eight hundred thousand, four million four hundred thousand, and three hundred thousand acre-feet in Arizona, California, and Nevada, respectively, diversions for the purposes of the central Arizona unit shall be so limited as to assure the availability of water in quantities sufficient to provide for the aggregate annual consumptive use of four million four hundred thousand acre-feet under water delivery contracts made with entities in the State of California. The terms 'consumptive use' and 'main stream' as used in this Act shall have the meanings assigned to those terms in the decree in Arizona against California dated March 9, 1964, —— U.S. ——;

"(c) undertake comprehensive investigations, in cooperation with other concerned agencies to demonstrate the feasibility of proposed development plans in maintaining an adequate water quality throughout the basin;

"(d) construct, operate, and maintain such additional works as shall from time to time be authorized by the Congress as units of the project;

"(e) investigate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for (1) basic public outdoor recreation facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of units of the project herein and hereafter authorized, conservation of the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic objects and the wildlife on said lands, and public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas created thereunder in a manner coordinated and consistent with the other purposes of such units, and (2) facilities, consistent with the primary purposes of such units for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the operation, maintenance, and additional development of lands or facilities or to dispose of such lands or facilities to Federal agencies or State or local public bodies by lease, transfer, conveyance, or exchange, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote the development and operation of such lands or facilities in the public interest for purposes of this subsection.

"SEC. 5. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the project herein and hereafter authorized, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902; 32 Stat. 388 and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto).

"(b) Contracts for the delivery of water from such units shall conform to and be made in accordance with the requirements of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057).

"(c) The Secretary—

"(1) may require that contracts for the delivery of water for irrigation purposes from the Central Arizona Unit provide for the delivery of such water at an identical price per acre-foot for water of the same class at the several points of delivery from the main canals and conduits and from such other points of delivery as the Secretary may designate; shall require that water furnished by or through such unit shall not be used for the irrigation of lands not having a recent irrigation history, as determined by the Secretary; and shall require as a condition precedent to each contract that there be in effect measures adequate, in his judgment, to control expansion of irrigation from aquifers affected by irrigation in the contract service area; and the canals and distribution systems through which water is conveyed after its delivery by the United States to the contractor shall be provided and maintained with linings to the extent, adequate in his judgment, to prevent excessive conveyance losses; and long-term contracts relating to irrigation water supply shall provide that water made available thereunder may be made available by the Secretary for municipal or miscellaneous purposes, if and to the extent that such water is not required by the contractor for irrigation purposes; and

"(2) may enter into contracts relating to municipal and industrial water supply from the project without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of section 9(c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1194) and may provide for the delivery of such water at an identical price per acre-foot for water of the same class at the several points of delivery from the main canals and conduits; and

"(3) may require as a condition in any contract under which water is provided under the project that the contractor agree to accept mainstream water in exchange for or in replacement of existing supplies from sources other than the mainstream but no such exchange or replacement shall require a contractor to bear any cost of said exchange or replacement water in excess of the costs that would have been incurred in connection with the continued use by the contractor of its existing supply, nor shall such exchange or replacement otherwise result in economic injury to the contractor.

"SEC. 6. Upon completion of each unit of the project herein or hereafter authorized, or separate feature thereof, the Secretary shall allocate the total costs of constructing said unit or feature to commercial power, irrigation, municipal and industrial water supply, flood control, navigation, area redevelopment, recreation, fish and wildlife, or any other purposes authorized under the Federal reclamation laws. Costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife resources resulting from the construction of the project shall be considered as project costs and allocated as may be appropriate among the project functions. Costs of construction, operation, and maintenance allocated to area redevelopment, and other authorized nonreimbursable purposes shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this Act. Costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall be nonreimbursable within appropriate limits determined by the Secretary to be consistent with the provisions of law and policy applicable to other similar Federal projects and programs. On January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the Congress beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, upon the status of the revenues from and the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the project for the previous fiscal year. The Secretary's report shall be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accomplishing full repayment.

"SEC. 7. The Secretary shall determine the repayment capability of Indian lands within, under, or served by any unit of the project. Construction costs allocated to irrigation of Indian lands (including provision of water for incidental domestic and stockwater uses) and within the repayment capability of such lands shall be subject to the Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564), and such costs as are beyond repayment capability of such lands shall be nonreimbursable.

"SEC. 8. This Act shall be deemed a supplement to the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388 and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto). Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Act of April 11, 1956 (Colorado River Storage Project Act) (70 Stat. 105), the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994), the opinion and any decree entered by the Supreme Court of the United States in Arizona against California (373 U.S. 456), or, except as otherwise provided herein, the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057) or the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774).

"SEC. 9. (a) There is hereby created the Colorado-Pacific Regional Water Commission (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission') composed of members to be appointed as follows:

"(1) A Chairman appointed by the President: *Provided,* That in the event the Chairman is the head of a Federal department or agency, he may appoint a deputy to act in his stead during his absence;

"(2) One member representing each of the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah, appointed by the Governor of the State, and one member representing each other State which the President may find to be affected, such member to be appointed by the Governor of such State; and

"(3) One member appointed by and representing each of the Secretaries of Agriculture, the Army, Health, Education, and Welfare, and State and one member representing each of such other departments and agencies as the President may designate.

"(b) The compensation of each member shall be paid by the entity appointing him.

"(c) The functions of the Commission shall be advisory only, and in its advisory capacity the Commission shall—

"(1) Assist in the coordination of further Federal, State, interstate, and local plans for the conservation, augmentation, and beneficial utilization of the water and related land resources of the Lower Colorado River Basin and affected areas.

"(2) Advise and consult with the Secretary of the Interior with respect to his responsibilities under section 3 of this Act.

"(3) Recommend long-range schedules of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data and for investigation, planning, and construction of projects.

"(4) Recommend to the appropriate Federal and State agencies studies of water resources and related land resources in the region as the Commission believes are necessary in the preparation of the plans described in clause (1) of this subsection.

"(d) In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Commission may—

"(1) Employ and compensate such personnel as it deems advisable.

"(2) Use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as departments and agencies of the United States.

"(3) Acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary.

"(4) Accept for any of its purposes and functions appropriations, donations, and grants of money, equipment supplies, materials, facilities and services, and receive, utilize, and dispose of the same.

"(5) Incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this section.

"(e) The Commission shall determine the proportionate shares of its expenses which shall be borne by the Federal Government and each of the States. The Commission shall prepare a budget annually and transmit it to the Federal departments and the States. Estimates of proposed appropriations from the Federal Government shall be included in the budget estimates submitted by the Secretary of the Interior under the Budgeting and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended, and may include an amount for advance to the Commission against State appropriations for which delay is anticipated by reason of later legislative sessions.

"SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are required to carry out the purposes of this Act.

"Amend the title so as to read: 'A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes.'

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

APPROVAL OF MILITARY PAY BILL URGED

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, recently, the Senate enacted a pay increase for Federal employees. I feel that it is not only proper but also imperative that our attention now focus on increasing the salaries of those who are maintaining freedom's eternal vigilance and preserving the uneasy peace existing in today's world.

History has demonstrated that when peace prevails citizens forget too quickly the sacrifices made by our military when our Republic was challenged.

Let me say that I am not going to be guilty of such shortsightedness. Though we live in an era of modern warfare, I believe that—

Neither missiles ready for launching,
Nor Sac bombers constant alert
Nay, not Polaris subs worldwide
(As vital as they are)
Are themselves sufficient
For it was, is, and always will be
The will and desire of the fighting man
That is decisive when victory or defeat hangs in balance.

Yes; even in today's atomic, automated age, the soldier remains important. In fact, there has never been a period of history when the caliber of our servicemen was so important. Our complex modern warfare demands trained personnel. Yet, our servicemen see their civilian neighbors compensated at much higher rates for comparable duties. In too many cases the lucrative pay of civilian profession lures competent and needed men from the services. This is both expensive to the taxpayers and detrimental to our overall defense posture. We must adopt policies designed to encourage servicemen to stay in the service. This necessitates both better pay and better living conditions for our military.

I urge approval of the military pay bill.

IMPLEMENTATION OF PUBLIC LAW 88–379, THE ANDERSON WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH ACT

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, on Monday, July 21, the Senate received from the President of the United States notice that he has approved and signed S. 2, the Water Resources Research Act of 1964, known to us as the Anderson Act.

Secretary of the Interior Udall has today announced the establishment of an Office of Water Resources Research, and the appointment of Dr. John C. Calhoun, Jr., as the Acting Director of the new office. The Associate Director is Mr. E. D. Eaton, formerly a member of the professional staff of the Senate Interior Committee.

The 88th Congress is making an outstanding record in the resources and conservation field. The enactment of S. 2, which will stimulate, in universities throughout the Nation, research into water problems and the training of much-needed hydroscientists, will, in the judgment of many leaders in the resources fields, prove ultimately to rival in importance the Hatch Act of 1877, which established our agricultural experiment stations.

I am especially pleased, Mr. President, that in his statement upon approval of the S. 2, President Lyndon Johnson gave recognition to our colleague, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, the author of the bill, who in recent years has provided leadership in many fields of resources legislation. It has been my privilege to cosponsor a number of the bills he has, and is, helping us write into law.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement made by the President of the United States, upon signing S. 2; and the announcement of Secretary of Interior Udall, issued today, on the implementation of the bill, which is now Public Law 88–379.

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

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT, JULY 17, 1964

The Water Resources Research Act of 1964, which I have approved today, fills a vital need.

Abundant good water is essential to continued economic growth and progress. The Congress has found that we have entered a period in which acute water shortages are hampering our industries, our agriculture, our recreation, and our individual health and happiness.

Assuming a continuation of current practices, by the year 2000 there will not be enough usable water to meet the water requirements of parts of the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

This legislation will help us solve this problem. It will create local centers of water research. It will enlist the intellectual power of universities and research institutes in a nationwide effort to conserve and utilize our water resources for the common benefit. The new centers will be concerned with municipal and regional, as well as with national water problems. Their ready accessibility to State and local officials will permit each problem to be attacked on an individual basis, the only way in which the complex characteristics of each water deficiency can be resolved. The bill contemplates a high degree of interstate cooperation, and I urge that this be encouraged.

In large measure, this legislation is a tribute to the vision and wisdom of Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico. He has long recognized the problems. He developed the program. He guided it through Congress. He has been in the forefront of the effort to see that adequate supplies of water are available in all parts of the Nation.

One provision of the bill, however, causes me serious concern, and I request its deletion. The Secretary of the Interior, in administering the program is required, in effect, to obtain the approval of the committees of the House and Senate for each water research grant or contract. Although this legislation is so phrased that it is not technically subject to constitutional objection, it violates the spirit of the constitutional requirement of separation of power between the executive and legislative branches. It is both inappropriate and inefficient for committees of the Congress to participate in the award of individual contracts or grants. Apart from the question of the relationship between the executive and legislative branches, the delays which would ensue from the suggested procedure would be detrimental to both scientific research and the timely achievement of the important mission of the legislation.

[News release from U.S. Department of the Interior, July 21, 1964]

OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH ESTABLISHED

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall announced today that he has set up an Office of Water Resources Research (OWRR) to administer the new program of grants to universities and research institutions provided by the Water Resources Research Act.

Secretary Udall said he has appointed John C. Calhoun, Jr., to be Acting Director of the new office and E. D. Eaton to be Associate Director.

Dr. Calhoun has been Science Adviser and Assistant to the Secretary since May 1963 and will continue to hold this post. Mr. Eaton has been a member of the Department's resources program staff since 1961.

Secretary Udall said: "The Water Resources Research Act, signed into law July 17 by President Johnson, will give a great forward push to water conservation and development. It provides for furnishing financial assistance to non-Federal research in discovering new and improved ways of dealing with water problems. This means that the whole Nation will now benefit from the brainpower in universities being applied to critical water problems.

"With our rapid population and economic growth, we must provide for greatly increased water use—about double during the next two decades and much more than that before the end of the century.

"But a good many localities already are running short of water and generally throughout the Nation there is insufficient water of good quality available without substantial treatment for meeting our growing requirements.

"This means," Udall said, "that it is essential to get much more use out of the water than we now do. We must do a better job of conserving water; we must use it more economically and efficiently; we must protect its quality from pollution; we must find more economical means of treating it; and we must store and regulate floods so that they do not rush to sea unused.

