tion allowance under the award made by Arbitration Board No. 282 was reduced by reason of their service in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 12736. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 1183. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.J. Res. 1184. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to permit any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population with the approval of a majority of its voters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.J. Res. 1185. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a joint committee of the two Houses of the Congress to study matters relating to the implementation of the award of the Board established under Public Law 88–108 to arbitrate a labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and their employees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.J. Res. 1186. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim National Volunteer Fireman's Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.J. Res. 1187. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that no person may be a Member of Congress unless such person, when elected or appointed, possesses the qualifications of electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State from which he is chosen, and has been an inhabitant for at least 5 years of such State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 369. Concurrent resolution to bring justice to Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H. Res. 891. Resolution authorizing a review of national policy for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 12737. A bill for the relief of Marion W. Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12738. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Suat-Lieu Soong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12739. A bill for the relief of William H. Stewart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 12740. A bill for the relief of Angelo Drakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 12741. A bill for the relief of Fotini Ralli Hohlfelder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 12742. A bill for the relief of Georgios P. Sotos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 12743. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charley Conley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 12744. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Pitino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 12745. A bill for the relief of Rita Castillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12746. A bill for the relief of Jorge Antonio Cabrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12747. A bill for the relief of Seoung Lek Rim and his wife, Chun Hye Rim (nee Choe); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 12748. A bill for the relief of Frank Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

1048. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, New York, N.Y., requesting consideration of his petition with reference to proposing legislation to make it a Federal crime to attempt to assault or murder any Federal official receiving $25,000 or more annual salary, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1964

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

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

O Thou Father of our spirits, who heareth prayer, breathe upon us now, we beseech Thee, the benediction of Thy holy calm. Soothe the anxieties of our so often baffled minds, so that with the shield of Thy peace and the sword of Thy truth, we may face, free and fearless, whatever tests this day may hold.

Kindle on the altar of our hearts, we pray, a flame of devotion to freedom's cause in all the world, that in its white heat every grosser passion may be consumed. Heal the divisions which shorten the arm of our national might as we stand at this crossroad of history. Override the errors of our faulty judgments. So shall Thy kingdom come and Thy will be done in our lives and in all the earth.

In the dear Redeemer's name, we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 29, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

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; and

S. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of a committee print entitled "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments."

The message also 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 House to the bill (S. 745) to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

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. 9124. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to vitalize the Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9718. An act to authorize the crediting of certain military service for purposes of Reserve retired pay; and

H.R. 12308. An act to authorize removal of a flight hazard at the U.S. Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2512) to clarify the status of members of the National Guard while attending or instructing at National Guard schools established under the authority of the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 11302) to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 653. An act to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Ariz. and Nev., and for other purposes;

S. 1024. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes;

S. 1082. An act to establish in the Treasury a correctional industries fund for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6233. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Association, Inc.; and

H.R. 6593. An act for the relief of Earnest O. Scott.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 11302) to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADJUSTMENTS IN ANNUITIES UNDER THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, if the conference report is brought up on the

bill (S. 745) to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, I shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote and will want to be apprised of it.

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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

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

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Communications Satellite Corp.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

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

COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

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

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

RETIREMENT TODAY OF JERRY O'LEARY, WASHINGTON EVENING STAR REPORTER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there is always cause for a touch of sadness when one of the most beloved members of the fourth estate reaches the time of retirement. It is especially so, in this particular instance, when we note that today marks the retirement of our old and valued, tried and true friend, Jerry O'Leary, Sr., of the Washington Evening Star.

In my opinion, the members of the fourth estate have treated Congress with great impartiality, consideration, and understanding down through the years. They have used their bylines to to give us credit which sometimes we did not deserve, and to criticize us on occasions when we deserved it; but, on the whole, they have treated us impartially and well.

At this time, with the approval of my colleagues in the Senate, I should like to furnish the byline, instead of Jerry O'Leary.

Jerry O'Leary is a native Washingtonian. For 50 years he has been a newspaperman. He started on the old Washington Herald in 1914. After brief periods on the Washington Times and the Washington Post, he joined the staff of the Washington Evening Star and the Washington Sunday Star in 1917.

After 8 years of general assignments covering the District Building, he was made a member of the Capitol staff in 1925 and has covered the proceedings of the Senate for 39 years.

He has also covered the national conventions of both parties since 1932. He has followed the campaign trail for presidential and vice-presidential candidates since 1940.

In my book, Jerry O'Leary is one of the finest, gentlest, fairest, and kindest men I have ever known.

Although he will be retiring today, he will not be leaving us, because we need men like Jerry O'Leary to continue to decipher this body, to understand what makes Congress "tick," and to understand, also, the makeup of the men and women who comprise this body and the House of Representatives.

Let me say publicly that it is with regret that I note the retirement of this great and fine newspaperman. It is with anticipation that I look forward to our continued friendship in the years ahead. I assure Jerry that I will continue to depend upon him for advice and counsel from time to time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in Roll Call of September 24, 1964, entitled "Retiring Jerry O'Leary Recalls Good Old Days."

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

RETIRING JERRY O'LEARY RECALLS GOOD OLD DAYS

Jeremiah O'Leary, Sr., whose seniority dates from 1925, when he first began covering the Senate for the Evening Star, will retire at the end of this month.

Surveying the changes he's seen in the Senate during those years, Mr. O'Leary says the most striking ones are of style—in oratory, in dress and debate.

"It may be the influence of that informal television delivery," he said, "but you just don't hear flowery thunder-and-damnation speeches any more. I doubt if anyone even learns to declaim in that fashion any more. I suppose the last of the old style speakers was Senator Clyde Hoey (Democrat, of North Carolina)."

Senator Hoey, who died in 1954, was also a prime practitioner of the art of dressing like a Senator. He always wore a stiff collar and morning coat. Another snappy dresser, Mr. O'Leary recalls fondly, was J. Ham Lewis, of Illinois, who also sported a Van Dyck.

"They wore frock coats, white vests, striped trousers. They looked the part. They didn't want to dress like other people."

Another past glory in the Senate was the cut-and-thrust debate.

"There used to be a lot of that give and take in the Senate." Mr. O'Leary said, "but it's given way to set-piece speeches. I guess they do most of their battling in committee now."

Another thing of the past is the really last-ditch, bitter end filibuster. The last one Mr. O'Leary recalls was on an atomic energy bill, when the Senate stayed in session continuously, night and day, from Monday through Saturday as weary opponents tried to talk the bill to death. Nowadays, the Senate leadership doesn't make life that disagreeable for filibusters. Though, of course, it could.

But the glory of the Senate in his younger days, Mr. O'Leary says, was its orators.

"When Bill Borah was going to speak, the word would get out and the galleries would fill with people waiting for that 4th of July oratory."

However, Mr. O'Leary says, the changes in the Senate are on the surface only. "It's not as picturesque as it was," he says, "but it's just as important. I guess it's modernizing, like everything else."

Mr. O'Leary, whose son, Jerry, also works for the Star, says he's made no special plans for his retirement. Friends think he'll intensify his rooting for the Washington Senators. All he's sure of is that he won't be writing a book.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is something of a novelty that Jerry O'Leary is a native Washingtonian, because they are rather few and far between in a town which was captured and taken over by us "outlanders" ever since the beginning of the Republic. Every time I meet a native Washingtonian, I look at him two or three times because he is a kind of distinctive breed unto himself.

The memorandum I hold in my hand about Jerry does not indicate how old he is, but if he became a reporter in 1914, that is when I was 18 years old. I cannot rightly say where I was, but I believe that I was carrying a dinner bucket in a factory in my hometown.

So, here was Jerry O'Leary working on the old Washington Herald. Those must have been great days, because the world was shaken with dizzy adventure. In those days, I do not suppose that Jerry had to be on shoe leather too much, in order to find copy. It was fairly running

out of his ears, even though he may have been a young reporter.

Jerry has had a variety of experience on nearly every Washington paper, I suppose, except the Washington Daily News.

He went to the Washington Evening Star in 1917. Where was I in 1917? Either I was in the Army or Uncle Sam had already measured me for my new Easter suit and did not ask me what color I preferred. Jerry was doing business in Washington at that time and he has been going on ever since.

Mr. President, Jerry O'Leary is not going to retire. There is a young Jerry O'Leary, and there is an old Jerry O'Leary. I am not sure which is youngest in spirit, because I read both their headlines.

If Jerry retires today, he will be around these "diggings" tomorrow and start asking about civil rights, tariff specifications, tariffs on brooms, and all that sort of thing. I am delighted that he will be around, especially when he does these special stories. If and when I run again for office, I am going to make sure that he does a very special story about me—even though he does not believe it when he writes it—so that I can use it as campaign material.

The Senate salutes Jerry O'Leary for the affable, able, and agreeable person he is.

One would think that members of the fourth estate would lose their tempers as a result of the cavalier way in which we sometimes treat them.

A boy would come in the Chamber and say, "O'Leary wants to see you." The reply would be, "Tell him I am busy." Or the boy might say, "Jerry O'Leary wants to see you at the front door." The reply might be, "Tell him I am on the way to my office post haste, and I have no time to bother."

One would think that would make Jerry mad. That does not make him mad. That only sharpens his wit. He would go immediately to the Senator's office. That is the stuff that makes a great newspaperman. He has been a great newspaperman for 50 long years. In this accelerated age it is really something for one to stay with the same craft for half a century, and to improve with each shining day.

I believe Jerry O'Leary is better now as a newspaperman than he ever was. When the Washington Star editor reads the RECORD, I hope he will get him back to work and keep him up here.

Reporters are all like old shoes. I like to have them around. I like to go to the Press Gallery twice a week, sit down and visit, and let the questions come thick and fast. And what a fellowship it really is. There is nothing to equal it. So, I salute a great newspaperman and one whom I esteem as a great friend.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am glad to associate myself with the sentiments that have been expressed by the distinguished majority and minority leaders with respect to the announced retirement of one of Washington's most able and popular news reporters, Jerry O'Leary.

I do not know just when I first became acquainted with him, but I have known Jerry for several years. I first knew him when he was reporting the proceedings of the Congress here on the Hill.

I have long admired him because of his capacity, and the competent and efficient way he performed his duties to the public and for the great newspaper that he represented. I admire him for his courtesy and consideration for those of us who sometimes make news and who have the heavy responsibilities of legislating for the greatest country in the world.

I was always impressed with his diligence in searching out the news and his determination to get the information and facts as accurately as possible before reporting them. I have found Jerry to be fair and objective in reporting the facts. He tried to convey the truth to his readers as he saw it. My contacts with him over the years have been most pleasant. I have always enjoyed my interviews with him.

Whenever committees on which I have served and particularly those committees on which I have had the honor of serving as chairman made news, whenever we took any action or performed any service that was newsworthy, Jerry endeavored to report it in its proper perspective and to convey the facts in their true light to the readers of his article.

We regret his retirement. I shall miss seeing him at work daily here with the other reporters.

I join with all other Senators and his friends in wishing him the reward of happiness and contentment that I trust will attend him in his retirement years and also in any other avocation or activity of life that he wishes to follow.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not believe there is a Member of the Senate who regrets the retirement of Jerry O'Leary more than I.

During the many years that I have been here, Jerry has enjoyed the respect and the confidence of Senators in a manner which has not been exceeded by any other member of the news media, although we respect nearly all of them.

Jerry has been a true reporter, concentrating on the facts. I have never known him to slant a story or to write a biased story. He has always been without prejudice.

I believe that what makes Jerry this way is the nature of the man himself. But it has occurred to me that perhaps being a voteless Washingtonian for so long has enabled him to judge us impartially and without bias.

My hope for Jerry is that he has a good and adequate retirement and will not forget to come back to see us frequently.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in the words of laudation that have been expressed concerning Jerry O'Leary.

My contact with Jerry has been rather limited. He probably does not know that, although our contact was limited, there has been a communication between us which has caused me to develop great affection for him.

Frequently in life, we develop admiration for individuals who never have knowledge of such admiration. I occupy that position with regard to Mr. O'Leary. I have talked to him. And I have listened to his genial and gentle voice. He called me last night on the telephone. I immediately recognized his voice because of its gentility and humility.

I have read his articles, and to the extent that I have had knowledge of the subjects which he discussed in those articles, I have always found them replete with objectivity and honesty.

Nothing that we could say about Mr. O'Leary would add luster to the distinguished service that he has rendered this area as a newspaperman. He has built a monument for himself in the newspaper world. He has developed for himself the respect of Members of Congress.

I offer my felicitations to him. I thank him for the extraordinary work that he has done as a servant of the public for 50 years. I wish him many years of good health, happiness, and comfort.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I shall always recall with pleasure that on the day before a friend of 31 years' standing decided to retire after 50 years of labor in the vineyard, he handed me a copy of the speech that I shall make in the Senate today on the subject of how an alien tree from Japan has crowded out of the sun a native solid oak. I am reminded of the lopsided effect that the Supreme Court has had on our Constitution.

Few Senators can join Jerry O'Leary and me in saying that we have labored in the vineyard for 50 years. He started his journalistic career in the same year that I started my political career. I participated in a kind of runoff convention in 1914 which decided who would be a candidate from that area for the State senate. I was defeated by one vote. That was the only time in my life that I have ever been defeated in any convention. After that I stayed out of conventions as much as possible. In 1915 I ran for the Senate in the primary, and so my legislative career covers only 48 years.

Of course, I have known Jerry better since I moved over to the Senate side in the winter of 1946. He has been a credit and an honor to the journalistic profession. He has not always given publicity to some of the speeches that I have made in the Senate, but whenever he wrote about one of my speeches he always was accurate. He was never unfair.

I regret to see Jerry O'Leary retire because I am more or less in the same shoes. If I should retire, what would I do? When one has been in one undertaking for 50 years, he cannot hunt and fish all the time. One must have something to do or he will rust out rapidly. I think I shall ask for a little conference with my friend Jerry to see if I can find some type of work which would be appropriate and, in line with his wonderful training, and, as Adams said of Jefferson, his felicity of expression, perhaps I can find the way.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I join other Senators in expressing my great admiration for Jerry O'Leary. I wish to tell him publicly that I am, indeed, sorry that he is leaving us. I have greatly admired his writings and his work. I have not known him as well as have the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and some others. I am certain of that. But

I have followed his writings with a great deal of interest. I thoroughly concur in everything that other Senators have said about him. The Senate gallery will not be the same with Mr. O'Leary gone. I am sure he will be back on occasions to visit us.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I deeply regret that Jerry A. O'Leary has made the decision to retire from the active ranks of the Washington newspaper corps.

I fully realize that he has more than earned relief from the exacting tasks of his profession after reporting from the Washington scene for 50 years.

I can understand how he feels in need of a rest, and how his family believes this is to be in the interest of his good health and long life.

I am sure every Member of the U.S. Senate, which he has covered for 39 years, wishes for Jerry O'Leary the complete fulfillment of his personal desires.

I have been in the Senate nearly 32 of the years he has been looking down on us from the Press Gallery, and I want to be in the forefront of those who wish him well.

I shall miss him as a friend. The Senate will miss the accuracy of his reports. The Star will miss the caliber of his work. The country will miss his contributions to current information.

Speaking from my long experience in the Senate, and as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I can truthfully say that I do not believe Jerry O'Leary's coverage of the Senate and the committee can be surpassed for faithful accuracy, knowledgeable background, and fairness.

And when I say this about the way he mastered his profession, I intend it to speak for the man himself. Jerry O'Leary is a man who governs himself and possesses himself.

He has never laid himself open to reproach, because the caliber of his work is irreproachable. His own respect for his responsibilities contributes to the respect others hold for him.

I have watched Jerry O'Leary work with admiration, and I have read the informative product of his enterprise and effort with interest and never a doubt as to its authenticity.

He is a man of highest character, a fine sense of proportion, and a capacity for distinguishing. He lays hold of the news with study and investigation, and presents the ensemble with conciseness and clarity.

He is never a man for the careless use of words. Jerry O'Leary is a newspaperman completely emancipated from error, known to us all for his dedication to the constructive use of his talents, powers, intellect, and experience.

I know that the trademarks of a good news story these days are a short beginning, and a short ending—close together.

For Jerry O'Leary I hope his retirement will have a long beginning and a long ending—far apart—unless he should decide to come back to the Senate Press Gallery.

Meanwhile, I hope he will drop around to see his old friends of the Senate whether they are at work or at home.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I know that it is with a deep sense of regret that we on both sides of the aisle received the news that Jerry O'Leary, one of the Nation's outstanding newspaper reporters is retiring after 40 years of outstanding service with the Washington Star.

Jerry is well known to all of us. His objective and fair coverage of the activities in the Congress have brought great credit and great pride to the newspaper profession. I know from personal experience of the great respect with which he is held not only by myself but by all of us here in the Congress.

Though he has unquestionably earned retirement, we all sincerely hope that he will return frequently to Capitol Hill.

I want to take this opportunity to express my sincere best wishes to both Jerry and Mrs. O'Leary, his devoted wife, and my hope that they will enjoy many, many more years of health and happiness together. I sincerely wish Jerry well in all future endeavors. He is unquestionably not only a great reporter but a great American.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD with my remarks a copy of a letter which Jerry received from the President of the United States, extolling his virtues as a great reporter and newspaperman.

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

SEPTEMBER 30, 1964.

Mr. JEREMIAH A. O'LEARY,
The Washington Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JERRY: Your retirement today after 40 years with the Washington Star is yet another landmark in the story of the 88th Congress.

However, you have served the Senate through your informed and incisive reporting even longer than any present Member of that body. You have had an unparalleled opportunity to study and know the life of that great deliberative assembly. I know from personal experience that many legislators and countless readers have benefited from your judgment and wisdom.

Surely you will sustain your deep interest in Congress and political affairs, but it is good to know that you will be able to do so now in reasonable leisure. Also, I am confident that you and your fine family will have many more years of happiness together.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON RESEARCH FACILITIES FOR POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE, BROOKLYN, N.Y.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the provision of additional research facilities for the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, N.Y.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON RESEARCH FACILITIES AT NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK, N.Y.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction and renovation of research facilities at New York University, New York, N.Y.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON UNNECESSARY COST TO THE GOVERNMENT THROUGH THE LEASING OF ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING SYSTEMS BY THE BACCHUS WORKS, HERCULES POWDER CO., MAGNA, UTAH

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary cost to the Government through the leasing of electronic data processing systems by the Bacchus Works, Hercules Powder Co., Magna, Utah, Department of Defense, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ENTITLED "DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE HANDLING OF POOLED COTTON ALLOTMENTS OF BILLIE SOL ESTES"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL, SUPPLEMENTAL, AND ADDITIONAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1607)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate Government Operations Committee, I am filing a report of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of its study relating to certain operations of the Department of Agriculture and of relationships existing between personnel of that Department and Billie Sol Estes.

About 2½ years ago, Billie Sol Estes was arrested in Pecos, Tex. This arrest marked the beginning of a prolonged period of public attention centered on him. Our investigation was undertaken at a time when Estes was the subject of almost daily headline news stories; and when there were current rumors of cotton allotment manipulations favoring him in the Department of Agriculture.

The appearance of Billie Sol Estes before the subcommittee had to be postponed for more than a year. This postponement was in harmony with our longstanding policy of being scrupulous not to infringe on or prejudice the rights of defendants who were under indictment and awaiting trial on criminal charges. At the conclusion of our original series of hearings, when Estes would normally have been called to testify, there were both Federal and State indictments pending against him. At the request of Estes' attorney and the attorney general of Texas, and later because of similar requests by the Department of Justice and the Federal judge before whom Estes was to be tried, we delayed his appearance until these court trials were finished. We called him before the subcommittee to testify on November 12, 1963. He invoked the fifth amendment in response to all pertinent questions.

Immediately thereafter a report was drafted and on December 18, 1963, this proposed report was distributed to the members of the subcommittee for their study, suggestions, and recommendations or approval. It was not until a few days ago that the subcommittee arrived at and agreed to the basic report which I now submit. It was further agreed that each member who desired to supplement the basic report with his own views could do so. Accordingly, in addition to the prin-

cipal report, the document I am submitting contains the separate views of Senator KARL E. MUNDT, jointly with Senator CARL T. CURTIS, and those of Senator SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., jointly with Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE. I am also submitting separate individual views of my own.

I believe much good has resulted from this investigation. As this report sets forth, many needed reforms have been brought about in the areas in which weaknesses or deficiencies were revealed by evidence adduced at the hearings. It is probable that the reforms would not have been made except for these revelations. Revisions and improvement in organization are among the major benefits that usually result from the work of this subcommittee.

Mr. President, I offer for filing with the Senate the report entitled "Department of Agriculture Handling of Pooled Cotton Allotments of Billie Sol Estes," and ask that it be printed, together with the separate and individual views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The report will be received, and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of August 1964. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

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

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, AUGUST 1964 AND JULY 1964, AND PAY, JULY 1964 AND JUNE 1964

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for August 1964 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In August numbered—	In July numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In July was—	In June was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,495,604	2,492,061	+3,543	$1,430,729	$1,389,857	+$40,872
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,461,958	1,461,345	+613	835,445	798,017	+37,428
Department of Defense	1,033,646	1,030,716	+2,930	595,284	591,840	+3,444
Inside the United States	2,337,527	2,336,638	+889			
Outside the United States	158,077	155,423	+2,654			
Industrial employment	550,996	551,298	−302			
Foreign nationals	135,516	136,707	−1,191	25,106	26,047	−941

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1964, and comparison with July 1964, and pay for July 1964, and comparison with June 1964*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	August	July	Increase	Decrease	July	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	111,637	[1] 112,212		575	$62,470	$56,250	$6,220	
Commerce	32,345	32,461		116	23,471	21,865	1,606	
Health, Education, and Welfare	83,813	84,048		235	48,817	47,320	1,497	
Interior	68,237	[1] 69,814		1,577	43,428	40,499	2,929	
Justice	32,802	32,668	134		24,165	22,738	1,427	
Labor	9,313	9,393		80	6,628	6,340	288	
Post Office	593,196	588,065	5,131		301,721	289,604	12,117	
State [2] [3]	41,678	41,697		19	24,289	22,854	1,435	
Treasury	87,393	88,041		648	58,294	55,481	2,813	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	350	353		3	268	253	15	
Bureau of the Budget	514	524		10	517	463	54	
Council of Economic Advisers	41	47		6	41	37	4	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	77	76	1		56	56		
National Aeronautics and Space Council	26	25	1		25	24	1	
National Security Council	42	43		1	40	38	2	
Office of Emergency Planning	336	351		15	333	321	12	
Office of Science and Technology	76	119		43	55	44	11	
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	32	30	2		29	27	2	
President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy	22	21	1		27	34		$7
President's Committee on Consumer Interests	12	13		1	15	9	6	
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	10	10			8	5	3	
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	26	26			31	24	7	
American Battle Monuments Commission	440	442		2	103	98	5	
Atomic Energy Commission	7,317	7,363		46	6,220	5,950	270	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	637	638		1	471	440	31	
Civil Aeronautics Board	838	843		5	736	700	36	
Civil Service Commission	3,812	3,850		38	2,624	2,489	135	
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5			5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6			6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	93	97		4	60	51	9	
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			3	3		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	295	295			210	223		$13
Farm Credit Administration	227	229		2	205	182	23	
Federal Aviation Agency	45,480	45,431	49		36,576	35,588	988	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			5	5		
Federal Communications Commission	1,520	1,531		11	1,210	1,140	70	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,355	1,342	13		998	917	81	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,283	1,299		16	985	887	98	
Federal Maritime Commission	238	237	1		205	193	12	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	416	411	5		412	390	22	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1964, and comparison with July 1964, and pay for July 1964, and comparison with June 1964*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	August	July	Increase	Decrease	July	June	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued								
Federal Power Commission	1,099	1,131		32	$899	$852	47	
Federal Radiation Council	4	4			4	4		
Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska	6	6			5	5		
Federal Trade Commission	1,140	1,148		8	950	896	$54	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	215	205	10		119	117	2	
General Accounting Office	4,355	4,363		8	3,273	3,090	183	
General Service Administration	34,974	35,140		166	19,033	18,110	923	
Government Printing Office	7,415	7,369	46		4,984	4,583	401	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,779	13,883		104	9,739	9,379	360	
Indian Claims Commission	20	20			21	31		10
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,395	2,390	5		1,851	1,789	62	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	33,066	33,153		87	27,485	26,895	560	
National Capital Housing Authority	439	431	8		224	232		8
National Capital Planning Commission	55	58		3	48	45	3	
National Capital Transportation Agency	36	37		1	43	40	3	
National Gallery of Art	318	319		1	155	144	11	
National Labor Relations Board	2,095	2,075	20		1,651	1,557	94	
National Mediation Board	127	136		9	127	121	6	
National Science Foundation	943	1,019		76	766	761	5	
Panama Canal	14,679	14,795		116	4,194	5,282		1,088
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	62	63		1	47	43	4	
Railroad Retirement Board	1,823	1,845		22	1,186	1,134	52	
Renegotiation Board	199	202		3	195	192	3	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	161	163		2	111	108	3	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,379	1,375	4		1,078	1,025	53	
Selective Service System	7,128	7,130		2	2,503	2,393	110	
Small Business Administration	3,401	3,384	17		2,503	2,363	140	
Smithsonian Institution	1,697	1,731		34	962	852	110	
Soldiers' Home	1,120	1,113	7		403	381	22	
Subversive Activities Control Board	28	29		1	24	24		
Tariff Commission	283	291		8	233	222	11	
Tax Court of the United States	157	155	2		147	137	10	
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,612	17,551	61		12,230	11,538	692	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	159	174		15	158	147	11	
U.S. Information Agency	11,911	11,936		25	4,763	6,223		$1,460
United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico [4]	4	[1] 3	1		1		1	
Veterans' Administration	171,273	171,884		611	87,364	83,601	3,763	
Virgin Islands Corporation	451	568		117	204	148	56	
Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission	1	1			([5])	([5])		
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,461,958	1,461,345	5,519	4,906	835,445	798,017	40,014	2,586
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			613				37,428	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,084	2,135		51	1,967	1,785	182	
Department of the Army	372,206	370,445	1,761		204,209	[1] 210,183		5,974
Department of the Navy	330,165	330,048	117		[6] 202,084	194,294	7,790	
Department of the Air Force	293,343	292,406	937		166,948	[1] 164,454	2,494	
Defense Atomic Support Agency	1,911	1,917		6	1,070	1,039	31	
Defense Communications Agency	908	891	17		741	551	190	
Defense Intelligence Agency	2,110	2,087	23		1,636	1,599	37	
Defense Supply Agency	30,389	30,264	125		16,302	17,616		1,314
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	41	41			38	36	2	
Interdepartmental activities	8	8			5	6		1
International military activities	55	55			44	41	3	
Armed Forces information and education activities	426	419	7		240	236	4	
Total, Department of Defense	1,033,646	1,030,716	2,987	57	595,284	591,840	10,733	7,289
Net increase, Department of Defense			2,930				3,444	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [7]	2,495,604	2,492,061	8,506	4,963	1,430,729	1,389,857	50,747	9,875
Net increase, including Department of Defense			3,543				40,872	

[1] Revised on basis of later information.
[2] August figure includes 15,564 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 15,545 in July and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The August figure includes 4,083 of these trust fund employees, and the July figure includes 4,070.
[3] August figure includes 1,139 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 1,171 in July and their pay.
[4] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 88-271.
[5] Less than $500.
[6] Subject to revision.
[7] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1964, and comparison with July 1964*

Department or agency	August	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	110,402	[1] 111,021		619
Commerce	31,687	31,816		129
Health, Education, and Welfare	83,122	83,353		231
Interior	67,640	[1] 69,218		1,578
Justice	32,437	32,310	127	
Labor	9,215	9,310		95
Post Office	591,596	586,479	5,117	
State [2 3]	11,113	11,107	6	
Treasury	86,718	87,376		658
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	350	353		3
Bureau of the Budget	514	524		10
Council of Economic Advisers	41	47		6
Executive Office of the President—Continued				
Executive Mansion and Grounds	77	76	1	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	26	25	1	
National Security Council	42	43		1
Office of Emergency Planning	336	351		15
Office of Science and Technology	76	119		43
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	32	30	2	
President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy	22	21	1	
President's Committee on Consumer Interests	12	13		1
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	10	10		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1964, and comparison with July 1964*—Continued

Department or agency	August	July	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	26	26		
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7		
Atomic Energy Commission	7,281	7,330		49
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	637	638		1
Civil Aeronautics Board	838	843		5
Civil Service Commission	3,810	3,847		37
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	93	97		4
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	295	295		
Farm Credit Administration	227	229		2
Federal Aviation Agency	44,367	44,325	42	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,517	1,528		11
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,353	1,340	13	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,283	1,299		16
Federal Maritime Commission	238	237	1	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	416	411	5	
Federal Power Commission	1,099	1,131		32
Federal Radiation Council	4	4		
Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska	6	6		
Federal Trade Commission	1,140	1,148		8
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	183	174	9	
General Accounting Office	4,287	4,287		
General Services Administration	34,950	35,116		166
Government Printing Office	7,415	7,369	46	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,576	13,678		102
Indian Claims Commission	20	20		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,395	2,390	5	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	33,054	33,140		86
National Capital Housing Authority	439	431	8	
National Capital Planning Commission	55	58		3
National Capital Transportation Agency	36	37		1
National Gallery of Art	318	319		1
National Labor Relations Board	2,061	2,042	19	
National Mediation Board	127	136		9
National Science Foundation	940	1,015		75
Panama Canal	169	169		
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	62	63		1
Railroad Retirement Board	1,823	1,845		22
Renegotiation Board	199	202		3
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	161	163		2
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,379	1,375	4	
Selective Service System	6,978	6,981		3
Small Business Administration	3,343	3,326	17	
Smithsonian Institution	1,677	1,713		36
Soldiers' Home	1,120	1,113	7	
Subversive Activities Control Board	28	29		1
Tariff Commission	283	291		8
Tax Court of the United States	157	155	2	
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,610	17,549	61	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	159	174		15
United States Information Agency	3,485	3,483	2	
United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico [4]	4	[1] 3	1	
Veterans' Administration	170,285	170,897		612
Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission	1	1		
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,398,904	1,398,107	5,497	4,700
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			797	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,035	2,088		53
Department of the Army	324,207	324,143	64	
Department of the Navy	307,221	307,314		93
Department of the Air Force	269,381	269,373	8	
Defense Atomic Support Agency	1,911	1,917		6
Defense Communications Agency	860	843	17	
Defense Intelligence Agency	2,110	2,087	23	
Defense Supply Agency	30,389	30,264	125	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	41	41		
Interdepartmental activities	8	8		
International military activities	34	34		
Armed Forces information and education activities	426	419	7	
Total, Department of Defense	938,623	938,531	244	152
Net increase, Department of Defense			92	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,337,527	2,336,638	5,741	4,852
Net increase, including Department of Defense			889	

[1] Revised on basis of later information.
[2] August figure includes 3,110 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 3,068 in July.
[3] August figure includes 748 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 777 in July.
[4] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 88-271.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1964, and comparison with July 1964*

Department or agency	August	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,235	1,191	44	
Commerce	658	645	13	
Health, Education, and Welfare	691	695		4
Interior	597	596	1	
Justice	365	358	7	
Labor	98	83	15	
Post Office	1,600	1,586	14	
State [1] [2]	30,565	30,590		25
Treasury	675	665	10	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	433	435		2
Atomic Energy Commission	36	33	3	
Civil Service Commission	2	3		1
Federal Aviation Agency	1,113	1,106	7	
Federal Communications Commission	3	3		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	32	31	1	
General Accounting Office	68	76		8
General Services Administration	24	24		
Housing and Home Finance Agency	203	205		2
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	12	13		1
National Labor Relations Board	34	33	1	
National Science Foundation	3	4		1
Panama Canal	14,510	14,626		116
Selective Service System	150	149	1	
Independent agencies—Continued				
Small Business Administration	58	58		
Smithsonian Institution	20	18	2	
Tennessee Valley Authority	2	2		
U.S. Information Agency	8,426	8,453		27
Veterans' Administration	988	987	1	
Virgin Islands Corporation	451	568		117
Total, excluding Department of Defense	63,054	63,238	120	304
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			184	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	49	47	2	
Department of the Army	47,999	46,302	1,697	
Department of the Navy	22,944	22,734	210	
Department of the Air Force	23,962	23,033	929	
Defense Communications Agency	48	48		
International military activities	21	21		
Total, Department of Defense	95,023	92,185	2,838	
Net increase, Department of Defense			2,838	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	158,077	155,423	2,958	304
Net increase, including Department of Defense			2,654	

[1] August figure includes 12,454 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 12,477 in July. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The August figure includes 4,083 of these trust fund employees and the July figure includes 4,070.
[2] August figure includes 391 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 394 in July.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1964, and comparison with July 1964*

Department or agency	August	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,594	3,911		317
Commerce	5,769	5,787		18
Interior	9,635	9,470	165	
Post Office	276	275	1	
Treasury	5,410	5,389	21	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	272	278		6
Federal Aviation Agency	2,709	2,661	58	
General Services Administration	2,061	2,001	60	
Government Printing Office	7,415	7,369	46	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	33,066	33,153		87
Panama Canal	7,282	7,318		36
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	160	159	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,477	14,417	60	
Virgin Islands Corporation	451	568		117
Total, excluding Department of Defense	92,577	92,756	420	581
Net decrease, excluding Department of of Defense			179	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 137,099	[2] 137,073	26	
Outside the United States	[1] 4,259	[2] 4,109	150	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	186,360	186,513		153
Outside the United States	1,274	1,275		1
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	126,922	126,973		51
Outside the United States	886	966		80
Defense Supply Agency:				
Inside the United States	1,619	1,633		14
Total, Department of Defense	458,419	458,542	176	299
Net decrease, Department of Defense			123	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	550,996	551,298	578	880
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			302	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds which they are paid, as of August 1964, and comparison with July 1964*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	August	July	August	July	August	July	August	July
Crete	83	85					83	85
England	2,470	2,490			83	97	2,387	2,393
France	16,295	16,411	13,011	13,097	9	9	3,275	3,305
Germany	67,226	67,827	56,635	57,130	71	71	10,520	10,626
Greece	294	285			35	35	259	250
Japan	42,655	43,065	14,688	14,792	12,502	12,520	15,465	15,753
Korea	5,471	5,506	5,471	5,506				
Morocco	609	626			609	626		
Netherlands	53	54					53	54
Trinidad	360	358			360	358		
Total	135,516	136,707	89,805	90,525	13,669	13,716	32,042	32,466

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of August totaling 2,495,604. This was a net increase of 3,543, as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of July.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1965, which began July 1, 1964, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July	2,492,061	10,479	
August	2,495,604	3,543	

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of August was 1,461,958, an increase of 613 as compared with the July total of 1,461,345. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in August was 1,033,646, an increase of 2,930 as compared with 1,030,716, in July.

Among the civilian agencies the largest increase was reported by the Post Office Department with 5,131. The larger decreases were reported by Interior Department with 1,577, Treasury Department with 648, Veterans Administration with 611, and Agriculture Department with 575.

In the Department of Defense the largest increases in civilian employment were reported by the Department of the Army with 1,761, and the Department of the Air Force with 937.

Total employment inside the United States in August was 2,337,527, an increase of 889 as compared with July. Total employment outside the United States in August was 158,077, an increase of 2,654 as compared with July. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in August totaled 550,996, a decrease of 302.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,495,604 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 135,516 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during August who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in July was 136,707. A breakdown of this employment for August follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Crete	83			83
England	2,470		83	2,387
France	16,295	13,011	9	3,275
Germany	67,226	56,635	71	10,520
Greece	294		35	259
Japan	42,655	14,688	12,502	15,465
Korea	5,471	5,471		
Morocco	609		609	
Netherlands	53			53
Trinidad	360		360	
Total	135,516	89,805	13,669	32,042

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 3227. A bill for the relief of Dr. Darius Khorsand;

S. 3228. A bill to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and the spouse and children of such specialists; and

S. 3229. A bill for the relief of Maria Carmen Arias de Cidre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 3230. A bill for the relief of Vukota Vukadinovic;

S. 3231. A bill for the relief of Mitar Damjanovic;

S. 3232. A bill for the relief of Angel D. Cortes, his wife, Concepcion Marti Cortes, and their children, Maria de los Angeles Cortes, Juan Francisco Cortes, and Avelina Cortes; and

S. 3233. A bill for the relief of George A. Halaby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

S. 3234. A bill for the relief of Susana Juh-Mei Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAYH (for Mr. HARTKE):

S. 3235. A bill for the relief of Violet Shina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

S.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution to require reasonable standards of fire prevention and

protection in the institutional care of public assistance recipients; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 79, ENTITLED "REMARKS AND SPEECHES OF JOHN F. KENNEDY IN THE HOUSE AND SENATE"

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 377) providing for the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 79, entitled "Remarks and Speeches of John F. Kennedy in the House and Senate", which was considered and agreed to.

REQUIREMENT OF REASONABLE STANDARDS OF FIRE PREVENTION AND SAFETY IN THE MAINTENANCE OF NURSING HOMES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in the past, the Nation has experienced periodic shock over one tragic fire after another in nursing homes providing care to elderly men and women.

The Federal Government must assume some of the responsibility for those terrible occurrences, many of which could have been prevented had proper safeguards been in existence. The majority of elderly persons in nursing homes are public assistance recipients. The Federal Government pays over half of the more than $300 million spent annually for their care.

Late last year 63 elderly people were burned to death in a firetrap functioning as a nursing home in Fitchville, Ohio, very close to where I was born and reared—26 of those 63 persons were public assistance recipients. Federal money helped pay the cost of maintaining them in what turned out to be a deathtrap.

Mr. President, we have a responsibility to see to it that those unfortunate people on public assistance can go to sleep at night without the terrifying and all-too-often real fear of awakening in a burning building. We also have a responsibility to the families of these elderly men and women. We must assure them that their parents and grandparents and loved ones are safe.

I intend to meet my responsibility. I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would prohibit the use of Federal assistance funds to pay for care of elderly persons in nursing homes which fail to meet high standards of fire safety and protection acceptable to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I am aware that substandard institutions will not be able to improve the quality of their structures overnight. For that reason, my resolution authorizes the Secretary to afford such institutions reasonable time and opportunity for compliance.

It is my hope that the States will increase their allowances for nursing home care in order to meet such additional costs as may be entailed by the necessity of meeting necessary standards of safety. However, even if such allowances are not increased, there is absolutely no way that we, in good conscience, can justify continued Federal participation in the cost of maintaining assistance recipients in unsafe institutions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent not only that the joint resolution be appropriately referred but that it be printed as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 208) to require reasonable standards of fire prevention and protection in the institutional care of public assistance recipients, introduced by Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the conscience of the Nation has been shocked too often by such tragic occurrences as the recent nursing home fire in Fitchville, Ohio, in which the lives of sixty-three aged, bed-ridden patients were brought to a terrible end; and

Whereas twenty-six of those sixty-three unfortunate citizens who lost their lives in that holocaust were public assistance recipients whose expenses in that nursing home were being paid for in part by Federal funds; and

Whereas throughout the country more than half of the cost of care of public assistance recipients in nursing homes is being paid for by Federal funds; and

Whereas the Congress has an obligation to assure that Federal funds are not used to place or maintain public assistance recipients in unsafe institutions; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated in instance after instance that such fires would not have occurred and lives would not have been lost if reasonable standards of fire prevention and protection has been fully observed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no funds hereafter appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be made available to any State for the purpose of defraying any part of the cost of caring for public assistance recipients in any nursing home or similar institution (other than a hospital) which, after reasonable opportunity for compliance, has failed to meet reasonable standards of fire prevention and protection prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

INDONESIA'S AGGRESSION AGAINST MALAYSIA—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF SENATE RESOLUTION 376

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the United States is on record as supporting Malaysia's independence and territorial integrity. President Johnson was specific on this matter in his meeting with the Prime Minister of Malaysia last July. In the U.N. Security Council earlier this month Ambassador Stevenson reaffirmed America's position, and rightly termed "dangerous" the arguments used by the Indonesian Ambassador to justify the power play of the dictator, Sukarno.

The quackery argued by Indonesia in the U.N. is contrary to international law and convention. It is out of line with the U.N. Charter. It tramples on the right of self-determination, and the principles of international conduct piously professed by the Indonesian Government.

The situation in Malaysia, Mr. President, involves more than local mischief-making. As Senators know, a relatively mild resolution on Indonesia's aggression was vetoed in the Security Council by the Soviet Union—in defiance, Mr. President, of the orderly procedure and commonsense overwhelmingly supported by the Council members. Hopefully, this accomplice in aggression will not be given the last word. And I am confident this will not be the case.

The Uniting for Peace Resolution, adopted by the Council Assembly in 1950, offers a proper alternative. The resolution declares that the Security Council's failure to exercise its responsibility because of a lack of unanimity of its permanent members "does not relieve the United Nations of its responsibility under the charter to maintain international peace and security."

The resolution authorizes the General Assembly to consider and make recommendations on any situation where the Security Council has failed to act, and "where there appears to be a threat to the peace or a breach of the peace or an act of aggression."

It would seem reasonable to suggest that our Government make every effort to implement the United for Peace Resolution in the case of Indonesia's aggression, and seek to place the matter on the agenda of the forthcoming meeting of the U.N. General Assembly. In my book, Mr. President, this would serve the cause of world stability and peace, the security of the smaller nations, and, hopefully, the future welfare of the U.N. as an effective forum for the settlement of disputes.

Last week the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] introduced Senate Resolution 376. The resolution is intended to express the sense of the Senate on the subject of Indonesia's aggression along the lines I have indicated.

Mr. President, I request that I be listed as a cosponsor of this resolution. I firmly believe that passage of this resolution would strengthen the hand of President Johnson, the Secretary of State, and especially the U.S. delegation to the U.N., as they continue with other governments to cope with an undeniable case of aggression.

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

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 30, 1964, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 653. An act to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Ariz. and Nev., and for other purposes;

S. 1024. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay

relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes; and

S. 1082. An act to establish in the Treasury a correctional industries fund for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HERBERT WALTERS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks about a colleague who will soon retire. That is Senator HERBERT WALTERS, who took the place of the distinguished Senator Estes Kefauver from Tennessee. Senator WALTERS has been with us only a few months. I had the pleasure of knowing him a long time before he came to the Senate. He was a national committeeman—I believe he still is—from the State of Tennessee. I was national committeeman from the State of North Carolina, and we had many happy associations over the years in working for the Democratic Party, our States, and our local organizations.

I was delighted to see HERB WALTERS come to the Senate. In the brief years I have been here I have seen about 40 new Senators come into the Senate, and I do not recall a single one who ever moved in with greater ease, grace, and desire to work than did HERB WALTERS. He is present at nearly every rollcall. He is on hand for the consideration of every piece of legislation.

He has caught on quickly. He is moving rapidly in the circles of the Senate. He is admired and respected by every other Senator and those who are employed in the Senate. He has endeared himself to them by his kindness, his graciousness, and his loyalty, not only to his State, but to the institution of which he is now a part. He is not running for reelection. He will not return to the Senate, as he told us the other day. I say to him again that he will always be a Senator. He will always be welcome to these Chambers and to all the institutions that pertain to the Senate, and we hope that he will come back and visit with us as often as he can. We shall miss him. We wish him the greatest of all pleasures when he goes back to his native State of Tennessee.

As the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] pointed out in relation to Jerry O'Leary, I am certain that HERB WALTERS will not return to Tennessee and sit down, because he is not a sitter. He is a worker. He will be working in his chosen field for the good of his State and for the good of humanity wherever he is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, long before Senator WALTERS ever came to this body I came to know him exceedingly well in the State of Tennessee. First, he was a man of affairs and a doer if ever I saw one. My interest sprang from the fact that I have a son-in-law, a daughter, and two grandchildren living in Tennessee, and on the occasions when I went there to visit, almost invariably I would encounter Mr. WALTERS. He is one of the most gentle persons I have ever known. While he was a Democrat, he was a Democrat with restraint and a gentleman under every circumstance. That obtained even though he was a Democratic national committeeman from the State of Tennessee.

I salute the friendship that has existed between us over a long period of years, and I salute a very great gentleman and a great citizen of Tennessee. While he was here by appointment for only one session, he certainly has been diligent. He has accepted all the chores that have been assigned to him, and we shall certainly miss him on his departure from this body.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, 26 years ago, it was my high honor and coveted privilege to speak for the Daughters of the American Revolution on the front lawn of the U.S. Supreme Court Building on the occasion of planting a scarlet oak tree, as an emblem of the perpetuity of constitutional government. On that occasion, I addressed myself, first, to the importance of trees and the fact that trees are the oldest living things on earth and the knowledge of their use an indicator of man's progress from the stone age to the mastery of the seas. I concluded the dedication of that scarlet oak tree by saying:

In planting this oak tree on the grounds of the Supreme Court Building the Daughters of the American Revolution serve notice on all who may seek, openly or covertly, to destroy or undermine our edifice of constitutional American liberty, "We have just begun to fight." Constitutional American liberty is our richest heritage. We intend to pass it on to those who come after us.

Time after time, in the past 10 years, I have had occasion to complain of what the Supreme Court, in a naked grasp for power, has done to undermine our edifice of constitutional American liberty. It has construed the due process clause of the 14th amendment as an unlimited grant of power to invade the legislative prerogatives of the Congress, on the one hand, and to nullify the constitutional rights of the States, on the other; leaving in a lopsided condition a great instrument, intended to create three equal and coordinate branches of a Federal Union, composed of sovereign States.

Recently, I had occasion to examine the scarlet oak that I helped to plant in the Supreme Court yard on the 19th of April in 1938 and was distressed to find that an alien tree, said to be a product of Japan, had made the same type of inroad upon our American scarlet oak that the Supreme Court has made upon our Constitution. The Supreme Court groundskeeper informs me that the alien tree is a Sophora Japonica—a name that indicates, of course, that it is a Japanese tree. Twenty-six years ago, it was a relatively small tree. But that foreign tree, like many foreign ideas such as communism, made such a rapid growth that it completely blocked the growth of the scarlet oak on the side next to the Sophora Japonica.

Mr. President, I ask all lovers of trees, and all lovers of the Constitution, to visit the front lawn of the marble palace that houses our Highest Court and see what has happened in the brief span of 26 years to a tree that the Daughters of the American Revolution dedicated to the perpetuity of constitutional liberty. Then they will better understand why I am so distressed over what has happened to our Constitution in the intervening years and why I do not think that, because a majority of the Supreme Court thinks a particular reform is desirable, this gives them constitutional authority to rewrite laws or to amend the Constitution so as to carry out their so-called reforms.

Mr. President, I was elected to the House of Representatives in November 1932 on a Democratic platform that promised the Nation economy and the preservation of a system of private enterprise within the framework of the Constitution. Therefore, I frankly confess that it has been a source of genuine sorrow to me that in this historic session of the 88th Congress I have so frequently found it necessary to vote against bills that I thought were unconstitutional and against measures that I thought involved either imprudent spending or would create a trend toward a welfare state. As evidence, Mr. President, of my consistent support of the principles of Jefferson and Jackson, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, the speech I made on April 19, 1938, at the dedication of a scarlet oak tree, in which I stressed my adherence to a system of private enterprise within the framework of constitutional liberty.

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

Madam Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it was indeed a happy thought for the descendants of those who fought for freedom and framed for us a Constitution under which we enjoy constitutional liberty to dedicate on these historic grounds, to the perpetuity of constitutional government, a noble oak.

Trees are the oldest living things on earth, and are, therefore, fitting emblems of institutions which we wish to see endure. Sequoia trees in California have been definitely ascertained to be as much as 4,000 years old, and next June a tree in the Sequoia National Park will be dedicated to the memory of that great American woman, Susan B. Anthony, which is estimated to be at least 3,000 years old. What better monument could there be to the progress of mankind than a noble tree that knew the sunshine and the rain long before King Solomon floated the tall cedars of Lebanon to Joppa for his marvelous temple and that has withstood all of the vicissitudes of the elements through the intervening centuries?

The scientists, who apparently derive pleasure from a rationalistic philosophy of life, tell us that the earth was probably formed by a mighty star passing close to the sun at great speed, pulling from the sun's surface a great chunk of matter that became suspended in the universe and later known to us as the earth. For me, a simpler and more satisfying belief, especially since our scientists have as yet offered no rational explanation of the existence of the sun, is the story of creation as recounted in Genesis. Those of us who believe that story believe that God created the earth and all living things thereon. We believe it was no mere accident that the earth was so formed, that a part of it was dry land and a part of it seas, and the whole so shaped, as Solomon

tells us, that all of the rivers of the earth flow into the sea yet the sea is never filled. Neither do we believe it was any mere accident that God made the earth habitable for man by producing trees before he produced man. Being a fundamentalist in my beliefs, I accept the story of Genesis that on the third day of creation, whether that day be 24 hours or 24 billion hours, before He created any other living thing God created grass, shrubs, and every kind of tree that yields seed. Therefore, the tree is not only the oldest living thing on earth, but it likewise was the first living thing.

Our meager knowledge of the Garden of Eden is almost limited to the fact that it contained trees. The flaming sword that drove Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden spared the trees. A great painter has pictured Eve in old age being borne on a stretcher, and pointing to a clump of trees in the distance she appears to be saying to her son Seth: "That is paradise." For us, trees should ever be symbolic of paradise regained.

The story of the use of trees is the story of civilization. When early mankind learned to use trees in the making of ships his real progress commenced. Long before the Egyptians invented the wheel, ships made of trees were man's principal means of transportation. Not only were they the bearers of early commerce of the world but likewise the bearers of the world's discoverers. Without ships there would have been no discovery of America and there would have been no settlement of the white man at Jamestown and Plymouth. And what a contribution trees made to the life of those early pioneers. They furnished homes and the furniture of those homes. They furnished fire, and at times their nuts and berries furnished food. They preserved the flow and purity of the drinking water, and the decomposition of their leaves through the centuries built up the fertility of the soil. Every town in America started as a town of wooden houses, and even the first iron horse was fired with wood and run upon wooden rails. With little capital and no factories the colonists found the timber resources of the land constituted their principal wealth, and the working of that timber their principal activity.

Through the use of the magnificent white oak and live oak trees of North America, we as a young Nation produced the clipper ships that threatened the supremacy of Great Britain upon the high seas. In fact, before the Revolutionary War, British shipping interests became so alarmed over our rapidly growing commerce that Parliament passed an act prohibiting the import in the colonies of the products of the West Indies except in British bottoms.

Of the great variety of trees that the American settler found in this new land of promise, the oak was the most important and the one with which he was the most familiar. To me it is a significant fact that wherever we find the oak we find a sturdy, independent, and liberty-loving people—a type of people that has made the greater progress in civilization. One of the grounds of complaint preferred by the barons against King John was the fact that he had set aside for royal use some of the finest oak forests of England, denying to the people even the pleasure of hunting in those forests. And late in the 17th century England attempted to reserve for the use of the Royal Navy the choicest timber in the New England territory, marking with the Crown symbol—the broad arrow—the finest oaks. That invasion of New England liberty helped to bring on the Revolutionary War. It is, therefore, but natural that the character of the oaks represents to us strength, permanence, and independence.

Of the 55 species of oak which are native to North America, the Scarlet Oak is one of the prettiest and most showy, while partaking of the inherent sturdiness of the oak family. When the Midas hand of fall touches the greenness of our mountainsides and our hardwood trees in gold and crimson dresses bid farewell to summer, the maple, the black gum, and the dogwood must yield the crown to the scarlet oak, the most brilliant of all and the last to part with its finery.

But it is not primarily as an ornament that we are dedicating here today a member of the oak family. We have selected the oak because it symbolizes our struggle for liberty and our inherited English system of self-government.

"What gnarled stretch, what depth of shade, is his!
There needs no crown to mark the forest's king;
How in his leaves outshines full summer's bliss!
Sun, storm, rain, dew, to him their tribute bring.
Which he with such benignant royalty
Accepts, as overpayeth what is lent;
All nature seems his vassal proud to be,
And cunning only for his ornament.

"So, from oft converse with life's wintry gales,
Should man learn how to clasp with tougher roots
The inspiring earth; how otherwise avails
The leaf-creating sap that sunward shoots?
So every year that falls with noiseless flake
Should fill old scars upon the stormward side,
And make hoar age revered for age's sake,
Not for traditions of youth's leafy pride."

Our Nation has experienced 7 lean years, 7 troublesome years. No longer is there free land in the West for those who find themselves displaced in industry. Through a prodigal and most unwise use of a great sustaining resource, our forests, the millions who depend upon the soil for a livelihood have found their income greatly reduced. Never was there greater need for the people of this Nation to take stock of the natural resources that are left and to renew their allegiance to the soil from whence comes all true wealth. And in doing so, we should likewise take stock of those principles of character which are best exemplified in the character of the oak. We need in our land today a rebirth of the pioneer spirit; a rebirth of sturdiness, independence, and self-reliance; a rebirth of the fundamental belief that the prosperity of a nation comes and can only come from toil and self-sacrifice. Whether you are a rationalist or a fundamentalist, I believe you will agree with me that no act of the Congress can repeal this law of Genesis: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread until thou return unto the ground." When we face life's wintry gales, we should learn from the sturdy oak, the uncrowned king of the forests, how to "clasp with tougher roots the inspiring earth."

May the tree that we are planting today also teach us how to protect and preserve with greater faith, with greater confidence, and with greater strength the form of government handed down to us by our revolutionary ancestors. There are some in our land today who take that form of government for granted and are indifferent as to its blessings. There are some who are openly opposed to it, but, fortunately, their number is relatively small. There is still another group which, to my mind, is even more dangerous than either of those I have mentioned; namely, the group while professing to believe in constitutional government would nevertheless undermine in insidious ways the great instrument under which that form of government has been enjoyed in this country for a century and a half. Men of that type are not new to this age.

The great statesman Daniel Webster knew and recognized them in his day and time. Standing on the steps of the Capitol on the 100th anniversary of the birth of our greatest American, George Washington, Daniel Webster said of the destruction of the Constitution: "Other misfortunes may be borne, or their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still under a new cultivation, they will grow green again, and ripen to future harvests. It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No; if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful, and a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty."

In planting this oak tree on the grounds of the Supreme Court Building the Daughters of the American Revolution serve notice on all who may seek, openly or covertly, to destroy or undermine our edifice of constitutional American liberty, "We have just begun to fight." Constitutional American liberty is our richest heritage. We intend to pass it on to those who come after us.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 79, ENTITLED "REMARKS AND SPEECHES OF JOHN F. KENNEDY IN THE HOUSE AND SENATE"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after conferring with the distinguished minority leader, I send to the desk, on behalf of myself and the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 79, entitled "Remarks and Speeches of John F. Kennedy in the House and Senate."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the reason for the resolution is that we understand under the resolution passed by the Senate there will be only 500 copies. This resolution will provide for an additional 900 copies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 377) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations nine hundred additional copies of Senate Document No. 79, Eighty-eighth Congress, second session, entitled "Remarks and Speeches of John F. Kennedy in the House and Senate."

GOLDWATER NO "DEMAGOG"

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this morning there appeared in the Washington Post a column by John Chamberlain, who writes under the general byline of "These Days." In this particular column, styled "Goldwater No 'Demagog'," he writes on the whole question of extremism.

It has occurred to me that within the next few days we shall observe the anniversary of the discovery of America by a man who, in his time, was one of the greatest of all extremists. His name was Christopher Columbus. Together with his brother Bartholomew, who was a mapmaker, he insisted that the world was round. The wonder is that, with such heretical utterances back in 1492, Christopher Columbus was not burned at the stake. The professors at the university simply could not countenance, nor could the church countenance, that kind of doctrine. If it had not been for the gracious Queen Isabella, he would not have been able to sail westward with the *Nina*, the *Pinta*, and the *Santa Maria* to find what he thought would be gold and spices. Instead, he found an island in the Caribbean, where he landed on the 12th of October.

So as we observe the 472d anniversary of the discovery of America, we can think of one of the world's greatest extremists.

John Chamberlain, a man of considerable talent, has done an exceptionally fine piece of work in this article with respect to Senator GOLDWATER. I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

THESE DAYS—GOLDWATER NO "DEMAGOG"

(By John Chamberlain)

Whatever may be the faults of BARRY GOLDWATER, he is not one of "those who rave and rant" about anything. So far as his own personal speechmaking is concerned, he has been waging the least demagogic national campaign that anyone now alive could possibly remember.

Just consider how he has been breaking all the more cynical campaign rules. He goes into West Virginia and unburdens himself on the subject of the current antipoverty campaign for the allegiance of the Appalachian States. He says a mere billion dollars will do practically nothing toward eliminating poverty, which is certainly a true statement. But it is not the sort of thing that a demagogic ranter and raver would choose to tell an audience in the heart of the region that will be getting the money.

On his swing through the South, Mr. GOLDWATER stops in Tennessee. There, where it is supposed to be political suicide to attack the TVA, he reaffirms his proposal to sell certain TVA appendages, such as fertilizer plants, to private owners.

Moving on into Texas, he speaks at Fort Worth, where the local plant of General Dynamics Corp. has been awarded a $6 billion contract to manufacture the TFX aircraft. He tells the Texans that the TFX contract was "politically oriented," and that it should have gone to Boeing in Seattle, a company which, Senator GOLDWATER said, was in a position to make a better plane.

Mr. GOLDWATER's refusal to play it safe is cause for almost ecstatic wonder in a most unlikely place, the little Freedom and Union magazine put out by Clarence Streit, the prophet of a federation of the Atlantic democracies. When Mr. GOLDWATER made clear at San Francisco that "Atlantic union is a key issue to him," says Streit, "the extreme nationalists in the Goldwater camp and his extreme critics in the other who seem convinced that he is dominated by 'isolationists,' 'Birchers,' and 'Fascists' * * * were struck dumb." Streit finds Mr. GOLDWATER far more satisfactory than Lyndon Johnson on the subject of Atlantic community, for the Johnson acceptance speech at Atlantic City "made no reference to Atlantica, whose flowering had so big a place in Senator GOLDWATER's acceptance."

As the GOLDWATER campaign unfolds, it becomes increasingly apparent that we have a most unpolitical nominee contending for the Presidency. The man seems extreme because he is extremely honest. It is true, of course, that GOLDWATER hasn't been talking recently about making social security voluntary, which might be construed as a retreat.

But the reason for the silence, I think, is that Mr. GOLDWATER despairs of making himself understood on the subject in a campaign year. The original Goldwater statement on social security followed the publication of a poll taken in Britain which indicated that more than 50 percent of the English voters would like to have the opportunity to contract out of Government welfare schemes. "Contracting out" implies that welfare must be kept up, but that a choice would be allowed between the public and private kinds.

Now it is not true that the American Government is powerless to find a way to finance a social security system that would permit a person to select a public or a private old-age insurance policy, the qualifying stipulation being that he must maintain either one or the other. But a presidential candidate would have to take a battery of insurance actuaries along with him to be convincing on this point. And very few people would hang around long enough to listen.

Senator GOLDWATER's honesty, which transcends the call of duty, recalls that of John Stuart Mill in Victorian times. When he was campaigning for the English Parliament in 1865, Mill was confronted by a group of workingmen who asked him if he had authored a quote that said "the lower classes, though mostly habitual liars, are ashamed of lying." Mill looked the workingmen in the eye and said, "I did." Whereupon they cheered him and voted for him—and he won his seat in Commons.

That, however, was a century ago. And besides, it was in another country.

THE FUTURE OF TRUTH-IN-PACKAGING LEGISLATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, at this point in the history of the 88th Congress—when pressures mount to adjourn, Members are eager to go home and a few are apprehensive that they will not be allowed to return—I take comfort from one small political fact of life. It is that on this Hill there are some "deaths" which need not be accepted as final.

Therefore, Mr. President, I rise now not to eulogize a dear friend of mine—truth in packaging—now "dying" in the Judiciary Committee, but to announce that—granted the opportunity—I shall breathe new life into it next Congress.

Further, I pledge to devote fresh vigor and new dedication to its enactment as the law of the land.

One camp of observers will greet this announcement with either amusement at my folly or fear of my success. However, I feel certain that millions of consumers over our Nation would want it no other way and would be deeply disappointed in me if I behaved otherwise.

Certainly, I am not so naive as to think that the achievement of my promise will be easy. The opposition began lining up in June of 1961, when investigative hearings opened. The last time we counted noses, we found companies representing more than $100 billion in annual sales—almost one-sixth of our gross national product—opposing S. 387.

Thus far, the success of this opposition is apparent—success achieved mainly with only the weak allegation of "unnecessary and unwanted."

Yet, these same critics who oppose the legislation as "unnecessary and unwanted" eagerly participated in the drafting of a model administrative ruling proposed to the States by the National Conference of Weights and Measures on the prominence and placement of quantity statements on package labels. It is true that by their participation, industry spokesmen watered down the original recommendations of the State weights and measures officials. Nevertheless, some minimum standards for type size were adopted by the conference on June 18 of this year.

Surely, my colleagues will allow me a bit of amusement at the irony involved not only in this proposal but in a headline in the August 1964 issue of Modern Packaging which heralded its adoption. The headline was "Standards at Last for Conspicuous Labeling." My amusement over this article comes, of course, because the ruling adopts the philosophy of the first three sections of the truth-in-packaging bill—a bill so violently condemned by industry. In fact, some witnesses at our hearings said that these exact sections would amount to confusing the American housewife—that confusion to come, I gather, by telling her clearly how much is in a package.

Frankly, the adoption of this ruling and its warm acceptance by industry spokesmen came about, I think, because business has discovered that the information and protection truth in packaging seeks to give the consumer is far from "unwanted and unnecessary."

There have been many indications of the consumer demand. For instance, a survey to determine consumer attitudes was conducted by the Institute for Design Analysis in the San Francisco Bay area in July 1963.

Mr. President, in summarizing their findings, the institute said:

> The survey revealed a widespread dissatisfaction and distrust of present consumer goods packaging practices.

Those who would blame one PHILIP A. HART for planting this seed of dissatisfaction might be interested in the fact that while more than 50 percent of the total felt that packages and labels do not give enough information, less than 25 percent had heard of the Hart bill.

But how effective can this recommendation by the national conference be? The suggested regulation does not have the force of law—unless adopted by the 50 individual States of the Union—a formidable, if not hopeless task.

In the meantime, industry is free to disregard the standards at will. And if one firm sees fit not to go along, who can blame those who must compete if they do the same? We heard too many ethical businessmen say that they could not get off the merry-go-round of bad practices, until some minimum guideliness for all were established, to hold much hope for voluntary action.

However, there are other sections of the bill aimed at practices which continue unabated and upon which no action has been taken. One of these is the discretionary authority S. 387 grants to FTC and FDA to establish standards on a product line basis to eliminate deceptive sizes.

This from the beginning—and up to this minute—has been one of the most strongly attacked sections of the bill by industry.

In fact, the Modern Packaging article to which I referred reports:

> About all that remains in the Hart bill are its demands for standardization of package sizes and elimination of fractional weights—both of which, industry can prove, would result not in benefits to the consumer, but in higher cost.

Mr. President, the Hart bill does not intend to "standardize" in the sense of the word used by the article. All it asks is a reasonable relationship between package size and quantity of contents.

It seems to me that one enlightened manufacturer of dry cereals—a manufacturer who, I am happy to say, has headquarters in Michigan—has recently proven that not only is it not necessary to raise prices when you adopt a compact package but the consumer acceptance acclaim is well worth any cost of changing.

The bill seeks also to assure that, where necessary, reasonable weights and measures will be used instead of the proliferation of odd sizes in many product lines which make rational price comparisons almost an impossibility.

How necessary is this? Well, Modern Packaging has an article in its September issue entitled "The Case for Standardization." The editorial concludes:

> Participation in the new international movement toward standardization of package sizes seems to us a "must" for American packages—not merely as a defensive measure, but for the real advantages that it may bring.

The editorial refers to advantages for manufacturers. The advantages to the consumer are just as obvious.

My own State of Michigan has recently adopted the first revision of its weights and measures law since 1913. It is heartening to note that some provisions aimed at practices exposed by the truth-in-packaging hearings are included in this bill.

Certainly, the minimum protection offered by this measure to the citizens of Michigan should be available to all citizens of these United States.

The Trade Press, voice of the industries involved, has expressed increasing concern with the problems manufacturers face in packaging products for the many diverse State standards prevalent in the country.

Only by the flexible approach to nationwide standards encompassed in the truth-in-packaging bill can a measure of uniformity and consumer assistance be achieved in the next decade.

No, Mr. President, truth in packaging ought not be allowed to die. There is too much work yet to be done. I believe experience will prove it to be of benefit to packagers and consumers alike.

At this time, Mr. President, I should also like to express my thanks to the members of the Judiciary Committee who have authorized the subcommittee report on the truth in-packaging bill to be published as a committee print. Hopefully, this report will be available for distribution in approximately 1 month.

GREAT LAKES WATER LEVELS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, this morning's papers carry the welcome word that Governor Romney has joined me and my colleagues from the Midwest States in requesting an International Joint Commission study of the Great Lakes water levels problems.

I made exactly this proposal to Secretary of State Dean Rusk on April 15 of this year. Senators NELSON and PROXMIRE, HUMPHREY and MCCARTHY, BAYH and HARTKE, CLARK, and DOUGLAS all associated themselves with this request.

On May 8 and June 5, I reported to the Senate on the progress of this proposal, noting that it had been well received in virtually all quarters. On July 24 the Senate Commerce Committee held a public hearing—which I chaired—on the status of the matter, with the principal executive departments involved reporting on the steps that had been taken to implement my proposal. Since Governor Romney was in Washington at the time, I invited him to appear at that hearing and he presented some helpful but necessarily extemporaneous remarks.

At that July 24 hearing, as I reported to a public meeting in Lansing on July 28, the representative of the Department of State informed us that upon receipt of my letter to Secretary Rusk "first proposing that the Department discuss with the Canadian Government the possibility of a reference to the IJC on the problem of the water levels of the Great Lakes," agreement had been sought among the interested Federal agencies; that such agreement had been reached; that the proposal had been transmitted to the Canadian Government as an official proposal having the full support of the administration; that agreement had been reached on the Canadian side on the proposed draft of the reference which they wish to submit to the IJC; that there remained only the task of reconciling the terms of the two Governments' drafts.

We therefore welcome the support of Governor Romney and will welcome the interest and cooperation of other officials and interested citizens on both sides of the border.

An article in the September 28, 1964, issue of U.S. News & World Report, "When Water Runs Short in the Great Lakes," well points out that these problems affect Canada as much as they do the United States, and that we must jointly seek out the answers.

However beneficial a control of the lake levels might be, my own thinking is that we are going to have to look ahead in terms of diversion of additional water into the Great Lakes Basin. This water, as far as we now know, could come only from Canada. And to anyone whose instinctive reaction might be "but the Canadians would not want to divert any of their rivers down into the Great Lakes," I point out that turning unused or little-used waters into the basin would be of enormous benefit to the heartland of Canadian industry and shipping.

The pros and cons of this proposal and others will, I hope, be the subject of study by the appropriate body, the International Joint Commission.

While we are on this subject, Mr. President, I want to make one thing very clear, as I did at our public hearing on July 24. Yes, the levels of the Great Lakes present a serious problem now and, absent any action on our part, could become disastrous. We would be derelict if we did not put our best minds to work on possible and economically feasible solutions. However, we resent slanted advertisements that seek to discourage shipping from our Great Lakes routes. I point out that at the present time any ship that can transit the seaway locks, which provide for ships of a maximum draft of 25½ feet, can be accommodated in the Detroit port. The water depth for the entire route between Detroit and the seaway is presently 27 feet, or better. Through the end of August, seaway commerce had reached the total of 24 million net tons, compared to 18 million net tons last year.

Because we have the prudence and the foresight to want to look ahead and make sure that our magnificent water resource will serve the needs of the future as well as the needs of today, this should not be used to penalize lake ports through adverse "scare" publicity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the U.S. News & World Report article referred to above be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

WHEN WATER RUNS SHORT IN THE GREAT LAKES

(Once again the Great Lakes and their rivers have dropped below normal levels—bringing heavy losses and hardships to people and cities on their shores. What causes the lakes to rise and fall so much? Can anything be done about it? Are new remedies going to be tried? Both Canada and the United States are agreed that more controls are needed. But they will be costly.)

The violent ups and downs of the Great Lakes are fast becoming one of the most ticklish problems ever faced by the United States and Canada.

Only 12 years ago, high water was overflowing the Great Lakes basin, creating havoc on both sides of the international boundary. Today, abnormally low water is proving equally disastrous.

Hydropower generation has had to be cut back. Ships cannot carry full cargoes up and

down the St. Lawrence Seaway. Ports and harbors are losing business. Changing shorelines have left lakeshore cottages and resorts high and dry. Industries and cities are finding pollution harder to handle.

The current water shortage has added new urgency to a centuries-old problem that has grown more acute with each passing year: preserving and conserving the Great Lakes for future generations.

Alarmed authorities in the United States and Canada met three times this past summer in emergency conference.