"Scientists and engineers in Government agencies do outstanding work on these problems and they will continue to be the backbone of the research effort. But the problems are so many and so large and the urgency is so great that we also have to make full use of the knowledge and ability of non-Federal research workers in universities and elsewhere.

"This is provided for in the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 passed by Congress on July 2, 1964. The act was first sponsored by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, as S. 2, and it has been widely endorsed by many Members of Congress, State officials, professional, scientific, and citizen groups. It is a real milestone in natural resources conservation."

The act authorizes a continuing program of (a) annual grants to aid one State water resources research center in each State, and (b) grants to aid specific water resources research at land-grant universities; also authorized is a smaller 10-year program of grants to aid water research at other universities or research institutions.

In addition to producing new knowledge to be used in solving water problems, Secretary Udall emphasized two other important results:

"One result will be that the State and interstate water research centers will be available to State governments and local communities. This will make them more effective in dealing with local water matters—and water supply and water use are important State and local responsibilities. The State water resources research centers can aid local officials and others because they will be readily accessible to the people of their State, and they can supply information on local conditions and problems. This will greatly strengthen the grassroots participation in water matters.

"A second result will be to produce additional highly trained water scientists and engineers. Many more such people will be needed at all levels of government, in industry, and in other capacities to plan and carry out water conservation and development work. We know that present government and private water resource facilities will have to be enlarged and extended to meet water requirements in the years ahead. Through association with the research work aided by this new program, well-qualified people will be produced at universities throughout the country. Qualified manpower is one of the main shortages in the water field, and this program will help meet that need."

Rules and regulations governing the grants program will be issued by the Department shortly.

Dr. Calhoun came to the Department from the Texas State University on a leave of absence from his position as vice president for engineering and vice chancellor for development, Texas A. & M. University System. He is a petroleum engineer who has held positions in the industry and on the faculties of Texas State University, Pennsylvania State University, and the University of Oklahoma. He resided with his wife and family in McLean, Va.

Mr. Eaton, before coming with the Department was consultant to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Select Committee on National Water Resources. He and his wife reside in Washington, D.C.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2642) to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the pending business there be a time limitation of 1 hour on each amendment, to be equally divided between the majority and minority leaders, and that there be 4 hours on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That during the further consideration of the bill (S. 2642) to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States, there be a limitation of debate of 1 hour on each amendment, to be equally divided and controlled by the majority and the minority leaders, and of 4 hours on the bill, divided and controlled as above.

JULY 22, 1964.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Montana can inform me whether the Senate will take up the amendments this evening?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. The Senate will take up at least the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], which will be offered very shortly, I hope. Also, the Senate will consider any others which may be available, because it will likely be in session until 7 o'clock this evening, or a little later, and I would hope some amendments would be offered in the meantime.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NELSON BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE ON THE MILITARY PAY BILL

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the military pay bill, S. 3001, went on the calendar on July 15, while the Senate was in recess.

I had a hearing scheduled in Escanaba, Mich., which had been scheduled at the request of the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. It was not possible, therefore, when the bill came up on Monday, for me to be on the floor of the Senate.

The bill was placed on the calendar on July 15, while the Senate was in recess. No notice had gone to anyone in the Senate.

My office requested Mr. Valeo to request a delay of 1 day on the military pay bill so that I would have an opportunity to participate. That request was denied by the leadership, I regret to say.

Therefore, it was necessary for me to submit a statement to the House Armed Services Committee which is today conducting hearings on the military pay bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement I submitted to the House Armed Services Committee this morning be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON, PREPARED FOR THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, JULY 22, 1964

I am submitting this statement for consideration of the House Armed Services Committee because the service pay of the enlisted man for his first 2 years is so inadequate that it ought, I think, be a matter of concern to all of us.

In general, the military pay increase bill, is one that should be supported by every Member of Congress. Our men in service deserve adequate pay. In view of the recent pay increase legislation for civilian Government employees, this bill, which gives a 2½-percent increase to some military men, is certainly justified.

Nonetheless, I believe it suffers from a serious deficiency. Continuing a policy we have followed for the last 12 years, it does not grant a salary increase to the enlisted man in his first 2 years of service. Whereas this policy may have been justified in the past when service was universal or nearly so, it would seem to be grossly unfair to continue it any longer.

The bill leaves unchanged the existing pay schedule which rewards the entering enlisted man with only $78 per month for his service to his country. I believe it can be shown that this low pay is one of the main reasons we have been failing to hold men in the lower ranks. Moreover, it is undoubtedly one of the main reasons more men do not volunteer for service. And, since we are now drafting only 90,000 men per year on an average, the failure to increase pay and other incentives to volunteers helps perpetuate the draft which, I believe, is rapidly becoming obsolete.

For these various reasons I would like to suggest that the committee consider the following additions to the legislation:

A provision which would grant pay increases of 8½ percent to enlisted men in their first 2 years of service. (This would be an increase corresponding to the increase provided for officers in their first 2 years under the pending legislation.)

A provision which would direct the Secretary of Defense to offer for congressional consideration, study, and debate, a broad plan of general pay increases designed to better attract and retain high quality men, especially in the lower ranks, so that the present high turnover could be reduced.

Consider some of the results of our present failure to pay an adequate wage to men in the lower ranks of military service:

We have not raised the pay of first year enlistees for 12 years. Since 1952, a man entering service has been paid $78 per month. During this period the average total pay increase for the services has been 39.2 percent. In reality, of course, since the first 2-year men have received no raise at all, this percentage figure understates the basic fact that the great majority of servicemen have had very substantial pay increases relative to the first 2-year enlistees, who have had none.

Since 1946, the only pay increase for entering enlistees has been the 1952 raise of $3 per month, from $75 to $78. Over a year's period this amounts to $36. Thus, on average in the 18 years since 1946, his pay bracket has been raised about $2 per year, or the pitifully low annual increase in weekly pay of about 4 cents. This has been a major factor contributing to the unfortunate situation summarized by a recent Department of the Air Force study entitled "Economic Status of Certain Air Force Personnel."

One hundred sixty-nine thousand airmen draw less pay than the poverty level standards set by the President's Council on Economic Advisers.

Eight thousand airmen are below poverty level even after adjustment is made for the value of their rations and quarters.

Seventy thousand airmen must resort to "moonlighting" to supplement their incomes.

Sixty thousand airmen are actually eligible for various relief benefits.

Incredible as it must seem to us, more than 5,000 airmen are actually receiving relief.

The Air Force Relief Agency, in response to the emergency needs of airmen, spent one-half of its $2 million 1963 budget on such basics as food, clothing, and rent.

The Senate Armed Services Committee report on the bill under consideration states that its purpose is to "provide a timely increase in basic pay for the members of the uniformed services and thereby maintain a reasonable comparison in compensation trends for military personnel."

If indeed we are to be faithful to this purpose I believe we should increase the pay of first term military men. Some 840,000 military members with less than 2 years of service will not receive a raise under this bill. This amounts to 35 percent of the 2.3 million active duty enlisted members forecast for fiscal year 1965.

Ninety-five percent of the enlisted members who are being denied an increase under S. 3001 fall into the lowest three pay grades, private first class and below, E–1, E–2, E–3. Of the 5 percent remaining, 45,000, fully 40,000 are in the next higher grade, corporal, E–4.

Every Member of Congress is reminded daily of the state of affairs in the lower ranks by the number of requests he receives for hardship discharges based mainly on financial need.

The only reason things are not worse is that lower graders are mostly unmarried and they receive rations and quarters. If this were not true, they would be among the most impoverished citizens in these United States with their $961.32 first year take-home pay.

But even taking the factors of rations and quarters into consideration, they are at a distinct disadvantage even in comparison to the least skilled, lowest ranked Federal employee. After we add the value of these benefits to the first year salary of the enlisted man, I estimate that the lowest paid white-collar Federal employee receives 47 percent more annually, and the lowest paid blue-collar Federal employee receives 71 percent more.

Perhaps a more relevant comparison is between the first year enlisted man and the entering apprentice, rather than the lowest paid worker, for, of course, the services do not accept all those who might qualify simply for clerk or janitorial work. I estimate that the average Federal employee at the beginning apprentice level receives 125 percent more than the entering serviceman.

I believe our men in service deserve better treatment than this.

And I believe that our Nation's military strength could be substantially improved by providing better treatment, for one result of our present pay schedules is a strikingly high turnover of personnel. The following figures show that we are not able to retain trained personnel for substantial periods of time with existing pay rates, especially at the lower ranks:

In the average year, 236,000 men at or below the E–3 level leave the service for reasons other than retirement.

If the next higher grade is included, E–4 (corporal level), the yearly loss for reasons other than retirement amounts to 380,000.

Thus, on average, every 4 years we lose the equivalent of the total number of men in service at these levels. Almost as many men as the total estimated complement of men at or below the E–3 level, (1.09 million for 1965) and more than the total estimated complement of those at or below E–4 (1.54 million) leave service in every 4-year period.

This high loss rate in the lower ranks is highly uneconomic, is detrimental to military morale, and is certain to have a weakening effect upon our military efficiency. I believe better pay would substantially reduce the rate of loss.

Thus, both for reasons of fairness, and of sound military personnel policy, I respectfully urge that the pay increase legislation now being considered be modified to include substantial pay increases for men in their first years of service.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2642) to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the poet Shelley once said, "Weep for Adonais—he is dead." At this hour it is fitting that we should paraphrase this to read, "Weep for civil service for she is dying."

Even in her state of expiration, the administration would sully her honor and stain her virtue with a dirty political brush.

The merit system, which was created under the Presidency of Chester Allen Arthur, has been respected and strengthened by virtually every administration, Republican or Democratic, since that time.

Yet, there are those who would despoil its traditions and use the civil service system as an arm of the Democratic National Committee.

They would have the old standards of ability and merit give way to the wheel and the deal tactics which were abandoned by even the most sordid figures nearly a century ago.

Mr. President, the patronage grabbers, the zealots who would pervert the civil service have forgotten to look at their calendars. Despite their fondest yearnings, it is not yet 1984.

In the spring of 1963, an effort was made to call attention to the White House efforts to create a new area of political patronage—summer jobs in the executive agencies for college students.

When the administration first stated that college students seeking summer positions would be screened by the White House, a storm of outrage broke loose which was answered by assurances that this procedure involved not patronage but simply coordination.

On March 27, 1963, the Civil Service Commission Chairman attempted to reassure the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. He contended to the committee that the only reason the White House wanted the names of summer job applicants was to arrange seminars for them.

Senators will recall that the truth finally came out after a great deal of digging by Joseph Young of the Washington Evening Star, and the cries of innocence no longer emanated from the White House.

However, during the earlier stages of the controversy, while both the White House and the Civil Service Commission were issuing denials of wrongdoing, the official publication of the National Federation of College Young Democrats had this to say:

> You may have noticed in recent newspaper stories that responsibility for such summer jobs has been transferred to the White House.
>
> The Young Democrats division has checked out what this means for you.
>
> We have been recommended to suggest the following procedure. Write to your Senator or Congressman, asking him for a form 57. When you return it, ask him to enclose an accompanying letter of recommendation and to forward it with the form 57 to Mrs. Dorothy Davies at the White House.

The publication went on to point out that if prospective job applicants have any trouble, they should contact Jim Hunt, the college director of the Democratic National Committee.

Apparently nothing is sacred, not even summertime civil service positions, when the wheelers and the dealers spring into action.

After pressure from the press and Republicans in Congress, the Civil Service Commission, on April 8, 1963, acted to prevent the White House and Federal agencies from appointing students to summer Federal jobs in Washington solely on the basis of political influence.

It allegedly withdrew from all agencies the authority to make temporary appointments and said that the power would not be restored until the Commission was convinced that appointments would be made without political clearances and in full compliance with the law and the Commission's rules and regulations.

This was the first time in history that it became necessary for the Commission to call a special session in order to prevent partisan political considerations from governing the selection of Federal employees.

The Commission informed agency heads that political clearance is clearly illegal, and it cited chapter and verse of the laws and regulations to back up its opinion.

A Civil Service Commission official summed up the unwholesome situation in this fashion:

> We were sorry to have to do it but we were placed in an impossible situation where our honor and virtue and the integrity of the system was at stake.

This was the first evidence that the Democratic administration was willing to exploit young students for political ends. It was followed by further convincing proof.

The so-called impartial White House seminars which were conducted in 1963 were the next target for the wheelers and dealers. Lectures were scheduled allegedly to give the summer job holders a broader view of Government operations. The nonpartisan National Center for Education and Politics reported the meetings had definite political overtones.