They found no quick and simple answers, but they agreed that long-term corrective action must be started soon to safeguard North America's most priceless fresh water supply.

KEY TO AN EMPIRE

The Great Lakes, twisting westward a third of the way across the continent, are the largest source of fresh water in the world.

Along the shores of this huge water system, a rich industrial empire has developed and thrived.

More than 80 million people live in the 8 U.S. States and 2 Canadian Provinces flanking the Great Lakes. Directly and indirectly, their fortunes are tied to North America's inland seas.

Fresh water is becoming increasingly scarce. Water already is used again and again—in homes and factories, for transportation, power generation, recreation, fishing and farming.

WATER TO MAKE STEEL

It takes 500 tons of water to make a ton of steel, twice as much to grow a ton of wheat. A city like Chicago must have over a billion gallons a day.

Needs are multiplying everywhere. Water used per person, now more than 200 gallons a day in some places, is expected to be double that by 1980.

Consequently, the wasteful and destructive cycle of high and low levels on the Great Lakes, unchecked since the lakes were scoured out by retreating glaciers 20,000 years ago, is no longer tolerable, according to experts.

Taming the Great Lakes, however, runs into the unique geography of the lake region.

Almost one-third of the surface of the 295,000 square miles in the Great Lakes' watershed is water. In most watersheds only about one-tenth of the surface is water. This relative lack of land surface in the lake region is a handicap, exaggerating the impact of changes in rainfall, runoff and evaporation—the major influences on water levels and supply.

Thus a drought in the Great Lakes basin has unusually severe effects.

Consider the past 3½ years: Rainfall in this period has been almost 1 foot below normal on Lake Michigan and Lake Erie, and around 7 inches under par on Lake Superior, Lake Huron, and Lake Ontario.

Such dry spells, with fewer clouds and more sunshine, accelerate the rate of evaporation. And evaporation losses, which vary from lake to lake, are bad enough at any time, ranging as high as 34 inches—almost 3 feet—on Lake Erie even in an average year.

As a result of the recent drought, each month this year new record lows have been noted on the Great Lakes, with a drop of more than 3 feet in the level of Lake Michigan and Lake Huron.

COSTLY INCHES

Experts calculate that a drop of 1 inch in water levels means a $1 million loss per year for power producers and a decrease of 60 to 100 tons in the payload of every ship.

Iron-ore carriers estimate lost revenues from smaller loads may reach $13 million in 1964 alone, and other cargo carriers also are suffering.

At the same time, the water shortage has reduced hydropower output. In the past 19 months, the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission has burned up $20 million worth of coal to replace lost hydrocapacity. This experience has been matched by producers of power in northern New York.

Add the cost of extra dredging, of relocating docks, of ruined fishing grounds, and aggravated pollution, and the toll taken by this low-water cycle has already reached $100 million or more, according to some estimates.

High water can be just as destructive, flooding out powerplants, eroding shorelines, and destroying waterfront properties. Damage from the last high-water cycle in 1952–53 totaled at least $100 million.

A PRACTICAL QUESTION

With bills like these to be paid, both the United States and Canada are agreed on the need to stabilize Great Lakes levels. The question yet to be decided is how much control is practical and economical.

Because of the vast area covered by the lakes, fantastic volumes of water are involved in the most modest change in lake levels.

For example, if 10,000 cubic feet of water could be emptied into Lake Superior every second for the next 5½ years and held there, the level of the lake would rise only 1 foot.

By comparison, nature's changes are on an awesome scale.

Indications are that Lake Michigan has been up to 60 feet higher than its present level, and as much as 350 feet lower, since the last ice age. But the biggest variation since records were started in 1860 has been 6.6 feet.

Rainfall, or lack of it, still makes the big difference, but other factors also influence water levels and supplies. These include diversions, changes in lake outlets, and other manmade controls.

MAN'S TINKERING

Man has been tinkering with the Great Lakes for years. The flow of water over Niagara Falls, which is at the eastern end of Lake Erie, is strictly regulated day and night.

Ship's channels have been deepened in the rivers that connect the lakes. Large volumes of water are diverted both in and out of the lakes for sanitation, power, and navigation purposes.

All these manmade checks and balances have effects, lowering some lakes and raising others. Communities, companies, and individuals living along the lakes or on rivers that are affected by them have a big stake in any changes now or in the future in lake controls.

As indicated on the map on page 99, the levels of two lakes—Superior at the western end of the chain and Ontario at the eastern end—are now held within certain limits by a complicated system of navigation locks, powerplants, and dams with gates that can be opened and closed. Comparable control is being urged for the three other lakes. But the big puzzle is how to do it. As yet no one appears to know exactly what can or should be done.

The first move is up to leaders in Washington and Ottawa. They are expected to authorize a comprehensive study soon of the Great Lakes water system—past, present, and future. Plans for remedies will be based on this survey.

Whatever the diagnosis, the cure is bound to be difficult and expensive, particularly for Lake Huron and Lake Michigan, which are in reality one huge lake with only a single outlet. That at least, is the conclusion of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, based on extensive investigation of lake levels.

The Engineers' report, due to be filed in December, will stress the need for a lake-sized "faucet" at the lower end of Lake Huron that could be turned off, and on. This plan would involve a dam with gates, to back up water and dole it out when levels are low, plus some method of discharging large volumes of water when levels are high.

THE TOUGHER PROBLEM

The high-water problem is the one that poses the most difficulty. Engineers estimate that at times it would take a discharge of water equal to 2½ St. Clair and Detroit rivers to flush away the excess water on the twin lakes of Michigan and Huron.

In fact, the Engineers suggest it would not be economically feasible now to install the complicated plumbing needed to regulate Lakes Michigan, Huron, and Erie. The cost of this plumbing is unofficially estimated at around $1 billion—twice as much as the St. Lawrence Seaway.

However, the new study now planned will consider all aspects of water in the Great Lakes basin and may permit a more favorable verdict.

A 12-GOVERNMENT TASK

Political complications involved in any decision to regulate the lakes cannot be minimized. Twelve governments will have to cooperate: the Government of Canada and two Canadian Provinces on one side; the U.S. Government and eight States on the other side. But the climate for cooperation is improving.

"We made more progress at three meetings this summer than we have in the last 3 years," says A. J. Meserow, chairman of the Great Lakes Commission, an action group formed by the eight U.S. States bordering the lakes. He is confident that all the Great Lakes can and will be regulated.

Will adequate controls of the lakes assure enough fresh water for future needs in North America's industrial heartland? Experts differ, but the consensus is: Yes—for a while, provided pollution can be controlled.

In the long run the final answer may be to bring surplus water from Canada's northern river systems and deliver it to the Great Lakes, the western plains, and perhaps as far south as Mexico. These imaginative, costly schemes for reversing Canada's northern rivers are still on the drawing boards, but hardheaded politicians do not dismiss them lightly.

"Within 10 years, a start will be made on diverting our northern waters to southern use," prophesies Arthur Laing, Canada's Minister of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources.

THE WARREN COMMISSION REPORT ON THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I call the Senate's attention to an editorial printed in this morning's Baltimore Sun.

Certainly the Warren Commission report is, and should be, in the minds of all thinking Americans today. Perhaps the press, more than any other segment of our society, will look at it most thoughtfully. Every major newspaper will undoubtedly editorialize on the merits of the report's criticism—not only of the press, but of all others who played important parts in the events of that tragic day in Dallas.

The Sun's dispassionate analysis is, I believe, an outstanding piece of editorializing, and I am in complete agreement with it. This newspaper agrees with the report—admits the fault of the press in the bizarre proceedings following the tragedy—and continues:

It is impossible to imagine any rules the press could have imposed on itself in advance. * * * It is a matter of conscience.

It is not, in our opinion, a matter for a formal code of professional ethics.

No one can deny that, in the development of our democracy, the press has played a major role in the protection of our essential freedoms. Without a free press, there is truly no freedom for any segment of our society. Certainly the press has been difficult at times. No one in public life can deny this. But in the vast majority of cases, the free and uninhibited atmosphere in which the press operates has nurtured the seeds of liberty and brought them to bloom.

Any limitation of this atmosphere must be imposed by the press itself, through, as the Sun has indicated, its own conscience. It is unthinkable that any governmental authority should attempt to establish the sort of controls which, too often, we witness in other countries.

Quite the contrary—it seems to me that, in cases which do not involve national security, members of the press should be given greater latitude, should be allowed access to more material rather than being spoon fed only that information which is deemed necessary for favorable coverage. None can deny the tendency of administrators, officials, and politicians to hide the unpleasant and, in the words of the lyricist, "accentuate the positive."

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

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

THE PRESS AND DALLAS

The press, by which is meant here the newsgatherers for daily and other publications, for the press associations and for television and radio, including cameramen and technicians, cannot ignore the Warren Commission's finding that its operations contributed to the confusion amid which Jack Ruby killed Lee Harvey Oswald in the Dallas police building last November 24.

The Commission expressed the belief, on the basis of its intensive investigation, that "the news media, as well as the police authorities, who failed to impose conditions more in keeping with the orderly processes of justice, must share responsibility for the failure of law enforcement which occurred in connection with the death of Oswald." The Commission said further that "the promulgation of a code of professional ethics governing representatives of all news media would be welcome evidence that the press had profited by the lesson of Dallas," and noted "the need for the exercise of self-restraint by the news media in periods when the demand for information must be tempered by other fundamental requirements of our society."

It does not suffice to reply in general terms that the press constantly exercises a considerable degree of self-restraint, in matters of the national security and in matters of the processes of law; for in this particular instance the presence of the press in great numbers unquestionably helped to create a situation in which a man was killed, and a situation which, had he lived, would have worked against his fair and impartial trial.

Nor does it quite suffice to agree with the Commission's findings that for that situation the Dallas police were chiefly at fault, in not laying down rules for the press and seeing that they were complied with, in not refraining from an almost continuous stream of revelations of evidence—some accurate, some in error—and in the failure to check unauthorized visitors that permitted Ruby not only to be in the basement of the police building to kill Oswald on Sunday but also to visit the third floor on Friday and to appear at the bizarre Oswald "press conference" just after midnight that night.

The point is that if the press had not been there, with its persistence and its number and its lights and cameras and microphones and cables, the killing might possibly not have occurred, and the evidence would probably not have been given out the way it was.

The press has been increasingly conscious, in recent years of fuller communications and a proliferation of kinds of media, of the difficulties posed by "mass reporting." Reporting en masse works sometimes against accuracy, and sometimes makes for a certain shallowness of information—on the whole, people in the news talk more glibly to many people than to few—and often causes confusion, though almost never matching in magnitude the confusion of Dallas.

For those 2 days in Dallas were a terrible and extraordinary 2 days: and it is impossible to imagine any rules the press could have imposed on itself in advance. It has subsequently been suggested that the press pool its reporters and photographers for major news events. Pooling indeed has been done in the past, particularly in time of war, in the main because of limited facilities, and is still sometimes done. But its practice is confined to predictable happenings. What happened in Dallas was not just a major news event. It was a catastrophe, and there chanced to be on hand more than 300 newsmen, American and foreign, national and Texan, trying desperately to tell just what did happen, and in truth doing their jobs well.

Except for one quoted remark by a reporter who taunted the police with alleged mistreatment of Oswald, the Warren Commission cited no specific instance of unethical behavior. Its criticism was broader, and in those terms the press cannot deny that it has justice in it. Because of last November, the press is more deeply concerned than ever about how it comports itself as it goes about its work, and about its heavy public responsibilities.

It is a matter of conscience. It is not, in our opinion, a matter for a formal code of professional ethics. Among the characteristics of a free press is the characteristic of self-discipline, and the characteristic also that nobody, outside the press or in, has the authority to impose formal and binding rules.

AMERICANS CAN BE PROUD

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, from a 7-year-old who lives in the State of New York, to the President of the United States, over the past 6 months Alaskans have received precious treasures of sympathy and help. During this period of Alaska's travail, priceless ingredients of faith, determination, friendship, and dedication have been vividly demonstrated.

Nowhere on this continent has a catastrophe been so devastating as that which struck Alaska on Good Friday, March 27. We shall not soon forget the terrible events which had their beginning at 5:36 p.m., Alaska standard time, when the earth shifted and the seas ran high.

Those events, which bred devastation beyond imagination, also bred imagination to conquer that devastation. It is time, Mr. President, to pay tribute to the great spirit which on that terrible night moved Alaskans to unite and to begin the awesome task of reconstruction before the earth stopped moving under their feet. The same spirit moved our President, the Congress, organizations, and individuals to pledge themselves to the recovery effort.

The assistance has been massive, and in many instances unprecedented. Much of the story has been told in two official reports, published during recent days, by the Office of Emergency Planning and the Federal Reconstruction and Development Commission for Alaska. At several points in this address, I shall quote from these reports.

But nowhere in the reports is recorded the proper measure of thanks which Americans, including all Alaskans, owe to Director Edward A. McDermott, of the Office of Emergency Planning; to Senator Clinton P. Anderson, who only a few days after the earthquake was named by President Johnson to be chairman of the newly created Federal Reconstruction Commission; to Administrator Eugene P. Foley, of the Small Business Administration; to Dwight A. Ink, Executive Director of the Commission; and to so many others. On them and on all who have worked with them, the burden has been heavy, but never overwhelming. Their contributions have inspired and made possible the recovery of the 49th State, a task which 6 months ago seemed almost insurmountable. Much remains to be done; but the foundations have been well laid, and hopes for Alaska's future are high.

Where does one begin, Mr. President, to chronicle the deeds; to record the names of those who have done so much; to list the work of the Federal, State, and local governments; to tell the story of the earthquake and subsequent events? It cannot be done adequately. The work of countless individuals, both in and out of government, has been invaluable. Perhaps some day the assistance in dollars can be added up; but how does one total the intangibles of human spirit and giving?

In the report of the Federal Reconstruction Commission, an effort has been made to list the help which poured out to Alaska from places far and near. That record is admittedly far from complete. It does not, for example, mention the thousands of dollars contributed to Valdez by the employees and management of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. It does not mention the thousands of messages relayed throughout America by amateur "ham" radio operators from Alaska at a time when regular communication channels were closed. It does not mention the donations from many communities throughout this land, such as those from Allentown, Pa., which were driven across the country by volunteers of the International Teamsters Union. It does not mention the faith shown in Alaska's future by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers by investing more than $1 million with an Alaska bank, to help provide financing for new Alaska homes. It does not mention perhaps the most appealing contribution of all, which was sent to Mayor George Sharrock, of

Anchorage, by John Loeb Beaty, of Port Jefferson, N.Y. This 7-year-old wrote:

I wanted to send my Easter basket but my daddy said the eggs would not last. I am sending you $1 instead.

But the Commission's report, recorded here, at least tells much of the story—the response of neighbor to neighbor, stranger to stranger, foreigner to Alaskan, American to American:

RESCUE WORK OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR

The success of the immediate recovery effort in Alaska can be attributed, to a large degree, to the prompt and efficient help which came from the private sector. Charitable and professional organizations, clubs, and church groups immediately set up emergency housing, prepared food, and performed rescue missions. By the time the recovery activities of the private sector are complete, over 20 organizations will have spent more than $1.5 million. Throughout the recovery effort, the Alaska Civil Defense Office coordinated the relief activities of the private sector.

Red Cross: The Red Cross sent representatives to Anchorage, Cordova, Homer, Kenai, Kodiak, Seldovia, Seward, and Valdez. They established their national disaster team headquarters in the Anchorage YMCA building on March 28, bringing supplies, blankets, sheets, and funds to supplement the YMCA's depleted stocks. This made it possible for the YMCA to continue its food and shelter service. Later in the recovery effort the Red Cross moved its headquarters to the American Baptist Church in Anchorage.

The Red Cross cooperated closely with Federal, State, and local groups in providing food, clothing, and medical care. They also repaired and rebuilt homes, replaced household furniture, replaced or repaired occupational supplies and equipment, handled welfare inquiries concerning Alaskan residents, and gave grants to needy families.

The Red Cross not only helped people in the disaster area, but also cared for earthquake victims taken to Glenallen and Fairbanks, and moved some families to Seattle. By the end of June, the Red Cross had spent $739,500 on 907 families who were homeless, hungry, or in need of some kind of assistance. The Red Cross has also earmarked $398,000 for native villages, to supplement the funds of the Bureau of Indian Affairs—the Federal agency which is organizing the immediate recovery and long-range reconstruction in native villages. All Red Cross assistance is an outright grant requiring no repayment. Total Red Cross expenditures to date as reported by the Red Cross Washington Office are $825,225. By the time all relief cases are closed, Red Cross expenditures will be well over $1 million.

YMCA: Immediately after the disaster, the YMCA prepared their Anchorage building for recovery efforts. The Y set up an area to serve food, and arranged housing for homeless people. YMCA personnel recruited volunteers to maintain the building and to set up beds in the clubrooms and in the auditorium.

On the first night, over 200 people were housed and hundreds more were served coffee and sandwiches. In the first 5 days over 1,000 persons were housed; thousands more were fed. With the help of church groups, the Girls' Service Organization, the Equipment Club (Air Force and Army men), a 15-man crew from Northwest Airlines who were forced to evacuate the Westward Hotel, and others, the YMCA maintained a 24-hour food and shelter service. The Explorer Scouts set up a Civil Defense radio contact in the YMCA building to send and receive pertinent information concerning people who needed help, the availability of shelter and food, and the location of areas which were too dangerous to travel. YMCA relief efforts were continued for about 1 month, with expenditures totaling between $10,000 and $12,000.

Salvation Army: The Salvation Army was active in Anchorage, Cordova, English Bay, Glenallen, Homer, Hope, Kodiak, Portage, Seldovia, Seward, Valdez, and in more remote sections of southeastern Alaska. In Anchorage 682 families were given groceries, staples, and grants; 302 families were given clothing and bedding; 3,443 sitdown meals were served at the social center; and there were 100,350 canteen servings. In other towns the Salvation Army provided food, clothing, rescue equipment, mobile homes, and repair service for needed buildings which had been damaged in the quake. As of June 11, the Salvation Army had spent or committed $186,000.

American Legion: Shortly after the earthquake, the national commander of the American Legion asked the 17,000 Legion posts and 14,000 auxiliary units to help the earthquake victims. As of June 11, the Legion had collected $50,635 in donations. With part of this money the Legion provided 82 families in Alaska with grants to enable them to purchase needed items which were lost in the quake.

Lions Club, district 49: This organization "adopted" the community of Afognak, which was evacuated and resettled on Kodiak Island. The Lions Club had earmarked $35,000 for the project, but ended up spending $50,000. In gratitude to the club, the new village was named "Port Lions."

Alaska Bar Association: The association provided a legal aid service for several weeks following the earthquake. The service was available to all persons in the Anchorage area who needed immediate relief from legal obligations.

Boy Scouts of America: Before communications were restored, the boys served as "runners" between State civil defense and other agencies. They directed traffic, served as guards around civil defense and damage areas, and also served as drivers to deliver supplies and messages to relief headquarters within the city. Fifty-three Explorer Scouts contributed 2,720 man-hours.

Alaska Council of Churches: The council acted as a clearinghouse for welfare information between churches, and as a coordinating agency to prevent duplication of relief work. The council distributed funds of the member churches on the basis of demonstrated need. The aid given by the churches is usually for long-range building repairs. Individual churches, however, extended the assistance to include emergency housing and food supplies. Many churches which are not council members also contributed to the recovery effort. Total council expenditures will total $15,000.

Veterans of Foreign Wars: The Veterans of Foreign Wars were active in many communities in Alaska, donating $80,000 in relief assistance to veterans and their families.

Anchorage Panhellenic Association: The association worked with West High School counselors to help graduating girls continue their plans to go to college. They helped the girls find summer employment, oncampus employment at Alaska Methodist University, scholarship aid, and group transportation rates. The association plans to offer free room and board to girls in other towns who wish to attend college in Anchorage.

Anchorage Junior Chamber of Commerce: The Jaycees have planned a "Quake—Alaska" (Quick United Action To Kindle the Economy of Alaska) project. The project consists of two phases: publicizing the need for legislation to assist recovery, and soliciting funds from other Jaycee locals for the recovery effort. The Jaycee assistance is both immediate and long-range. The Jaycee-ettes have donated $100 to the "Quake—Alaska" project.

Governor's Fund: Shortly after the earthquake the Governor of Alaska, William A. Egan, established the Governor's Reconstruction Fund. As of July 30, 1964, the fund contained $115,403.97 in donations. Money has come from all over the Nation, and from foreign countries.

Some of the largest donations have come from Japan. Within a few days after the earthquake, the Japanese Consul General in Seattle presented Governor Egan with a $10,000 check from the Japanese Government. Japan, which has also been the victim of earthquakes, is well aware of the hardships Alaskans are enduring. The Japanese Fisheries Association gave the State of Alaska $5,000 on April 7; and on June 8 the Governor of Kanagawa, Japan, presented the Secretary of State for Alaska with $4,933.49 in donations from the citizens of Kanagawa.

A $1,500 contribution was sent by Louis M. Suiter, chairman of the board of trustees of the Bell Helicopter Co. Humanity Fund. The money represented contributions from individual employees of the company.

One large gift was a check for $3,824.97—a contribution from west coast lumber dealers and manufacturers in the States of Washington and Oregon. The check was in addition to a shipment of lumber and other building materials donated by the companies in May.

Lumber donations: On May 2 the *Coastal Monarch* left the harbor at Portland, Oreg., for Alaska with 4,100 tons of lumber and other building materials. The supplies were a donation from companies in Washington and Oregon. The ship arrived at Kodiak, where 1,608 tons were unloaded, on May 8. The rest of the supplies were unloaded at Seward on May 14. The Army Transportation Corps, which supplied the transportation, the Bureau of Yards and Docks, which did the unloading at Kodiak, and the Corps of Engineers, which did the unloading at Seward, were all reimbursed by OEP for transportation and stevedore costs.

AFL–CIO: The unions' headquarters in Washington, D.C., donated $25,000 for Alaskan reconstruction.

Others: The Alaska Educational Association disbursed about $30,000 as of May 1, 1964, to teachers who lost members of their families in the quake. The League of Women Voters has aided in relief, both on an immediate and a long-range basis, by helping to get information out to the public.

Many other organizations were ready to help if needed, and have plans for helping in the long-range reconstruction program. Among these are the Alaska Nurses Association, the Anchorage Community Chest, the Anchorage Women's Club, the local Order of Moose No. 1534, the Rainbow Demolay, the PEO Sisterhood, the National Association of Legal Secretaries, and the Anchorage Tuberculosis Association, Inc.

Finally, there were two new organizations formed as a result of the disaster: the Alaska Earthquake Disaster Fund and the Rebuild Alaska Committee.

The Alaska Earthquake Disaster Fund was organized in Fairbanks as a result of people from all over Alaska expressing a desire to contribute money for recovery. A trusteeship with three banks participating was set up to handle the donation fund. A special three-man committee, representing the fund, flew to Valdez. Some victims were evacuated, and housed and fed in Fairbanks. Arrangements were made for others to travel to the Lower 48.

The Rebuild Alaska Committee is a statewide incorporated organization attempting to raise money through a nationwide radio and television appeal sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters. The committee plans to make capital available to affected businesses and communities. As of August 15, the committee had $10,000 in available funds with a lot of mail not yet opened.

It is recognized that many other organizations and individuals made contributions and assisted Alaska in other ways, and that it would be impossible to assure appropriate recognition to all of the companies, labor unions, eleemosynary organizations, and individuals.

In the first few days after the March 27 earthquake, which was the fourth most intense in recorded history, and was made all the more unbearable and damaging because of its duration, it was impossible to assess the damage. What was known was that the Richter scale recorded an intensity of 8.4, one of the most violent ever experienced throughout the world. What was known was that the earthquake and subsequent waves had struck at the heart of Alaska's economic and population center. The disaster area encompassed 60 percent of Alaska's population, which produces over 55 percent of Alaska's revenue.

The Commission's report stated:

In a State with broad-based economy, such a blow would have been awesome. For Alaska, it was calamitous.

In the weeks and months which followed, more firm estimates have been possible. The report of the Office of Emergency Planning tells in these words of the damage:

The earthquake which struck south central Alaska on the evening of March 27, 1964, resulted in one of the greatest disasters in the recorded history of the United States.

The violent upheaval and subsidence of land caused by the quake itself and the mammoth tidal waves triggered by the seismic disturbance combined to produce major damage to homes, harbors, transportation systems, and public facilities over an area of about 50,000 square miles.

The severest damage occurred on the Kenai Peninsula—Cook Inlet area which includes Anchorage, Whittier, Homer, Seldovia, and Seward; Kodiak Island; and Valdez and Cordova on the northern and eastern shores of Prince William Sound.

Though this triangle comprises less than 10 percent of the land area of Alaska, nearly half of the population live and work in the affected area. It is the economic heart of the State. The major rail and highway lines to the interior pass through the damaged area. The fishing industry, the principal industrial and commercial firms, the major military bases, and the ports which feed the vast interior of the State are centered here.

Casualties were remarkably light; physical damage, in proportion to the total resources of the State, was extraordinarily heavy, with total public and private losses running to slightly over $300 million.

In a wealthier State a disaster of this magnitude would have caused great economic disruption. To Alaska, the economic consequences of the earthquake were catastrophic.

All Alaskan ports in the earthquake area were inoperable except the port of Anchorage where operations were severely restricted until emergency repairs could be made.

Approximately 150 miles of the single track Alaska Railroad from Seward north to Fairbanks suffered intermittent damage, principally at Seward, Whittier, Portage, Turnagain Arm, and Anchorage. Highways running through the area were affected by the collapse of bridges, landslides, and the subsidence of foundations.

Excessive damage occurred to the fishing fleet, small boat harbors, processing plants, and other waterfront installations vital to the fishing industry, upon which the economy of Alaska is largely dependent.

Military installations, including Fort Richardson, Elmendorf Air Force Base, and the naval station on Kodiak, suffered damages of about $36 million. Other Federal property also sustained damage in the amount of about $36 million.

Gross damage to public facilities of State and local governments is currently estimated at $110 million. This includes public buildings, schools, hospitals, airfields, city-owned docks, and public utilities. In addition, it is estimated that some $56 million will be required to restore State and local roads to preearthquake condition.

Private real property damaged or destroyed by the earthquake and tidal waves runs to about $77 million. Personal property losses have not been calculated.

The OEP estimate of damage of over $300 million compares with earlier damage estimates of between $400 and $500 million. The present figure derives from an August 12 OEP report, and is exclusive of personal property losses and losses in income:

Federal:	
Military	$35,610,000
Nonmilitary	35,641,000
Non-Federal:	
State and local	107,373,000
Highways	55,568,000
Real Private Property	77,000,000
Total	311,092,000

The first days after the disaster brought vital assistance and magnificent cooperation from the military establishment in Alaska, headed by Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves, Commander in Chief of the Alaskan Command. At all times, he and all officers and men under his command moved in concert with civilian officials. The story of this assistance is told in these words from the Commission's report:

During the first 48 hours following the earthquake, while the Federal Government was organizing its relief effort and bringing assistance into Alaska, the military components in Alaska initiated emergency relief measures to supplement State and local efforts.

The earthquake had completely disrupted normal civilian communications in the disaster area. Within minutes after the earthquake, the Command Post of the Alaskan Military Command at Anchorage became the center through which communications were reestablished between Alaska and Washington and between State and city civil defense headquarters in south-central Alaska.

The Military Affiliate Radio System (MARS) on Elmendorf Air Force Base went into operation on emergency power in less than 1 hour after the earthquake, and maintained a 24-hour schedule until April 15. MARS handled 9,379 messages.

Military communications personnel and signal battalions worked with civilian companies to restore communication service and to assure continuous service.

Assistance to the Greater Anchorage area began immediately. Military water trailers were supplying water to the Greater Anchorage area within 3 hours after the earthquake. Within 48 hours, four water purification units were flown in from the 4th Infantry Division at Fort Lewis, Wash.

At dawn, on the morning after the earthquake, a massive airlift began. Seventeen Provider (C–123) military transports of the Alaska Air Command carried relief supplies and equipment (provided largely from military stocks) to Seward, Valdez, Kodiak, and other isolated communities.

Also that same morning, Fort Richardson opened four field messhalls operating around the clock. One mess alone served 7,462 meals and used 198 pounds of coffee. Elmendorf's 5040th Food Service Squadron also went on 24-hour shifts, and during the 4 days following the earthquake served 44,487 regular meals and 11,820 C-ration meals.

Both Elmendorf and Richardson arranged emergency housing for displaced personnel. Within 2 hours, structures at those bases still safe for occupancy were identified; and bedding, rations, and field kitchens were available for about 5,000 people.

In response to a request from Anchorage officials, military authorities assigned troops to assist in security and travel control. Assignments were completed within 2 hours after the earthquake. By the second day after the earthquake, there were approximately 1,000 Army troops manning guard posts 24 hours a day in Anchorage.

In addition to the extensive assistance given by the military to the major urban area of Greater Anchorage, aid was given to virtually all other stricken areas. For example, at Kodiak, the Navy committed 1,135 men for 190,374 man-hours of emergency assistance work. The Navy distributed about 1,000 blankets which were flown in from Seattle and Whidbey Island; served 12,000 meals to evacuees during the first 48 hours; and supplied generators, pumps, medicine, rope, sleeping bags, and similar items urgently needed in Kodiak.

Additional materials and supplies made available by the military to civilian communities and Government agencies included hundreds of sleeping bags, beds, cases of C-rations, mattresses, blankets, wire, lime, sanitation kit, radio receivers, and arctic gear.

Military doctors and nurses assisted local medical authorities. The morning following the earthquake, a military medical team of 5 doctors, 10 nurses, 2 anesthetists and 20 medical specialists were flown to Alaska from Fort Lewis, Wash.

Local fuel distributors were provided 244,000 gallons of fuel oil from military stocks for relief of the local populace.

Military trucks, cranes, wreckers, bulldozers, and mobile radio units with drivers and operators were sent to assist civilian authorities.

This was the military community responding to the civilian community in a time of need.

An immediate personal inspection in Alaska was made by Director McDermott, at President Johnson's request, and by the Alaska congressional delegation. A few days later, the two Alaska Senators met with the President, Representative RALPH J. RIVERS having remained in the earthquake area, to lend assistance wherever possible. That meeting was also attended by Director McDermott and Director Kermit Gordon, of the Bureau of the Budget, and by members of their staffs.

It was then that the decision was made to organize the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska.

It was then that President Johnson suggested that Senator ANDERSON head the Commission.

It was on the same day, April 2, that the President signed Executive Order No. 11150, establishing the Commission, and designating Senator ANDERSON as its Chairman, and the following as members: The Secretaries of Defense, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor Health, Education, and Welfare; the Administrators of the Federal Aviation Agency, the Small Business Administration and the Housing and Home Finance

Agency; the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission; and the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

The following, taken from the Commission's report, tells in a brief way of the task forces created and the work of the Alaska Field Committee, and lists the personnel who, by their devoted hours of hard work, have earned the gratitude of all Alaskans:

THE FEDERAL COMMISSION'S TASK FORCES AND THE ALASKA FIELD COMMITTEE

I. TASK FORCES

At a meeting of the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska on April 7, 1964, agreement was reached to establish eight special task forces composed of representatives from selected Federal agencies.

Each of the task forces was given one specific area to study in order to assist the Federal Commission in developing coordinated reconstruction and long-range development plans for Alaska. These task forces were:

1. Community facilities.
2. Economic stabilization.
3. Financial institutions.
4. Housing.
5. Industrial development.
6. Natural resources.
7. Ports and fishing.
8. Transportation.

A Scientific and Engineering Task Force was established a short time later, after the need for this type of task force became evident.

II. ALASKA FIELD COMMITTEE

At the Federal Commission's meeting on April 7, it was decided that a field committee should be established in Alaska within the framework of the Commission. The membership was composed of representatives of agencies serving on the Federal Commission which have staffs in Alaska.

This committee provided coordination at the field level for those problems which cut across agency lines of responsibility. It helped to bridge the geographical gap of over 3,000 miles between Washington and the site of the reconstruction effort in Alaska. Through the field committee, information concerning the progress of reconstruction was forwarded directly to the Executive Director in Washington at the same time it was moving upward through channels in the responsible agencies. Problems in one agency affecting the work of other agencies were flagged at an early stage for both the interested agencies and the Commission.

Although the field committee did not have authority to direct actions of the various agencies, the drawing together of agency representatives in the field committee was one method of coordination used by the Federal Commission. As the design phase neared completion, special project management sessions were called by the chairman of the field committee involving those agencies having responsibility for reconstruction of public facilities. Primary purpose of these sessions was to flag problems and agree upon action to be taken.

TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP

Community facilities

Crow, John O., Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

Lund, Chester B., Office of Field Administrator, Health, Education, and Welfare.

Phillips, Robert Y., Director, Government Readiness, Office of Emergency Planning.

Wadsworth, John G., Deputy Assistant Commissioner for Buildings Management, General Services Administration.

Woolner, Sidney H., Commissioner, Community Facilities Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency (Chairman).

Economic stabilization

Lundquist, Clarence T., Administrator, Wage and Hour Public Contracts Division, Labor.

Skubal, Leonard A., Chief, Economic Stabilization Division, Office of Emergency Planning (Chairman).

Financial institutions

Carlock, John K., Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Treasury (Chairman).

Leef, Pierron R., Small Business Administration.

Solomon, Frederic, Director, Division of Examinations, Federal Reserve System.

Tracy, Frank E., Assistant to Board of Directors, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Walters, Lawrence M., Deputy Director, Division of Supervision and Examinations, Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Housing

Brickfield, Cyril F., Chief Benefits Director, Veterans' Administration.

Cowles, Clarence, Director, Office of Financial Services, Small Business Administration.

Malotky, Louis D., Director, Rural Housing Loan Division, Farmers Home Administration, Agriculture.

Schussheim, Morton J., Assistant Administrator, Program Policy, Housing and Home Finance Agency (Chairman).

Walters, Lawrence M., Deputy Director, Division of Supervision and Examinations, Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Industrial development

Bertsch, Anthony A., Assistant Administrator, Industrial Mobilization, Commerce.

Cass, Millard, Deputy Under Secretary, Labor.

Donat, George, Administrator, Business and Defense Services, Commerce (Chairman).

Eno, Lloyd, Office of Emergency Planning.

Struby, William F., Assistant to Director, Office of Financial Services, Small Business Administration.

Tidd, J. Thomas, Deputy Director, Office of Policy Development, Federal Aviation Agency.

Natural resources development

Green, John C., Director, Office of Research, Office of Emergency Planning.

Johnson, Wendell E., Civil Works, Office of Chief of Engineers, Department of Army, Defense.

Rettie, James B., Jr., Senior Economist, Office of the Secretary, Interior (Chairman).

Tomlinson, George E., Deputy Chief, Bureau of Power, Federal Power Commission.

Walter, George H., Deputy Assistant to the Secretary, Agriculture.

Ports and fishing

Gurnee, Mark S., Civil Works, Office of Chief of Engineers, Department of Army, Defense.

Laferty, John G., Chief, Food, Welfare and Fuels Resources, Resources Readiness Division, Office of Emergency Planning.

McKernan, Donald L. Director, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Interior (Chairman).

Struby, William F., Assistant to Director, Office of Financial Services, Small Business Administration.

Scientific and engineering

Algermissen, S. T., Data Analysis and Research Branch, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Commerce.

Dobrovolny, Ernest, Engineering Geology Branch, Geological Survey, Interior.

Eberlein, G. D., Alaskan Geology Branch, Geological Survey, Interior.

Gates, George O., U.S. Geological Survey, Interior (alternate to Eberlein).

Nesbitt, R. H., Civil Works, Office of Chief of Engineers, Department of Army, Defense.

Schaem, William E., Military Construction, Office of Chief of Engineers, Department of Army, Defense (Chairman).

Whitten, C. A., Office of Physical Sciences, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Commerce.

Scientific and engineering field team

Carstensen, Ove, North Pacific Division, Corps of Engineers, Department of Army, Defense.

Cloud, William K., Seismological Field Survey, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Commerce.

Dobrovolny, Ernest, Engineer, Geology Branch, Geological Survey, Interior.

Eckel, Edwin B., Special Projects Branch, Geological Survey, Interior (Chairman).

Stuart, W. Harold, North Pacific Division, Corps of Engineers, Department of Army, Defense.

Transportation

Bridwell, Lowell K., Special Assistant to Under Secertary for Transportation, Commerce (Chairman).

Caputo, Vincent F., Director, Transportation and Warehousing Policy, Installation and Logistics, Defense.

Mangan, Robert M., The Alaska Railroad, Interior.

May, Timothy J., Managing Director, Federal Maritime Commission.

Revelle, Paul, Office of Emergency Planning.

Tidd, J. Thomas, Deputy Director, Office of Policy Development, Federal Aviation Agency.

ALASKA FIELD COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Burke Riley, Regional Coordinator, Department of the Interior (Chairman).

Francis Anderson, Corps of Engineers.

Robert Butler, Branch Manager, Small Business Administration.

Dr. Ardell B. Colyar, Deputy Regional Director, Arctic Health Research Center.

Clyde S. Courtnage, Director, Alaska Field Office, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Col. Clare F. Farley (replaced Colonel Sawyer on August 22, 1964), District Engineer, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army.

Joseph Fiala, State Supervisor, Department of Labor.

Victor Fischer, Assistant Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Joseph H. FitzGerald, Coordinator, Alaska Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission.

Dr. Jack A. King, Veterinarian in Charge, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

John Manley, General Manager, Alaska Railroad.

Dr. Allan Mick, Director, Experimental Station, Agriculture.

Nile Paull, Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency.

James G. Rogers, Director, Federal Aviation Agency.

Col. K. T. Sawyer, District Engineer, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army.

A. Q. Stine, Farmers Home Administration, Agriculture.

Creath A. Tooley, Office of Emergency Planning, Representative.

Roger Waller, Coordinator, U.S. Geological Survey.

Dr. Holman Wherritt, Deputy Area Medical Officer in Charge, Public Health Service.

R. H. Willman, Office of Emergency Planning, Representative.

FEDERAL RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMMISSION FOR ALASKA

Staff members[1]

Dwight A. Ink, Executive Director, Atomic Energy Commission.

Frank C. DiLuzio, Assistant to the Chairman.

Wilmot L. Averill, Deputy Executive Director.

Col. Harry N. Tufts, Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee.

---

[1] The majority of the Commission staff were on loan part time from other agencies.

Howard Bray, Press Secretary to the Chairman.
Col. Harold F. Dyer, Corps of Engineers.
David B. Finnegan, Department of the Interior.
Lewis David Gelfan, Information Advisor.
Hugh A. Johnson, Department of Agriculture.
Eugene Keith, Atomic Energy Commission.
Milton M. Mayer, Housing and Home Finance Agency.
John McCollum, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
Col. William J. Penly, Corps of Engineers.
Joseph E. Reeve, Bureau of the Budget.
Robert M. Webb, Department of Agriculture.
Dale E. Zimmerman, Department of Interior.
Jean L. Barker, Secretary.
Luna E. Diamond, Secretarial Assistant to the Chairman.
Margaret S. Dougherty, Secretary.
Thelma V. Fleming, Atomic Energy Commission.
Rhoda W. Gorman, Administrative Assistant.
Helen Marmoll, Editorial Assistant.
Marlou Quintana, Clerical Assistant to the Chairman.
Zell Skillern, Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee.
Sandra V. Watson, Clerk-Stenographer.

On the day following the creation of the Federal Reconstruction Commission, Alaska's Gov. William A. Egan—whose leadership has been remarkable in every way—established the Alaska Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission, which worked with the Federal Commission in the restoration of Alaska. Governor Egan sent to Washington, to remain here for many weeks, George N. Hayes, Alaska's able and energetic attorney general, who, only recently, returned to the private practice of law. His contributions were many, and important. Enough credit cannot be heaped upon him. The Governor also called upon the abilities of Joseph H. FitzGerald, by naming him coordinator of the State's commission.

In the meantime, the Office of Emergency Planning had moved into high gear, under the authority of the Federal Disaster Act, Public Law 81–875. In major disaster areas, funds are allocated from the President's Disaster Fund to supplement State and local efforts for the protection of life and property and the emergency repair of essential public facilities.

As described in the OEP's recent report to the President, here is how the program was applied in Alaska:

On the recommendation of OEP, the President, on April 3, approved an initial allocation of $5 million for disaster relief operations in Alaska. A second allocation in the amount of $12 million was made on June 12. Further allocations will be recommended to the President as the Public Law 81–857 work progresses. Most of the money made available by the President will be used for the reimbursement of Federal agencies performing work at the request of OEP.

While restoration of public facilities under the Federal Disaster Act is limited to "emergency repairs and temporary replacements," much of the work authorized by OEP in Alaska will, nevertheless, contribute to the permanent reconstruction program. Through close coordination of the plans and actions of the several departments and agencies represented on the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska, which was established by executive order on April 2, an orderly and effective progression from the immediate post-disaster phase to the recovery and eventual rehabilitation periods is now underway.

As plans for the meshing of immediate recovery and long-range reconstruction activities proceeded in Washington, a wide range of emergency activities continued in the disaster area, directed and coordinated by the OEP field office in Anchorage.

Much of the work was performed by other Federal agencies under direct assignment from OEP. Other work was undertaken under the statutory authorities of other agencies.

OEP assigned specific missions to individual agencies consistent with their day-to-day responsibilities. The Corps of Engineers was requested to perform demolition and debris clearance; the emergency restoration of public utilities; and the rebuilding of docks, schools, hospitals, and other essential facilities in most damaged areas of the State. The Navy's Bureau of Yards and Docks was asked to perform similar functions on Kodiak Island. The Federal Aviation Agency was requested to repair damaged State and municipal airports. The Housing and Home Finance Agency was asked to develop plans for meeting emergency housing needs.

First priority was given to the emergency repair of damaged water and sewage systems whose disruption constituted an immediate health hazard. Power and communications systems essential to the public welfare were also given prompt attention.

Demolition of damaged structures and the clearance of debris and wreckage from disaster-affected areas was begun immediately.

The various modes of transportation serving Alaska were restored to service in a relatively short time, though permanent repair and replacement will require large expenditures and up to 3 years of construction.

To insure that damaged or destroyed facilities would be reconstructed on sound building sites, OEP directed that scientific studies of soil foundations and altered land configurations be made at selected locations throughout the damaged area. Permanent reconstruction activities depend to a large degree on the results of this preliminary and exploratory work. Where work could proceed without awaiting the results of these tests, OEP authorized immediate repairs to essential public facilities.

Current estimates for work authorized under Public Law 875 range between $60 and $70 million. Twenty-seven percent of the authorized work was under contract by mid-August, and about 15 percent of the total work is now complete.

Mr. President, many Federal agencies have rendered assistance and are giving it. Damaged military installations are being repaired by the Department of Defense; the Alaska Railroad and dock and rail facilities at Seward are being rebuilt; roads and bridges in the forests and on the Federal Aid Highway System are being reconstructed; small boat harbors, so vital to Alaska's fishing industry, will be restored; native villages are being restored or relocated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, with the assistance of the Red Cross, the Lions Club, and other private organizations and individuals; and schools are being rebuilt. What seemed an impossible task is being conquered.

Many other steps were taken by Federal agencies within existing authority. Every agency has worked hard to assist. Laws and regulations have been interpreted as liberally as possible; and concrete help, through waivers, forgiveness of debts where possible, expanded loan programs and other help, has come from such agencies as the Small Business Administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Farmers Home Administration, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Veterans' Administration. From them has come the kind of help which will go far to make Alaska whole again.

Of particular importance to Alaska's recovery has been the disaster loan program of the SBA, as put into effect by Alaska's great friend, Administrator Eugene P. Foley. Mr. Foley rushed financial experts to Alaska, and opened emergency offices in Anchorage, Kodiak, Seward, Homer, Seldovia, and Valdez. Disaster loans have been made to repair or replace homes and businesses. Such loans are made at an interest rate of 3 percent; and Mr. Foley established amortization periods as long as 30 years, where warranted. A moratorium on interest for 1 year and on the payment of the principal for 5 years has been granted in many instances.

As of September 23, the SBA had approved for Alaska:

455 home disaster loans	$9,014,594
490 business disaster loans	41,555,985
Total	50,570,579

Of this total, 814 checks, for $33,279,727, had been issued.

Another example of Federal loan assistance comes from the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. The fishing industry, a major factor in Alaska's economy, suffered about $14 million in damages to, and losses of, boats, canneries, and gear. Under special 3-percent interest disaster terms, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has, from its fisheries loan program, approved 59 applications, amounting to $9,575,000, following the Alaska disaster.

The loan programs of the Federal Government have been intelligently applied to meet the need and to demonstrate the Government's faith in the future of Alaska.

From the beginning, Mr. President, Congress showed a determination to stand by the State of Alaska. Unprecedented speed attended its first action. In 1 day, both the House and the Senate voted to replenish the President's disaster fund by $50 million, not specifically appropriated for Alaska, but understood to be used there in large measure.

The passage by Congress of several other vital measures was swift.

I would be reciting a far different story today if Congress had not demonstrated its sympathy and goodwill by the passage of concrete and helpful legislation. Alaskans will always be grateful to all the Members of Congress, and particularly to the leadership on both sides of the aisle, to the chairmen of the House and Senate Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to the chairmen of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and the other members of those four committees.

The legislative history of the Alaska disaster measures for both the public

and the private sectors of Alaska's economy is recorded in the report of the Federal Reconstruction Commission, as is a table setting forth in summary Federal assistance for Alaska which has been given and which it is estimated will be required, as follows:

SPECIAL LEGISLATION

Although unparalleled Federal assistance was being provided, it was soon apparent that Alaska would require even more Federal disaster aid than could be provided under existing programs.

TRANSITIONAL GRANTS

In 1959, Congress appropriated $28.5 million in transitional grants for a 5-year period in order to help Alaska assume responsibility for public services previously provided by the Federal Government. This authority expired on June 30, 1964.

In order to maintain essential local and State services after the earthquake, the President requested a $22.5 million authorization in new transitional grants for the period through June 30, 1966. The loss of tax revenue and emergency expenditures jeopardized the continuation of many State and local government services. Municipal operations in several small communities would have been crippled without Federal assistance. The Bureau of the Budget estimated there would be a requirement for $22.5 million to meet the shortfall in Alaska's anticipated revenues and to provide for extraordinary State and local expenditures.

Congress increased the President's request for transitional grant funds from $22.5 to $23.5 million to allow for loss of revenue by the Anchorage Independent School District. On May 25, the President requested a $17 million appropriation from this authorization as part of a broad request for $52.2 million to meet various program requirements in Alaska. Except for $500,000 allocated to the Federal Aviation Agency to continue airport operations, all of the $17 million transitional grant money has been turned over to the State. The total amount appropriated by the Congress was about $41 million after major deletions of $5.2 million for the Alaska Railroad, and $5.6 million for Corps of Engineers small-boat harbor expansion projects.

RETROACTIVE INSURANCE

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON of Washington, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, introduced S. 2719 which was a measure to provide retroactive earthquake insurance to Alaskans. Hearings were held on this bill. The administration witnesses objected to the proposal and recommended that the problem of earthquake insurance be part of the study that would be authorized by S. 2032.

AMENDMENTS TO ALASKA OMNIBUS ACT

While the task forces and special committees were gathering data for their reports to the Commission, Federal agencies were preparing recommendations concerning needs for special legislation. Following a careful review of various legislative proposals submitted by the several Federal agencies, the Commission recommended a broad legislative package to the President.

In drafting this legislation, the Commission, recognizing the need for early passage limited the legislation to Alaska and the disaster area to avoid issues unrelated to the Alaska disaster. The proposed legislation amended the Alaska Omnibus Act and provided additional, and in most cases, new types of assistance for highways, urban renewal, debt adjustment, harbor, and disaster loans.

In transmitting this proposal to Congress on May 27, 1964, the President said:

"The legislation which I am proposing—based on recommendations of the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska—will provide greater flexibility in Federal programs to cope with the extraordinary circumstances arising out of the earthquake.

"Concern for our fellow citizen alone compels prompt action on this proposal but practical considerations are also most important. The construction season in Alaska is about to begin and is of short duration. The sooner Alaska can complete its reconstruction efforts the sooner it can begin to devote its efforts toward the further development of the State's resources."

The legislation was introduced as S. 2881 and H.R. 11438 and was referred to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of both Houses to expedite handling, since these committees had jurisdiction over the Alaska Statehood Act and the Alaska Omnibus Act 6 years earlier.

One of the immediate needs in Alaska was restoration of severely-damaged roads. To repair and reconstruct the Federal-aid highways outside the national forests, the new legislation provides for an increase in the Federal share of reconstruction costs from 50 to 94.9 percent. This adopts the same formula used in determining the Federal share of costs for new construction of Federal-aid highways in Alaska. To cover this increase, appropriations for this purpose were not to exceed $51 million.

The legislation authorizes the Corps of Engineers to make modifications on previously authorized civil works projects, if modification was needed to overcome the adverse effects of the earthquake. This legislation was designed primarily to assist in the expansion of small-boat harbors to provide for current and reasonably prospective requirements.

The legislation also authorizes the Farmers Home Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration and the Housing and Home Finance Agency to adjust the indebtedness of some of their borrowers, thereby enabling them to overcome some earthquake losses. The purpose of this amendment to adjust indebtedness was to place the programs of these agencies on the same general footing as other Federal loan programs.

Another amendment to the Omnibus Act authorizes the Administrator of HHFA to enter into contracts for grants not exceeding $25 million for urban renewal projects in the Alaskan disaster area. Such authorization was in addition to and separate from that in the Housing Act of 1949. The Commission did not recommend any percentage increase in the Federal share for urban renewal projects.

In order to restore the State's credit and to help finance the State's earthquake-related capital projects, the legislation authorizes purchase by the Federal Government of up to $25 million of State of Alaska bonds or the loan of $25 million to the State.

The Federal Commission hoped that the State's ability to sell bonds at a near normal interest rate (3.5 to 4 percent) might encourage the sale of Alaska bonds in the private market. If not, as soon as the State's credit was restored, the bonds could either be sold in the private market by the Federal Government, or refinanced in the private market by the State.

Congress amended the Commission-sponsored legislation in three principal areas:

First, the Federal share of urban renewal projects in the Alaskan disaster area was increased from 75 percent to 90 percent of the net project cost. After the initial cost estimates were substantially reduced, and land stabilization measures found necessary, the Commission agreed that an increase in the Federal share to 90 percent was justified.

Second, Congress authorized HHFA to purchase (as part of the $25 million bond authorization provision) up to $7.2 million in State of Alaska bonds for completing State capital improvement programs. Before the earthquake, these bonds had been approved by the State but not issued.

Third, Congress provided authority for Federal grants to help adjust or retire the outstanding mortgage obligations on the 1- to 4-family properties which were severely damaged or destroyed by the earthquake. In carrying out this provision, the President may make grants to the State not to exceed $5.5 million, to match State funds on a 50–50 basis.

The mortgage retirement provision specifies that in order for the State to receive a grant, it must submit an implementing plan to be approved by the President. This plan must: designate the State agency responsible for retiring or adjusting the mortgages; assure that the mortgagor will absorb the damage loss to the extent of his equity in the property in addition to paying $1,000 on his outstanding mortgage obligation; limit the payments on a single property to $30,000; issue regulations providing equitable treatment for all; prevent unjustified windfalls to the State, mortgagees, or mortgagors; and make such reports as the President requests.

Congress completed action on this legislation on August 8, 1964; and the President signed the bill on August 19, 1964. These amendments were the culmination of legislative proposals designed to aid in the reconstruction of Alaska. The following is a table summarizing actual and anticipated Federal assistance to Alaska.

Estimated Federal assistance to Alaska resulting from Mar. 27, 1964, earthquake

[In millions]

	Total Federal costs [1]
Federal aid to State and local governments:	
Disaster relief (OEP)	$60.0 to $70.0
Transitional grants (President)	17.0 to 23.5
Highways (Commerce)	43.0 to 63.0
Urban Renewal grants (HHFA)	25.0 to 40.0
Purchase of Alaska bonds (HHFA)	10.0 to 25.0
Planning advances (HHFA)	.3 to .4
Subtotal	155.3 to 221.9
Federal aid to private individuals and groups:	
Loans by SBA, Interior, Agriculture	60.0 to 70.0
Forgiveness and other adjustments on outstanding loans (Agriculture, HHFA, VA, and President)	7.0 to 10.0
Tax refunds and offsets (Treasury)	20.0 to 30.0
Subtotal	87.0 to 110.0
Restoration of Federal facilities and direct Federal operations:	
Defense facilities, etc. (Defense)	$35.6
Alaska Railroad (Interior)	27.0
All other Federal agencies	19.6
Subtotal	82.2
Grand total (nearest million)	325.0 to 414.0

[1] Single figures have been added into both totals.

How did the Federal Government go about its monumental task, when faced, as it was, with Alaska's short construction season and problems of immense dimensions? Here are excerpts from the

Commission's report on reconstruction plans and scheduling:

These plans were developed by Federal, State, and local officials in cooperation with the Commission staff. In addition, staff representatives worked closely with OEP and the Department of Defense personnel in expediting work schedules.

The Commission has, however, avoided placing all work on a crash basis in order to lessen inflation pressures, discourage the importation of non-Alaskan labor and pace the reconstruction period for noncritical work. The Commission believes that this policy will strengthen the Alaskan economy. The Office of Emergency Planning estimates that about two-thirds of the Public Law 81–875 funds available to Alaska will be under contract by the end of 1964. By this time, at least one-third of the emergency reconstruction will be completed.

A pattern was followed during reconstruction planning in order to insure a sound reconstruction program. First, the responsible agencies made emergency repairs to the utilities and highways. Second, extensive geology and soils studies were made to determine where these facilities should be permanently reconstructed. Third, the projects were designed. (In order to expedite the reconstruction, project design often paralleled the soil studies.) Finally, proposals from potential contractors were evaluated and contracts awarded. Because of the short construction season, almost every step was telescoped in time over that normally required. The Commission has urged the use of double shifts, incentive contracts, and more stringent project control methods, whenever necessary.

WATER AND SEWERS

Top priority has been given to the restoration of water and sewer lines. Within a few days after the earthquake, emergency repairs were started by the Department of Defense at the request of OEP. Irrigation pipes were laid above ground and garden hoses connected to houses as a temporary water system in many areas.

Permanent reconstruction and restoration of all seriously damaged waterlines were scheduled for completion by early fall. All major breaks in sewerlines will be restored this summer and fall.

HIGHWAYS

Except for the highway around Turnagain Arm and along Copper River, all highways have been temporarily repaired and can handle normal traffic loads at reduced speeds. Permanent reconstruction has been scheduled over a 3-year period. Reconstructing all damaged highways to present design standards would cost a maximum of $65 million. This figure includes the $29 million required for repair and replacement of forest highways, and $36 million for other highways in the Federal-aid system.

A major problem is the highway which runs for many miles along the coast at the base of mountains around Turnagain Arm. Because of the general subsidence of land in that part of Alaska, much of the highway is flooded at high tide. The State highway commission, utilizing 94.9 percent Federal grant funds made available under the Omnibus Act, has made a major effort to raise the level of the road sufficiently to withstand the high tides expected in September, October and November of 1964. The high tides, accompanied by unfavorable winds, could tear out substantial portions of the road already restored.

ALASKA RAILROAD

Alaska Railroad reconstruction is being accomplished by internal resources, by contract and through the Corps of Engineers (Seward port facilities). Excluding the Seward facilities and the rail line from Portage to Seward, the railroad will be restored to prequake standards by the end of the year. The railroad is currently carrying more freight than last year at this time.

The railroad around Turnagain Arm, however, is confronted with inundation following high tides this fall similar to the problem of the highway. Land subsidence has placed much of the track below water level, but the roadbed is being raised and armored with riprap as rapidly as possible, in a race against the high fall tides.

SCHOOLS

Repair of most of the schools will be finished in time for the 1964 fall term. Where permanent new buildings are required, however, completion is scheduled for the opening of school in 1965. Double shifts will be necessary in only two or three schools this fall as a result of earthquake damage.

AIRFIELDS

Because air transportation plays a major role in Alaska, airport facilities had to be restored as rapidly as possible. Accordingly, the Federal Aviation Agency effort was directed toward the repair, either permanent or temporary, of FAA owned and operated air navigation and traffic control facilities. Almost all of the FAA facilities were operable within 9 hours after the earthquake.

Although the runways and taxiways at Anchorage International Airport were operable, the earthquake destroyed the traffic control tower. Emergency measures were taken immediately; and within an hour, air traffic was being controlled from an FAA-owned aircraft parked on the field. Later, a temporary traffic control tower was established at Lake Hood. This facility will be used until the new traffic control tower is constructed this fall.

In the Seward area, a mobile air traffic control tower was also established. Destruction of harbor and railroad facilities, and severe damage to the Seward-Anchorage road link, made air transportation the chief means of support in Seward for 40 days. FAA also repaired communications systems used by the Weather Bureau.

Considerable FAA effort has been devoted to the inspection of remote airfields and the development of plans for repairing the nine State- or municipally-owned fields. Most of the necessary repairs will be completed this fall.

PORTS

Port facilities are vital to the economy of Alaska, and their reconstruction has been assigned a priority second only to that of water and sewers. Almost all of the goods going to and from central Alaska pass through these port facilities. Further, the economies of most of the small towns in this area depend heavily upon the fishing industries and require docks and small-boat harbors for their existence.

Planning for small-boat harbor construction has been complicated by delays in the passage of the omnibus act brought about by prolonged consideration of certain amendments. However, the design has not been delayed and restoration work is about to begin.

The first objective has been to proceed fast enough with construction to provide limited protection for small fishing boats during this winter. Completion of the harbors is scheduled for winter or early spring, in order to be ready for the spring fishing season. The omnibus act authorized expansion of harbors in several communities beyond that which existed at the time of the earthquake. (Funds had not yet been appropriated at the time of this report.) Dock rebuilding schedules are similar to those of small-boat harbors.

POWER

The largest nonmilitary power project in Alaska, the Eklutna hydroelectric project, received only minor damage and was able to continue normal operations after the earthquake. The second largest nonmilitary generating plant, the Cooper Lake project of the Chugach Electric Cooperative Association, also received only minor damage although there was major damage to part of the Anchorage transmission line. The line has been restored on a temporary basis. Service to Kenai Peninsula was not interrupted.

A number of the smaller powerplants in the earthquake area were damaged; but service was quickly restored through interconnections with other sources, and through utilization of mobile generating units provided by the military. Immediately following the earthquake, the Federal Power Commission sent a team of engineers to Alaska. The resulting FPC report was given to all agencies concerned.

Reconstruction efforts have included urban renewal project planning for Anchorage, Valdez, Seldovia, Kodiak, Seward, and Cordova; and special terms were written into the Alaska Omnibus Act for a helpful matching ratio of 90 to 10 on the Federal-local share of net project costs. It is expected that the Federal share will be in the neighborhood of $25 million.

Exclusive of any urban renewal assistance which may be given, the Commission's report gives the following summary of reconstruction activities in the Communities of Anchorage, Cordova, Homer, Kodiak, Seldovia, Seward, Valdez, and Whittier:

ANCHORAGE

In addition to structural damage from the magnitude and duration of the quake, major destruction was caused by quake-induced landslides. Anchorage did not receive serious damage from the tsunami. The major destruction occurred from four slides: Fourth Avenue, L Street, Turnagain Heights, and Government Hill. An extensive geological and soils exploration and evaluation project which provided reconstruction guidance was made. In order that reconstruction in the suspected landslide areas would not be delayed until the final reports were completed, arrangements were made for priority of four preliminary reports. This allowed earlier initiation of reconstruction.

All emergency work has been completed, including temporary (summer) sewer and water repairs, temporary power system repairs, city dock repair, emergency repairs to Anchorage International Airport, a temporary bulk petroleum tanker unloading facility, and necessary demolition and cleanup.

Permanent repairs to utilities are scheduled for completion as follows: Muncipal light and power repair—August 1965, with the priority work to be done in 1964; water system—completed in November 1964, with priority work done by September 1964; sanitary sewers—completed July 1965, with priority work done in 1964; storm sewers—completed July 1965, with priority work done in 1964.

Repairs to city-owned public buildings are scheduled for completion in November 1964. Repairs to schools in the Anchorage Independent School District are scheduled to be completed in August 1964, in time for the fall term—except for West High School which will be rebuilt by September 1965; the Denali Elementary School, by December 1964; and Government Hill Elementary School which should occupy a new building by July 1965.

Permanent repairs to Anchorage International Airport are underway. The new control tower is scheduled for completion in November 1964. Reconstruction and repairs to the Alaska Railroad building complex in Anchorage will be complete in November

1964, and the marshaling yard should be restored by November 1965.

The urban renewal project for the central business district is underway with the design of large-scale landslide stabilization measures designed to protect adjacent private property valued at many millions of dollars. The reconstruction phase of the projects, if approved, will be completed in 1965. The city has decided to go forward with a pilot stabilization project in the residential area of Turnagain, using urban renewal funds.

As of August 20, 1964, the Office of Emergency Planning has estimated eligible reconstruction projects for this community at $17,260,000. The Anchorage Independent School District has eligible projects estimated to cost $5,529,000.

CORDOVA

The tsunami which reached Cordova elevated the water 5 feet above the highest high-tide line; and extensive damage to piers, docks and houses resulted along the waterfront. The vicinity was further affected by a general uplift between +6.5 and +7.5 feet which impaired the utilization of the shoreline installations by the lowered water levels. The restoration of the small-boat harbor is scheduled to begin about mid-September and be completed about the end of this year. Repair and extension of the sewer outfall was completed at the end of August. Restoration of the water system will proceed on a priority basis with completion scheduled this fall. Two urban renewal projects to rehabilitate the shoreline facilities are being formulated.

As of August 20, 1964, the Office of Emergency Planning has approved reconstruction projects for this community at an estimated total cost of $1,421,000.

HOMER

Losses on the 5-mile Homer Spit, resulting from land subsidence and high water, included serious damage to the highway, the city dock, the small-boat harbor, POL tankage, canneries, and tourist facilities.

A temporary dock has been built and a permanent city dock is to be completed by November 15, 1964. Replacement of the small-boat harbor and facilities began in August and is scheduled for completion June 15, 1965, with a usable portion to be completed by this winter. The highway reconstruction on a higher grade to compensate for the subsidence will be delayed until next spring to permit evaluation of the new pattern of erosion or deposition to be established over the winter season. Hospital and grade school repairs are minor and are scheduled for completion by August 30, 1964.

As of August 20, 1964, the Office of Emergency Planning has approved reconstruction projects for this community at an estimated total cost of $1,565,000.

KODIAK

The disaster struck Kodiak in three phases—quake, inundations, and 100-knot winds. The industrial waterfront and the low-lying commercial area were severely damaged.

Demolition of unsafe structures and cleanup of debris are complete. Repairs to the sewage lift station are complete. Repairs to sidewalks, sewer, water, and storm drain systems are scheduled for completion in October 1964. A contract for a displaced persons trailer camp has been awarded. A new city dock is being built using, in part, a grant in lieu of repair. Completion is scheduled for July 1965, with a usable facility by December 1964.

The raising of both breakwaters has been completed. Contracts for restoration of small-boat harbor facilities (floats, parking lot, etc.) were let in August and are scheduled for completion in January 1965; inner floats, October 31, 1964.

An urban renewal project for the heavily damaged commercial area has been agreed upon; and land acquisition to permit utility installations before severe weather is being expedited. The lower portion of the commercial section is being filled to compensate for the general subsidence of Kodiak of 5 to 6 feet.

As of August 20, 1964, the Office of Emergency Planning has approved reconstruction projects for this community at an estimated total cost of $3,194,000.

SEWARD

Damage at Seward was caused by shoreline and offshore slides, tsunamis, and fire. The fire, resulting from the ruptured oil tanks, was carried by the tsunamis and slide-induced waves.

The small-boat harbor disappeared. Most of the railroad trackage within the city, a large portion of the water, sewer, and powerlines, the electric generating station, and most of the petroleum bulk storage tanks were lost.

Debris cleanup, except for the Alaska Railroad area, is complete. Most emergency repairs are complete and reconstruction has begun.

Repairs to the Seward Airport are scheduled for completion in September 1964. Seward's city dock should be usable by November 1964, and completely restored by September 1965. Restoration of water and sewage lines has been assigned high priority to insure restoration of services in October 1964, before the cold weather. The city hospital and public school repairs should be finished by September 1964.

The electric distribution system should be restored by November 1964. Permament restoration of the powerplant is scheduled for completion October 30, 1965. Meanwhile, arrangements have been made to provide emergency standby power.

The small-boat basin is scheduled for completion by March 1965, and the floats and other inner harbor facilities should be installed by May 1965. Design of the railroad dock warehouses and marshaling yard is complete, but the project completion date has not yet been established.

An urban renewal project is being planned for the waterfront area of the city where most of the extensive earthquake and tsunami damage occurred in Seward. The new plan places the port facilities where they are less vulnerable to slides resulting from earthquakes.

As of August 20, 1964, the Office of Emergency Planning has approved reconstruction projects for this community at an estimated total cost of $10,268,000.

SELDOVIA

Seldovia's quake-resultant problem is land subsidence. In relation to the tides, Seldovia's waterfront is several feet lower than before, and because much of the town is on pilings along the boardwalk, it is in jeopardy when high winds combine with high tides.

The airport and the airport road repairs are scheduled for completion in September 1964. The rock breakwaters at Seldovia are being raised and replacement of boat and seaplane floats are scheduled for completion in September 1964. An emergency proposal to provide storm wave protection during high tides by sinking four surplus ships offshore from the endangered facilities is being evaluated.

An urban renewal project has been proposed for Seldovia and the preliminary work necessary for preparing a project plan is in process. Under this project, land will be developed on which buildings now threatened by high tides can move to higher ground. The city will receive a Public Law 875 grant in lieu of raising its boardwalk which will supplement the urban renewal funds.

As of August 20, 1964, the Office of Emergency Planning has approved reconstruction projects for this community at an estimated total cost of $1,035,000.

VALDEZ

The quake and tsunamis caused the industrial waterfront to slide into the bay and most of the remaining village was severely damaged by the inundations. The proposal of the town to abandon the damaged townsite in favor of the Mineral Creek site was strongly endorsed by the Scientific and Engineering Task Force and is being made possible under the aegis of an urban renewal project and Public Law 81–875. The major expenditure of funds, therefore, is for the new site with only the minimum effort required to enable residents to live at the existing site during the winter is being scheduled.

Emergency repairs to the city hospital and the old ferry landing were completed on May 22, 1964. Debris removal was completed in June. Priority was given to the winterizing of the sewer and water systems in the existing townsite which was completed in August 1964. Temporary repair of those portions of the junior-senior high school to be used this winter is scheduled for completion in September 1964.

Valdez Airport and the Robe Lake Seaplane Base repairs are scheduled for completion by the end of September 1964.

The urban renewal project for the new Mineral Creek townsite was utilized to comprehensively plan land utilization, utility and street layouts as well as integrate the waterfront and town development.

The old road to the new townsite is being maintained until it is replaced by a permanent highway.

Replacement of the grade school at the new townsite is scheduled for completion in September 1964. A usable city dock facility at the new townsite will be available in November 1964, with completion by August 30, 1965.

The small-boat basin and inner-harbor facilities at the new site should be completed in May 1965, although the scheduled progress will permit limited use this winter. Reconstruction of the State mental health hospital and the highway administration facilities at the new townsite is being scheduled by the State.

As of August 20, 1964, the Office of Emergency Planning has approved reconstruction projects for this community at an estimated total cost of $5,977,000.

WHITTIER

Although seismic shock damaged some of the structures, more destruction was caused by the high water and the fire which followed. Except for a small amount of debris clearance, minimum restoration of rail and rail unloading facilities has been accomplished by the Department of Interior. It is anticipated that on the completion of the rail dock, yard, and warehouse complex in Seward, all functions but the seatrain activity currently in Whittier will be relocated at Seward.

As of August 20, 1964, the Office of Emergency Planning has approved reconstruction projects for this community at an estimated total cost of $14,000.

Plus the following from the OEP report:

Old Harbor and Kaguyak, coastal communities on Kodiak Island, were completely wiped out by the tidal wave. Ouzinkie, at the northeast tip of the island, was also severely damaged. All three villages are being rebuilt with assistance from the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The high school at Palmer, north of Anchorage, suffered minor damage. Repairs were completed in May at a cost of $10,000.

Kenai Central High School sustained $15,000 in eligible Public Law 875 damage.

Emergency repairs will be accomplished in September.

Klawock, on Prince of Wales Island far to the southeast of the area of major destruction, lost its harbor floats. They are being replaced by OEP at a cost of $25,000.

Girdwood and Soldatna on the Kenai Peninsula, sustained some damage to transportation facilities, but service was quickly restored.

In his report to the President, the OEP's Director McDermott has reached the following conclusions:

The Federal family has learned much from this unprecedented experience and these lessons, properly applied, can substantially improve our capability to deal with any emergency that may confront us. For example:

(a) The validity of our present approach to resources management, known as the comprehensive program, has been verified and the early extension of this capability to all States and territories is highly desirable.