Indeed, this situation became so bad that several reforms of the program were suggested by Representative WILLIAM WIDNALL and the American Political Science Association.

One might have imagined hopefully that the administration had learned its lesson and that the student job program would now be free from the odorous taint of partisan political considerations. Yet, the wheelers and dealers would not have it so.

Joseph Young, a staff writer for the Washington Evening Star, reported in last night's issue that college students in summer Government jobs are being recruited for active service in President Johnson's reelection campaign. The Young Citizens for Johnson, he said, in cooperation with the Democratic National Committee, have distributed literature at White House seminars to young men and women who have secured summer jobs in the Federal service under civil service authority. Young charged that those at the head of the drive openly acknowledge that the purpose is to enlist students in active campaigning for President Johnson after the convention closes, as well as to get them to start Johnson for President groups on their college campuses when they return to school in September.

Democratic spokesmen, according to Young, have boasted that they have gotten around the Hatch Act, but the Star columnist properly characterized the conduct of the administration when he stated:

> It raises the question of civil service rules as well as ethics in contacting the youths who are serving in Federal jobs that have been expressly authorized by the Civil Service Commission on the condition that there be no politics involved in their employment.

Mr. President, the wheelers and dealers were not satisfied with the mere distribution of political literature at the supposedly impartial White House seminars. They told the students how arrangements could be made for them to attend the Democratic National Convention, how to get campaign outfits, and how to participate in Democratic rallies.

So that Senators will have the full story on the third major endeavor of the administration to use the civil service program as a political football, I ask unanimous consent that the Star article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

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

JOHNSON CAMPAIGN RECRUITS STUDENTS IN FEDERAL JOBS

(By Joseph Young)

College students in summer Government jobs here are being recruited for active service in President Johnson's reelection campaign.

The Young Citizens for Johnson, in cooperation with the Democratic National Committee, have distributed literature at White House seminars to young men and women who have secured summer jobs in the Federal service under civil service authority.

The literature distributed among most of the 5,000 students in summer Federal jobs invites those interested to attend the Democratic National Convention in Atlantic City next month as convention volunteers.

Those in charge of the drive acknowledge that the purpose is to enlist the students in active campaigning for President Johnson after the convention closes, as well as to get them to start Johnson for President groups on their college campuses when they return to school in September.

Senator BAYH, Democrat, of Indiana, is national chairman of the Young Citizens for Johnson group.

MUST QUIT SUMMER JOBS

Spokesman for the organization say no violation of the Hatch Act is involved because the students have been told they will have to quit their Federal summer jobs by August 24 when the Democratic National Convention begins if they are to be accepted as convention volunteers.

However, it raises the question of civil service rules as well as ethics in contacting the youths who are serving in Federal jobs that have been expressly authorized by the Civil Service Commission on the condition that there be no politics involved in their employment.

Last year, after newspaper publicity about White House attempts to gain control over the filling of these summer jobs, the Civil Service Commission stepped in and took away agencies' authority to fill these positions unless political considerations were barred.

All agencies agreed to these terms and the authority was restored to them this year for hiring the students for these jobs.

ATTEND SEMINARS

Not all 5,000 are college students, but many are. It is college students the Young Citizens for Johnson are mainly interested in recruiting for the forthcoming political campaign.

The students are brought together once a week or every 2 weeks for so-called White House seminars, though the meetings are held in the Sheraton-Park Hotel. Object of the seminars is to acquaint the students with the workings of Government and the hope that some of them on graduation will choose the Federal service as a career.

They have been addressed by Attorney General Kennedy and several other top Government officials and President Johnson is scheduled to address them next week.

At last Friday's session, literature was distributed to the students inviting them to attend the Democratic convention as volunteers. They were told that special arrangements would be made to house the volunteers at about $5 a night.

However, they were told they would have to pay a $10 registration fee to pay for the purchase of an official campaign outfit to identify all convention volunteers—a matching shift and headband for the girls and a matching vest and straw hat for the men. Deadline for applications was set at July 25. Their duties would include serving as hosts, secretaries, guides, drivers, etc., at the convention.

Spokesmen for the Young Citizens for Johnson say the response has been very good. "We are being swamped with applications," one spokesman said.

ONE-DAY PLAN OFFERED

The sheet distributed to the students also offered an alternate plan to those who found they could not attend the entire convention. They could attend the convention for 1 day—on August 25—to attend the Youth Day rally which will be held on the convention floor.

Those who are still unconvinced about participating in either of the two alternatives were invited to attend a party in Senator BAYH's office at 5:30 p.m., July 28, for further discussion.

The students who are interested in enlisting as convention volunteers or attending the 1-day convention youth rally were given two names to contact on Capitol Hill—a college student working for Senator BAYH and another in the office of Representative BOLLING, Democrat, of Missouri.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, what does all this have to do with the bill presently under consideration? Let me explain.

The pending legislation would create a Job Corps in which there would be enrolled young persons age 16 through 21. Many enrollees in the corps will live in conservation camps away from the watchful eyes of Congress and the public. They will be in large measure poorly adjusted children who have dropped out of school or who have failed to pass the Selective Service mental achievement examination.

All of the rules and regulations that govern their conduct and the nature of the education programs they receive will be set and determined by Federal officials of the executive branch.

These young boys lacking a sense of direction and seeking to find themselves are a perfect target for the experts of the fast deal and the propaganda horn.

If the freewheelers have thrice used the college student program for political ends under the Washington spotlight, to what extremes will they go in the backwater country where the barricades say "No visitors" and a military-type atmosphere prevails?

This is not the Germany of the 1930's where political indoctrination was part and parcel of the new order.

This is not an Iron Curtain nation where it is the nature of things to tinker with the political beliefs and allegiances of its young people.

There is no minister of propaganda here, and if we are vigilant and watchful, there never will be.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which is designed to bar politics from the Job Corps program. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 53, between lines 4 and 5, to add the following new section:

> SEC. 107. (a) No officer or employee of the executive branch of the Federal Government shall make any inquiry concerning the political affiliation or beliefs of any enrollee or applicant for enrollment in the Corps.

All disclosures concerning such matters shall be ignored, except as to such membership in political parties or organizations as constitutes by law a disqualification for Government employment. No discrimination shall be exercised, threatened or promised by any person in the executive branch of the Federal Government against or in favor of any enrollee in the Corps, or any applicant for enrollment in the Corps because of his political affiliation or beliefs, except as may be specifically authorized or required by law.

(b) No officer, employee or enrollee of the Corps shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns, except as may be provided by or pursuant to statute, and no such officer, employee or enrollee shall use his official position or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the results thereof. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express, in their private capacities, their opinions on all political subjects and candidates.

(c) Whenever the United States Civil Service Commission finds that any person has violated the foregoing provisions, it shall, after giving due notice and opportunity for explanation to the officer or employee or enrollee concerned, certify the facts to the Director with specific instructions as to discipline or dismissal or other corrective actions.

Redesignate section 107 as section 108.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the amendment would forbid any officer or employee of the executive branch from making any inquiry concerning the political affiliation or beliefs of any enrollee or applicant for enrollment in the corps.

It would forbid discrimination against or in favor of any enrollee or prospective enrollee because of his political affiliation or beliefs.

It would prevent any officer or employee or enrollee of the corps from taking any active part in political management or political campaigns, while at the same time preserving their right to vote and to express, in their private capacities, their opinions on all political subjects and candidates.

The amendment is aimed at the three specific types of abuses we have seen in the civil service summer job program.

If it is adopted, the administration will not be free to select enrollees on a political basis as they attempted to do in the summer job situation.

If the amendment is adopted, there will be no political indoctrination, no information dispensed in the camps about campaign outfits and political party rallies.

We like to say with respect to political indoctrination that "it can't happen here" but it has happened within the last year and it will happen again unless the Congress acts to prevent politics from entering the gates of the Job Corps camps.

The Germans had a word for camps where thought control was employed, and the word was not conservation.

Let us ever be on the lookout for those who would stain wholesome education and training with their political hue of propaganda.

Let us keep politics in the public arena and out of the Job Corps.

Let us adopt the pending amendment.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand that the substance of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Vermont contemplates the complete elimination of any political consideration in the hiring, directing, and otherwise handling of enrollees in the Job Corps plan?

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No questions will be permitted to be asked concerning one's political affiliations, except those that now pertain to existing law?

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And no discriminatory practice will be allowed against an enrollee on the basis of political affiliation?

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of proposing a unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be included in the previous consent agreement, and that he be allowed 1½ hours under the agreement, 45 minutes to a side?

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

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. MCNAMARA. I thank the Senator from Vermont for yielding.

Without agreeing to all of the allegations made by the Senator in his remarks, I agree to his objectives with regard to the bill. I am sure the intent of the amendment would have been carried out in any case. However, if the Senator believes this should be spelled out in the bill, on behalf of the committee that has been handling this legislation, I shall be pleased to accept the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Florida will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 53, between lines 11 and 12, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

REQUIREMENT FOR STATE APPROVAL OF CONSERVATION CAMPS AND TRAINING CENTERS

SEC. 108. In carrying out the provisions of Part A of this title no conservation camp, training center, or other similar facility designed to carry out the purposes of this Act, shall be established within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed establishment has been submitted to the Governor of the State and such plan has not been disapproved by him within 30 days of such submission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that the amendment of the Senator from Florida is the amendment that applies to the youth camps. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct. I had thought that I would wait until tomorrow to make a statement, but I shall make it now. The amendment merely provides that no youth camps shall be established in any State without the consent of the Governor of that State. The amendment would specifically give the Governor 30 days after he had been notified that there would be a youth camp established in the State in which he could veto it. He could say, "We do not want such a youth camp in our State."

The amendment would give each State some privilege with respect to the determination as to whether or not that State wishes a youth camp of the nature proposed in its State.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator in charge of the bill, the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], indicated a few moments ago that, while the amendment had some limitations in terms of what he thought was the better way to operate under the bill, it was at least livable.

Since there are other amendments that will be taken up tomorrow, which is somewhat of a change of signals, I might say to the Senator from Florida that, since I am interested in the Senator's amendment and have discussed it with him, we might inquire of the Senator in charge of the bill as to whether he is willing to accept the amendment tonight as a measure of further progress on the bill, so that we can proceed with certain other amendments tomorrow.

Mr. SMATHERS. I shall be happy to accept the suggestion of the distinguished whip. I ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether or not he would be willing to accept my amendment.

Mr. MCNAMARA. If the Senator will yield——

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. MCNAMARA. My position, as enunciated by the majority whip, indicates that I have some reluctance to do so, but upon the recommendation of the leadership I would be prepared to accept the amendment for the committee.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BREWSTER obtained the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. For the information of the Senate, does the Senator expect that following the action which he will seek now on the bill there will be yea-and-nay votes on amendments tonight?

Mr. TOWER. I am trying to determine whether any Senator on our side wishes to vote tonight on an amendment.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe my amendment is next in line to be called up. I would prefer to have it dealt with tomorrow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the understanding that we had with the Senator from New York.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

REPEAL OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CREDIT UNIONS ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1112, the bill H.R. 8313.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8313) to repeal the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act, to convert credit unions incorporated under the provisions of the act to Federal credit unions, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1176), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 8313) to repeal the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act, to convert credit unions incorporated under the provisions of the act to Federal credit unions, and for other purposes, after full consideration, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to repeal the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act, and permit District of Columbia chartered credit unions incorporated under the provisions of that act to be chartered under the provisions of the Federal Credit Union Act.

Existing law provides that credit unions may receive charters from the State in which they are located, including the District of Columbia, or under the provisions of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1751).

There are presently in the District of Columbia 176 credit unions chartered under the Federal act and 16 credit unions chartered under the District act. However, all such credit unions are supervised by the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions pursuant to provisions of the Federal Credit Union Act. An important function of this Federal supervision is the auditing of the accounts of the various credit unions by the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions. In addition to supervision by the Director of Federal Credit Unions, the 16 District-chartered credit unions are also subject to regulation and supervision by the District of Columbia Commissioners, who are authorized under the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act to approve organization certificates, to suspend or revoke licenses, and approve bylaws. Also, the names of the board of directors, credit committee, and supervisory committee of District credit unions must be filed with the Board of Commissioners pursuant to the District act.

The enactment of H.R. 8313 will convert all District of Columbia credit unions under the sole jurisdiction of the Federal Credit Union Act and will remove the duplicity of regulation that now exists with regard to District of Columbia credit unions, thereby promoting increased efficiency and uniformity in their regulation.

Moreover, this transfer of functions to the Federal agency appears desirable for other reasons as well. The District of Columbia Credit Unions Act was approved in 1932, approximately 2 years before the Federal Credit Union Act was passed, and since that date virtually no changes have been made to bring the operation of the credit unions chartered by the District into line with more modern practices. As recently as 1959, however, the Federal Credit Union Act was amended and modernized in several important respects. For example, these amendments permit credit unions chartered under the Federal act to establish loan offices and to allow single signature loans up to $750. Also, the boards of directors of such credit unions may now declare dividends either semiannually or annually. Prior to 1959, only annual dividends were authorized. In contrast to these practices, under the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act unsecured loans are permitted only up to a limit of $300, and the members must still approve any dividend rate as recommended by the board of directors. Also, such dividends are authorized only on an annual basis. Thus, the provisions of H.R. 8313 would enable the 16 credit unions presently chartered under the obsolete District of Columbia act to operate on a comparable basis with the other 159 local credit unions with whom they must compete.

Still a further consideration of prime importance is the fact that if any Federal Government agency whose credit union is chartered by the District of Columbia should move from the District for any reason, its credit union would become nonfunctional. It would not be permitted to operate as a credit union outside of the District, nor could it convert to either a State or a Federal charter due to the lack of a conversion provision in the code. Furthermore, such a credit union could not liquidate as a District of Columbia chartered organization for the purpose of rechartering except under the corporate liquidation laws, which many smaller credit unions could not afford.

On January 22, 1964, the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce held a public hearing on S. 2055, a bill identical to H.R. 8313. Representatives from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Credit Union League, and the Agricultural Employees Credit Union for the District of Columbia appeared and testified in support of this legislation. The committee was also advised by the Assistant Secretary for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, of that Department's approval of the bill. The committee received no opposition to the bill's enactment.

RENEWAL OF AMERICAN LEGION MEDAL PATENT NUMBER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1129.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9833) granting a renewal of patent No. D–162,975, relating to a medal of the American Legion.

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, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1194), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 9833 is to grant a 14-year renewal of the design patent No. D–162,975, issued April 17, 1951, the same being the patent of the design of the American Legion's School Award Medal.

STATEMENT

The House of Representatives report reflects the following:

The American Legion is a nonpolitical, civilian organization, originally chartered by the act of Congress of September 16, 1919 (41 Stat. 284; 36 U.S.C. 41–51). Since 1921 the Legion has conducted a school award program involving the annual award of medals to grammar school graduates who exemplify the qualities of courage, honor, service, leadership, scholarship and, recently, patriotism. In 1951 the U.S. Patent Office issued the design patent whose renewal is the subject of this bill for the design of the medal being awarded by the American Legion in connection with its school award program. In the same year the Patent Office issued patent No. D–161,955, relating to a plaque used in connection with the American Legion school award program. The renewal of this design patent is the subject of a companion bill, H.R. 9834. Both such design patents will expire next year, and there is no way, short of an act of Congress, by which they can be extended or renewed.

Consistent committee practice in recent years has been to recommend the granting of renewals of design patents of emblems, badges, etc., of patriotic corporations, e.g., Daughters of the Confederacy (Public Law 213, 88th Cong.), American Legion, Sons of the American Legion, and American Legion Auxiliary (Public Laws 439, 437, and 438, respectively, 87th Cong.).

As indicated by the paragraph above, it has been the consistent practice to recommend the granting of renewals of design patents of emblems, badges, etc., of patriotic organizations, and this committee has concurred in that practice. The committee believes it to be of great value to these patriotic organizations to be able to maintain their emblems, plaques, and badges without the

fear of their being used by other persons or organizations upon the expiration of the patent. It is to the public interest that, as long as the organizations exist, their badges and emblems remain a part of the particular organization. In view of all of the foregoing, the committee concurs in the action of the House of Representatives and recommends that the bill, H.R. 9833, be considered favorably.

Attached hereto and made a part hereof is the letter of the national judge advocate of the American Legion to John S. Mears, assistant director, National Legislative Commission of the American Legion, and the report of the Department of Commerce approving the legislation.

RENEWAL OF AMERICAN LEGION PLAQUE PATENT NUMBER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1130.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9834) granting a renewal of patent No. D–161,955, relating to a plaque of the American Legion.

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, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1195), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 9834 is to grant a 14-year renewal of the design patent No. D–161,955, issued February 13, 1951, the same being the patent of the design of the American Legion's School Award Plaque.

STATEMENT

The House of Representatives report reflects the following:

The American Legion is a nonpolitical, civilian organization, originally chartered by the act of Congress of September 16, 1919 (51 Stat. 284; 36 U.S.C. 41–51). Since 1921 the Legion has conducted a school award program involving the annual award of medals to grammar school graduates who exemplify the qualities of courage, honor, service, leadership, scholarship and, recently, patriotism. The School Award Plaque is awarded to the educational institutions at which the recipients of the School Award Medals were trained. The plaque is of such design that it permits the engraving thereon of the names of 14 awardees of the School Award Medal. In 1951 the U.S. Patent Office issued design patent No. D–161,955, whose renewal is the subject of this bill, for the design of a plaque. In the same year the Patent Office issued patent No. D–162,975, relating to the School Award Medal, whose renewal is the subject of a companion bill, H.R. 9833. Both such design patents will expire next year and there is no way, short of an act of Congress, by which they can be extended or renewed.

Consistent committee practice in recent years has been to recommend the granting of renewals of design patents of emblems, badges, etc., of patriotic corporations; e.g., Daughters of the Confederacy (Public Law 213, 88th Cong.), American Legion, Sons of the American Legion, and American Legion Auxiliary (Public Laws 439, 437, and 438, respectively, 87th Cong.).

As indicated by the paragraph above, it has been the consistent practice to recommend the granting of renewals of design patents of emblems, badges, etc., of patriotic organizations, and this committee has concurred in that practice. The committee believes it to be of great value to these patriotic organizations to be able to maintain their emblems, plaques, and badges without the fear of their being used by other persons or organizations upon the expiration of the patent. It is to the public interest that, as long as the organizations exist their badges and emblems remain a part of the particular organization. In view of all of the foregoing, the committee concurs in the action of the House of Representatives and recommends that the bill, H.R. 9834, be considered favorably.

Attached hereto and made a part hereof is the letter of the national judge advocate of the American Legion to John S. Mears, assistant director, National Legislative Commission of the American Legion, and the report of the Department of Commerce approving the legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Maryland for his usual and unfailing consideration.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2642) to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Maryland will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 82, line 14, before "this title", insert "parts A and B of".

On page 88, line 3, before "this title", insert "parts A and B of".

On page 88, line 5, before "this title", insert "parts A and B of".

On page 88, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

"PART D—INDEMNITY PAYMENTS TO DAIRY FARMERS

"SEC. 331. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to make indemnity payments, at a rate not less than the support price for milk and dairy products, to dairy farmers who, as a result of any standard established by any Federal agency or agency of the District of Columbia, have been directed between January 1, 1964, and June 30, 1965, to remove their milk from any commercial market because it contained residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government. Such indemnity payments shall continue to each dairy farmer until he has been reinstated and is again allowed to dispose of his milk on commercial markets.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, this amendment would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers who have been forced to remove their milk from the commercial market because it contained certain chemical residues that have heretofore been recommended and authorized for use by the Federal Government.

This is the present situation. Over a period of several years the Department of Agriculture has recommended to farmers that they use Heptachlor and Dieldrin to control the alfalfa weevil in alfalfa that is being produced to make hay to feed livestock, particularly dairy cattle. Over a period of many years cattle agents all over the country instructed our farmers on the use of this pesticide. Fields were sprayed in the spring, again in the summer, and more recently—even in the fall. Heptachlor in a granular form was spread over the fields of Maryland, Virginia, and other farming States across the Nation in an attempt to control this pest.

Now what has happened? The Food and Drug Administration has developed a more accurate test which they use on milk, and they have determined that there is a residue of this chemical in milk. Therefore the Department of Public Health of the District of Columbia has required farmers in Virginia and Maryland where the residue of this chemical has been found in milk to discontinue the sale of their milk products to the District, and they have caused a very substantial number of farmers to dump their milk products on the ground.

This has caused a very serious loss to the producers, but this may well be only the start. This chemical has been used, and is being used, with the very definite recommendation of the Department of Agriculture, all over the United States. As of this time we do not know the extent of the contamination. The producers, in all good faith, have used the chemical, produced their crops, and fed them to their livestock, and now another branch of the Federal Government comes hard on the heels of the recommendation of the Department of Agriculture and says, "You cannot market your crop. You must dispose of it. Dump it out on the ground. It is not fit for human consumption." The apparent unfairness of this situation requires the attention of this Congress.

I have taken the opportunity to offer this amendment as an amendment to the antipoverty bill since time is of the essence. The antipoverty bill is aimed, among other things, at helping the small farmers. There are small farmers all over my State, and all over the Nation, who will suffer great economic loss if they are prevented from marketing their crops because of this new regulation, only the beginning of which we now perceive in the District of Columbia. We recognize the disastrous effect it is having on tens, and probably hundreds of farmers who attempt to market their products in the Nation's Capital. We can readily imagine the predicament that will face the cattle industry and related

livestock industries in which "contaminated" hay is being fed to livestock.

I therefore ask Senators to consider favorably the amendment I have offered.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I received, under date of July 21, from the president of the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers' Association, Inc., be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
July 21, 1964.

Hon. DANIEL B. BREWSTER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to you in my capacity as president of Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, and at the suggestion of many of our Maryland directors who have spoken to you regarding the pesticides residue problem, to urge you to introduce the attached amendment to the President's antipoverty bill, which is so urgently needed by so many of our dairy farmer members in the State of Maryland.

I know you are fully aware of the poverty conditions which have been created for the dairy farmers of Maryland by the sudden exclusion of their milk from the District of Columbia because same contains only the slightest possible trace of pesticides residue; and I know you are aware of the fact that such pesticides were used by our Maryland farmers only after same were highly recommended and prescribed for use by the U.S. Government. The result for these excluded farmers has been that they must continue to dump all of their milk production at the farms, and without any advance warning at all they have been completely deprived of their income and livelihoods.

I understand that one of our Maryland farmer-members actually spoke to President Johnson during his recent tour of poverty stricken areas in Maryland, and gained the impression that the new antipoverty program would make some provision for the effective relief of these disastrous conditions. In a later letter written to one of our poverty threatened members by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on behalf of President Johnson, it was stated:

"The President has asked us to thank you for your recent letter to him and to assure you of his concern with the problems faced by the farmers of our country. A major item in the President's antipoverty program would make available Federal grants to improve many small farms and thereby stimulate a permanent increase in income for many farmers.

"The President is aware of the hardship that has been imposed upon some dairy farmers in Maryland by the recent discovery of traces of pesticides in milk making the milk unmarketable. It is certainly to be hoped that the situation can be quickly remedied, and we understand that the local health officials are making every effort to clear up this problem and to prevent its reoccurrence by various control methods.

"Whatever the necessary steps are, I do know that all agencies which have any concern with this situation are making every effort to find the solution as quickly as possible. Thank you for writing to the President to express your concern."

A copy of this letter, along with a copy of a letter recently written on this subject by our General Manager, Mr. Click, are attached for your information.

Unfortunately however, the antipoverty bill as reported to the Senate does not cover this specific problem while, as indicated, it was apparently the intention of the administration that it should.

Consequently we strenuously request that you be good enough to make every effort on the floor of the Senate to gain adoption of the attached amendment to the antipoverty bill. Under present conditions it is estimated that the total cost of this indemnity program for the local area (Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia) would not exceed during the period February 1964 through June 1965, the sum of approximately $250,000; and it is intended merely as a stop-gap program to alleviate the prevailing poverty conditions until an effective program of research and testing can be established to eliminate the residue problem permanently.

Please be assured of the deepest possible appreciation of our membership for your vigorous support in this very serious matter.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

EDWARD C. NORMAN,
President.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the situation, also prepared by the secretary-treasurer of the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers' Association, be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

SUMMARY

This refers to the disastrous situation of dairy farmers being deprived of a livelihood due to the current pesticide problem, which principally involves Heptachlor and Dieldrin.