(b) There is no substitute for preplanned and tested procedures to deal with the problems of disaster.

(c) Damage assessment techniques must be improved and developmental work on a national system for the management of resources in an emergency must be continued as a priority nonmilitary preparedness program.

(d) Recovery from any disaster can best be expedited by centralized authority, direction and control of the many elements of government, at all levels, that contribute to the rehabilitation effort.

In its report to President Johnson, the Federal Reconstruction Commission submits 13 recommendations, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to minimize destruction and loss of life in future earthquakes, the Federal Commission offers the following recommendations:

(a) Conduct additional research on earthquake prediction techniques and on the propagation of seismic waves on land and sea.

(b) Establish a seismic sea-wave warning system in Alaska to provide the earliest possible warning to coastal areas of that State. The Honolulu service is wholly inadequate when an earthquake occurs in or near Alaska. It is necessary to improve and extend our sea-wave warning system in order to predict the magnitude of the wave, as well as the time of arrival.

(c) Utilizing all available information, initiate an earthquake hazard study of those populated areas within the U.S. portion of the circum-Pacific seismic belt which are of special interest from engineering, geologic and seismic standpoints. Principal types of earth materials should be classified with respect to recorded seismic activity, their probable response to seismic shock and the likelihood of damage to buildings.

(d) In those coastal areas in which dock and other port installations are subject to potential sliding, undertake coastal and marine geologic studies to assess potential hazards and develop recommendations for protective measures, or abandonment, as appropriate. In addition, further studies should be devoted to gaining an understanding of the mechanics of submarine landslides and the resultant local turbulent wave actions which cause excessive damage. Also, in areas potentially jeopardized by precipitous mountain terrain similar geologic studies should be made.

(e) Review the experience gained in Alaska and study building damages in order to develop any new criteria which might result in more effective or advanced building codes and zoning plans for seismic areas. More emphasis should be given to effective enforcement of current standards as recommended by Task Force Nine.

(f) The U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, the U.S. Geological Survey, the National Academy of Sciences, and other scientific and technical organizations should be urged to improve existing seismic equipment and develop more responsive automatic instrumentation. The experience of the Alaskan disaster pointed out very dramatically the need for more and better instrumentation. If one considers instrumentation developed for navigation aids, guidance and control systems by the combined military establishments and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, this Nation's present seismic equipment could be considered at least one generation behind.

(g) Review Federal aid policies for hazardous areas. It is impossible and often undesirable to avoid private or public construction in all areas in which there may be some slight risk of a future disaster. However, in those areas which engineers or scientists regard as particularly hazardous, Federal policies ought not to encourage further development. To do so it to help perpetuate an unnecessary risk to life and property.

(h) Discuss with Japan methods of relief and reconstruction. Japanese earthquake seismologists and engineers visited Alaska soon after the March 27 earthquake to analyze its effects. At this time, they offered not only technical assistance in the form of personnel, but also workable instrumentation for the detection of after-shocks. Discussions with Japanese officials indicate an interest in exchange of information concerning earthquakes and reconstruction policies in the two countries. Such exchanges should be encouraged.

(i) There is much evidence that under the auspices of UNESCO a worldwide effort is being mounted for active participation in analyzing earthquake phenomena and for sharing information among participating nations. At a recent meeting in Paris, participating nations agreed that such meetings and exchange of information would be on a continuing basis. International cooperation in earthquake warnings and scientific studies of earthquake dynamics should be encouraged. The possibility of expanding the United Nations role in this area should also be carefully considered.

(j) The activities of the Commission and the participating agencies should be examined to determine if this experience indicates desirable modifications to Public Law 81–875 to insure the most effective Federal response possible to future disasters.

(k) The unique approaches utilized to meet the Alaskan disaster should not necessarily be used as precedents for other disasters. The work of the Commission, however, underscores the importance of the President's desire for a prompt and thorough review of Federal assistance policies and programs for the private sector. This should include study and consideration of the possibility of adequate, private, disaster insurance coverage (earthquake, flood, or other) at reasonable costs.

(l) A study should be made to develop recommendations for improving Federal Government natural disaster planning. Practical measures for minimizing damage and loss should be identified and developed in advance and their adoption by both the private and public sectors should be encouraged. Even a nominal amount of such advance planning might substantially reduce the severity of loss if realistically related to those areas of the United States known to be particularly vulnerable and exposed to specific types of natural disasters such as earthquakes.

(m) Where properties in a disaster area are in continuing danger of damage which would constitute a hazard to people, authority should be given to an agency by which appropriate protective measures could be taken such as the moving of buildings to a new site.

All these recommendations are, no doubt, important in larger or smaller degree. Ranked near the top, it would seem, is the need for serious study of a disaster-insurance program for the entire country. Alaska's terrible ordeal is but one example of the unpredictable whims of nature which this year have caused havoc and distress throughout the country. The form of those whims has varied from earthquake to flood, from hurricane to fire; but the results have cut a similar pattern of destruction and damage. Surely there must be a way to mitigate the physical losses to property in major disasters. We should find that way.

Above all else, these disasters, and especially the Good Friday catastrophe in Alaska, have underscored a basic premise that makes this country great.

Therefore, a salute to the resiliency, the strength, and the resources of the human spirit.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] had this to say in his foreword to the Commission's report:

It has been said that the Federal Government has grown so large that it has lost its capacity to function quickly and effectively in response to domestic problems and that its great size has left it cold to the needs of the American people.

No surer refutation of this misconception comes to my mind than the manner in which the Government acted in the aftermath of the Alaska earthquake. Under existing laws, Federal agencies moved immediately to protect life and health from further harm and took steps to begin the herculean task of rebuilding what Nature had laid waste.

The degree of assistance was unparalleled and yet, even though this aid exceeded any previously provided a disaster-stricken State, the Federal Government looked beyond the immediate catastrophe toward providing a firm base for rebuilding an even better Alaska—a vigorous economy to match a vigorous spirit. The responsibility for this undertaking was assigned by the President to the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska.

The Federal Commission staff and the Federal departments and agencies represented on the Commission have had the finest degree of cooperation from the State of Alaska, from State agencies and local governments, from private Alaskan institutions, from the citizens of Alaska, and from a small army of individuals who volunteered their experience and unique talent for the reconstruction effort. Theirs is a story of which all Americans can be proud.

Indeed, Americans are proud, and Alaskans are grateful. So much has been done in so little time.

So, Mr. President, a salute to all those, named and unnamed, known and unknown, who have made it possible for me to say: "The faith of so many was well planted. Alaska is on the way back."

MUNICIPAL LEADERSHIP IN OUR FEDERAL SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON]

has for many months served with distinction with me on the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations. Our activities there have clearly shown that in the future greater attention must be given to problems of Federal-State-local relationships. One of the principal conclusions we have reached during our work has been that a major reason for the marked growth of the Federal Government is the tendency to bypass local government, and to look to the Federal Government for assistance in seeking solutions to local problems.

In an address which Senator PEARSON delivered before the League of Kansas Municipalities, in Wichita, Kans., on September 21, he stated that local government is the frontline of democracy, and is the point in our Federal system where the problems of the people first emerge. He pointed out that we must strive to strengthen and concentrate more upon our local governments. Senator PEARSON underscored the challenges which local leadership must face, and outlined the problems that local leadership can best handle. He emphasized that effective municipal action and dynamic local leadership constitute one of our greatest national strengths. He concluded that "the opportunity for municipal leadership in the Federal system was never greater."

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MUNICIPAL LEADERSHIP IN OUR FEDERAL SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT

(Address by Senator PEARSON at 54th annual city convention of League of Kansas Municipalities, Wichita, Kans., on September 21, 1964)

Local government is the front line of democracy. It is the point in our Federal system where the problems of people, living together in an organized society, first emerge.

It is in our cities, school districts, and counties where the governed and those who govern come into daily contact. It is here where we sense the obligation of citizenship, the meaning of public decisions, and the responsibility of public office. This intimate and essential relationship of government and people makes the municipal role in the Federal system a vital one.

Local government, as we exercise it, is a major deterrent against the conformist type of civilization in which the mandates of a central government set the direction of every public policy and the pace of their execution.

Our urban and rural communities, like individuals, have great differences. The first pilgrims landing on these shores, the first family driving its wagons over Kansas plains and setting in place their sod hut, the eager student studying at today's school, the astronaut waiting on the pad at Cape Kennedy, all possess different objectives in life, different wants, different satisfactions. We have made room for all and have encouraged each.

While seeking common, broad national goals, we have sought to encourage the same range of local initiative on the part of local government. Local government has offered to each community the opportunity to pursue its own objectives as its people determine them. This Nation and its people have grown and prospered in the diversity which its local government encourages. The diverse interests of our society makes it imperative that local government remains influential in our Federal system.

In Kansas, cities have been urged to seek new ways to satisfy particular local needs. The home rule amendment to the Kansas Constitution, which the league developed and sponsored, is certainly an expression of confidence of Kansans in this concept and in their cities as vital instruments of accomplishment. The judicious use of this broad new authority is certainly a tribute to the integrity of many sincere local government officials who have been chosen to guide such local efforts. Kansas municipal leadership has been revitalized with new tools with which to meet its challenges. Municipal leadership throughout the Nation needs to recognize its new challenges and devise the tools to cope with them.

We as a nation are confronted with a vast array of very difficult and complicated problems as we try to deal with our diverse society. These problems are compounded by the pressures arising from our national obligations.

Our gross national product is growing at a surprising rate, but unemployment and relief recipients remain constantly high. How do we make it possible for all Americans to participate in the fruits of an expanding economy?

Our domestic economy is intimately related to our ability to maintain a high level of exports, but foreign trade is a two-way proposition. How do we maintain a high level of exports and still deal with the distressing effects of massive imports of oil, beef, watches, umbrellas and typewriters?

Our national security and many aspects of our economy are threatened by a rapidly changing military technology. Can we safely phase out manned bombers without the benefit of battle-tested missile systems to replace them? How do we discontinue certain military production and close military bases without doing great damage to local economies?

Our military force deployment is conditioned upon agreements with our allies and commitments through international organizations such as NATO and SEATO. Will the domestic politics of our allies mesh with our security needs if a crisis occurs?

These are indeed sizable and difficult problems. They will trouble any national administration and any Congress for a long time to come.

There are troubles of equal proportion, however, in the tasks which face local government.

The increasing competition for adequate revenue from local sources has historically troubled you. How much more can local governments improve their efficiency to further stretch their limited dollars? Can you continue to minimize service without jeopardizing your ability to fulfill responsible municipal objectives?

Central cities, and particularly the cores of those cities, are experiencing serious problems as physical facilities deteriorate and businesses and people seek new and modern surroundings. How can these essential parts of a vigorous community be salvaged and restored?

The growth of suburbs, satellite cities, special districts, and overlapping county operations confuse orderly urban growth. Shifting population leaves some cities with long histories merely shells of yesteryear. Can order be expected in urban growth? Can dying cities be salvaged?

These are questions to test the ingenuity of any local government official. They need not take a back seat to our national or international problems in either difficulty or importance.

I suspect, however, that at this point we could draw some generally accepted observations about these problems and some conclusion about the direction to which we must look for possible solutions.

Revenue: The local tax base must be broadened and the States must accept greater fiscal responsibility for financing functions which are a legitimate statewide responsibility.

Central cities: Sprawling urban areas are here to stay. The central city will probably never recapture the people, the industry and the land uses it once possessed. It must revitalize itself but it may have to perform different functions than in the past.

Suburbs: They are a fact. The task is not to destroy suburbs and satellite communities but to make them a social and economic part of the whole urban complex. Neat and tidy structures of governments will be the exception, not the rule. The real job is to learn how to develop metropolitanwide policies and how to efficiently manage metropolitan confusion.

Declining cities: All cities do not have the same future. Many will grow. Some will just hang on. Some will actually die. This is a hard fact to accept, especially if yours is one of those which is not growing. But it is a matter of historical fact that no Federal program, no State aid, and no local campaign can compete for long with the massive forces of technology and economics which dictate the existence, form and character of cities.

These observations will not find unanimous agreement but they do possess a high degree of acceptance—because they have been the subject of extensive debate.

Our municipal struggles are well defined, as evidenced by these observations. We have sought to secure efficient local government and honest administration. Cities are, as a result, well run enterprises.

More recently, Americans have become infatuated with the administrative structure of metropolitan areas and the physical plant of our city. At all levels of government, major attention has been focused on seeking new forms of government and on programs to construct or reconstruct more efficient street systems and more modern and eye-pleasing buildings. These efforts have produced sporadic successes.

We have finally reached the point where attention is focusing on the needs of people in our cities. Government, after all, is to serve people but somehow we have allowed our attention to become so centered on the fixtures of government that its real purpose has too frequently disappeared from view.

The human needs of the city must become the focus of our attention. It is here that local leadership faces its greatest challenge. It is in dealing with this vital need that local government can once more come into its own. It is in leading a struggle to satisfy the human problems which confront 70 percent of our citizens as they seek a better life in urban areas that municipalities can exert a new leadership in the Federal system.

As attorneys, accountants, engineers, planners, and building inspectors, we have examined the legal, physical, and financial aspects of our cities in detail. We know what is legal, and what is not. We know where the water comes from and how to treat it. We know what a safe building is and when one should be condemned. We know how to seal coat a street or paint a long-lasting stripe on it.

As mayors, managers, and councilmen, we know how to put together a package of community services, budget funds to finance them and administer city business in an efficient manner.

We really are quite knowledgeable about many aspects of the city.

In spite of this extensive knowledge, we don't know why our young people drop out of school or how to keep them in. We don't know why juvenile delinquency continues to climb in our better educated and more

effluent urban society. We haven't found a way to protect our cities from growing numbers of dwellings which are a community blight and a personal disgrace to those who occupy them. We have only begun to recognize that many of our people are not prepared to compete for the benefits of an expanding economy and we certainly haven't begun to devise programs which will relieve their plight.

People entangled in these conditions have traditionally been good Americans and good local citizens. They have, however, become a part of an America, and a part of a community, which has passed them by. The accumulation of these conditions has made these elements of many of our major cities ripe for agitators and violence. In frustration, and with proper stimulation, they have succumbed to the way of the mob.

It is appalling that violence and racial strife should be necessary to focus local attention on the needs of our neighbors. It is indeed unfortunate that these problems should become a national issue on such a tide. It will be tragic if the National Government finds it necessary to prescribe in detail the countermeasures.

These human problems, which come into sharpest focus in our urban areas, are of long standing and they are deeply rooted. Corrective measures will not be found in a national crusade. At the national level, there is too great a tendency to manipulate the symbols and the emotions associated with these problems for personal political gain. This is cruel and destructive of positive effort.

These are the problems which demand the kind of attention local interests under local leadership can provide best. Community action is constantly tempered by the cool intimacy of local knowledge and personal contact.

The manner in which local government resolves this vital responsibility will, in my opinion, determine the future influence of municipal leadership in our Federal system.

It is necessary that cities accept this responsibility. The spark has been struck. Urban residents are increasingly aware of the negative influence of congestion, pollution, blight, slums and poverty, upon their personal well-being. National political leadership is equally aware that it need not rely on transcient local political figures to deliver block votes if these issues can be profitably manipulated through Federal programs. Only effective municipal action can preserve the integrity of cities and project municipal leadership into a sphere of meaningful national influence.

It is proper that cities act. Today we in America are becoming more diversified and more pluralistic. The evidence is abundant. Instead of encouraging such characteristics as tight family ties, strong neighborhood commitments, and deep personal concern for the problems of others common to the more conformists cultures, our sociologists complain of just the opposite. In this climate, simple solutions to problems evade us. We find many painful dilemmas. Troublesome controversy appears at every turn. If we are to remain consistent to our past and support one of our greatest strengths, this increasing diversity must be accommodated. This certainly will not be accomplished by a politically inspired national program which imposes a nationwide pattern. It can be done through local programs.

It is possible for cities to act. City government leadership is in the most effective position to initiate action for the community. Further, as city officials you have at your call a broad range of community leadership and almost unlimited technical assistance. Municipal government leadership may have to broaden its concept of urban leadership to deal with some of the issues I have discussed. The city government itself may actually assume a secondary role in the final resolution of its problems. But the key, it seems to me, is a local solution—a solution in which the city government itself may only be the activator.

The opportunity for municipal leadership in the Federal system was never greater. If cities will concern themselves with the fundamental problems of their people, the city will emerge as the critical leadership element in the Federal system.

THE COMPARATIVE VOTING RECORDS OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND SENATOR GOLDWATER

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I submit, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the comparative voting records of President Lyndon B. Johnson, when he was a Member of the U.S. Senate, and of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, on conservation, recreation, and resource development legislation. This memorandum is enlightening, and this information should be made available to the growing group of conservation-minded citizens who are concerned with preservation of our natural resources and their wise use and economical development at all stages of government and private enterprise.

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

COMPARATIVE VOTING RECORDS OF SENATORS LYNDON B. JOHNSON AND BARRY GOLDWATER RELATIVE TO CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES LEGISLATION

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

There is no better place to begin than to examine the great Tennessee Valley Authority project. Senator GOLDWATER's opinion and position with respect to this tremendous regional resource project is well known.

The TVA Financing Act of 1957 (S. 1869): Senator GOLDWATER offered a motion to recommit S. 1869 to the Senate Committee on Public Works. Senator GOLDWATER contended: (1) Congress should not permit any agency of the Federal Government to finance its own operations; (2) TVA should be taken over by the States in the area it serves; and (3) TVA should never have been created. The opponents contended that even President Eisenhower recommended against dismembering TVA and for enactment of the measure which would let TVA finance its own development out of its own power revenues. These increased developments were needed to meet growing needs of an area of more than 5 million people. The Goldwater motion was rejected 61 to 22. Senator GOLDWATER, of course, voted for his motion to recommit. Senator Lyndon Johnson voted against recommital of this bill.

The second amendment on S. 1869 concerned the Saltonstall amendment to remove from the Board of Directors of TVA their entire authority of issuing bonds and to place this authority in the Secretary of the Treasury. This amendment was rejected 46 to 37. Senator Johnson voted "no"; Senator GOLDWATER voted "yea." If adopted this amendment would have defeated the purpose of the self-financing bill by taking the management out of the hands of the Directors of TVA—the responsibility which the Directors have exercised through the years. On final passage, this bill was approved in the Senate 61 to 20. Senator Johnson voted "yea" for passage while Senator GOLDWATER voted "no" against passage. The bill would have authorized TVA to issue and sell up to $750 million in revenue bonds outstanding at any one time to assist in financing its power program. The bill died in the House.

The next item is the Tennessee Valley Authority Financing Act of 1959 (H.R. 3460). The votes that took place on the bill of 1957 paved the way for action on the 1959 proposal. The major vote came on the Cotton motion to recommit the bill to the Senate Public Works Committee. This motion was rejected by 73 to 17. Senator Johnson voted against recommital; Senator GOLDWATER voted for recommittal. This bill was passed subsequent to that recommittal vote by a voice vote on July 9, 1959. It authorized the TVA to issue and sell revenue bonds up to the $750 million figure outstanding at any one time to assist in financing additions to its power system and for construction, acquisition, enlargement, improvement or replacement of any plant or any other facility. The principal and interest on the bonds are payable from TVA's power revenues. This bill became Public Law 86–137. Senator GOLDWATER's position was in opposition to the proper development of the water resources of the Tennessee Valley area. President Johnson's vote was a vote in support of the full development and utilization of the water and power resources of this important region. The TVA has brought light to a former regional area of darkness. By so doing, the entire Nation has benefited from the glow.

WATER POLLUTION

Water Pollution Control Act of 1959 (H.R. 3610): H.R. 3610 was a bill which would have authorized the Public Health Service to stimulate construction of much needed municipal waste treatment facilities to prevent untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from being discharged into any waters. This would have increased construction grants for projects from a quarter of a million dollars to $400,000 for each individual project. It would allow the cities and municipalities to join together to build joint treatment facilities. It would have authorized $80 million annually for construction instead of $50 million which was presently in effect. It was a total authorization of an $800 million expenditure in the field of water pollution control. This was in 1959 and it came to the Senate after having first passed the House. It was approved by the Senate by a vote of 61 to 27. Senator Johnson voted for the bill; Senator GOLDWATER voted "No." Unfortunately, the bill was vetoed by President Eisenhower.

WILDERNESS PRESERVATION

Although President Johnson was Vice President in 1961 when the first record vote came on the Senate floor on the wilderness bill and he was President on September 3, 1964, when he signed into law S. 4, the bill to establish a national wilderness preservation system. It is interesting to note the opposite positions taken on this significant conservation measure. In 1961 Senator GOLDWATER voted in favor of the motion to refer the wilderness bill (S. 174) to the Committee on Agriculture. The Senate Interior Committee, which has jurisdiction over the legislation, had acted on the bill and for the first time, after many years of struggle, had reported the bill to the Senate for its consideration. Fortunately, this motion to refer which amounted to recommittal of the bill was defeated 41 to 32. Senator GOLDWATER announced for the decision to rerefer the bill to Agriculture. He voted for two crippling amendments which were offered by opponents of the measure, and he was paired against the final passage of the bill. The bill passed 78 to 8, but it died in the House of Representatives.

However, when S. 4 was introduced in the 88th Congress, the Senate Interior Committee again promptly considered this measure, and it was reported to the Senate for action. Senator GOLDWATER once demonstrated his opposition to this important proposal to preserve a portion of our wild areas

for generations yet unborn. He voted for every crippling amendment which was offered and he was one of 12 Members of the Senate who voted against final passage. The bill passed overwhelmingly by a vote of 73 to 12. The majority of the Members of both parties expressed their approval for this important measure as did President Johnson when he signed it into law this year at a ceremony which he described of historic importance in the conservation movement.

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH ACT OF 1964

In recent years there has been a growing awareness that no future problem facing our Nation is of greater significance than that of preventing a shortage of our water resources. In recognition of this, the Senate established a Select Committee on National Water Resources, chaired by the late Senator Kerr of Oklahoma. The Select Committee held extensive hearings, in all parts of the Nation, and published several significant and important studies. Recommendations were submitted which, if implemented, would greatly contribute toward the solution of this growing national problem. One of the recommendations called for more intensive research in basic hydrological sciences. As a result of this recommendation, in the 88th Congress Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, introduced S. 2, a bill to establish water resources research centers at State colleges and universities and to stimulate water research at other centers of competence. The basic purpose of this act was to promote a more adequate program of water research in utilizing our universities in this effort. Not only do we need to know more about water, but also we need to train more scientists who can help solve our water problems.

The Senate Interior Committee reported the bill to the Senate for consideration. On the floor of the Senate there were two significant amendments offered by the opponents of this type of Federal action. The first amendment was offered by Senator ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado. His amendment: (1) would have reduced the authorizations for water resources research to such an extent that the program would have been unworkable; (2) it would have terminated the program in 5 years; and (3) it would have limited the scope of research projects which would have rendered the bill absolutely meaningless. The simple effect of his amendment would have been to have "gutted" the bill. Fortunately, the amendment was rejected by almost 2 to 1. The Senator from Arizona, Mr. GOLDWATER, voted for this crippling amendment. The administration was against this amendment.

The second amendment was offered by Senator COTTON, Republican, of New Hampshire. His amendment was intended to reduce by 20 percent the authorization for water resources research, except for the land-grant college program. His amendment was also rejected, but Senator GOLDWATER voted for it. After this amendment failed, S. 2 was passed by a voice vote. As passed by the Senate and the House this act will stimulate more effective research at industrial, State and local levels and will contribute toward the training of additional scientists by our colleges and universities around the country. It was for these reasons that President Lyndon Johnson signed this bill into law this year. If Senator GOLDWATER and his philosophy had prevailed, one more backward step would have been taken in our efforts to meet the needs of our people with our available resources.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST-PACIFIC SOUTHWEST POWER INTERTIE

Recently, President Johnson signed into law, S. 1007, a bill which paved the way for completion of the proposal to establish the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie project. This legislation was the final step in the long journey to implement this concept whereby the surplus power resources in one region of the country may be utilized where they are urgently needed in another region, while at the same time providing for the needed protection for the people and industry at the source of origin. This was a significant step forward in the full utilization of our national resources. This effort demonstrated the kind of cooperation entire regions can display and will ultimately result in benefits for all of our people. However, in the 87th Congress, when initial efforts were made to enact this legislation, the Senate Interior Committee reported the predecessor bill to S. 1007, which was S. 3153. Republican Senator SCOTT offered a motion to recommit the bill to the committee. This was long after extensive hearings had been held and after the committee had reported the bill to the Senate for final consideration. Fortunately, the motion to recommit was rejected by a vote of 53 to 33. Senator GOLDWATER, who had argued against this bill on the floor of the Senate several days prior to actual voting, was paired for the motion to recommit. After the defeat of this motion, the bill was passed by a vote of 51 to 36 and sent to the House of Representatives. Senator GOLDWATER was also paired against final passage. Unfortunately, in the 87th Congress, the bill did not get through the House of Representatives. The proponents of the measure were successful in passing it in the 88th Congress and thus allowing President Johnson to sign it into law with his strong support and approval. There were no record votes on the measure in the Senate in the 88th Congress, but Senator GOLDWATER had amply demonstrated his opposition to this kind of far-reaching proposal, even though his native State of Arizona in the Southwest will be one of the prime beneficiaries of the surplus power generated in the Northwest.

THE HELLS CANYON DAM ACT OF 1956 (S. 1333)

The first of the Senate record votes on the great battle to develop the water resources of the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon came in 1956. Both Senator GOLDWATER and President Johnson were Members of the Senate and had an opportunity to demonstrate their positions on the question of how and whether our natural resources shall be harnessed to work for the good of all of our people. The bill failed of passage in the Senate in 1956 by a vote of 51 to 41. Forty-three of those Senators opposing it were members of the Republican Party. Senator GOLDWATER voted against passage of this bill. Thirty-nine of the 41 Senators who voted for the bill were Democrats; among them was Senator Lyndon B. Johnson.

THE HELLS CANYON DAM ACT OF 1957 (S. 555)

In 1957 the proposal to authorize Federal construction of Hells Canyon Dam once more came before the Senate. This time, the vote was reversed. The measure passed 45 to 38. Senator Johnson indicated his support of this proposal in 1957 as he had in 1956. He was paired in favor of final passage of the bill. Senator GOLDWATER voted "no." He continued his vehement opposition against the bill. He had consistently demonstrated that he is opposed to any projects which do not benefit directly the local interest of his own constituency. Although he has supported Colorado River development by the Federal Government and has asked all of the people of the United States to spend over $1 billion to construct the central Arizona project he has failed to provide the same kind of support to other areas of the Nation where projects of equal merit need to be developed.

THE COLUMBIA RIVER POWER-PRIEST RAPIDS ACT OF 1954 (H.R. 7664)

This power project in the State of Washington passed by a voice vote and became Public Law 544 of the 83d Congress. It permitted a Washington State power agency to construct Priest Rapids Dam on the Columbia River. The significant vote that occurred on this bill in the Senate was an amendment which was offered by Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON of Washington State. Their amendment would have given preference in sales of power to rural cooperatives and municipalities. Unfortunately, this amendment, which would have benefitted the small co-ops and public agencies was rejected by a vote of 45 to 29. Senator Lyndon Johnson voted "yea" as an indication of his support for the co-ops and for the application of power preference for municipalities. Senator GOLDWATER voted against the amendment, clearly going on record as being opposed to the preference provision for the public agencies.

LEAD-ZINC ACT OF 1960 (H.R. 8860)

This bill was intended to help stabilize the domestic lead and zinc mining industry by aiding the small producers of this important commodity. The bill aimed to conserve our domestic reserves and to provide jobs for the unemployed miners in depressed lead-zinc communities. The problems besetting the domestic lead and zinc industry have been multiplying over the years. This legislation was an effort to help the small lead-zinc producer and the Senate passed it by a vote of 59 to 28. Senator Johnson voted in favor of the bill; Senator GOLDWATER voted against the bill. The bill passed both Houses, but President Eisenhower pocket vetoed the measure. When Mr. Johnson moved up to the Vice Presidency in 1961, the new administration supported a small producer's lead and zinc bill, and it became public law. In 1963, during the 1st session of the 88th Congress, clarifying legislation was introduced to amend the act in order to insure that the purposes behind the original introduction were achieved. The Congress intended this bill to provide aid only for the small producer of lead and zinc. It was enacted for the miner whose principal product was lead and zinc and whose lead and zinc production was not a byproduct of some other mineral he was producing. However, when this legislation to amend the basic act was considered on the floor of the Senate, Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, offered an amendment to terminate the entire program on February 15, 1964, instead of December 31, 1965, as provided by the act. His amendment was rejected by a vote of 50 to 32. Senator GOLDWATER voted for the amendment which would have ended the progam almost 2 years earlier than was originally provided. The administration opposed Senator WILLIAMS' amendment which was vigorously supported by Senator GOLDWATER. If the Williams amendment had carried, it would have dealt a severe blow to the economies of several of our States where the independent small producers account for much of the lead-zinc production.

RECREATION AREAS AND NATIONAL PARKS

Probably in no other area of resource management has so much progress been made in the last 4 years than in the development of our Nation's outdoor recreational opportunities. Since the beginning of the Kennedy-Johnson era, the administration and the Congress have cooperated in making a record that is unequaled in achievement in any comparable period. For instance, after several years of little activity, three great national recreational areas were added

to our national park system. They were the national seashores at Cape Cod in Massachusetts, at Point Reyes in California, and at Padre Island, Tex., in the Gulf of Mexico. These additions to our national park system covered each of the great ocean shorelines of our Nation. Due to tremendous support and organization of both the executive and legislative branches of Government, these measures were enacted with a minimum of meaningful opposition. This is not to say that there were not those who were opposed to this type of legislation, just as there are always in our midst those who are opposed to the development of our Nation's resources for the good of all the people.

The decisive battle on the three recreation areas came on S. 4, the bill to establish the Padre Island National Seashore in the 87th Congress. The bill was reported by our committee, and on the floor a motion was offered by Senator TOWER, of Texas, to recommit the bill to the Interior Committee. This in effect would have killed the bill and the prospect for establishing a great public national recreation area on the Gulf of Mexico. Fortunately, the motion to recommit was rejected by a vote of 45 to 39. Senator GOLDWATER voted for the motion to recommit. Subsequently, another amendment was offered which would have directed the Secretary of the Interior to establish a road through the entire length of the seashore area, with access roads to the mainland from the north and south ends of the island. This proposal was opposed by the administration and by those who were interested in preserving insofar as possible the natural quality and beauty of this area. In addition, such a proposal would have been extremely expensive and it was put forth by those who had originally opposed the concept of establishing this national recreation area. Therefore, this amendment was contradictory to the record of its proponents and was merely put forth as a delaying tactic and an effort to thwart the proposal. This amendment was rejected over 2 to 1 by a vote of 58 to 24. Senator GOLDWATER voted for this amendment. The bill subsequently was passed by a voice vote and became Public Law 87-712.

Probably no more significant legislation has been passed in the last 4 years dealing with the development of our recreational resources than H.R. 3846, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act which was enacted in the 2d session of the 88th Congress. President Johnson signed it into law on September 3, 1964. This bill, in the Senate was attacked by several members of the Goldwater wing of the Republican Party and three crippling amendments were offered to the proposal which, fortunately, were overwhelmingly defeated. Senator GOLDWATER was absent and did not vote on these proposals, but members of his wing of the Republican Party were recorded in favor of each crippling amendment.

SUMMARY

This effort has been made to point out the basic differences in philosophy of these two men toward the conservation and development of our Nation's natural resources for the benefit of all our citizens.

A search has been made of issues on which the positions of each were recorded and were found to represent different basic approaches to the treatment of the problems in this significant area of national concern. There were other examples which could have been detailed relating to individual votes on numerous appropriation bills and amendments thereto. However, I believe the trend has clearly been established by this examination into the public positions expressed on fundamental and specific issues over the years.

It appears that this year's campaign by the Goldwater wing of the Republican Party is calling attention to some strange knowledge alleged to be stored in one's heart, and that if one will just carefully examine deep into his heart he will recognize that what Mr. GOLDWATER is saying is really true. When it comes to the field of conservation of our resources, deep in my heart a careful examination of Mr. GOLDWATER's record results in a severe case of heartburn.

Goldwater voting record on major legislation

NATURAL RESOURCES

	Goldwater	Republican majority	Democratic majority
Interior appropriations for 1962:			
Amendment providing $2,000,000 to rehabilitate and conserve rangelands in the Western States. (Passed 42 to 28 June 11, 1962.)	No	88 percent no	87 percent yes.
Amendment to provide $6,000,000 for access roads. (Passed 49 to 40, June 12, 1962)	No	78 percent no	74 percent yes.
Motion to recommit bill to Appropriations Committee with instructions to reduce it to House total of $868,595,000. (Defeated 26 to 60, June 12, 1962.)	Yes	77 percent yes	95 percent no.
Lead-zinc subsidies, 1960: Passage of bill authorizing subsidies to small lead and zinc producers. (Passed 59 to 28, Aug. 19, 1960).	No	62 percent no	83 percent yes.
Migratory waterfowl conservation, 1961: Passage of bill authorizing $50,000,000 over a 5-year period to accelerate Federal acquisitions of wetlands for migratory waterfowl. (Passed 65 to 8, Aug. 28, 1961.)	No	76 percent yes	98 percent yes.
National Wilderness Preservation System, 1961: Passage of bill providing for a complete review of all wilderness-type areas in order to open certain lands on which commercial activities are currently barred. (Passed 78 to 8, Sept. 6, 1961.)	Paired no	80 percent yes	96 percent yes.
National Fisheries and Aquarium Center: Passage of bill authorizing the construction of a $10,000,000 National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia, displaying fresh water, marine and shellfish, and other aquatic resources for educational, recreational, cultural, and scientific purposes. (Passed 42 to 20, Sept. 21, 1962.)	Paired no	52 percent no	77 percent yes.
Oceanography, 1961: Passage of bill authorizing a $700,000,000, 10-year program of oceanographic and Great Lakes research. (Passed 50 to 32, July 28, 1961.)	Paired no	83 percent no	87 percent yes.
Submerged lands, 1953: Amendment to set aside offshore oil funds for health and other purposes. (Defeated 27 to 64, May 5, 1953.)	No	95 percent no	52 percent yes.
Water pollution control, 1959: Bill authorizing Federal grants of $80,000,000 over a 10-year period to help communities build sewage plants. (Passed 61 to 27, Sept. 9, 1959.)	No	59 percent no	86 percent yes.