On behalf of your constituents in the dairy business who are members of our organization we appeal to you for help. We urge that the District of Columbia Department of Public Health discontinue its present policy. We urge that this Department adopt the program for pesticide control of the State of Maryland and the State of Virginia, which are synonymous. Under regulation and law this can be done with approval of the Food and Drug Administration.

As you know, the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the past several years has been recommending the use of these pesticides throughout the State of Maryland and other areas of this milk shed for the control of alfalfa weevil. It was apparently felt by this Department that there would not be enough residual effect from using feeds produced after treatment with chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides to contaminate milk from the fat of the animals.

The Food and Drug Administration has developed a new testing method which is 10 times more sensitive than tests that were used prior to the fall of 1963. Milk, unlike many other food items, has no tolerance for the presence of residues under the food and drug law. We are told, therefore, that under these laws immediate steps must be taken to assure the public that milk is, or will be, free of residues at the new present actionable levels.

The Department of Agriculture's apparent lack of research information based on present-day methods of testing, plus the introduction last fall of new methodology of testing (about the same time that Heptachlor was being put on alfalfa fields), are the principal causes of our dilemma. The District of Columbia Public Health feels that at this time they must follow the new lower actionable level according to food and drug's new test. As a result, the Health Department is on continuous testing basis of milk from individual producer shipments and are, without warning, suspending producers' permits wherever it is found that milk supplies are above actionable level on the present new basis.

This association feels, and we are certain that we speak for each of its individual members, that this change of rules is disastrous. Producers have followed directions and recommendations of one branch of the Government and now find themselves in jeopardy on milk shipments from another branch of the Government. This has come about on the basis of no warning to producers and without sufficient time having been allowed to permit producers to adjust.

Our contacts and meetings with Food and Drug Administration officials have been on a very cooperative basis. In many of these meetings in the last several months we have been led to believe that, even though new actionable levels are established by regulations, programs which are set up to eliminate the problem by showing continuous progress toward lowering the levels of pesticide residues over a reasonable period of time are satisfactory. In fact, we are working with such programs within the State of Maryland, within the State of Virginia, and are helping to set up such a program within the State of Pennsylvania. After repeated conferences with the officials of the District of Columbia Health Department, we feel that no cooperation has been extended by them toward producers, or toward the officials conducting programs in the surrounding States at this time.

In fact, the program that has been set up and is operating within the State of Maryland and the State of Virginia consists of a testing program on truck loads of milk to establish the actual residue level that exists and to single out the individual milk producer who, through no fault of his own, is caught in this squeeze. With the cooperation of the officials and industry people, an individual producer has an opportunity to reduce the residue in his milk. This is accomplished through a program of testing feed, changing to different feeds, and the many other tedious tasks involved. At present there are no cutoffs from shipment in this program, except in extremely high cases. I can assure you also that rapid progress is being made in these States. The cooperation of the producers, the county agricultural agents, the State universities, and the State health departments, as well as the industry people, is doing a job that is almost unparalleled. The Food and Drug Administration is aware of these programs and the progress being made.

Compare the above described programs, if you will, with the so-called program being enacted by the District of Columbia Health Department in which, as rapidly as they are able to detect questionable truck loads they are testing individual shippers' milk. On the basis of one test this department is immediately suspending shipments from individual shippers at the very lowest limits actionable by Food and Drug Administration methods. This program was set up and inaugurated early this spring by the Health Department without consultation with the dairy industry.

This type of arbitrary regulation is without precedent. Down through the years, whenever any change in regulations has been promoted, there has always been a certain time lapse in which to give the producers and industry time to comply with new regulations and changes. By the same token, there has always been complete cooperation between industry, producers, and the health department in inaugurating and enforcing new regulations. For example, the new District code for milk production, which went into effect January 1, 1960, was written and announced to the general public well in advance of the effective date. Also, in our programs of the past years to eliminate animal diseases, such as tuberculosis and brucellosis, several years' time was allowed for the process of eliminating these hazards.

We believe it would be only fair to have the same consideration in the present sit-

uation. This is especially true in view of the fact that it cannot be proven that the present levels of pesticides involve a public health hazard. We, as a producer organization, are most desirous of having a milk supply that is free from all pesticides and are working diligently toward this end. As a producing industry, we have for some 40 years worked toward, and believed our chief responsibility to be, a milk supply of the highest quality which offers the greatest health protection to the consuming public.

We cannot inaugurate a progressive program under the present policy of control. We can eliminate this problem only through education of producers as new information becomes available on how and what to feed, and how to manage the herds to eliminate this problem. Individual permit suspension is not necessary except in the very few cases of individual noncooperation after the producer has been apprised of his situation and has been allowed sufficient time to do something about it.

At the present time the following conditions exist within the dairy industry of this Washington milkshed:

(a) Drought: We are facing the third straight year of extremely adverse weather conditions in which producers have been unable to grow sufficient feed for their herds. At this writing there is no pasture, practically no prospect for a second and third hay cutting, corn supplies appear to be stunted to the point where the silage feed crop will be greatly hampered. These facts, coupled with the fact that for 3 years farm credit has been extended to the breaking point, have caused banks, machinery dealers, feed dealers, and the general communities to be concerned greatly over this economic situation; and producers who are caught in this cost-price squeeze are being forced out of business.

(b) Feed contamination: The University of Maryland and other institutions are doing an outstanding job for producers with the pesticide problem in their testing procedures through all of their laboratory facilities. They are determining what feed, if any, is safe to feed from a pesticide point of view.

The 1964 hay crop, which was made early this spring, is showing to be more than 90 percent contaminated with pesticides. The producers followed the recommendations of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and applied Heptachlor or Dieldrin. Furthermore, recent tests are showing that alfalfa fields, which were previously treated with Heptachlor or Dieldrin, that have been plowed up and planted with new feed crops, are showing the pesticide in the new crops. In other words, if a producer had a 200-acre dairy farm with 50 acres of alfalfa, he now has only a 150-acre dairy farm on which to produce feed for his animals.

(c) Fear and confusion of the individual: Dairymen living in the same communities may be suspended from shipping milk if they hold a Washington permit, while their neighbors are not being suspended from shipping milk if they ship to another State or city. The people in these communities have followed the same recommendations and the same general farm practices. This is causing grave concern among individuals who are afraid day by day, in this land of freedom, that their livelihood may be cut off tomorrow.

Under the conditions described above, milk supplies for the Washington market are dwindling. Receipts of this association at this writing are running more than 15,000 gallons of milk a day less than last year.

Producers holding Washington market permits are up in arms about the treatment they are receiving from the District Health Department and are seeking ways and means of securing other markets as a result. Under the conditions, it is hard to blame them individually. However, the Washington milk supply must be maintained on a basis which will allow the consumer an adequate supply at a reasonable price. Under the present situation the supply cannot continue to remain adequate.

Again, on behalf of your constituents in the dairy business who are our members, we appeal to you for help. We urge that the District of Columbia Department of Public Health discontinue its present policy. We urge that this Department adopt the program for pesticide control of the State of Maryland and the State of Virginia, which are synonymous. Under regulation and law this can be done with approval of the Food and Drug Administration. We could then establish a uniform program for this entire area which would get better, faster, and more permanent results in the reduction of the pesticide problem. These results could be obtained without the expenditure of a vast amount of public funds or increased personnel and laboratory facilities.

Very truly yours,

JAMES E. CLICK,
Secretary-Treasurer, General Manager, Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. I ask the Senator to permit me to join with him in sponsorship of the amendment. I should like to be a cosponsor of the amendment, if I may.

Mr. BREWSTER. I shall be very glad to have the senior Senator from Maryland as a cosponsor of this amendment. I well know of his great interest in the farmers of our State.

Mr. BEALL. I thank the Senator.

I also call attention to the fact that our colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], has had the same problem in his area, particularly in Jefferson County. I know he has worked on it and given it great study during recent months, as we have across the river in Maryland. I know he wants to be associated with us in this amendment.

Since the first of this year, I have been deeply concerned with the difficulties Maryland milk producers have experienced subsequent to the discovery of the presence of minute particles of heptachlor in their milk. Heptachlor is an insecticide used to control the alfalfa weevil, a pest of alfalfa. Up until April 27 of this year, heptachlor was recommended by the Department of Agriculture for treating alfalfa. Discovery of heptachlor's presence in milk was made possible only by improved analytical procedures 10 times more sensitive than any previously used. As a result of the discovery of the heptachlor presence, farmer's milk permits have been revoked. This, of course, means that farmers have been deprived of their markets and forced to dump the milk on their farms. Obviously financial disaster faces these farmers. And this, Mr. President, resulted not from any wrongdoing on the part of the farmer, but to the contrary, the farmers, by using the insecticide, were following the procedures recommended by the Department of Agriculture.

I have explored every possible path through the various Federal agencies in an effort to secure financial assistance for these milk producers. For example, on May 7, I telegraphed the Secretary of Agriculture, urging that the Department of Agriculture indemnify the milk farmers under section 32 of Public Law 320 following the precedent used in the cranberry crisis.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my telegram, together with the Secretary's adverse reply, be placed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, it seems clear that all possible administrative remedies have been pursued. It is now apparent that legislation is needed. If we are to embark on a poverty program, I feel it is imperative that we provide for those farmers who are now suffering dire financial hardships because they followed the recommendations of the Agriculture Department in the use of insecticides. This amendment would pay the milk support price to those farmers whose milk permit was revoked.

In the debate here today I have heard Senators in justification of this bill state that our diminishing world population is creating problems in the streets of our cities. I have heard it said that rural families come to the cities and find themselves unable to cope with the complexities of city living.

It is then proposed in this bill that conservation camps would help the children of these displaced rural families.

I submit to the Senate that an amendment which is designed to prevent the destruction of dairy farmers in Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, North Carolina and other States where the alfafa weavil is a problem is germane to this legislation. It will prevent conditions that this bill seeks to correct. It will help prevent, in some cases at least, loss of gainful employment in our rural areas, thereby helping to delay the exodus of our rural population to the cities. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment as good, sound poverty prevention.

EXHIBIT 1

MAY 7, 1964.

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.:

Situation created by revocation of dairy permits of 14 area milk producers most serious. Producers who in good faith followed recommendations of Agriculture Department in use of insecticides face financial disaster. Section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress, provides you with authority to alleviate this disaster by initiating an indemnity program for these farmers. In analogous cranberry crisis, such authority was exercised. Although the financial loss, viewed in its totality falls far short of the cranberry case, I assure you individually each producer faces a financial future just as bleak as that from which the cranberry producers were rescued. It seems to me the same justice shown cranberry producers prompts implementation of the law in this case, and I so urge.

J. GLENN BEALL,
U.S. Senator, Maryland.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1964.

HON. J. GLENN BEALL,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BEALL: This is with further reference to your telegram of May 7, 1964, requesting assistance to dairy farmers whose

milk was found to contain actionable residues of heptachlor epoxide.

Careful consideration has been given to your request. We regret the necessity of informing you that, upon the basis of the facts and reasons contained in the attached statement, we do not believe that section 32 funds, or any other funds available to this Department, can be used for this purpose.

We appreciate your interest in this serious and difficult problem and welcome this opportunity to present the Department's views on the subject.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE L. MEHREN,
Assistant Secretary.

STATEMENT ON THE USE OF SECTION 32 FUNDS TO INDEMNIFY PRODUCERS FOR LOSSES DUE TO THE PRESENCE OF ACTIONABLE AMOUNTS OF CHLORINATED HYDROCARBON INSECTICIDE RESIDUES IN MILK

Heptachlor was first registered for use on alfalfa November 2, 1953. At that time it was covered by a 0.1 part per million tolerance. This use was canceled January 23, 1960, along with other registrations based on Food and Drug tolerances when those were changed to "zero" on January 19, 1960.

The alfalfa use was then reestablished in August 1960 for southeastern use only and on February 2, 1961, for western use on the basis that there would be no residues in alfalfa when it was treated in accordance with a clearly defined pattern of use. At that time, the USDA was aware of a Food and Drug policy of depending on methods sensitive to 0.1 part per million of chlorinated hydrocarbons in whole milk for regulatory action.

On May 25, 1962, the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council recommended that finite tolerances be established in milk at a level of 0.1 part per million on the basis of fluid milk containing 3.5 percent milk fat. This proposal was not adopted by the Food and Drug Administration. That agency indicated that it would not be willing to set finite tolerances for pesticides in milk, at least without a great deal more data.

Ever since the Food and Drug Administration established "zero" tolerances in 1960, it has consistently refused to rely on any given detection methodology as the one to be used to the exclusion of more sensitive techniques that might be developed later.

On October 11, 1963, the Food and Drug Administration notified the dairy industry groups that heptachlor and heptachlor epoxide, as well as aldrin, dieldrin, and endrin, could then be detected at 0.01 part per million in whole milk (0.25 part per million on the fat basis) and it would be the policy of Food and Drug to use those new methods to determine compliance of milk with the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Food and Drug officials took the position that residues above this sensitivity level may be dangerous, but acknowledged that data was not available to determine the level that would endanger public health.

Actions taken in California against cheese and milk products shortly thereafter disclosed that the spring use of heptachlor on alfalfa in the West risked contamination of milk, so that use was disapproved in December 1963. Convincing evidence was lacking, however, that the eastern use in the fall before November 15 could contaminate milk and that use was retained.

In February 1964, however, it came to our attention that the Baltimore district laboratory of Food and Drug was finding heptachlor in milk from several dairies in the northern counties of Maryland. When this information was made known to the cooperative buying milk from those dairies, the industry cut them off.

Analysis had found heptachlor in mixed feeds, as well as alfalfa, and that in the case where alfalfa was involved, at least one grower had misused the pesticide by applying it in the spring. This finding was confirmed by an "on site" inspection by the University of Maryland official who reported to us.

Then additional Food and Drug analyses of milk being sent to the Washington, D.C., market disclosed heptachlor epoxide in the milk from 14 dairies at levels in the milk fat of from 0.34 to 2.24 parts per million. The District of Columbia Health Department declared the milk from these dairies ineligible, after a meeting held on April 22, 1964, with broad representation from dairy, health, and agricultural interests.

We continued to have serious doubt that the previously registered pattern of fall use of heptachlor in the East was primarily responsible for this situation. Over 2,000 dairies supply the milk coming into Baltimore and Washington. Only 20 were suspended, whereas heptachlor was widely used. It seemed logical to suspect misuse in the cases where alfalfa could be responsible and it was known that contamination of mixed feeds was a definite factor as well.

This suspicion found some confirmation in the results of 3,000 check tests by the Food and Drug Administration between July 1, 1963, and March 10, 1964. Of these tests, only 49, or 1.9 percent, turned up with actionable pesticide residues. Of the 49 actionable samples 29 showed levels of dieldrin and 16 heptachlor epoxide. Further testing is being performed by the Food and Drug Administration and these tests may present a different set of statistics from which different conclusions may be drawn.

In the meantime, we had only suspicion to go on. There was no hard evidence either way that the producers whose milk was found contaminated strictly followed the prescribed directions or did not follow them. However, as a result of improved chemical methods for detecting trace amounts of heptachlor, the actionable level was reduced below the amount which could be detected at the time of registration. In view of the zero tolerance for residues of heptachlor in alfalfa and the absence of a tolerance for residues of heptachlor in milk, registration was canceled by this Department on April 28, 1964.

If alfalfa containing heptachlor is fed to dairy herds, the residues enter the blood stream and are stored in the body fat. There is a progressive buildup as the animal is fed the contaminated feed over a long period. Since milk fat carries about the same levels of residues as the body fat, when a detectable level of residue is reached it will show in the milk fat. To reduce this level it is necessary to place the animal on a partial starvation diet to consume some of the body fat and thus "bleed off" some of the residue until it is reduced below detectable levels. The length of time this will take depends upon the extent to which the residue has built up before it is detected. This treatment was successful in restoring eligibility to the six Maryland herds whose milk was found to be contaminated in February and two of the herds whose milk was found to be contaminated in April. Since the levels of heptachlor epoxide found in the Maryland herds ranged from 0.34 to 2.24 parts per million, it is hoped that this treatment will restore the eligibility of some or all of the remainder of these herds very soon.

We are informed that to assist in this treatment and to prevent further contamination the Extension Service at the Universities of Maryland and Pennsylvania State are making available to producers procedures whereby samples of alfalfa may be submitted for tests as to the presence of insecticides. Also, the Maryland-Virginia Milk Producers Association is said to be offering to help its producers to eliminate pesticide residues before they get into the milk.

Such are the facts as we understand them. We now come to the question of whether this Department can or should seek ways to indemnify producers whose milk was found to be contaminated by chlorinated hydrocarbon residues. In considering this question, we have studied the availability of section 32 funds (sec. 32, Public Law 320, 74th Cong., as amended, 7 U.S.C. 612c) to finance programs in aid of these producers. Section 32, as amended, provides, in part, that:

"There is appropriated for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, an amount equal to 30 per centum of the gross receipts from duties collected under the customs laws during the period January 1 to December 31, both inclusive, preceding the beginning of each such fiscal year. Such sums shall be maintained in a separate fund and shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture only to (1) encourage the exportation of agricultural commodities and products thereof by the payment of benefits in connection with the exportation thereof or of indemnities for losses incurred in connection with such exportation, or by payments to producers in connection with the production of that part of any agricultural commodity required for domestic consumption; (2) encourage the domestic consumption of such commodities or products by diverting them, by the payment of benefits or indemnities or by other means, from the normal channels of trade and commerce or by increasing their utilization through benefits, indemnities, donations, or by other means, among persons in low-income groups as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture; and (3) reestablish farmers' purchasing power by making payments in connection with the normal production of any agricultural commodity for domestic consumption. Determinations of the Secretary as to what constitutes diversion and what constitutes normal channels of trade and commerce and what constitutes normal production for domestic consumption shall be final."

Programs under clauses (1) and (2) obviously cannot apply to contaminated products, the consumption of which is prohibited. Under the facts before us, we do not believe that there is a basis under clause (3) to indemnify the farmers in question for losses on contaminated milk. Their loss has not been due to a failure of the domestic market to absorb at fair prices the normal production for domestic consumption. We find nothing in the history of section 32 which would support a conclusion that Congress intended that clause (3) could be used to indemnify a few individual producers for loss of purchasing power due to isolated mishaps in their farming operations. Such would be in the nature of crop insurance.

Under clause (3) payments to farmers can be made only in connection with normal production for domestic consumption. It is seriously to be questioned whether the production of contaminated milk can be considered as normal production for domestic consumption within the meaning of this clause. We have never had a clause (3) program for payments on contaminated products. When this clause was used as authority for a program in 1960 to assist cranberry producers, payments were made only with respect to wholesome cranberries for which a market had been lost because of publicity given to the contamination of an extremely small fraction of the cranberries. No payments were made on berries found to be contaminated. (See H. Rept. No. 1592, 86th Cong., 2d sess., on Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration appropriation bill, 1961, pp. 19–21.)

If the rationale of the cranberry program was applied to the present situation, we would make payments on only wholesome

milk, but not on the contaminated milk, and this would not help the producers whose milk is banned from the market. We are now supporting the price of wholesome milk by buying butter, cheese, and nonfat solids under the Agricultural Act of 1949. In the past we have also purchased such products with section 32 funds for distribution to schools, charitable institutions, and relief feeding.

Even if no question existed as to the legal availability of section 32 funds to make payments on contaminated products, we would still have reservations concerning whether the facts set forth above would justify such use.

On the basis of present statistics, only one or two out of a hundred samples tested by the new sensitive method disclose the presence of actionable amounts of chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticide residues in milk. In one case it was definitely proven that the procedure was not followed when the insecticide was applied in the spring.

Moreover, there would be no way to verify in individual cases that the procedures had been followed. The heptachlor residues found in milk this spring would have had to come from alfalfa grown on fields to which heptachlor was applied prior to November 15, 1962.

This inability to verify compliance with approved procedures in connection with indemnity claims raises a serious public policy question. We know that the use of pesticides and insecticides has been of great benefit to the farmer and to the consumer. The public has the right to demand that every precaution be taken in their application. One of the means of insuring that such precautions are taken is the threat of financial loss arising out of the condemnation of contaminated food. The removal of this threat by indemnity payments could well lessen the care taken in their use and this result would certainly not be in the public interest.

This is not to say that insecticide residues are not a problem and a serious one, but the problem is not confined to milk. It covers all food products, including fruits, vegetables, and meat. Many lots of these products are condemned each year and the producers of these products suffer serious losses without indemnity payments of any kind, despite the fact that the improved sensitivity of detection techniques applies to them as well as to milk.

Both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are deeply interested in protecting the public health, and at the same time neither of them want to hurt the farmer. Our two Departments are cooperating closely in a common effort to find a solution to the insecticide residue problem. This joint effort is receiving the active support of the Congress. The House of Representatives has approved a budget request for expanded research on pesticides and insecticides, including effects of residues.

We do not believe that indemnity payments is the answer to this problem, particularly on the basis of the facts now known. We think the better solution is to direct our efforts toward learning more about insecticide residues and tolerance levels which cannot possibly endanger public health. This will not only protect the producer, but will maintain consumer confidence in a pure and wholesome milk supply.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. I am sure the Senators brings up a question that is of great interest to many Senators. Several States have been mentioned that are involved in situations similar to that of Maryland. I have received mail from milk producers in Michigan along the same line. However, despite this fact, the legislation involved in the amendment has already been or is before the Agriculture Committee in the House of Representatives. I have been advised that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in the Senate, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], has indicated a great interest in the measure. I have heard him speak about it personally. I am sure he is prepared, at an early date, to proceed in this area.

I think it is one which should not come into the picture in a bill which came from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, because the committee has not had an opportunity to give it proper treatment. I am sure better legislation would be obtained—and it is needed legislation—to compensate the milk producers who have been damaged by the procedures of the various agencies of the U.S. Government.

I hope the Senator will not press his amendment at this time, but will leave it to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with the understanding on the part of the leadership that this matter will be given prompt attention in this session.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I say to the Senator from Maryland that I support the purpose of his amendment, because the milk industry has been not only jeopardized but seriously threatened by the impact of pesticides.

The distinguished Senator from Maryland will recall that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] has been conducting a full-scale inquiry into the harmful effects of pesticides and what type of controls ought to be utilized to protect the public health.

The Senator from Connecticut, as a member of my subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, has been conducting hearings under a special resolution for that subcommittee.

Other Senators have proposals similar to that proposed by the Senator from Maryland. It is my view that these proposals should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—not to be delayed. I do not want the Senator to get that idea. The House has already undertaken hearings. The Agriculture Committee will have several sessions between now and adjournment.

The Senator from Minnesota will press, with all the power at his command—limited though it be—for prompt action by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I feel that not only would such an amendment to the pending bill be somewhat nongermane—that, of course, would not be fatal—but the pending bill has a particular purpose; and I hope that the Senator will accede to the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan, who is the Senator in charge of the bill, in the knowledge that the Senator from Minnesota will join the Senator from Maryland and his colleague in his endeavor to have much needed legislation enacted for the protection of the dairy farmers.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, those of us who have been faced with this particular problem are dedicated to the support of an amendment of this type. However, we realize that the argument presented by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the majority whip, is a compelling one, and the expression made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], who is in charge of the bill, also make it important that we not press the matter at this time. Nevertheless, I commend the junior Senator from Maryland, joined by the senior Senator from Maryland, for having presented the amendment.

In Jefferson County, in the eastern panhandle of West Virginia, we have a similar problem. It is a very acute one. I conferred with one farmer who told me that his entire livestock herd may be lost. Thousands of dollars are involved—a substantial financial loss to this one farmer alone; much privation is already being experienced.

I take some comfort from the expressions here that the matter will not be delayed, and that the appropriate committee of the Senate will move into this matter. I again commend the Senator from Maryland for calling the attention of all Senators to this very perplexing problem which is one that needs solution. I believe the discussion has been clarifying and helpful.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who are expressing their support for the subject matter of the amendment which I have offered. I am encouraged by the majority whip's comment that he will use his recognized powers of persuasion to bring this matter to the early attention of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I point out to the Senate that a large number of farmers in the States of Virginia, West Virginia, and Maryland have suffered grievously. This may well be only the beginning. Many farmers in our areas may receive great and undue harm from this obvious paradox in our Government's approach to agriculture. On the one hand the Government recommends vigorously the use of pesticides and on the other hand, shortly thereafter, if not at the same time, it tells the farmers they cannot sell their crops because they used those same pesticides.