PUBLIC POWER

Atomic Energy Act of 1954:			
Amendment to bar AEC from entering into the Dixon-Yates contract. (Defeated 36 to 55, July 21, 1954.)	Paired no	96 percent no	75 percent yes.
Amendment to permit Government generation of atomic power and to require that preference be given to public bodies and cooperatives in disposing of Government-generated power from Government plants. (Passed 45 to 41, July 22, 1954.)	No	85 percent no	86 percent yes.
Motion to table amendment which would permit President to deal with more than 1 nation in setting up an exchange of atomic information in an international pool. (Passed 46 to 41, July 23, 1954.)	Yes	98 percent yes	95 percent no.
Motion to table amendment which would require compulsory licensing of patents obtained in atomic energy field. (Passed 41 to 37, July 23, 1954.)	Yes	100 percent yes	97 percent no.
Amendment to provide that companies given AEC licenses for production of commercial power be subject to regulatory features of Federal Power Act. (Defeated 23 to 54, July 26, 1954.)	No	98 percent no	58 percent yes.
Adoption of House-Senate conference report without provision for compulsory sharing of patents and with an ineffective "preference" provision. (Defeated 41 to 48, Aug. 13, 1954.)	Yes	89 percent yes	95 percent no.
Atomic reactors: Bill authorizing $400,000,000 over 5-year period for development of atomic reactors for electric power. (Passed 49 to 40, July 12, 1956.)	No	93 percent no	100 percent yes.
Atomic construction, 1957:			
Amendment to delete authorizations for natural uranium reactor and plutonium recycling plant. (Defeated 34 to 42, Aug. 16, 1957.)	Announced yes	89 percent yes	95 percent no.
Amendment to delete provision that Atomic Energy Commission work on cooperative power reactor demonstration program. (Defeated 34 to 42, Aug. 16, 1957.) Bill passed by voice vote.	Announced yes	86 percent yes	95 percent no.
Atomic Energy Commission authorization for fiscal 1962: Amendment to delete $95,000,000 authorization for construction of electric generating facilities for the new Hanford, Wash., plutonium-producing reactor. (Defeated 36 to 54, July 18, 1961.) Bill passed by voice vote.	Yes	81 percent yes	81 percent no.
Columbia River power project, 1954: Amendment to give preference in sales of power to rural cooperatives and municipalities. (Defeated 29 to 45, July 12, 1954.)	No	98 percent no	84 percent yes.
Hells Canyon Dam, 1956: Bill providing for Federal high dam at Hells Canyon on Snake River at Idaho-Oregon border. (Defeated 41 to 51, July 19, 1956.)	No	96 percent no	83 percent yes.
Hells Canyon Dam, 1957: Bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a Federal high dam on the Snake River. (Passed 45 to 38, June 21. 1957.)	No	87 percent no	89 percent yes.

Goldwater voting record on major legislation—Continued

PUBLIC POWER

	Goldwater	Republican majority	Democratic majority
Pacific Northwest power, 1962: Bill to provide permanent priority on Pacific Northwest power to public or private consumers of electricity from Bonneville Power's marketing area. (Passed 51 to 36, Aug. 8, 1962.)	Paired, no	90 percent no	84 percent yes.
Niagara power development, 1956: Passage of bill authorizing New York State development of Niagara River in accordance with Federal preference clause requirements. (Passed 48 to 39, May 16, 1956.)	Paired no	80 percent no	87 percent yes.
TVA financing, 1957:			
Amendment to take from TVA directors their authority for issuing bonds. (Defeated 37 to 46, Aug. 9, 1957.)	Yes	74 percent yes	85 percent no.
Passage of TVA financing bill. (Passed 61 to 20, Aug. 9, 1957.)	No	63 percent yes	88 percent yes.
TVA financing, 1959: Motion to recommit (kill) bill. (Defeated 17 to 73, July 9, 1959.)	Yes	53 percent no	97 percent no.

PUBLIC WORKS

Community Facilities Act, 1958:			
Amendment to lower interest rates from 3.5 to 3 percent. (Defeated 40 to 41, Apr. 15, 1958)	No	95 percent no	95 percent yes.
Amendment to reduce authorization by half. (Defeated 33 to 52, Apr. 16, 1958.)	Paired yes	76 percent yes	95 percent no.
Passage of bill authorizing $1,000,000,000 in loans to State and local governments for construction of such community facilities as new water systems, sewer systems, hospitals, school buildings, and other public works, etc. (Passed 60 to 26, Apr. 16, 1958.)	Announced no	55 percent no	93 percent yes.
Disaster insurance, 1956:			
Amendment to require States to pay part of the cost of the program after June 30, 1959. (Passed 39 to 31, May 10, 1956.) Bill passed 61 to 7, May 10, 1956; Goldwater for.	Yes	92 percent yes	88 percent no.
Flood Control Act of 1959: Bill authorizing $1,500,000,000 for construction of 132 rivers and harbors and flood control projects. (Passed 70 to 5, June 17, 1960.)	No	85 percent yes	98 percent yes.
Revised public works appropriation for 1960:			
Bill appropriating $1,176,579,834 for public works in fiscal 1960. (Passed 73 to 15, Sept. 8, 1959.)	No	56 percent yes	98 percent yes.
Passage of appropriation over President's veto. (Passed 72 to 23, Sept. 10, 1959.)	No	64 percent no	97 percent yes.
Public works appropriations 1962:			
Amendment to cut from $500,000,000 to $300,000,000 in funds already authorized. (Defeated 16 to 44, Sept. 29, 1962.)	Paired yes	68 percent yes	93 percent no.
Passage of bill appropriating $5,200,000,000 for public works projects and the Atomic Energy Commission in fiscal 1963. (Passed 64 to 8, Oct. 1, 1962.)	No	77 percent yes	96 percent yes.
Standby Public Works Act of 1962:			
Amendment to authorize appropriation of $750,000,000 (instead $600,000,000) for an immediate program of public works projects in areas of heavy unemployment. (Passed 43 to 32, May 28, 1962.)	Announced no	97 percent no	91 percent yes.
Amendment to authorize appropriations of $750,000,000 for a standby public works program after June 20, 1963. (Passed 37 to 36, May 28, 1962.)	Announced no	100 percent no	88 percent yes.
Passage of bill. (Passed 44 to 32; May 28, 1962.)	No	83 percent no	83 percent yes.
Supplemental public works, 1963: Amendment to cut $200,000,000 from the proposed $450,000,000 for new public works projects. The accelerated public works program is designed to provide quick, temporary employment in areas suffering prolonged joblessness. (Defeated 26 to 60, May 1, 1963.)	Paired yes	75 percent yes	91 percent no.
Omnibus rivers and harbors, 1957: Motion to recommit bill to committee with instructions to reduce total authorization by at least $350,000,000. (Defeated 27 to 55, Mar. 28, 1957.) Bill passed 42 to 22, Mar. 28, 1957; Goldwater absent.	Yes	55 percent yes	88 percent no.
River and Harbor and Flood Control Act, 1958: Passage of bill authorizing $1,500,000,000 for river and harbor, beach erosion, and flood control for 150 projects. (Passed 52 to 11, Apr. 2, 1958.)	No	72 percent yes	94 percent yes.
Santa Maria project, 1954: Amendment to continue 160-acre limitation reclamation law. (Defeated 17 to 45, Aug. 18, 1954.)	No	100 percent no	58 perent yes

CIVIL RIGHTS

Civil Rights Act of 1957: Passage of bill. (Passed 72 to 18, August 7, 1957.)	Yes	100 percent yes	80 percent yes.
Civil Rights Amendments of 1960:			
Motion to invoke cloture. (Defeated 42 to 53, March 10, 1960.)	No	63 percent no	52 percent no.
Bill making obstruction of all Federal court orders a crime, outlawing all bombings and bomb threats, etc. (Passed 71 to 18, April 8, 1960.)	Announced yes	100 percent yes	70 percent yes.
Civil Rights Act of 1964:			
Motion to invoke cloture. (Passed 71 to 29, June 10, 1964.)	No	82 percent yes	66 percent yes.
Bill to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. district courts to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect the constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs and to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity. (Passed 73 to 27, June 19, 1964.)	No	82 percent yes	69 percent yes.

NORTH CAROLINA SIGNERS OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, some weeks ago my good friend, Wade Lucas, public information officer of the North Carolina Department of Conservation and Development, visited Independence National Historical Park, in Philadelphia, Pa., and was prompted by his visit to write an article relating to the North Carolinians who signed the Declaration of Independence and participated in the framing of the Constitution of the United States. The article was published on September 20, 1964, in the Goldsboro News-Argus, of Goldsboro, N.C. Since the signing and drafting of these great national charters are of general interest throughout the country, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Lucas be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

[From the Goldsboro (N.C.) News-Argus of Sept. 20, 1964]

NORTH CAROLINA LEADERS GET LITTLE NOTE IN INDEPENDENCE HALL GALLERY

(By Wade Lucas)

PHILADELPHIA, PA.—A touring North Carolinian, who likes to tell people in other States about the glorious history that North Carolina has, cannot but help having something akin to a letdown feeling when he visits Independence National Historical Park here.

For within this enclosure are such historical buildings as Independence Hall, where the Declaration of Independence was signed and where the Federal Constitution was adopted, are located.

Also within this enclosure is Congress Hall, where the fledgling American Congress held its sessions from 1790 to 1800, where the First and Second Banks of the United States were established, and where other historical buildings, like Carpenters' Hall, just seem to ooze history.

Considerable work is being done to refurbish Independence Hall, where George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Monroe, and so many others, known today as the Founding Fathers, labored to lay the groundwork of what are now the United States of America.

It was in Congress Hall, located on the left of Independence Hall, where the touring North Carolinian got that letdown feeling as he gazed at the portraits of the notables who served in the American Congress from 1790 to 1800 when the seat of government was moved to Washington, D.C.

This Tar Heel, who likes his history and who likes to boast that North Carolina is one of the Thirteen Original Colonies, looked at portrait after portrait in Congress Hall before he found one of a North Carolinian. And it was the only one.

That portrait shows the likeness of former Gov. Richard Dobbs Spaight, who served in Congress from North Carolina from 1798 to 1801 and who was killed in a duel at New

Bern in 1802 in the aftermath of a political quarrel with John Stanley. That, incidentally, was the last duel of major importance fought in North Carolina, according to that eminent historian, Gertrude Carraway, director of the Tryon Palace Restoration at New Bern.

Governor Spaight's portrait hangs in what is known as the Conference Room. It is located just off the Chamber in which the Members of the House of Representatives held their session on the third floor.

And to reach the third floor takes a bit of doing, especially for a slightly overweight Tar Heel. But it is worth the climb.

A National Park Service guide, chatting briefly with the visiting Tar Heel, commented rather dryly that "I'll bet old John Adams found the going rough up those stairs."

The guide had reference to John Adams, a Member of that early House of Representatives from Massachusetts and who later became the second President of the United States. Mr. Adams was more than slightly on the obese side, his portraits show.

Somewhat disturbed about the fact he could find the portrait of only one North Carolinian hanging in Independence Hall, where William Hooper, John Penn, and Joseph Hewes were the North Carolinians to affix their signatures to the Declaration of Independence in July 1776, and in Congress Hall, the visiting Tar Heel asked some questions.

He even went so far as to visit Melford O. Anderson, National Park Service superintendent in charge of what must be the most famous bit of historical ground in all America, and asked why there were no more portraits of North Carolinians visible other than that of Richard Dobbs Spaight.

Anderson had what he apparently considered a ready answer. He said the National Park Service, which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior and which took over the supervision and maintenance of this historical area by act of Congress in 1951, is currently engaged in a vast refurbishing job as a part of the NPS's Mission 66.

This Mission 66, designed to help preserve many of America's most historical areas, will hardly be completed insofar as Independence National Park is concerned by 1966. It may be 1976, as one park service employee told the visiting Tar Heel.

Anderson said there are numerous pictures of America's early statesmen stored in the vault of the old First Bank of the United States. But he did not know how many of them are portraits of such North Carolinians as William Hooper, John Penn, and Joseph Hewes, who bravely signed the Declaration of Independence and incurred the wrath of King George III, of Great Britain, or was it England at that time?

Nor did he know whether that vault in a bank, where the Nation's first bank robbery was said to have occurred under the very noses of those early statesmen, contains portraits of the three North Carolinians who signed the Federal Constitution in 1787.

Superintendent Anderson did attempt to locate the curator, but he could not be found.

Those North Carolina signers of the Federal Constitution in 1787 at the Constitutional Convention in September of that year were:

Dr. Hugh Williamson, a Member of Congress and who is buried near his old hometown of Edenton.

William Blount, a Member of the Continental Congress and who is buried near Windsor.

And Richard Dobbs Spaight, Governor of North Carolina from 1792 to 1795 and later Member of Congress from 1798 to 1801.

Since this is Constitution Week, it is appropriate that mention should be made that the 54 delegates met in Independence Hall from May 25, 1787, and labored for 4 months before they fashioned a U.S. Constitution, which has been much amended and, to hear some people, much flouted since its adoption in September 1787.

But it was not until 1789 that North Carolina ratified the Federal Constitution at the North Carolina Convention of 1789 held in the old State House in Fayetteville. The reason was that many North Carolinians did not like some parts of that Constitution then even as some do not like it now.

But the touring Tar Heel, making his first visit to Philadelphia, liked what he saw. He saw and admired the Liberty Bell. He saw where a modern touch to this old cradle of American Liberty has been given by the placing of a bronze marker in front of Independence Hall where the late President John F. Kennedy stood on July 4, 1962, and made his famed "Unity of Nations" speech. But he though then—and thinks now—that this historical area, visited annually by more than 2 million people, ought to have more about North Carolina than it now has.

CONFERENCE AGREEMENTS ON S. 3060, NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT AND PUBLIC LAW 815—PUBLIC LAW 874 AMENDMENTS AND EXTENSION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a number of my colleagues have made inquiry of me regarding the agreements reached by the conference committee on S. 3060, the bill to expand and extend the National Defense Education Act and its impacted area legislation.

As Senators are aware, it is planned that this matter will be brought up first in the House of Representatives at an early date. However, in order that the basic funds breakdown under the conference report may be available to Senators, I ask unanimous consent that there appear at this point in my remarks a summary by the Office of Education of the contents of the conference version of S. 3060, title by title together with a series of tables relating to certain of the titles.

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS, S. 3060, AMENDMENTS AGREED UPON BY SENATE-HOUSE CONFEREES, SEPTEMBER 24, 1964

CONFERENCE REPORT

Three-year extension of the entire act.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

After reference to imbalances in our educational programs omits the language: "which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics and modern foreign languages and trained in technology."

TITLE II—STUDENT LOANS

Increases authorization to $163.3 million in fiscal year 1965 from present $135 million, $179.3 million in 1966, $190 million in 1967, and $195 million in 1968.

Removes annual institutional ceiling of $800,000.

Extends loan program to accredited postsecondary business schools and technical institutions, public, and nonprofit private.

Defines eligible institutions of higher education to make specific reference to public and other nonprofit collegiate and associate degree schools of nursing.

Eliminates special consideration provision for prospective elementary school teachers and for students with superior background in science, mathematics, engineering, and language. Replaces with provision giving priority for the granting of loans to students with "superior academic background."

Increases yearly limit on loans to graduate and professional students from $1,000 to $2,500; increases aggregate limit for such students from $5,000 to $10,000.

Authorizes institutions to extend moratorium on loan repayments (but not on accrual of interest) to part-time students.

Extends "forgiveness" to teachers in nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education.

Allows part-time students carrying at least a one-half academic workload to receive loans.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING INSTRUCTION IN SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES, AND OTHER CRITICAL SUBJECTS

Expands the program for equipment acquisition and State supervision by adding English, reading, history, geography, civics; increases authorization from present $70 million annually to $90 million for acquisition of equipment; from present $5 million annually to $10 million for State supervision and administration.

Provides for promulgation of allotment ratio biennially, and increases the minimum yearly allotment to each State to $50,000.

Authorizes schools to use equipment for other subjects "if there exists a critical need therefor."

Provides for the computation of the rate of interest on loans to nonprofit private schools for each fiscal year rather than for each month.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

Increases maximum number of fellowships to 3,000 in fiscal year 1965; 6,000 in 1966; 7,500 in 1967; and 7,500 in 1968. In fiscal year 1965, one-half of the fellowships, and not less than one-third of the fellowships in fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968 must be in "new or expanded" study programs.

In determining number of fellowships to be awarded for study at any one institution, Commissioner must consider national and regional need for facilities.

Limits award to include any person studying for a Ph. D. and intending to teach, or continue to teach, in an institution of higher education.

No awards for study at a "school or department of divinity."

Adjusts fellowship stipends for full calendar year of study and permits awards for any 3 years of graduate study.

TITLE V—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING

Increases authorizations to $24 million in fiscal year 1965 from present $17.5 million; $24.5 million in 1966; $30 million in 1967; and $30 million in 1968.

Extends program to all elementary grades, public junior colleges and public technical institutes.

Authorizes guidance and counseling institutes at not less than the present level of $7.25 million. These institutes are for counseling and guidance personnel in elementary or secondary schools, or in institutions of higher education (including junior colleges and technical institutes).

TITLE VI—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Increases authorization for language development program (VI–A) to $13 million in fiscal year 1965 from present $8 million;

$14 million in 1966; $16 million in 1967; and $18 million in 1968.

Modern language institutes (see title XI).

TITLE X—ADMINISTRATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF STATE STATISTICAL SERVICES

Requires State agency to keep records and afford access thereto.

Requires accounting procedures to assure proper disbursement of Federal funds, "including such funds paid by the State to the local educational agencies."

TITLE XI—TRAINING INSTITUTES

Authorizes guidance and counseling institutes at not less than the present level of $7.25 million. These institutes are for counseling and guidance personnel in elementary or secondary schools, or in institutions of higher education (including junior colleges and technical institutes).

Authorizes $32.75 million each for fiscal years 1965–68 for institutes for teacher or supervisors (or student teachers or supervisors) of modern foreign language reading, history, geography, English, disadvantaged youth, school library personnel, educational media specialists.

Stipends may be paid to all who attend institutes.

FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

Extends the federally impacted areas legislation (Public Laws 815, 874) for 1 year and directs a study of the effects of these laws. Includes District of Columbia in this program.

Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations, National Defense Education Act of 1958, title II, sec. 202(a), as proposed to be amended by Senate-House conference, Sept. 24, 1964

STUDENT LOANS

State	Fiscal year 1965	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968
United States and outlying parts	$163,300,000	$179,300,000	$190,000,000	$195,000,000
50 States and District of Columbia	162,176,927	178,066,889	188,693,302	193,658,914
Alabama	2,245,349	2,465,346	2,612,470	2,681,219
Alaska	65,897	72,255	76,567	78,581
Arizona	1,660,469	1,823,161	1,931,961	1,982,802
Arkansas	1,453,648	1,596,075	1,691,323	1,735,832
California	16,936,492	18,595,915	19,705,653	20,224,225
Colorado	2,270,206	2,492,639	2,641,391	2,710,901
Connecticut	2,071,351	2,274,300	2,410,023	2,473,444
Delaware	318,837	350,076	370,968	380,730
Florida	3,709,141	4,072,560	4,315,596	4,429,164
Georgia	2,704,085	2,969,029	3,146,211	3,229,006
Hawaii	568,096	623,757	660,981	678,375
Idaho	641,498	704,351	746,385	766,026
Illinois	8,082,566	8,874,490	9,404,088	9,651,564
Indiana	4,678,718	5,137,135	5,443,701	5,586,956
Iowa	3,103,388	3,407,456	3,610,801	3,705,822
Kansas	2,659,417	2,919,985	3,094,240	3,175,667
Kentucky	2,307,863	2,533,985	2,685,205	2,755,868
Louisiana	2,969,172	3,260,089	3,454,640	3,545,551
Maine	672,622	738,525	782,598	803,192
Maryland	2,298,143	2,523,313	2,673,896	2,744,262
Massachusetts	6,283,631	6,899,296	7,311,022	7,503,418
Michigan	7,057,009	7,748,449	8,210,849	8,426,924
Minnesota	3,954,895	4,342,392	4,601,531	4,722,624
Mississippi	1,931,505	2,120,752	2,247,311	2,306,451
Missouri	4,036,476	4,431,967	4,696,451	4,820,042
Montana	744,378	817,311	866,085	888,877
Nebraska	$1,546,967	$1,698,538	$1,799,901	$1,847,266
Nevada	176,388	193,670	205,228	210,629
New Hampshire	660,512	725,229	768,508	788,732
New Jersey	3,140,674	3,448,394	3,654,182	3,750,345
New Mexico	832,864	914,467	969,039	994,540
New York	13,144,547	14,432,439	15,293,716	15,696,183
North Carolina	4,104,514	4,506,671	4,775,613	4,901,287
North Dakota	786,815	863,906	915,461	939,552
Ohio	7,977,456	8,759,081	9,281,792	9,526,050
Oklahoma	2,636,526	2,894,850	3,067,605	3,148,331
Oregon	2,221,926	2,439,629	2,585,217	2,653,249
Pennsylvania	8,563,875	9,402,957	9,964,093	10,226,306
Rhode Island	861,757	946,192	1,002,657	1,029,043
South Carolina	1,640,605	1,801,350	1,908,849	1,959,082
South Dakota	758,931	833,290	883,018	906,255
Tennessee	3,205,418	3,519,483	3,729,513	3,827,658
Texas	8,943,740	9,820,040	10,406,065	10,679,909
Utah	1,844,824	2,025,579	2,146,458	2,202,944
Vermont	563,741	618,975	655,914	673,175
Virginia	2,706,635	2,971,829	3,149,177	3,232,050
Washington	3,265,223	3,585,147	3,799,097	3,899,073
West Virginia	1,424,223	1,563,767	1,657,088	1,700,695
Wisconsin	3,981,929	4,372,076	4,632,986	4,754,906
Wyoming	339,392	372,645	394,883	405,275
District of Columbia	1,422,683	1,562,076	1,655,295	1,698,856
American Samoa				
Canal Zone	23,157	25,426	26,944	27,653
Guam	16,890	18,545	19,651	20,169
Puerto Rico	1,081,698	1,187,682	1,258,558	1,291,678
Virgin Islands	1,328	1,458	1,545	1,586

NOTE.—Distribution of all amounts estimated on the basis of full-time degree credit enrollment (excluding U.S. service schools), fall 1963.

Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations, National Defense Education Act of 1958, title III, sec. 302(a), as proposed to be amended by Senate-House conference, Sept. 24, 1964, for each of fiscal years 1965, 1966, 1967, and 1968

State	Acquisition of equipment for science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects		State administration and supervision
	Grants for public schools	Loans for nonpublic schools	
United States and outlying parts	$79,200,000	$10,800,000	$10,000,000
50 States and District of Columbia	77,769,460	10,672,056	9,837,327
Alabama	2,089,073	53,059	188,955
Alaska	95,345	3,727	50,000
Arizona	825,045	56,075	82,976
Arkansas	1,096,763	21,472	99,201
California	4,692,896	693,843	849,066
Colorado	866,393	76,660	100,434
Connecticut	707,227	194,312	127,955
Delaware	133,952	33,894	50,000
Florida	2,256,586	154,385	264,126
Georgia	2,513,700	46,138	227,362
Hawaii	274,115	53,946	50,000
Idaho	430,778	15,971	50,000
Illinois	2,836,888	929,856	494,570
Indiana	2,028,256	227,141	245,847
Iowa	1,361,199	171,598	144,386
Kansas	1,025,334	91,211	113,784
Kentucky	1,852,916	155,272	167,595
Louisiana	2,141,299	250,387	193,679
Maine	494,084	62,641	50,525
Maryland	1,306,554	242,402	170,060
Massachusetts	1,528,454	461,379	247,901
Michigan	3,281,426	594,469	436,240
Minnesota	1,730,299	297,944	186,490
Mississippi	1,482,787	33,716	134,117
Missouri	1,684,094	294,573	210,521
Montana	353,453	36,733	50,000
Nebraska	687,541	100,261	73,734
Nevada	$96,991	$7,098	$50,000
New Hampshire	271,085	61,931	50,000
New Jersey	1,681,223	525,262	304,177
New Mexico	667,596	48,090	60,383
New York	4,443,154	1,486,173	803,881
North Carolina	2,915,620	34,426	263,716
North Dakota	397,376	36,378	50,000
Ohio	3,755,845	674,145	524,761
Oklahoma	1,266,671	37,798	124,464
Oregon	799,514	62,109	94,888
Pennsylvania	4,186,466	1,082,466	557,418
Rhode Island	297,661	93,518	50,000
South Carolina	1,621,303	28,038	146,646
South Dakota	441,994	41,347	50,000
Tennessee	2,159,466	55,011	195,322
Texas	5,374,317	266,180	550,229
Utah	616,541	10,825	57,713
Vermont	203,123	31,232	50,000
Virginia	2,262,271	98,487	224,487
Washington	1,235,333	102,213	157,326
West Virginia	1,105,846	30,699	100,023
Wisconsin	1,852,429	454,281	212,369
Wyoming	165,221	6,921	50,000
District of Columbia	175,957	44,363	50,000
American Samoa	50,000	2,307	10,000
Canal Zone	50,000	1,242	10,000
Guam	50,000	8,695	10,000
Puerto Rico	1,230,540	110,199	122,673
Virgin Islands	50,000	5,501	10,000

Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations, National Defense Education Act of 1958, title V, pt. A, sec. 501, as proposed to be amended by Senate-House conference, Sept. 24, 1964

GUIDANCE COUNSELING AND TESTING

State	Fiscal year 1965	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968
United States and outlying parts	$24,000,000	$24,500,000	$30,000,000	$30,000,000
50 States and District of Columbia	23,616,000	24,108,000	29,520,000	29,520,000
Alabama	465,334	475,091	582,223	582,223
Alaska	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Arizona	204,342	208,627	255,672	255,672
Arkansas	244,301	249,423	305,667	305,667
California	2,090,971	2,134,810	2,616,209	2,616,209
Colorado	247,335	252,521	309,464	309,464
Connecticut	315,112	321,719	394,267	394,267
Delaware	59,684	60,936	74,676	74,676
Florida	650,456	664,094	813,847	813,847
Georgia	559,919	571,658	700,567	700,567
Hawaii	93,067	95,018	116,445	116,445
Idaho	99,136	101,215	124,039	124,039
Illinois	1,217,962	1,243,498	1,523,907	1,523,907
Indiana	605,440	618,134	757,523	757,523
Iowa	355,576	363,031	444,895	444,895
Kansas	280,212	286,087	350,600	350,600
Kentucky	412,731	421,385	516,407	516,407
Louisiana	476,968	486,968	596,779	596,779
Maine	124,426	127,035	155,681	155,681
Maryland	418,801	427,582	524,001	524,001
Massachusetts	610,498	623,298	763,852	763,852
Michigan	1,074,315	1,096,840	1,344,177	1,344,177
Minnesota	459,265	468,894	574,629	574,629
Mississippi	330,286	337,211	413,252	413,252
Missouri	518,443	529,313	648,673	648,673
Montana	95,090	97,084	118,976	118,976
Nebraska	181,582	185,389	227,194	227,194
Nevada	$50,000	$50,000	$52,527	$52,527
New Hampshire	76,376	77,977	95,561	95,561
New Jersey	749,087	764,793	937,253	937,253
New Mexico	148,705	151,822	186,058	186,058
New York	1,979,695	2,021,201	2,476,982	2,476,982
North Carolina	649,445	663,061	812,581	812,581
North Dakota	88,515	90,371	110,749	110,749
Ohio	1,292,314	1,319,410	1,616,936	1,616,936
Oklahoma	306,514	312,940	383,508	383,508
Oregon	233,679	238,578	292,377	292,377
Pennsylvania	1,372,736	1,401,518	1,717,559	1,717,559
Rhode Island	101,665	103,797	127,203	127,203
South Carolina	361,140	368,712	451,856	451,856
South Dakota	98,631	100,699	123,406	123,406
Tennessee	481,014	491,099	601,842	601,842
Texas	1,355,033	1,383,444	1,695,409	1,695,409
Utah	142,129	145,109	177,831	177,831
Vermont	50,074	51,124	62,652	62,652
Virginia	552,837	564,428	691,707	691,707
Washington	387,441	395,565	484,764	484,764
West Virginia	246,324	251,488	308,199	308,199
Wisconsin	522,995	533,961	654,369	654,369
Wyoming	50,000	50,000	56,957	56,957
District of Columbia	78,399	80,042	98,092	98,092
Outlying parts	384,000	392,000	480,000	480,000
American Samoa	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Canal Zone	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Guam	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Puerto Rico	304,000	312,000	400,000	400,000
Virgin Islands	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000

NOTE.—Distribution of all amounts estimated on the basis of school-age (5 to 17) population as of July 1, 1962, for the 50 States, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico and as of Apr. 1, 1960, for the other outlying parts.

"THE ELECTION: WHAT'S GOOD FOR HOUSING?"

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the October issue of House & Home, which subscribers are receiving today. House & Home is a business publication with well over 100,000 subscribers—builders, architects, lenders, and so forth—who make up the giant housing industry. It is by all odds the most important publication in its field. Until August this year, it was published by Time, Inc.: it is now published by another giant, the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. This editorial, by Editor Richard O'Neill, is a landmark, for the magazine has never before openly supported a candidate for President.

I believe that this editorial is both forthright and an outstanding service to the homebuilding industry; and I am glad this magazine is endorsing Lyndon Johnson for election to the Presidency.

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

THE ELECTION: WHAT'S GOOD FOR HOUSING?

(By Richard W. O'Neill)

In its proposals to both Republican and Democratic platform committees, NAHB urged that "the Government-industry partnership should try to achieve a decent home for all Americans." House & Home agrees. "Government-industry partnership," always basic to housing, takes on added importance this year.

Like it or not, the Federal Government is inextricably and inevitably involved in housing. Both parties have good records in housing legislation. And in both there are many men and factions who understand both the need for housing and the ability of our industry to provide it.

Except in the war years, housing has prospered under every administration since 1934. In the past 3½ years 5.3 million new housing units have been built, and we are now building at an annual rate of almost 1.6 million units. There is every reason to believe that if present patterns of Federal housing legislation are continued, we could reach a yearly rate of 2 million units by 1968. By any measure that is good business. To insure good business, the housing industry must now look hard at the choice to be made next month. President Johnson's record—and philosophy—is written into the 1964 Housing Act for all to see. His opponent is a far less known quantity.

Lacking any assurances from Senator GOLDWATER, we can only judge him on his voting record.

Since 1954 GOLDWATER has voted against every congressional measure that would have created more housing and for every measure that would have curtailed housing. We cannot judge his understanding of housing's problems and responsibilities, since he has so rarely discussed them—either on the Senate floor or in public speeches. But if the Republican platform is any criterion, his understanding is sketchy and confused. Items:

The platform blames the Democrats for urban renewal programs that "created new slums by forcing the poor from their homes to make room for luxury apartments." The fact is urban renewal has not created new slums. What's more, both major parties have supported renewal ever since its inception in the 1949 Housing Act—and as recently as last month in the 1964 Housing Act.

The platform accuses the Johnson administration of failing to attract more private capital to housing. But more than 95 percent of all capital in housing is already private capital. So attracting more can hardly be a major problem.

In light of the Republican platform and in light of GOLDWATER's voting record, the housing industry has a right to demand a clear statement of the role his administration would play in housing—what laws he would enact and what laws he would repeal. True, the office of the Presidency might change GOLDWATER's attitude toward housing as it has changed the attitudes of other Chief Executives.

The question is will the Senator change his views enough to cope with the huge problems in urban growth—and hence housing—that lie just ahead? The United States is undergoing a process of urbanization that will, in a few years, have 8 out of 10 Americans living in and around our cities. Before 1999 we will rebuild almost all of our urban centers. The forces behind intensified urbanization—migrating populations, industrial growth, and regional economic changes—are all well above and beyond local determination and local control. The Federal Government should take a more vital role in housing by providing monetary and legislative tools that private industry needs to handle new housing problems created by this urbanization. In the face of these forces, GOLDWATER's espousal of Federal withdrawal from local affairs could be bad news for housing.

The record of both candidates is clear. GOLDWATER could curtail Federal involvement in housing. There is no question where Johnson stands. His approach to housing and urban problems is one that should be readily understood by every housing professional: "The solution to these problems does not rest on a massive program in Washington. Nor can it rely solely on the strained resources of local authorities. They require us to create new concepts of cooperation—a creative federalism—between the National Capital and the leaders of local communities.

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

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H.R. 12253.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12253) to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

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

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

FRANK B. ROWLETT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 1494, H.R. 7348.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7348) for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I call up my amendment at the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, it is proposed to strike out line 6 and insert the following: "which sum shall be considered a payment in consideration of a transfer by Frank B. Rowlett of property consisting of all substantial rights to a patent within the meaning of section 1235 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, in full settlement."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this amendment is offered to meet Treasury Department objection to the bill. It is my opinion that the bill is meritorious and should be passed. However, the Treasury Department objects to the tax principle involved in one provision, and it may be compelled to advocate a veto of the bill because of this tax principle involved, although the bill in other respects is meritorious.

I move adoption of the amendment, in order to meet the Treasury Department's objection, and I trust that the bill will be enacted into law.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this is a bill which provides for an award to Mr. Frank B. Rowlett of $100,000 for the contributions he has made in the field of crypto-analysis and cryptography. He was associated with a Mr. William F. Friedman in this work, which goes back many years. About 8 years ago Mr. Friedman was awarded a like sum. The Defense Department felt that Mr. Rowlett was fully entitled to this amount for the contributions he has made and the inventions which he has sponsored in the field of cryptography. Mr. Rowlett is still in Government service with a rating of GS–18.

This question was considered at length by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, but one objection was raised with respect to the tax feature.

I join in the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana to make this amount subject to a capital gains tax; although, I must say that it runs a little against the grain. If the man has done outstanding work and the Government itself wants to reward him and give him an award for work well done, let us give it to him, and not try to let the heavy hand of the Treasury reach out and pull away $25,000 of the $100,000. That sounds too much like Indian giving to me. I would rather have it across the board. When Government does that, one must assume that somehow the heart is not quite in it. As recited in "The Vision of Sir Launfal":

> For the gift without the giver is bare.

I believe that in this case the Government, as the giver, is just a little bare when it comes to fully expressing its appreciation. But if this measure is in danger of a veto, or if it is in danger of opposition by the Treasury—I learned long ago that three-fourths of a loaf is much better than no bread at all—I shall concur in it under circumstances in which I have no other choice to pursue.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator was much more generous in compromising last night.

He had the votes to defeat the amendment last night. I believe he is making a very fine compromise. He feels that without the amendment, the bill would be vetoed, and there would be no bill. I believe he is making an exceedingly good compromise. I believe it would be a fine thing to pass the bill in this form, in view of the fact that the Treasury is very much concerned about the principles involved because of the tax features.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the committee, beginning on the first page of the report, be printed at this point in the RECORD in its entirety. It is in some detail.

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

STATEMENT

The facts surrounding this legislation are set forth in House Report 1689 on H.R. 7348, as follows:

"In its report to the committee on the bill, the Department of Defense stated that it had examined the merits of the case and strongly recommended that Mr. Rowlett be granted relief. The Department further stated that Mr. Rowlett has had a long and distinguished career in the field of cryptology. According to its records, he conceived fundamental principles which assured the high security capability of major cryptographic systems and equipment used so successfully by the United States during World War II. These are still in use and held in a classified status, and have significant commercial potential value which is probably greatly in excess of the payment proposed by the bill.

"Mr. Rowlett began his Government service on April 1, 1930, as a junior cryptanalyst, P–1, in the Office of the Chief Signal Officer, Signal Corps, U.S. Army. Between 1930 and 1935 Mr. Rowlett, still a junior cryptanalyst, pioneered in the development of concepts, techniques, and devices which established the practicality of applying computerlike devices to the general field of cryptography. During this same period he also conceived the basic principles underlying the inventions cited in the proposed bill, and jointly with Mr. William F. Friedman invented methods for the practical application of these principles. In 1935 he was listed in official memorandums as principal assistant to Mr. Friedman, chief cryptanalyst for the Office of the Chief Signal Officer since 1921. The following year, 1936, he was promoted to assistant cryptanalyst, P–2. Just prior to World War II he was responsible for the specific direction and coordination of U.S. Army activities which culminated in the successful breaking of a Japanese cipher machine of major importance. When he was furloughed for military duty on February 16, 1942, Mr. Rowlett had advanced to the position of senior cryptanalyst, P–5. Commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Signal Corps, U.S. Army, he was assigned the MOS of cryptanalytic officer. During his military service, he was awarded the Legion of Merit (United States) and the Order of the British Empire (British). He was separated from the service as a colonel. On May 2, 1946, Mr. Rowlett returned to his civilian employment with the Office of the Chief Signal Officer as a research analyst (cryptanalytic), P–8. He continued to serve with this agency until September 30, 1949, when he transferred to the newly created Armed Forces Security Agency (the predecessor of the National Security Agency) and assumed a key position, Technical Director, Operations. On February 15, 1952, he resigned his position with NSA and accepted an appointment with the Central Intelligence Agency. During his employment with CIA, he served as a senior staff officer in grades GS–16 and GS–17 and was awarded the Distinguished Intelligence Medal. On July 12, 1958, he returned to the National Security Agency as Special Assistant to the Director, GS–18, a position he still holds. He has continued to make significant contributions to the science of cryptography, and in April 1960 received the National Security Agency Exceptional Civilian Service Award.

"Patent applications for the two inventions cited in the proposed bill were filed by the Army in 1936 (serial No. 70,412) and 1942 (serial No. 443,320), respectively. Mr. Friedman and Mr. Rowlett, then principal assistant to Mr. Friedman, were listed as coinventors in both applications. It is these two inventions that have resulted in the high degree of security capability for U.S. communications beginning before World War II and continuing to the present. A memorandum written to the Signal Corps Patent Office by Mr. Friedman and Mr. Rowlett on August 31, 1935, credits Mr. Rowlett with contributing the fundamental principle and three of the five subsidiary principles and Mr. Friedman with contributing two of the five subsidiary principles. With respect to the first invention, it appears that Mr. Rowlett's contribution was the greater. A Navy document entitled 'The Contribution of the Signal Corps,' dated November 2, 1943, and prepared by Capt. L. S. Stafford, U.S. Navy, states in part:

" 'Rowlett is entitled to full credit for his discovery of the principle * * * and Friedman and Rowlett jointly are entitled to full credit for their joint invention of methods of applying and reducing his principle to practical form.' (NOTE.—Classified portions deleted.)

"The respective contributions of the two men to the second invention are not officially recorded. Since Mr. Rowlett and Mr. Friedman were joint inventors in both inventions, however, they have equal rights in these inventions and their losses due to the

imposition of secrecy by the Government would be the same.

"In the early 1950's several private bills were introduced in behalf of Mr. Friedman, each proposing an award to compensate him for his loss of commercial rights to cryptologic inventions covered by applications for patents held in secrecy by the Government. In 1956 one of these bills was enacted and became Private Law 625, 84th Congress. Although two of the inventions for which Mr. Friedman received his award are the same inventions upon which the present bill is founded, Mr. Rowlett did not become a party of any of the private bills which sought to compensate Mr. Friedman. In the memorandum he prepared on September 20, 1962, when he formally sought the Department's permission to seek legislative relief, Mr. Rowlett explained in paragraph 3:

" 'I was asked by Mr. Friedman sometime prior to 1952 to join him in presenting his case to Congress. I declined, pointing out to him that I thought the Government should take the initiative in recognizing our contributions if they were worthy of monetary award. While I still feel the Government should take the initiative, enough time has elapsed since Friedman received his award to cause me to conclude it is most unlikely that my contributions will be recognized unless I take positive steps to bring their merits to the attention of the Congress.'

"The records of the Department of Defense disclose that, in his appeal for relief, Mr. Friedman stressed the importance of the two inventions of which he was coinventor with Mr. Rowlett over the five additional inventions to which he held sole patent rights, and that he associated his loss mainly to his inability to exploit these two inventions. Of the seven inventions he stressed the importance of the 1936 invention (patent application serial No. 70,412) above all others and placed the 1942 invention (patent application serial No. 443,320) next in importance. He then developed detailed evidence which convinced the Department and the Congress that, if he had been able to exploit these two inventions domestically and among allied foreign governments, he would have obtained amounts of money far in excess of the sum of money he sought from Congress.

"In its report to the committee on the bill, the Department of Defense stated that the Department's views today are properly reflected by the following extract from a letter dated July 6, 1953, which the Honorable Robert T. Stevens, Secretary of the Army, sent to the Honorable Chauncey W. Reed, then chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, with respect to H.R. 1152, 83d Congress, a bill for the relief of William F. Friedman:

" 'When the fruit of an inventor's labor has been of substantial benefit to his government and his right to seek reward for his efforts is impaired for so great a period of time for security reasons, it is equitable that he be compensated for his loss. This view is in accord with the policy of the Department of encouraging technological advancement. To deny an inventor the right to seek gain from his inventions merely because they are vital to our national defense and the security of the Government, while permitting such pursuit by inventors in other fields where security interests are not paramount, would be discriminatory and would discourage advancement in matters vital to our national defense.'

"In recommending favorable consideration of the bill while opposing the tax exemption provision, the Department of Defense stated:

" 'The Department of Defense considers that, in view of the available evidence, Mr. Rowlett is equitably entitled to compensation equal to that of Mr. Friedman. Accordingly, the Department favors the grant of an award of $100,000 to Mr. Rowlett in full settlement for his rights in the inventions which are referred to in H.R. 7348. The Department opposes, however, the provision in H.R. 7348 which would exempt the award to Mr. Rowlett from taxation for the reasons expressed in the enclosed copy of a letter of February 17, 1964, from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.'

"The Treasury Department in a letter which accompanied the Defense Department report took the view that this payment is 'compensatory in nature' and that this fact supports subjecting it to taxation. The committee has considered the arguments advanced by the Treasury Department, but is of the opinion that the tax exemption feature should be retained in the bill. The payment in this instance could be said to be based upon the years of service and outstanding contributions of Mr. Rowlett, as well as upon a moral obligation on the part of the United States to pay equitable compensation for inventions subject to security restrictions. In this sense, it can be stated that the award is for meritorious service. In this connection, the committee feels that it is relevant to note that the income tax law itself contains an exemption for amounts received as prizes and awards made primarily in recognition of scientific achievement (26 U.S.C. 74(b)). The exemption of section 74(b) is made subject to the conditions that the recipient was selected without any action on his part to enter a contest or proceeding and is not required to render future services as a condition to receiving a reward. Also, it should be noted that Private Law 87–578 providing for an award to the estate of an inventor was amended on August 15, 1963, to extend tax exemption to the award authorized by the private law. In view of this precedent and in view of the particular circumstances of this case, it is recommended that the tax exemption be retained and that the bill be considered favorably.

"The committee is advised that an attorney has rendered services in connection with this matter. The bill, therefore, carries the usual 10-percent limitation upon attorney's fees."

The committee has received a supplemental report from the Treasury Department, which is hereto attached. After consideration of the report the committee believes that circumstances warrant the same treatment as was given in Private Law 87–578, as amended by Private Law 88–32, in regard to the tax exemption.

After a review of the foregoing, the committee concurs in the action of the House of Representatives and recommends that the bill, H.R. 7348, be considered favorably.

Attached hereto and made a part hereof are reports submitted by the Department of Commerce, the Department of Defense, and the Treasury Department on H.R. 7348.

GENERAL COUNSEL,
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C. September 17, 1963.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in reply to your request for the views of the Department of Commerce with respect to H.R. 7348, a bill for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett.

You are advised that while the language of H.R. 7348 undertakes to identify certain patent applications involved and although the administration of the patent law relating to issuance of patents is a responsibility of the Department of Commerce, the merits of the issue presented by the bill—whether a payment, as compensation for services rendered to the Government, in the proposed amount or otherwise, is appropriate—is a matter concerning which this Department is not informed. We defer in this matter to the agencies which may have been benefited from the activities of Mr. Rowlett.

The Bureau of the Budget advised there would be no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. GILES.

GENERAL COUNSEL
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1964.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You have requested the views of the Department of Defense on H.R. 7348, 88th Congress, a bill for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett, who is presently employed by the National Security Agency. The specific purpose of the bill is to authorize a lump-sum payment to Mr. Rowlett as equitable compensation for his loss of opportunity to realize benefit from his commercial rights to cryptologic inventions which the Government uses and holds in classified status.

The Department has examined the merits of the case and strongly recommends that Mr. Rowlett be granted relief. Mr. Rowlett has had a long and distinguished career in the field of cryptology. According to our records, he conceived fundamental principles which assured the high security capability of major cryptographic systems and equipment used so successfully by the United States during World War II. These are still in use and held in a classified status, and have significant commercial potential value which is probably greatly in excess of the payment proposed by the bill.

Mr. Rowlett began his Government service on April 1, 1930, as a junior cryptanalyst, P–1, in the Office of the Chief Signal Officer, Signal Corps, U.S. Army. Between 1930 and 1935 Mr. Rowlett, still a junior cryptanalyst, pioneered in the development of concepts, techniques, and devices which established the practicality of applying computerlike devices to the general field of cryptography. During this same period he also conceived the basic principles underlying the inventions cited in the proposed bill, and jointly with Mr. William F. Friedman invented methods for the practical application of these principles. In 1935 he was listed in official memorandums as principal assistant to Mr. Friedman, chief cryptanalyst for the Office of the Chief Signal Officer since 1921. The following year, 1936, he was promoted to assistant cryptanalyst, P–2. Just prior to World War II he was responsible for the specific direction and coordination of U.S. Army activities which culminated in the successful breaking of a Japanese cipher machine of major importance. When he was furloughed for military duty on February 16, 1942, Mr. Rowlett had advanced to the position of senior cryptanalyst, P–5. Commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Signal Corps, U.S. Army, he was assigned the MOS of crytanalytic officer. During his military service he was awarded the Legion of Merit (United States) and the Order of the British Empire (British). He was separated from the service as a colonel. On May 2, 1946, Mr. Rowlett returned to his civilian employment with the Office of the Chief Signal Officer as a research analyst (cryptanalytic), P–8. He continued to serve with this agency until September 30, 1949, when he transferred to the newly created Armed Forces Security Agency (the predecessor of the National Security Agency) and assumed a key position, Technical Director, Operations. On February 15, 1952, he resigned his position with NSA and accepted an appointment with the Central Intelligence Agency. During his employment with CIA he served as a senior staff officer in grades GS–16 and GS–17 and was awarded the Distinguished Intelligence

Medal. On July 12, 1958, he returned to the National Security Agency as Special Assistant to the Director, GS–18, a position he still holds. He has continued to make significant contributions to the science of cryptography, and in April 1960 received the National Security Agency Exceptional Civilian Service Award.

Patent applications for the two inventions cited in the proposed bill were filed by the Army in 1936 (serial No. 70,412) and 1942 (serial No. 443,320) respectively. Mr. Friedman and Mr. Rowlett, then principal assistant to Mr. Friedman were listed as co-inventors in both applications. It is these two inventions that have resulted in the high degree of security capability for U.S. communications beginning before World War II and continuing to the present. A memorandum written to the Signal Corps Patent Office by Mr. Friedman and Mr. Rowlett on August 31, 1935, credits Mr. Rowlett with contributing the fundamental principle and three of the five subsidiary principles and Mr. Friedman with contributing two of the five subsidiary principles. With respect to the first invention, it appears that Mr. Rowlett's contribution was the greater. A Navy document entitled "The Contribution of the Signal Corps," dated November 2, 1943, and prepared by Capt. L. S. Safford, U.S. Navy, states in part: "Rowlett is entitled to full credit for his discovery of the principle * * * and Friedman and Rowlett jointly are entitled to full credit for their joint invention of methods of applying and reducing this principle to practical form." (NOTE.—Classified portions deleted.) The respective contributions of the two men to the second invention are not officially recorded. Since Mr. Rowlett and Mr. Friedman were joint inventors in both inventions, however, they have equal rights in these inventions and their losses due to the imposition of secrecy by the Government would be the same.

In the early 1950's several private bills were introduced in behalf of Mr. Friedman, each proposing an award to compensate him for his loss of commercial rights to cryptologic inventions covered by applications for patents held in secrecy by the Government. In 1956 one of these bills was enacted and became Private Law 625, 84th Congress. Although two of the inventions for which Mr. Friedman received his award are the same inventions upon which the present bill is founded, Mr. Rowlett did not become a party to any of the private bills which sought to compensate Mr. Friedman. In the memorandum he prepared on September 20, 1962. when he formally sought the Department's permission to seek legislative relief, Mr. Rowlett explained in paragraph 3:

"I was asked by Mr. Friedman sometime prior to 1952 to join him in presenting his case to Congress. I declined, pointing out to him that I thought the Government should take the initiative in recognizing our contributions if they were worthy of monetary award. While I still feel the Government should take the initiative, enough time has elapsed since Friedman received his award to cause me to conclude it is most unlikely that my contributions will be recognized unless I take positive steps to bring their merits to the attention of the Congress."

The Department's records disclose that, in his appeal for relief, Mr. Friedman stressed the importance of the two inventions of which he was coinventor with Mr. Rowlett over the five additional inventions to which he held sole patent rights, and that he associated his loss mainly to his inability to exploit these two inventions. Of the seven inventions he stressed the importance of the 1936 invention (patent application serial No. 70,412) above all others and placed the 1942 invention (patent application serial No. 443,320) next in importance. He then developed detailed evidence which convinces the Department and the Congress that, if he had been able to exploit these two inventions domestically and among allied foreign governments, he would have obtained amounts of money far in excess of the sum of money he sought from Congress.

The Department's views today are properly reflected by the following extract from a letter dated July 6, 1953, which the Honorable Robert T. Stevens, Secretary of the Army, sent to the Honorable Chauncey W. Reed, then chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, with respect to H.R. 1152, 83d Congress, a bill for the relief of William F. Friedman:

"Where the fruits of an inventor's labor has been of substantial benefit to his Government and his right to seek reward for his efforts is impaired for so great a period of time for security reasons, it is equitable that he be compensated for his loss. This view is in accord with the policy of the Department of encouraging technological advancement. To deny an inventor the right to seek gain from his inventions merely because they are vital to our national defense and the security of the Government, while permitting such pursuit by inventors in other fields where security interests are not paramount, would be discriminatory and would discourage advancement in matters vital to our national defense."

The Department of Defense considers that, in view of the available evidence, Mr. Rowlett is equitably entitled to compensation equal to that of Mr. Friedman. Accordingly, the Department favors the grant of an award of $100,000 to Mr. Rowlett in full settlement for his rights in the inventions which are referred to in H.R. 7348. The Department opposes, however, the provision in H.R. 7348 which would exempt the award to Mr. Rowlett from taxation for the reasons expressed in the enclosed copy of a letter of February 17, 1964, from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this report for the consideration of the committee.

Sincerely,

L. NIEDERLEHNER
(For John T. McNaughton).

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., February 17, 1964.

Hon. KERMIT GORDON,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GORDON: You requested the views of this Department on the fact that H.R. 7348, a bill for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett, provides that the sum which will be paid to Mr. Rowlett shall be exempt from all taxation.

The specific purpose of H.R. 7348 is to authorize a lump sum payment to Mr. Rowlett as equitable compensation for his loss of opportunity to realize benefit from his commercial rights to cryptologic inventions which the Government uses and holds in a classified status. The Department of Defense has examined the merits of the case and strongly recommends that Mr. Rowlett be granted relief.

We have considered the general question of whether private relief bills should exempt the payments made by their terms from taxation. Of course, exemption, even if proper in cases like the present one where the award is compensatory in nature, would not be appropriate where actual compensation to the recipient of relief is not involved, as, for example, where the private bill lengthens the period of a statute of limitations.

Several reasons have been advanced to justify an exemption from taxation for compensatory awards in private relief bills, but we believe these reasons are not overly persuasive.

It has been argued that it is difficult in some cases for Congress to form a sound judgment on whether an award was appropriate in light of the taxes which would be payable upon it. This is because of problems in determining how the award should be taxed and the fact that the amount of tax imposed upon the award will frequently depend upon the other taxable income of the individual receiving relief. It has also been urged that if such awards are to be subject to tax, Congress, despite the difficulties mentioned above, may increase the amount of such awards to allow for the tax. However, these arguments overemphasize the difficulties in reaching a fair determination of appropriate compensation where an amount is to be subject to tax.

In addition, it has been urged that such awards frequently provide for lump sum payments to compensate for a loss of income which would have been received over a number of years. Thus, the taxation of such awards may be excessive because the lump payment is taxed in 1 year. However, assuming the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1964, the averaging provision adopted therein will operate to mitigate any unfair tax consequences which might result from the receipt of a compensatory award in a lump sum.

Where an award is compensatory in nature, that fact alone strongly supports subjecting it to taxation. The President of the United States, in approving H.R. 3662, for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett, expressed the hope that provisions exempting awards under private relief bills from taxation would not find their way into future private legislation and outlined some of the reasons why such exemptions are not proper. The President stated that the moral and equitable considerations supporting these awards argue strongly in favor of making them subject to the income tax laws. He stated that there was no valid reason for treating recipients of these compassionate awards more favorably than the taxpayers who must finance them and who receive no special treatment in meeting comparable tax obligations. The President expressed the view that the adjustment of the amount of the award by Congress did not provide an adequate basis for tax exemption since such action was inconsistent with the sound, prevailing practice under which an individual receives compensation or other payments and then has his tax liability computed under general tax law and, among other things, in relation to other sources of income.

For the foregoing reasons, the Treasury Department opposes exempting such awards from taxation. Therefore, it opposes such a provision in H.R. 7348.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY S. SURREY,
Assistant Secretary.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., September 10, 1964.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter supplements the Treasury Department's views on H.R. 7348, a bill for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett, which is now being considered by your committee. Our previous expression of views is set forth in the report of the House Committee on the Judiciary on this bill.

H.R. 7348 would pay $100,000 to Frank B. Rowlett in full settlement of all rights in respect to his cryptologic inventions which have been placed in secrecy status by the

Department of Defense. The Treasury Department is opposed to the provision in this bill which would exempt the $100,000 payment from all taxation.

The report of the House Committee on the Judiciary, in approving the exemption from tax, implies that section 74(b) of the Internal Revenue Code is a precedent for the exemption. The committee noted that "the income tax law itself contains an exemption for amounts received as prizes and award made primarily in recognition of scientific achievement (26 U.S.C. 74(b)). The exemption of section 74(b) is made subject to the conditions that the recipient was selected without any action on his part to enter a contest or proceeding and is not required to render future services as a condition to receiving a reward."

The Department believes that the congressional intent expressed in section 74(b) not only does not support exemption from tax for the $100,000 payment to Mr. Rowlett, but is contrary to such exemption. Section 74 was adopted by Congress in 1954 to overrule certain cases which held that some prizes or awards were not subject to tax, and laid down the general rule that gross income includes amounts received as prizes and awards. The narrow exemption in section 74(b) was intended to exempt such awards as the Nobel and Pulitzer Prizes. However, the reports of the congressional tax committees specifically stated that section 74(b) "is not intended to exclude prizes or awards from an employer to an employee in recognition of some achievement in connection with his employment." This rule is also set forth in the Treasury Department regulations. Therefore, even if one could view the payment to Mr. Rowlett as not being of a compensatory nature, which view the Treasury Department does not share, the payment would nevertheless constitute in substance an award from an employer to an employee in recognition of an achievement connected with his employment, and thus includible in gross income.

The Treasury Department believes that a tax exemption for this $100,000 payment to Mr. Rowlett would discriminate against other taxpayers similarly situated. For example, in 1956 Congress awarded $100,000 to Mr. Friedman, Mr. Rowlett's colleague, for his contribution to the two inventions for which Mr. Rowlett now seeks compensation. (Private Law 625, 84th Cong.) No tax exemption was provided for Mr. Friedman who did not have two tax benefits now available to Mr. Rowlett in the form of the recently enacted reduced rates of Federal income tax and the provision for income averaging. Similar awards of $100,000 also were made in the 85th Congress to Mr. Lawrence F. Safford for cryptographic systems developed by him, and in the 86th Congress to Col. John A. Ryan, Jr., for his development of a new bombing system (Private Law 494, 85th Cong.; Private Law 492, 86th Cong.). No exemption from tax was provided by Congress for these taxpayers.

The discrimination inherent in a tax exemption provision can be more fully appreciated by noting that, to have provided Mr. Rowlett's colleague, Mr. Friedman, with $100,000 of disposable income, after Federal income taxes at 1956 rates, would have required an award in excess of $500,000. This estimate assumes that Mr. Friedman's taxable income would have equaled the amount of the award and that he filed a joint return.

The report of the House Judiciary Committee also notes that Private Law 87-578, which provided an award of $100,000 to the estate of an inventor, was retroactively amended to extend tax exemption to the award. (Private Law 32, 88th Cong.) The Department believes that the tax exemption provided by Private Law 88-32, for the relief of the estate of Gregory J. Kessenich, should not be relied upon as a precedent to deviate from the prior uniform congressional practice of not providing tax exemption for awards of this nature. As set forth in your committee's report on the Kessenich bill, a Treasury Department staff memorandum noted that the income-averaging proposal contained in President Kennedy's 1963 tax message would, if enacted, accord relief for the future to taxpayers in situations where income is bunched in 1 year. Moreover, reduced rates of income taxation then being considered by Congress would provide additional relief. Your committee's report on the Kessenich bill further stated that your "committee does not approve of a tax-free amount as a matter of policy generally in bills for payments to individuals, but on occasion there are special circumstances which indicate that such a freedom from tax liability should be recognized." Perhaps the fact that income-averaging provisions of general applicability were then being considered by Congress was a significant factor in your committee's departure from its general policy in the Kessenich case.

Your committee's general policy of not approving a tax-free amount in bills for payments to individuals was subsequently endorsed by President Johnson in December 1963 when, in approving H.R. 3663 for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett, he expressed the hope that provisions exempting from taxation awards under private relief bills would not find their way into future private legislation and outlined some of the reasons why such exemptions are inappropriate. The President stated that the moral and equitable considerations supporting these awards argue strongly in favor of making them subject to the income tax laws. He stated that there was no valid reason for treating recipients of these compassionate awards more favorably than the taxpayers who must finance them and who receive no special treatment in meeting comparable tax obligations. The President expressed the view that the adjustment of the amount of the award by Congress did not provide an adequate basis for tax exemption since such action was inconsistent with the sound, prevailing practice under which an individual receives compensation or other payments and then has his tax liability computed under general tax law, and, among other things, in relation to other sources of income.

In summary, the Treasury Department believes that exempting from tax the $100,000 payment to Mr. Rowlett would discriminate against other taxpayers similarly situated, and particularly against Mr. Rowlett's colleague, Mr. Friedman, as well as other inventors whose $100,000 awards were subject to tax. The Department also believes that the recent enactment by Congress of reduced rates of income tax and the income-averaging provisions remove any special circumstances justifying freedom from tax liability in cases such as this.

For the foregoing reasons, the Treasury Department opposes the tax exemption provisions contained in H.R. 7348.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY S. SURREY,
Assistant Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 7348) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12253) to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], on behalf of himself, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] as follows:

On page 15, strike out lines 1 through 17 (section 21 of the bill).

Renumber the succeeding sections.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, my amendment would strike from the bill a provision that removes the 20-percent duty now imposed against the importation of Canadian limestone chips and spalls. A bill on this subject has been pending in the House.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I suggest that if the Senator wishes to offer the amendment, we could suggest the absence of a quorum in order that Senators who are interested in supporting the amendment and those who are particularly affected by it might be present to speak for their position.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely send the amendment to the desk at this time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is not calling the amendment up at this time?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Very well.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the amendment which was adopted by the committee, but which was not in the original bill, would remove the 20-percent duty on limestone.

The Great Lakes States of Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana,

and Ohio are vitally affected by the amendment that was adopted by the committee. We had no knowledge of the fact that this amendment was to be taken up.

We have not had an opportunity to make inquiry about what the real impact of the duty would be. I have tried to consult Senators from the Great Lakes area of the country. I have learned from them that the industry would be greatly harmed by the committee amendment to the bill.

I intend to make further inquiry concerning the real impact of the removal of this duty upon industries in Ohio, which are vitally interested. I shall later determine whether I shall press for the adoption of the measure.

Mr. President, I ask that the RECORD show that the amendment is cosponsored by my colleague, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

Section ——. Amendments to the Sugar Act of 1948.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. —. Amendments to the Sugar Act of 1948.

"(a) Section 202(c) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended (relating to quotas for foreign countries) is amended by striking out '1963 and 1964' in each place it appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "1963 through the first six months of 1965", and by adding a new subparagraph (7) at the end thereof as follows:

"'(7) The quantities established for the first six months of 1965 shall be one-half of the annnual quantities provided for in the other subparagraphs of this subsection (c).

"(b) Section 213 of such Act is amended (1) by striking from section 213(c) the language 'during the years 1962, 1963, and 1964, which fee in each such year shall be respectively 10, 20, and 30 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof 'during the years 1962, 1963, and 1964 and the first six months of 1965, which fee shall be 10 per centum in 1962, 20 per centum in 1963 and 30 per centum in 1964 and the first six months of 1965'; and (2) by striking from section 213 (c) the language 'during the years 1962, 1963, and 1964 shall be respectively 0.1, 0.2, and 0.3 of one cent per pound' and inserting in lieu thereof 'during the years 1962, 1963, 1964 and first six months of 1965 shall be in 1962 0.1 of one cent, in 1963 0.2 of one cent, and in 1964 and the first six months of 1965 0.3 of one cent per pound'.

"(c) The following new paragraph (3) is added at the end of section 202(a) of such Act:

"'(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the domestic beet sugar area and the mainland cane sugar area may be permitted to market in 1964, as determined by the Secretary, in addition to the quota established for such area in 1964, a quantity of sugar not exceeding 275,000 short tons, raw value, and 225,000 short tons, raw value, respectively, and such additional quantities of sugar shall be deducted from the quantities of sugar which otherwise may be authorized for purchase and importation in 1964 pursuant to section 202(c)(4)(A) of this Act.'"

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to carry out the intention and wishes that the administration expressed over the past 2 years, and to meet a situation which has developed within the past few weeks.

The amendment has three essential purposes—first, to extend the foreign quota provisions of the Sugar Act until June 30, 1965, as recommended this week in a letter dated September 25, 1964, from the Under Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Murphy. This letter was addressed to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.

The second provision would leave the fee on the global sugar quota intact at the full rate, and keep the fee on statutory sugar quotas applicable from January 1 to June 30, 1965, at 30 percent of the full rate on global sugar.

This, too, was recommended by Under Secretary Murphy in his letter of September 25, and in the letter dated September 28 from the State Department to Chairman Cooley, of the House Committee on Agriculture. It was recommended that any change in the fee be deferred for the time being.

The third purpose of the amendment is to permit domestic beet and mainland cane sugar areas to market up to 275,000 tons of beet and 225,000 tons of cane, respectively, of the extra sugar produced at Government request in 1963, but which they are now unable to market without congressional action.

This represents only a small part of the extra sugar which these two areas produced at Government request from the 1963 crops, and which are now being produced from the 1964 crop.

The fact that the Government urged these two areas to produce the extra sugar is well documented. The administration is also firmly on record as favoring congressional action to permit the marketing of the extra sugar. The administration has recommended that the 1964 domestic marketings be completely unlimited. This was done by the Secretary of Agriculture in December of 1963, and by the President himself in his message on the agricultural program in January of this year.

In the interest of orderly marketing, the bill does not go as far in regard to extra 1964 marketings as the administration recommended. It places the limits that I have mentioned, 275,000 tons for mainland beet, and 225,000 tons for mainland cane marketings.

Under the proposed amendment even these amounts could be less, if in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, authorization of the full amounts would contribute to disorderly marketing. Permitting the domestic market to market up to a total of 500,000 tons of additional sugar this year would not reduce the imports from any foreign country by one pound.

That extra allocation would come from the unallocated portion of the global quota. The remaining portion of the old Cuban quota had already been reserved by the Department of Agriculture earlier this year for the specific purpose of permitting some extra domestic marketings this year. Our American farmers desperately need the marketing relief which the bill would provide, modest as it is. In the absence of such relief, they would be forced to store sugar at great expense to themselves, even though the Government had urged them to produce it to sell and not to store.

Mr. President, in my opening statement I referred to certain expressions of policy by the administration. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the U.S. Department of Agriculture Release No. 848–63, dated March 14, 1963.

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

NO SUGARBEET ACREAGE RESTRICTIONS IN 1964

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman announced today that there will be no acreage restrictions (proportionate shares) on the 1964 crop of sugarbeets.

The 1963 domestic beet sugar marketing quota is approximately 2,700,000 tons. Stocks of beet sugar on hand January 1, 1963, amounted to 1,368,000 tons and it is anticipated that 616,000 tons will be produced from 1962-crop beets to be harvested in 1963. This provides a supply of 1,984,000 tons of beet sugar to meet requirements until new-crop sugar reaches the market next fall. Marketings of beet sugar in the last quarter of the year will be heavy. A larger quantity of old-crop sugar would have promoted more orderly marketing throughout the year in accordance with the present quota.

Production of sugar from the 1962 crop of beets had been estimated at 2,580,000 tons by the beet sugar industry. Even a large increase in 1963 production would not result in excessive reserve supplies.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture indicated it is too early to determine whether

restrictions will be necessary on the 1965 crop. However, it observed that production will have to exceed marketings sufficiently to create safe and reasonable stocks before acreage restrictions could be reimposed.

It is assumed that the industry will attempt in 1963 to produce at the maximum capacity of its plants. Today's action is expected to encourage plant expansion.

First, it should encourage existing plants to modernize and expand their facilities since they can now be assured of at least 2 years of unrestricted operations.

Second, new plants under construction for operation in 1963 and 1964 could be expanded immediately to their ultimate capacity so as to take advantage of this opportunity for full production and the building of production and marketing history in excess of the tonnage provided from the national acreage reserve.

USDA suggests that when acreage restrictions are reimposed, major consideration should be given to production history in the period immediately preceding the resumption of controls. That should provide fair treatment for those who increase production sufficiently to meet prospective marketing quotas and stock requirements.

Mr. BENNETT. The release states, among other things—

It is assumed that the industry will attempt in 1963 to produce at the maximum capacity of its plants. Today's action is expected to encourage plant expansion.

That action was an announcement that there would be no acreage restrictions in the 1964 crop of sugarbeets. It stated—

First, it should encourage existing plants to modernize and expand their facilities since they can now be assured of at least 2 years of unrestricted operations; second, new plants under construction for operation in 1963 and 1964 could be expanded immediately to their ultimate capacity so as to take advantage of this opportunity for full production and the building of production and marketing history in excess of the tonnage provided from the national acreage reserve.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD USDA Bulletin No. 1500–63 dated May 6 of that year.

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

NO SUGARBEET ACREAGE RESTRICTIONS FOR 1965 CROP

The U.S. Department of Agriculture announced today that acreage restrictions (proportionate shares) would not be established for the 1965 crop of sugarbeets.

This announcement was made concurrently with action taken by the Department which increased 1963 domestic sugar requirements (total quotas) from 9,800,000 tons to 10,400,000 tons. At the same time the 291,537 tons of 1963 quota increase accruing to the beet area was reallocated to the foreign countries because the anticipated supplies of beet sugar available this year make it unlikely that the area would market the additional sugar.

On March 14, 1963 (USDA 848–63), the Department announced that 1964 crop sugarbeet plantings would not be restricted. At that time, it was observed that beet sugar production would have to exceed marketings sufficiently to create safe and reasonable stock levels before acreage restrictions could be reimposed. Today's action establishing the 1963 requirements at 10,400,000 tons, with accompanying quotas for the beet area of 2,990,127 short tons, reemphasizes the need for additional beet stocks to permit the area to meet future marketing opportunities.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on June 5 Mr. Murphy, Under Secretary of Agriculture, testifying before the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, said—

One of the major objectives of the Department in announcing that restrictions would not be imposed upon sugarbeet production in 1964 and 1965 was to encourage the modernization and expansion of existing factories and the enlargement of factories now under construction.

On page 26 of the printed record of hearings on sugar prices before the Senate Finance Committee on May 29 and June 6, Mr. Lawrence Myers, then Director of the Sugar Policy staff of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, appeared with the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Murphy. Mr. Murphy said, in response to the question of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]—

Certainly we would hope that production will increase as a result of this action.

In a statement before the same subcommittee Mr. Myers said—and it was for exactly that reason, as the Secretary pointed out in his testimony this morning—that—

The industry is assured that acreage restrictions will not be applied in either 1964 or 1965 to encourage this modernization and expansion immediately, so that they would get on this higher basis of production.

Mr. President, there are other materials that I should like to offer for the RECORD without taking the time to read them. They include, first, a statement by Tom O. Murphy, Director of Sugar Policy Staff of the Agriculture Stabilization Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and second, a statement by Charles Murphy, the Under Secretary of Agriculture.