Because of the persuasive arguments by the manager of the bill and also by the majority whip and with their gracious assurances in mind, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1126.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that the amendment may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The amendment (No. 1126), ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 108, between lines 21 and 22, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 614. (a) In carrying out the provisions of parts B and C of title I, part A of title II, and part B of title III, the Director shall establish procedures which shall facilitate effective participation of the States in programs assisted under such parts. In pursuance thereof he shall use his best efforts to develop State plans to carry out the provisions of such parts and shall utilize State agencies and facilities in the administration of such parts whenever and wherever practicable, either at the initiation of programs under such parts or in the course thereof. Procedures established by the Director shall include provision for the referral of applications for assistance under such parts to the Governor of each State affected, or his designee, for such comments as he may deem appropriate in cases not otherwise provided for in this subsection.

"(b) The Director is authorized to make grants to or to contract with States and appropriate State agencies for the payment of the expenses of such agencies in performing their functions under subsection (a) hereof, and for the purpose of providing technical assistance to State and local government agencies in developing, conduction, and administering programs under the parts of this Act listed in subsection (a)."

Redesignate sections 614 and 615 as sections 615 and 616, respectively.

Mr. JAVITS. I reserve the time on my amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, on July 21, I submitted an amendment which would compensate dairy farmers for the great losses they have been sustaining because of their milk being confiscated.

I am sorry that a similar amendment has just been withdrawn. I am modifying my amendment, and it will be printed and lie on the table. I intend to call it up tomorrow. This is a very serious problem, and I intend to pursue the amendment very vigorously tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Oregon.

CUBAN AGGRESSION AND THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is my honor and privilege to serve, with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], as one of the two Senate aids to the Secretary of State at the diplomatic conference which is now being held in Washington of the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States. This historic conference is being held by the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States to consider the charges which have been filed against Cuba by an investigating committee of the Organization of American States which has found Castro Cuba to be guilty of acts of aggression and subversion against Venezuela.

Mr. President, Senator HICKENLOOPER and I are joined on the House side by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, Representative ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR., Democrat, of Alabama, and WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, Republican, of California.

I believe that every Member of Congress and every American would have been extremely proud, as I was proud this afternoon, to listen to the speech of our Secretary of State, as he presented to this historic conference the position of the United States in respect to the charges which the investigating committee of OAS has filed against Cuba for its acts of aggression and subversion against Venezuela.

I consider it a great privilege and honor to ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the statement made by the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, at the ninth meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the countries comprising the Organization of American States at the Pan American Union, in Washington, today.

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

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN RUSK AT THE NINTH MEETING OF FOREIGN MINISTERS, PAN AMERICAN UNION, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 21–24, 1964

Mr. Chairman, fellow Ministers, you have complimented us all, Mr. Chairman, in your willingness to serve as our presiding officer, and your chairmanship gives great satisfaction to every colleague at this table.

Five times in as many years the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics have met to consider situations affecting the peace of the hemisphere arising in whole or in part from the interventionist activities of the Castro regime. This is a measure of the frequency with which our regional security system has had to act to thwart Castro's aggressive designs.

In the face of continued Cuban aggression, the time has now come to make it abundantly clear to the Castro regime that the American Governments in complete solidarity will no longer tolerate its efforts to export revolution through the classic Communist techniques of terror, and guerrilla warfare, and the infiltration of arms and subversive agents.

ORIGINS OF CUBAN AGGRESSION

The pattern of Cuban aggression emerged soon after the Castro regime came to power in 1959. You will recall the armed expeditions which set forth from Cuban territory against Panama, the Dominican Republic, and Haiti during the first 6 months of that year. When this direct method of overthrowing governments failed, the Cuban Government turned to the indirect technique of subversion. From the sending of armed landing parties, Castro shifted to training in subversive techniques, transfer of funds for subversive elements, dissemination of systematic and hostile propaganda and the clandestine shipment of both arms and men. The new pattern emerged in full bloom last year when Castro made a major effort to disrupt the democratic elections in Venezuela and, beyond that, to destroy the democratic institutions of that country.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNIST BEACHHEAD IN CUBA

But it took some time to "tool up" the new mechanism for indirect aggression. Meanwhile, the Castro regime embarked upon another type of assault against the traditions and principles of the American community of nations: the establishment of the Communist system in Cuba itself and the facilitation of military intervention by an extra-continental totalitarian power in this hemisphere.

I will not take the time here to go into all the details, but you will recall that by mid-1960 the construction of the apparatus of a Communist state in Cuba was well advanced. Likewise its ties with the Soviet bloc and with Communist China were firmly established. Castro signed the first agreement with the Soviets in February 1960 and with the Red Chinese in July. Cuba established diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union in May 1960, and with the satellite countries in succeeding months. On July 9, 1960, Premier Khrushchev made his offer to support Cuba with rocket power, and President Dorticos replied the following day hailing as he put it "the message of solidarity spoken by the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union." These words were shortly followed by deeds in the form of shipments of large quantities of Soviet arms. On January 2, 1961, Castro paraded these weapons for the world to see, and the flow of arms and the parades continued in the years since.

By August 1960 when the American Foreign Ministers met in San Jose for the seventh meeting of consultation, Cuba clearly had become Communist and international communism had opened an important beachhead in the Western Hemisphere.

THE HEMISPHERE'S INITIAL RESPONSE

The response of the American governments to this flagrant challenge to hemisphere security fell short—surely we would have to say now—of the nature of the threat. Neither at the fifth meeting of consultation in 1959 nor the seventh meeting in 1960 did the Foreign Ministers act in a way to make clear to the Castro regime that the transformation of Cuba into a base of operations for international communism would not be tolerated by the American community.

The task of throwing up the hemisphere's defenses devolved on subsequent consultations beginning with the eighth meeting of Foreign Ministers in January 1962, at Punta del Este.

TRANSFORMATION OF THE HEMISPHERE'S ATTITUDE

The change in the hemisphere's attitude toward the danger represented by a Communist Cuba became clearly discernible in the careful study made by the Inter-American Peace Committee in November and December 1961. At the request of the Government of Peru, the Committee examined, among other things, the Castro regime's relations with the Sino-Soviet bloc and Cuba's promotion of subversion and revolution in other American Republics. The Committee in its report arrived at these principal con-

clusions—and let us not forget this documentation of our hemisphere:

1. "The identification of the Government of Cuba with the Marxist-Leninist ideology and socialism of the Soviet type, together with the rebuilding of the Cuban political organization on the basis of the one-party system of government that is in accordance with that ideology, presupposes positions that are basically antagonistic to the principle established in the charter of the Organization * * * that the solidarity of the American States and the high aims which are sought through it require the political organization of those states on the basis of the effective exercise of representative democracy.

2. "The present connections of the Government of Cuba with the Sino-Soviet bloc of countries are manifestly incompatible with the principles and standards that govern the regional system * * * [and] will prevent the said government from fulfilling the obligations in the charter of the Organization and the treaty of reciprocal assistance.

3. "As regards the intense subversive activity in which the countries of the Sino-Soviet bloc are engaged in America and the activities of the Cuban Government * * * it is evident that they would constitute acts that, within the system for the 'political defense' of the hemisphere, have been classed as acts of 'political aggression' or 'aggression of a nonmilitary character.'"

Based in large part on the findings of the Peace Committee, the American governments took their first historic stand against communism in Cuba at the Punta del Este Conference. Many of you were there. The fundamental decisions made then have been of major importance to us since. They stimulated a new awareness of the dangers inherent in the Communist offensive in America. They gave fresh impetus to efforts to develop internal security capabilities to combat subversion. They helped to fulfill a moral commitment of the Organization of American States to defend its basic purposes and principles against the open challenge of one of its members. And they served to pave the way for the swift, decisive and equally historic decision taken by the American governments on October 23, 1962, which played such a significant role in forcing the Soviet Union to withdraw its offensive weapons systems from Cuba.

CUBAN INTERVENTION IN VENEZUELA

The missile crisis removed whatever doubt remained concerning the Castro regime's status as a pawn of the Soviet bloc. It should have served as a warning to Castro and his followers that the American governments were united and firm in their resolve not to permit Cuba to be used as a base for the expansion of communism on this continent and that their patience was running out. Again he did not heed the warning. Instead, he redoubled his subversive offensive against the hemisphere and chose Venezuela as a primary target.

I would recall that in the summer of 1963 a Special Committee of the Council of the OAS, under the distinguished leadership of Ambassador de Lavalle of Peru, completed a detailed study of the Cuban effort to promote subversion in our countries. And in its report the committee noted that:

"Immediately after the October crisis, spokesmen for the Cuban Government began making a series of speeches openly advocating armed insurrection in Latin America as a means of introducing economic and social changes based on the Communist system. Although this does not constitute a position that is entirely different from that hitherto held by the Castro regime, the frequency, intensity, and origin of the provocations are such that they lead the Committee to conclude that the Cuban regime has begun a new phase of promoting and encouraging violent subversion in other countries of the hemisphere."

The Committee also called attention to what it described as "two facts that are intimately related to the policy enunciated by the Cuban leaders." "One of these," the Committee stated, "is the tactic of bringing hundreds of persons to Cuba from all the countries of the hemisphere in order to indoctrinate them and train them in the techniques of subversion. The second is the well-known plan of sabotage, terrorism, and guerrilla action that has been unleashed in certain countries, particularly in Venezuela, and the impetus that the Cuban Communist leaders have given to this movement."

In further explanation of its conclusion on Venezuela, the Committee added: "There is no doubt that the Castro regime has selected Venezuela as its primary target. This was indicated by the Communist spokesman Blas Roca in his speech on January 24, 1963, commemorating the fifth anniversary of the fall of Perez Jimenez: 'When the people of Venezuela achieve victory; he said when they gain full independence from imperialism * * * then all of America will be aflame, all America will advance, all of America will be freed once and for all from the ominous yoke of Yankee imperialism. If their struggle is a help to us today; he said their victory will be an even greater help. Then we shall no longer be a solitary island in the Caribbean confronting the Yankee imperialists, but rather we shall have a base of support on the mainland'."

And try they did—until they came up against the resolute will of the leaders and the people of Venezuela. The Cuban effort is detailed in the report of the OAS Investigating Committee, which serves as the basis for our action.

The Committee found these to be the chief manifestations of the Castro regime's intervention in Venezuela:

"1. A systematic and hostile campaign of propaganda against the Government of Venezuela, as well as the incitement to and support of the Communist subversion that is being carried out in that country;

"2. Training, in all kinds of subversive activities of numerous Venezuelan citizens, who traveled to Cuba for that purpose;

"3. Remittance of funds through these travelers and other channels, for the purpose of maintaining and increasing subversive activities; and

"4. The provision of arms to guerrilla and terrorist groups operating in Venezuela, as shown by the shipment of arms discovered on November 1, 1963, on the Paraguaná Peninsula, and the plan for the capture of the city of Caracas."

The evidence to support these findings is clearly and convincingly set forth in the report. The facts established by the investigating committee leave no doubt whatsoever of Cuba's part in this conspiracy against Venezuela.

I know of no greater tribute to democracy in this hemisphere, Mr. Chairman, in modern times—and no greater rebuff to the sinister designs of the Castro regime—than the manner in which the Venezuelan people went to the polls on December 1, 1963.

Based on this experience, it is my firm conviction that we have a solemn responsibility both to the Venezuelan people and to our own peoples not to permit the Castro regime to mount another subversive assault against any American republic. Our governments acted resolutely against a dictator of the right who plotted to assassinate President Betancourt in 1960. They unanimously agreed on sanctions. I now ask: Can we do less against a dictator of the left who tried to assassinate democracy in Venezuela?

LIKELIHOOD OF CONTINUED CUBAN SUBVERSION

By its very nature international communism is aggressive and expansive. We see it at work in all parts of the world, constantly probing and testing for weak spots which it might exploit. In modern dress it marches in the guise of diplomatic relations, trade missions and cultural exchanges, and peace movements, and youth organizations and the like. It flies the false ideological banners of "peaceful coexistence" and "wars of national liberation." But no one should be deceived.

We in the United States are under no illusion as to the designs of the Communists against us and the free world. We know that the Communist menace is deadly serious; that they seek their goals through varied means and that deceit is a standard element in their tactics.

We are fully aware—and should be—that Moscow, as well as Peiping and Habana, remains committed to the Communist world revolution. Chairman Khrushchev tells us frankly and bluntly that coexistence cannot extend to the ideological sphere, that between us there will be continued competition and conflict. Castro said on July 26 last year that in Latin America the course to follow is violent revolution waged by fighting revolutionaries, that the correlation of forces in the world had changed in favor of those seeking change through armed struggle, and that when revolutionaries in other Latin American countries know how to fulfill their duty, they will have the decided support of the Soviet Union and all the socialist camp, including Cuba.

Last week the Cuban Government, following the practice of other Communist governments, announced its slogans for this year's July 26 celebration. It is no accident, and indeed it is highly pertinent to our deliberations, that among the slogans this one appears: "Long live the heroic struggle of the Venezuelan people." In plain language that means: "Long live the struggle against the heroic Venezuelan people."

We should have no illusions about Castro's continuing purpose to export the Cuban revolution. He came to power with the design of converting the Andes into the Sierra Maestra of the Americas. That apparently remains his design. His temperament and ambition, the dynamics of his internal situation, the counsel of those whom he serves and those who serve him—all compel him to promote subversion as a means for breaking out of his insular position.

After years of self-righteous protestations that Cuba exported its revolution by example only, Castro in a recent press interview finally acknowledged that Cuba had been supporting, and will continue to support, subversive groups in other countries. This admission, it is true, adds nothing to what we had already learned through experience. It does serve, however, to underscore Castro's purpose to give the hemisphere no respite in his relentless campaign to foment subversion whenever and wherever conditions permit.

In this interview Castro also tried to put Cuba's subversive activities on the bargaining counter. I wish to make one point very clear: that as far as the United States is concerned, the encouragement and support of subversion by the Castro regime against other countries of this hemisphere is not a

subject for bargaining. It simply must stop. And when it does, the hemisphere will know it without the need for any discussions with the Castro regime.

TASK OF THIS MEETING

As I stated at the outset, I regard our task as being to determine what measures should now be taken to impress on the Castro regime that the hemisphere will no longer permit its subversive acts against the American Republics. In my opinion, there are three types of measures which we can take to drive this point home.

One should represent the American community's reaction to Castro's efforts to destroy democracy in Venezuela. Certainly this intervention should not be allowed to go without imposition of sanctions.

I want to make it very clear that the United States considers that the adoption of sanctions by the Foreign Ministers would be directed exclusively against the Castro regime and not against any other state or people. I hope this can be made clear in the final act of this conference. Rather our concern is that we not fail in our obligations to a sister republic which has been made the victim of aggression and, indeed, which even today continues to spend its blood and treasure to combat Castro-Communist subversion and to defend democracy and freedom. To respond to the call of our sister republic for collective action is our paramount obligation.

The second type of measure would carry the community's clear warning to the Castro regime that if it persists in acts of subversion in other American Republics, the full weight of the regional security system will be applied. This should serve as a deterrent. And I trust the Castro regime will heed such a message.

Awareness that subversion, supported by terror, sabotage and guerrilla action, as practiced by the international Communist movement, is as dangerous a form of aggression as an armed attack has been very slow in developing in this hemisphere, as well as in other parts of the world. I think it is fair to say that until very recently there has been a lack of sufficient understanding of this point everywhere, and this has led to uncertainty in some quarters as to whether our regional security system possesses an adequate mechanism for dealing with Communist subversion.

In the opinion of my government, there is no doubt that the Rio Treaty clearly recognizes multiple forms of aggression and provides effective machinery for defending against them. The preamble states that the treaty is intended, among other things, "to provide for effective reciprocal assistance to meet armed attacks against any American State, and in order to deal with threats of aggression against any of them." Article 3 provides for mutual assistance in meeting an armed attack against any signatory; article 6 specifically recognizes the existence of "aggression which is not an armed attack"; and finally, article 9, while defining unprovoked armed attack and invasion by the armed forces of a state as aggression, opens with the very significant wording: "In addition to other acts which the Organ of Consultation may characterize as aggression." And thus, we feel that the Rio Treaty specifically recognizes the existence of various forms of aggression and, most importantly, recognizes the authority of the Council of the Organization of American States, or the Meeting of Foreign Ministers, to characterize them as such. Article 3 of the Rio Treaty spells out procedures for prompt action in the event of armed attack. And article 6 does the same for a wide variety of situations falling short of armed attack.

A third type of measure should urge our own governments and those of other free world countries to take appropriate steps in the field of trade with Cuba. This is appropriate because the Communist threat to this hemisphere is a threat also to other parts of the free world.

I should like to mention two matters which, although not directly related to the subject of this meeting, nevertheless have an important bearing on our deliberations.

MESSAGE TO THE CUBAN PEOPLE

The one is that we should remember that the Cuban people, both inside and outside their troubled homeland, will be following our deliberations with greatest interest. They should know that they have not been forgotten and that our desires for a free Cuba remain unchanged. I know of no more eloquent and concise expression of these desires than that which President Kennedy and the Presidents of the Central American Republics and Panama, included in the Declaration of San José in March 1963. As a restatement of my Government's views on this point and in tribute to the memory of the late President, I should simply like to repeat a portion of that declaration to which other colleagues have already generally alluded. It states:

"The Presidents declared that they have no doubt that the genuine Cuban revolution will live again, and its betrayers will fall into the shadows of history, and the martyred people of the oppressed island of the Caribbean will be free from foreign Communist domination, free to choose for themselves, the kind of government they wish to have, and free to join their brothers of the hemisphere in the common undertaking to secure for each individual the liberty, dignity, and well-being which are the objectives of all free societies."

PROGRESS AND FREEDOM

In line with the final thought of that statement, I think we should never lose sight of the fact that our central task in this hemisphere is to promote progress with freedom. This is the vision of the Alliance for Progress. This is the path our governments have set for themselves under the Charter of Punta del Este. And President Johnson said last May in discussing the Alliance with the Ambassadors of your respective countries:

"In devotion to democracy," he said, "we are guided by the command of Bolivar that 'We must fearlessly lay the foundations of South American liberty: to hesitate is destruction.'

"Our charter," the President said, "charges each American country to seek and to strengthen representative democracy. Without that democracy, and the freedom it nourishes, material progress is an aimless enterprise, destroying the dignity of spirit it is meant to liberate. We will continue," Mr. Johnson said, "to join with you to encourage democracy until we build a hemisphere of free nations from Tierra del Fuego to the Arctic Circle."

I close, Mr. Chairman, with one final word, a word I know to be from both the Government and from the people of the United States to our friends throughout the hemisphere, a word on which my fellow countrymen are united, on a nonpartisan basis.

When our Founding Fathers signed our Declaration of Independence, Benjamin Franklin made the famous remark, "We must all hang together or assuredly we shall all hang separately."

Today, it is Venezuela which is under attack. Is there any one of us who can say with assurance "It cannot be my country tomorrow"? So let's say to our brothers in Venezuela, its Government and its brave people, "We are with you in full solidarity, and will act with you to insure the safety of your democracy." And let's say to the Castro regime, "Your interference in the affairs of other countries in this hemisphere must stop, must stop and stop now." This is the basis on which the attitude of the United States will rest when we come to the resolutions which will be before us.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. [Applause.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish only to add that in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I have sat through the sermons of this diplomatic Conference yesterday and today. We shall go back into session at 10 a.m. tomorrow morning. I have read the indictment against Castro's Cuba and I have studied the documents of proof. In my judgment they leave not the slightest doubt as to the transgression of the Rio Treaty by the Castro Communist regime of Cuba.

I completely agree with the position of my Government, and I support without reservation the recommendation of our Secretary of State speaking in behalf of my Government this afternoon. He made clear that the time has come when the members of the Organization of American States must determine whether or not they will make the Rio Treaty an effective instrument for the maintenance of peace in our hemisphere and an enforcible instrument for bringing to an end acts of aggression and subversion on the part of Cuba or, any other nation that might commit acts of aggression or subversion against any member nation of the Organization of American States.

Under the Rio Treaty, the signatories thereto mutually pledged that they would come to the assistance and defense of any country in the hemisphere whose sovereignty and whose rights were transgressed against by acts of aggression on the part of any other country.

The time has come when the Rio Treaty, in my judgment, must be applied and sanctions must be imposed upon Cuba on the part of all the signatories to the Rio Treaty, unless the Rio Treaty is to become a scrap of paper.

Speaking only for myself, in my individual capacity as a Senator, a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and chairman of its Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I interpret the major issue of this historic conference of the foreign ministers of the states of the Western Hemisphere to be simply this: Is the Rio Treaty to be a vital instrument for enforcing and maintaining the peace in the Western Hemisphere or is it to become naught but a scrap of paper? The final resolution to be passed later this week by this historic Conference will determine that question.

I wish to say, as the Secretary of State clearly implied in his truly great, historic speech of this afternoon, that it is up to the free nations of the Western Hemisphere to determine whether they are ready and willing to stop now Communist aggression and subversion in the Western Hemisphere by Castro Communist Cuba.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator spoke of the imposition of sanctions. What does he envision by that program?

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will permit me to say so, I do not think that as a participant in the Conference and as one of the aides to the Secretary of State, I should attempt to speak on the question. The Secretary of State has made very clear what the position of our Government is and he is the only one who should speak at this time for our Government as to what kind of sanctions our Government thinks should be adopted.

I speak this afternoon only to place in the RECORD the great speech of the Secretary of State and to make my formal announcement that I stand squarely, solidly, and completely behind the position that the Secretary of State took at the Foreign Ministers Conference this afternoon.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I did not hear the entire statement of the Senator from Oregon; but the extent to which I heard it permits me to say that I concur in the views which he expressed.

Mr. MORSE. I knew that the Senator from Ohio, as a colleague of mine on the Committee on Foreign Relations, would concur.

MONUMENT COMMEMORATING THE INDEPENDENCE OF MEXICO

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGOVERN in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 944) to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes, which was, on page 1, line 10, strike out all after "SEC. 2." over to and including "necessary" on page 2, line 1, and insert "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of $150,000."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, earlier a number of Senators joined me in introducing a bill by which the people of the United States would present to the people of Mexico a likeness, in bronze or stone, of Abraham Lincoln. The people of Mexico are our dear friends and neighbors. They share our love of freedom and our high esteem of the Great Emancipator. The bill passed the House of Representatives yesterday with an amendment placing a ceiling of $150,000 on the amount to be expended.

I am authorized to say that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT] concurs in the amendment, as indeed do I, and as does, I believe, every other Member of the Senate who did the bill the honor of attaching his name to it as a cosponsor.

Under those circumstances, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2642) to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Senators will be reading the RECORD overnight. I wish to invite attention to the fact that it is my amendment that is now pending. It is the first amendment that was offered. It provides for some element of control by the States over the antipoverty program which is contemplated by the bill, without interfering with the opportunity of the Director to move promptly and expeditiously into any area where immediate action is necessary, even before the State is ready to launch into the activity which is called for.

I spoke on this subject at considerable length earlier in the day. I respectfully refer Senators to the detailed analysis of the amendment and the germaneness to it of other Federal-State programs that are conducted in this field.

I invite attention to the fact that even today an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], which has already been accepted, goes much further, even, in respect of the particular camps that are provided for by title I of the bill, so as to require the consent of the States and 30 days' notice before the camps can even be established in the particular State.

I also point out that the problem is cared for by an amendment which was adopted in committee, in which I concurred, with Mr. Shriver, relating to the use of State camps—and there are many States in which there are such camps—so that there would be no duplication of activities.

But there is no substitute that I think answers the feeling of many Members of this body that the States should have an opportunity to handle what is essentially a State activity, under Federal coordination policies, with Federal help. The States should be given that opportunity. That is what my amendment seeks to accomplish.

I hope the Senate may consider my amendment favorably tomorrow.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

ORDER FOR MORNING HOUR TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself half a minute on the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate meets tomorrow, there be a morning hour of not to exceed one-half hour.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, pursuant to the previous order, I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, July 23, 1964, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 22, 1964:

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Lot Ensey, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code:

In the grade of general

Gen. Thomas S. Power, 481A (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

In the grade of lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Robert W. Burns, 527A (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Frank A. Bogart, 585A (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Harold W. Grant, 497A (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code:

Maj. Gen. William W. Momyer, 1964A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Jack G. Merrell, 1687A, Regular Air Force.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John H. Masters	Lewis W. Walt
George S. Bowman, Jr.	Carl A. Youngdale
	Ormond R. Simpson

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

William A. Stiles	Robert G. Owens, Jr.
Louis Metzger	Jonas M. Platt
Homer G. Hutchinson	Clifford B. Drake

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 22, 1964:

POSTMASTER

I withdraw the nomination sent to the Senate on February 3, 1964, of Charlie T. Cummings to be postmaster at Alvarado, in the State of Texas.