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

IMPORTANCE OF DOMESTIC SUGAR SUPPLIES

"Let me take this occasion to congratulate on two scores the farmers who grow sugarbeets and the companies which process them into sugar: First, that they were successful in producing a tremendous crop of sugar when it was needed. Second, that although they raised their prices last year they did not raise them as much as the cane sugar refiners did."—Tom O. Murphy, Director, Sugar Policy Staff, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at the annual meeting of the California Beet Growers Association, in San Francisco, January 31, 1964.

"Finally, let me say that all of us should be grateful for our Sugar Act and the assurance it makes possible for sugar supplies at this time. It should be abundantly clear that U.S. sugar supplies today would be infinitely more precarious if we had not had the protection of this law and the quota system over the past 30 years. For without this system, our domestic sugar industry might not have survived the disastrously low world prices of 1960–62. U.S. farmers today are producing and the U.S. processing industry is manufacturing 6 million tons of sugar that constitute nearly 60 percent of our sugar supplies. The protection that the Sugar Act has afforded over the years has maintained a healthy and growing domestic sugar industry which is indispensable in such a period of world shortage"—Charles S. Murphy, Under Secretary of Agriculture in testimony at hearings on sugar prices conducted by Senate Finance Committee, May 29 and June 6, 1963. (From p. 10 of printed record of hearings.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the reason why the beet and domestic cane producers were urged to increase their production in 1963—and that urging fell particularly on the beet producers—was that in that year the world price skyrocketed, and the supply of beet sugar helped to prevent the world price spiral from carrying the domestic price through the ceiling also.

Early in 1962 the world price of raw sugar was 2½ cents f.o.b. Caribbean ports. In mid-1962 the price began to rise. By 1963 the world price had doubled to roughly 5 cents. By the spring of 1963 world prices really began to spiral as world sugar supplies became tight as the result of a combination of three factors—First, a severe drop in sugar production following the application of Castro's economic policy from a sugar production of 7 million tons to 5 million tons in 1962 and then to 4 million tons in 1963 and 1964.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have discussed with a number of Senators who are interested in this subject the possibility of limiting debate on the amendment. I should like to ask unanimous consent that the debate on the Bennett amendment be limited to 1 hour on each side, the hour to be controlled by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], in opposition; that any amendment to the amendment be germane; and that time on the amendment to the amendment be one-half hour, the time to be equally divided between the proponents of such amendment and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that the time has already been appropriated? If one of us should need a little time, would it be available under the proposed limitation?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader, or, in his absence, the Senator in charge of the bill, allocate as much as 10 minutes to Senators who might not be able to obtain sufficient time to express their views with regard to the amendment or to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. Reserving the right to object, does the Senator from Utah correctly understand that the time required to say what he has already said will not be charged against the time allotted to him if the request of the Senator is agreed to?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator restate his request?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. One hour would be provided for the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the sponsor of the amendment, and 1 hour would be controled by the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], in opposition to the amendment; a half hour, which would be equally divided, would be provided for any amendment to the amendment, which must be germane. That half hour would be equally divided betwen the majority leader and the Senator in charge of the bill, who would have permission to allocate as much as 10 minutes to Senators who might be unable to obtain time from the controlled time.

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I was discussing the reason for the change in the world price in 1963.

In addition to the situation in Cuba, there were two poor sugarbeet crops in Europe and an increased per capita consumption. By March 1963, the U.S. price began to respond sharply to world sugar prices.

Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. BENNETT. In 1963, the U.S. price began to respond sharply to the world sugar price, and scare buying began. By the end of March, the world price was about 7 cents. The U.S. price was 7¼ cents. When we add the cost of freight and duty, the world price in the United States was 8 cents. By late April and early May, prices really took off. The peak price was May 22 and 23, when the raw sugar price was $13.20 a ton, and the comparable world price was $13.67. This represented a doubling of the U.S. price since 1962.

During the early part of 1963, when the U.S. raw sugar price was $13.20 and the refined cane sugar price was $16.30, beet sugar sold from 1 to 3 cents a pound below the refined cane price.

Beet sugar sellers raised their prices about an average of 10 percent during the period, but the beet sugar industry both had the sugar and an attitude of self-restraint which made it possible to limit the rise in the United States price even as much as it was limited.

The unrestricted 1964 crop of beet sugar is expected to be about 3.4 to 3.5 million tons, some 300,000 to 400,000 tons higher than the 1963 crop, and 700,000 to 800,00 tons higher than the 1964 quota. This extra sugar was produced at Government request. The beet sugar producers are asking for Congressional action to permit them to market some of the extra sugar, just as the domestic cane growers are asking for the right to sell a part of their extra production.

The amendment I have offered would permit them to market a small part of that extra sugar, not more than 275,000 tons of beet sugar and not more than 225,000 tons of cane sugar, and this only if the Secretary of Agriculture approves.

I am happy to yield at this time to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

How much time does the Senator from North Dakota wish?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I am very much pleased to join with my colleague, the senior Senator from Utah, in sponsoring this amendment which will extend the foreign sugar quotas for 6 months and which will also provide an increase in the marketing quotas for mainland cane sugar of 225,000 tons and for beet sugar of 275,000 tons. These increases are only for 1964.

The Senator from Utah has made an excellent case for this legislation. If we were looking only for cheap sugar supplies in the immediate future, perhaps the consumers would be better off if Congress did not extend the act; but the best assurance consumers have of continued adequate supplies of sugar at reasonable prices is to continue a healthy sugar industry in this country. Even more important is the need to maintain adequate sugar production in this country in the event of a future war. In the past two wars we had to depend on Cuba for much of our sugar supply. This supply will not be forthcoming in the future.

Under the Sugar Act the quotas for domestic areas and the Philippines do not expire until the end of 1966. However, the quotas for other foreign countries terminate this year.

It had been my hope that this Congress, prior to adjourning, would have enacted new sugar legislation—legislation which would have given greater recognition to our domestic sugar producers. Unfortunately, however, it appears now that it will be impossible to consider such legislation. This amendment will merely extend the foreign quota provision for 6 months and will also provide for the continuation of the import fees on country quota sugar and on global quota sugar.

A 6-month extension of existing foreign quotas will permit the next Congress to review our sugar program, including, I would hope, increasing the quotas to our domestic sugar producers. To do nothing at this time will result in a disorderly marketing situation for the early months of next year or until sugar legislation is enacted. This amendment, if adopted, will maintain the status quo in the sugar industry with respect to foreign quotas, but, in addition, will permit our domestic producers to market a portion of the sugar which they now have on hand, and which is in excess of their present marketing quotas. This excess sugar has been produced and refined with the encouragement of the U.S. Government.

When early in 1963 a critical foreign sugar supply situation became apparent, the Department of Agriculture turned to the domestic beet sugar industry as the quickest dependable source of greater production, and announced that there would be no acreage restrictions on sugarbeet planting in the years 1963, 1964, and 1965. The producers and the industry responded with immediate and substantial increases in production.

This increase in production was the sole reason why prices in this country ceased to skyrocket. Had not the sugarbeet cane producers increased production as they did, consumers would have been short of supply and would have paid much higher prices for their sugar.

These increases have been to the extent that we now have on hand a considerable amount of sugar in excess of our marketing quotas. The small added consideration given our domestic producers as the result of this amendment is, I believe, only keeping faith with them.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 or 4 minutes?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], which would extend for 6 months the present act, with permission to market additional tonnages of present production of sugar.

This is not exactly what the Senator from Kansas would have desired in sugar legislation, but we have arrived at a situation in which it is necessary to take action to prevent what I believe would be serious results, in the sugar market of the world and our own Nation, with a particularly serious effect on our producers.

Large areas of western Kansas are blessed by an almost unlimited supply of underground water which can be economically used for irrigation. Hundreds of farmers have irrigation wells in this part of the State. Irrigation has been used extensively to increase production of grain sorghums and, to a lesser extent, wheat, both surplus crops. Soil in this area is deep and rich, ideally suited to the production of sugarbeets, and needless to say, increased production of beets would aid immeasurably in crop diversification, and contribute materially to acreage reduction of crops now in surplus.

For 57 years sugarbeets have been successfully grown in the Arkansas River Valley of southwest Kansas and in the past decade successfully grown on irrigated acreage outside the Arkansas River Valley. Production records indicate for example, that in 1962 the tonnage of beets produced in Finney, Kearny, Haskell, Grant, and Stanton Counties was 133,056. The per acre production was 18.73 tons and sugar content 14.62.

Mr. President, our excellent results in the production of sugar have proved that our State can and does produce an excellent quality of sugarbeets. The problem in our State has been the lack of refining capacity.

Many changes have taken place in the sugar producing areas of the world since Congress passed the extension of the Sugar Act in 1962. There is no longer a world surplus of sugar. World reserve stocks of sugar which were substantial in mid-1962, are almost nonexistent. This was brought home very readily to the American housewife last summer when the price of sugar skyrocketed as the result of a scarcity of this very essential commodity.

Nearly one-third of world sugar production is under Communist control. Instability and political unrest plague

many of the sugar-producing nations of the world.

I feel, therefore, that it is in the public interest that the domestic sugar industry have an additional increase in the percentage of our total sugar supplies, which this amendment does not provide, but which I hope we can in the future support.

Great areas in northwest and southwest Kansas have proved their ability to produce sugarbeets. It is my hope that next year, when the Committee on Finance considers new sugar legislation, we may be able to obtain additional acreage for our sugarbeet producing areas.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has an amendment to offer to the pending amendment. Under the circumstances, I suggest that the Senate consider it now. I understand it can be considered now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator from Delaware offering his amendment at this time? The Chair hears none. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Section 212 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, 7 United States Code, section 1122, is proposed to be amended by striking out "distillation" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "production."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. I do not believe I shall need more than that.

In the Sugar Act Amendments of 1962, a technical language change was enacted to define "alcohol" as including all polyhydric alcohols. Since all polyhydric alcohols are not made by distillation, the technical language change is not fully effective unless a broader method of manufacture is specified in the statute.

In order to permit the manufacture of polyhydric alcohols from sugar, which is not subject to the restrictions of the Sugar Act, the word "distillation" in title 7 United States Code Annotated, section 1122(4) should be replaced by the word "production."

I understand there is no objection to the amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I do not know who controls the time in opposition. If I do, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah and other Senators.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Utah in offering his amendment. I am confident that even the adoption of this amendment, for a 6 months' extension of the Sugar Act, would not correct all the pressing difficulties which exist in the administration of the sugar program. Some of the difficulties and uncertainties that have arisen must be dealt with by the sugar producers of the United States, and these will not altogether be removed, but at least this extension will permit the necessary adjustments to be made. These are adjustments that must take place.

The amendment would extend the foreign quota provisions of the act until June 30, 1965. This is supported by the administration. I believe the 6 months' extension is necessary at this time, although Senators will recall that I was highly critical of the administration proposal of 2 years ago with respect to the handling of the global foreign quota.

I am hopeful that in the next session of Congress the administration, and, if not the administration, the Senate itself, will take up the problem and hold orderly hearings on the sugar program.

The second objective of the amendment—and this again is approved by the administration—is to leave the fee on the global sugar intact at the full rate, and keep the fee on statutory sugar quotas applicable for the January 1–June 30, 1965 period at 30 percent of the full rate on global sugar.

This proposal is designed to maintain the status quo, so far as we can, in this 6-month extension.

Finally, the amendment would permit the domestic beet and mainland cane sugar areas to market up to 275,000 and 225,000 tons, respectively, of the extra sugar produced at Government request, but which they are unable to market without congressional action. This represents only a small part of extra sugar which these two areas produced, at Government request, from 1963 crops and now from the 1964 crops. Here again I point out that I was very critical of the administration's policy 2 years ago.

When the Sugar Act was drastically revised, I indicated that I thought there would be a serious problem of short supply in the market and that the price of sugar would rise as much as 10 cents a pound. I regret to say that this is exactly what happened. I would rather have been proved to be in error.

In response to the urgings of the administration, the cane and beet sugar producers in the United States dramatically expanded their production. This section of our amendment would ease the period of adjustment, if adjustment is called for, and give Congress time to plan the necessary statutory changes which are called for by virtue of what we learned in 1963 and 1964, and from the changes which have taken place in both the production and the marketing of sugar in the past 2 years.

The fact that the Government urged these two sugar producing industries to produce extra sugar is well documented. The administration is also firmly on record as favoring congressional action to permit the marketing of the extra sugar. The administration has recommended that 1964 domestic marketings be completely unlimited. This was done by the Secretary of Agriculture, in December of 1963, and by the President himself in January of this year. In the interest of orderly marketing, the amendment does not go as far in regard to extra 1964 marketings as the administration recommended, or as far as the administration's recommendation would have permitted. It would place a limit of 275,000 tons on beet sugar and a limit of 225,000 tons on mainland cane marketings. Even these amounts can be reduced if in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture authorization of the full amounts would contribute to disorderly marketings.

Permitting domestic areas to market up to 500,000 tons of additional sugar this year would not reduce the quota of any foreign country by 1 pound. It would come from the unallocated portion of the global quota—the remaining portion of the old Cuba quota—which was reserved by the Department of Agriculture earlier this year for the specific purpose of permitting some extra domestic marketings this year.

It is my opinion that the adoption of the amendment would meet the moral commitment which the Department of Agriculture undertook.

It would help to insure the orderly marketing of surplus sugar which has been produced in the United States.

Third, it would provide time in which to give attention and consideration to planning a more or less permanent sugar program, one which would do justice to domestic producers and also take into account some of our commitments and obligations to foreign producers and suppliers for the American market.

I thank the Senator from Utah for yielding.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I was prepared to speak at great length on the Bennett amendment. Last night I was tempted to carry on an educational debate, because I believe this matter is of great importance, not especially to the State of Hawaii, but to the economy of the Nation. I should like to spend a few minutes discussing some of the allegations that have been made by the proponents of the Bennett amendment and to present what I consider are the facts in the case.

First, we should all realize that no real need exists today for any change in the basic law with respect to domestic quotas. The Bennett amendment has three sections. The first two sections relate to foreign quotas. I am not opposed to those two sections.

But the third section applies to domestic quotas. The only reason why the Sugar Act is being reviewed by the Senate is that the foreign quota provisions will expire at the end of 1964. Possibly something should be done, although I am satisfied that the present law can meet this contingency.

I note from the discussions today that the beet sugar industry is taking advantage of this limited reopening of the law to seek for itself a 275,000-ton or 10-percent, increase in its basic quota, and the mainland cane sugar industry a 225,000-ton, or approximately 20-percent, increase. It should be noted that this would be in addition to the substantial quota increase given the beet area in the 1962 act, the act that is in effect at this time. This is the increase that the beet industry publicly has said was to carry it through until 1966 only.

Now I should like to list 14 allegations and give 14 answers.

This afternoon the proponent of the amendment stated that our Government called upon the beet industry to produce all the sugar it could produce, and produce to the hilt, in 1963 and 1964. It is contended that the beet producers "patriotically responded" to the Government appeal, and that they, therefore, should be properly compensated for this patriotism with a quota increase. I should like to set forth the following:

The so-called Government appeals, which the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] has noted, were in the form of two press releases issued by the Department of Agriculture in the spring of 1963, announcing that no acreage limitations would be imposed on the 1964 and 1965 beet crops. Since 1960, because of the beet industry's reported crop shortages in marketings, the Department has permitted unrestricted plantings in an effort to have the industry build up and carry adequate inventory reserves. The two 1963 press releases were merely a continuation of that effort.

There has been no significant beet sugar response to either "appeal." The increase in sugarbeet acreage which occurred in 1963 was decided upon and contracted for before the Department's press releases were issued. The increase was not the result of press relations or Government appeals.

The additional acreage in 1964 was the result of two distinct factors: First, the "new grower" acreage reserve provisions of the 1962 act; second, some small new acreage to service the increased physical capacity of existing plants resulting from normal equipment replacement or improvement. Neither factor had anything to do with either of the Department's press releases. The additional acreage planted in the 1963 and 1964 crops was an understandable reaction to good prices and what appeared to be an attractive business opportunity. It was in no sense a sacrifice, a burden, or a patriotic response on the part of the beet industry to any so-called Government appeal.

The second allegation made by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is that the failure to increase their quota above the level established in 1962 would create a hardship because of the substantial capital investment made to expand capacity, again in response to the so-called Government appeals in the spring of 1963.

Except for several new plants operating or under construction in the new areas, under the so-called new-grower protection provision of the 1962 amendments, the primary capital investments made by the producers of beet sugar have been, according to their own annual reports, the normal routine ones for replacement, modernization, and improvement. Such investments have nothing to do with the Government's decision to leave the industry without acreage restrictions in 1964 and 1965. Most of the investment, if any, made by the growers in the expansion of the beet industry is protected by acreage reserve grants to new plants or for old plant expansion.

Furthermore, as the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] said in a recent letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, from which I quote a part:

> After all, beet growers purchase seed each year which is for a one-crop investment. They have switched from the production of one farm commodity to another in the past and can do so again.

The third allegation is that the beet industry is now faced with a burdensome sugar surplus, first with respect to production from the 1963 crop, and again with respect to the crop to be harvested this fall.

The facts are as follows: By January 1 of this year, their claim with respect to the 1963 crop was proved false by official U.S. Department of Agriculture records. Yet spokesmen for the beet industry have continued to foster the impression that they now have surplus 1963 crop sugar on hand. The beet industry ended 1963 with record marketings, particularly in the last few weeks of the year, which not only avoided any burdensome carryover into 1964, but actually left them with inadequate inventories for servicing their current quota in an orderly manner.

Nor will 1964 crop sugar create any inventory problems with the beet industry this year. While there has been some increase in beet acreage, the yield of the 1964 crop cannot be accurately measured until the beets have matured and are ready for processing.

Moreover, during 1964, only two-thirds of the current crop will be physically processed, and normally less than half of this would be marketed. Whether the inventory carryover into 1965 will exceed the reasonable level which the Department of Agriculture has continually pleaded with the industry to carry, and whether any relief might result in a continuation of an inadequate inventory level, cannot be actually determined until 1965. I have just been advised that by the end of October 1964, the warehouses will be nearly empty.

The next allegation of the beet industry is that foreign raw sugar producers currently selling in the U.S. market will not be hurt by cutting U.S. sugar imports, and that they really do not care about supplying the United States with sugar over and above the statutory quotas.

The foreign producers recognize that the sugar which they supply over and above their statutory quotas could be lost to them if a friendly, pro-United States Cuba were reestablished. Nonetheless, so long as Cuba continues in the Communist camp, the foreign producers quite naturally hope to be rewarded by adding to their permanent statutory quotas at least a portion of the global sugar which they have supplied. Meanwhile, our imports of global quota sugar provide an important part of the dollar earnings they need, if their purchases of American farm and factory products are to be kept at present levels.

I have noted that the Senator from Utah alleges that the beet sugar interests make a great point as to their "reliability" as suppliers. The beet interests claim that, beacuse they exist on the mainland of the United States, their production can be regarded as assured.

The beet industry has a history of erratic performance, particularly during periods of emergency or great need.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Does the Senator from Hawaii yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. INOUYE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. How long has the Sugar Act been on the statute books?

Mr. INOUYE. Since 1934.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that during all that period of time any legislation relating to the Sugar Act has originated in the House, as required under the Constitution, because it is a revenue act, and that it has had normal legislative hearings and has gone through the normal legislative process and has not been attached by way of an amendment as a rider to a nongermane bill?

Mr. INOUYE. The Senator is absolutely correct. I believe that precedents are replete in this area.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the Senator believe that an issue of this importance, not only to the sugarbeet industry but also to many segments of the economy, should have hearings and should follow the normal legislative routine of the Congress?

Mr. INOUYE. With that statement, I am in full agreement.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Senator from Hawaii know how many sugarbeet producers there are in the United States?

Mr. INOUYE. According to an estimate submitted by the beet industry, there are approximately 23,000.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Senator have any idea how many people are engaged in the refining industry in various capacities throughout the country, in the transportation of the product, the marketing of the product, the railroad industry's involvement therein, the stevedores, the shipping, and in various other areas?

Mr. INOUYE. I have no information as to the exact number of people involved, but I know that the investments made by the refineries along the eastern seaboard of the United States amount to more than half a billion dollars.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the Senator share my view that these also have an interest in the sugar bill and should have an opportunity to be heard and considered, and that this is something that vitally affects their interests, and that of their stockholders in the area, and their States?

Mr. INOUYE. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. TALMADGE. Are not some 20-odd countries also vitally interested in the proposed legislation with relation to marketing quotas?

Mr. INOUYE. The Senator is correct. Most of the 20 countries involved are in the Western Hemisphere, in Latin Amer-

ica. At this time, our Nation is trying to do its best to foster good relations with our friends in South America. Enactment of this bill would be a horrible Christmas present to give them.

Mr. TALMADGE. Are there not some 20-odd countries which have a vital stake in this issue, most of which are Latin American countries which we are trying to assist in the Alliance for Progress?

Mr. INOUYE. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the Senator believe that if we should enact this proposed legislation, it would prejudice their marketing quotas, and would prejudice our international relations with these 20-odd countries with which we are trying so desperately to foster good will, even to the extent of spending about a billion dollars of the American taxpayers' money there?

Mr. INOUYE. The Senator suggests in the most eloquent fashion the position of the State Department on this question. The State Department is afraid that this may be the consequence of the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not also true that the executive branch of the Government sent Congress a proposed resolution which would extend the present law, and present law only, for a period of some 6 months, until Congress, next year, in due course, after notice and hearing, could give consideration to all the matters involved in this complex proposed legislation?

Mr. INOUYE. The Senator is correct. In the latter part of September of this year, a leading official in the Department of Agriculture submitted a request from the executive department for a simple extension of the foreign provisions of the Sugar Act of 1962 for 6 months.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that the consumers of this country—190 million people—also have a vital interest in the proposed sugar legislation?

Mr. INOUYE. I believe that the consumers of this country are the most important people involved in this discussion.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the Senator believe that the American consumers should have an opportunity to be given notice, and to present testimony to be considered in connection with something so far reaching as this proposed legislation?

Mr. INOUYE. With that statement I am in complete agreement.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that the Committee on Agriculture, which met yesterday, refused to take action on this proposed type of amendment?

Mr. INOUYE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the Senator believe that the Senate would be acting futilely if it were to adopt this amendment, because the House would refuse to accept it?

Mr. INOUYE. Under precedents of the past, I assume that if this amendment were adopted, the House of Representatives would return the bill with a request to the Senate to delete therefrom the Bennett amendment. This has been done in the past; and as the Senator has just said, it would be an exercise in futility on the part of the Senate.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that every segment of the sugar industry, except those which produce sugarbeets, wished to act on the administration's resolution, and that the sugarbeet producers were the only segment of the industry which opposed the administration's resolution?

Mr. INOUYE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield to me on my own time?

Mr. INOUYE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the story that was released by Representative COOLEY, who has always been an enemy of the sugarbeet industry; but if the Senator will examine the list of sponsors of the Bennett amendment, he will find that all four Senators representing the cane producers on the mainland area are sponsors of the amendment. So while Representative COOLEY tried to leave that impression, it is obvious that the American cane producers, as well as the American beet producers, were anxious to have their quotas freed.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator from Utah for clarifying that point. I notice that the cane producers are also getting 275,000 tons in additional quotas, which may be one reason why the cane producers are interested in having this particular amendment adopted.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the same reason why the beet producers are interested in having the amendment adopted.

Mr. TALMADGE. It is my understanding that the cane producers, while opposing the quota, were in agreement that the administration's proposed resolution should be passed. The refiners were also in agreement. Everyone in the industry agreed except the sugarbeet producers, who were opposed to it. That is the reason we cannot get this proposed legislation by normal routine methods of legislation—that is, hearings in the House, to have the bill originate in the House because under the Constitution it is a revenue measure, and then to come to the Senate for appropriate and final action.

Mr. BENNETT. I have the impression that Representative COOLEY adjourned the meeting of his committee when he realized that the majority of the committee wished a bill substantially the same as that which I have introduced. As its chairman, he had the power to adjourn the committee without completing the testimony, or without giving the committee an opportunity to vote. Therefore, if we were to have any action taken on sugar, in view of the action of the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, it became necessary, this year, to have it taken on the Senate side.

Mr. TALMADGE. I am not aware of what occurred in the committee. I am aware of the fact that the Agriculture Committee of the House took no action. The proposed legislation involves many millions of people, the interests of beet producers, and the cane producers, the refiners and their employees, the shipping industry, the railroad industry, and labor—and finally most important of all, the American consumers, who should have an opportunity to be heard.

They ought to have an opportunity to testify. They ought to have an opportunity to cross-examine. Committees ought to have an opportunity to study and make a decision without reporting a bill of this magnitude on the spur of the moment, without an opportunity for notice, hearings, and testimony by those concerned.

I thank the Senator from Hawaii for yielding to me.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for his contribution. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. INOUYE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, all that the beet sugar producers are asking—and I believe the same is true for the cane sugar producers—is to supply a part of our consumption that Cuba formerly supplied to the United States. Americans ought to be able to supply at least that part of the sugar needs of the country that Cuba formerly supplied. It seems to me that this is a reasonable position to take.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, before I proceed, I believe that in fairness to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, I should say a few words.

I was privileged to sit as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture during my two terms in the House of Representatives. I was also privileged to serve under the leadership of Mr. COOLEY, of North Carolina, when the 1962 Sugar Act was passed. I was also privileged to work very closely with the chairman of the Finance Committee. I was appointed as a member of the conference committee to meet with the Senate conferees.

I know that Mr. COOLEY is very fair with the beet industry. In fact, the 1962 Sugar Act was extremely fair to the beet industry. That is agreed upon by the beet industry. The sole spokesman for the national sugar industry—and that covers refiners, industrial users, mainland cane, mainland beet, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands—happened to be president of one of the largest beet companies in the United States. He represented the industry. It was this proposal that was adopted by the committee, from what I can gather.

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

Mr. INOUYE. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I believe the record of what happened this week is that Mr. COOLEY adjourned the committee without finishing the hearings and without taking a vote, up or down, on the administration proposal.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I dislike to use my time on a discussion of what happened in the House. However, I believe this is a part of the discussion. I believe I should clarify it.

I have been advised that the chairman of the House committee sent inquiries to

various segments of our sugar industry in the United States, to find out whether they would go along with a 6 months' extension of the foreign provisions under the 1962 Sugar Act. All of the industry approved with the exception of the beet segment. They wanted to increase their acreage, and their tonnages.

When they held a meeting the other day, contrary to the contentions of the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the House Committee on Agriculture adjourned pursuant to a vote. It was not pursuant to the sole action of the chairman. The yeas and nays were taken. And if the supporters of the beet industry desired it, they could have had a rollcall. They did not ask for a rollcall.

I am certain that if the beet industry had gone along with a simple extension of the foreign provision, the House committee would have come forth with a bill. But, being threatened with the possibility of revising and passing a new sugar bill in the House, the chairman and the majority of the committee felt this would not be in the best interest of the economy of the United States.

Mr. President, there are a few additional allegations that I would like to cover. It has been said that in order to justify the desire of the beet industry for further increases, they have alleged, without offering any proof—because none exists—that friendly foreign sugar suppliers failed to provide needed supplies during the period of high demand several months ago.

The Department of Agriculture statistics prove that needed raw sugarcane supplies were forthcoming from foreign producers, and that sugarcane refineries operated at record levels to turn out all the refined cane sugar demanded by consumers.

Furthermore, in May 1963, the Department belatedly turned to our foreign suppliers for the additional sugar required to meet the increased demands of the consumers and to break the price spiral. In explaining in a press release of November 5, 1963, why total sugar stocks in the United States as we entered 1964 would be at an alltime high, the Department concluded that it was: "due to the fulfillment by foreign suppliers of both their 1963 country quotas and their global quota commitments."

There is another allegation made by supporters of the beet industry. They say that beet interests justify their increased quota demand by claiming that such increased beet production would help alleviate our surplus problems with respect to other farm commodities, such as cotton, corn, and wheat.

Sugarbeets are grown on only 23,000 farms out of 3,500,000. This represents less than 1 percent of the total number of farms in the United States. It accounts for only approximately four-tenths of 1 percent of the total cropland acreage. Sugarbeets are grown primarily on irrigated land. Thus, as a practical matter, such crops are not interchangeable with other crops. It is unlikely, therefore, that any substantial diversion of acreage from surplus crops to beets would occur.

It is certain, however, that a cutback in quotas, and hence in imports from countries supplying domestic cane refiners with raw sugar would reduce export sales of cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and other farm commodities.

As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] so eloquently pointed out, by cutting down the quotas for our friends in South America, we are actually taking dollars away from them with which they could buy cotton, corn, tobacco, and farm equipment.

If the Bennett amendment is agreed to, that will be the first step toward effectuating such a program. The Senator from Utah is justifiably proud of having so many cosponsors on the amendment. It leaves the impression, by naming the cosponsors, that the beet industry is a nationwide industry.

Statistics have been cited to the effect that beets are produced in 20 States, and shortly will be produced in 23 States. But the facts are very simple. In some of those States, there are as few as four farms producing beets. Two-thirds of the industry production comes from only four States. Sugarbeets constitute an insignificant part of the agriculture in most of the other States in which they are grown.

In view of the protection they are afforded, and the generous quota they were given as recently as 1962, I believe it can be aptly said of them, in the rearranged words of a former great world statesman: "Never have so few owed so much to so many."

There are two other allegations which I would like to answer at this time. It is alleged that the beet industry suppliers, the various elements of the American sugar industry and the executive agencies of the Government concerned with the sugar situation, were parties to an agreement in 1962 regarding domestic quotas.

In 1962 I was privileged to sit as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture. I know the trials and tribulations which had to be endured by all supporters. For several months, representatives of all segments of our sugar industry—the refiners, the industrial users, the mainland beet producers, the mainland cane producers, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands—sat together in conference after conference. They finally came forth with a measure which they unanimously agreed upon. That agreement became the basis for the 1962 act. The beet sugar industry is now saying that there was no agreement.

It should be further noted that representatives of the executive branch of the Government, including the Department of Agriculture, participated in those conferences. They offered advice and also concurred in what was done. So there resulted a gentleman's agreement in effect, although there was no written agreement, as such.

Mr. President, we should give the 1962 act an opportunity to work. It has 2 more years left. We have not reached the expiration of the 1962 act. It is only fair that we give it a trial. To date, the act has worked beautifully with the exception of a few months, when, because of a shortage of European sugar and Cuban sugar, problems arose in the United States.

The last allegation, which is the one about which we hear the most, is that the beet interests claim that the American consumer would benefit from an increase in the beet sugar quota.

The U.S. consumer is best served by having an ample supply of sugar continually available at reasonable and stable prices. A review of the experience of the past years is persuasive that the beet quota proposal threatens those interests. The beet industry seeks not an increase in the total supply of sugar available in the United States of America, which is the principal factor determining prices, but merely an increase in its share of the quota pie, the additional subsidy, and related costs resulting therefrom.

Several Senators have said that the proposal would be a temporary measure for 6 months as far as an increase in the tonnage is concerned. I am certain that all of us know that temporary measures have a tendency to become very permanent.

Before I close, I should like to say a few more words. At present world prices and present national prices, for each ton taken away from the global quota—and in the present case the amendment proposes to take away 500,000 tons—the cost to the U.S. Treasury would be approximately $70 per ton, or $35 million a year.

It breaks down to $40 a ton on import fees under the quota system, $12.50 a ton for the tariff, and $17.50 on the compliance payment, making a total, roughly, of $69 or $70. That is something of which the consumer and all taxpayers should be fully aware. The proposal involves nothing free. It means a great deal to the beet industry, and I believe it means a great deal also to the other important segments of the sugar industry which oppose the measure.

Mr. President, at an appropriate time I shall offer an amendment to strike out section 3 of the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

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

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

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. INOUYE. How many minutes have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wished to add a few words in support of the Senator, but I should be happy to have the Senator yield first to his colleague.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. FONG. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to my senior colleague.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the amendment submitted by my distinguished colleague from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE].

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

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I strongly oppose the pending Bennett amendment.

This amendment, in effect, rewrites the Sugar Act of 1962. That act provided for foreign quotas on sugar until December 31, 1964 and domestic quotas until December 31, 1966.

The pending amendment calling for a 500,000-ton increase in the marketing allotment for beet sugar would substantially alter the domestic cane and beet sugar share of the U.S. market, in favor of beet producers to the great detriment of the cane industry. This would have a profound and adverse impact on the sugar industry of our Nation's greatest sugar-producing State—Hawaii.

Sugar is a mainstay of our Island State's economy and Hawaii's leading income producer. In 1963, sugar—all cane—brought $188 million into the State's economy.

Sugar plantations provide a year-round employment for about 13,000 workers with a total payroll of approximately $62 million.

Sugar production in Hawaii is amazingly efficient, attaining the world's highest yields per acre. Hawaii's sugar workers have achieved the highest rate of productivity of sugar in the world. The man-hours required per ton to produce sugar are the lowest in the world.

The state of health of Hawaii's sugar industry and its future well-being are of utmost concern to Hawaii.

The proposed amendment would be directly harmful to Hawaii.

Beet sugar is grown mainly in the Western States. Hawaiian cane sugar is marketed mostly in the West. As beet sugar is a substandard wage industry, it offers unfair competition to Hawaiian sugar in Western markets.

Beetworkers are paid less than half as much as Hawaiian caneworkers. Beetfieldworkers in 1962 earned an average of only $1.16 an hour, compared to $2 an hour for Hawaiian canefieldworkers. Beetworkers received fringe benefits worth from 2 to 19 cents an hour, while Hawaiian caneworkers received 74 cents in fringe benefits an hour.

It is certainly not in the interest of labor or the Nation's economy to allow an industry paying substandard wages to push out companies that pay a living wage. Yet this is what the pending amendment would do.

The beet proposal would upset established marketing patterns, and thereby in the long run raise the level of consumer prices.

Whenever it becomes more profitable for beet sugar growers to raise a different crop, they would do so, resulting in a widely fluctuating supply of domestic sugar. This would affect the price of sugar. When supplies are down, prices go up.

The beet proposal would reduce cane sugar quotas of South American nations, and so reduce their dollar earnings and their capacity to buy U.S. exports. It would depress and hurt foreign trade and aggravate our already unfavorable balance of payments.

Thus, the beet sugar industry's demand that its marketing allotment be increased by 500,000 tons conflicts with the basic objectives of the Sugar Act as amended, which seeks to promote the welfare of all elements of America's sugar industry, to protect consumers, and to promote foreign trade.

To increase the 1964 marketing allotment for beet sugar without imposing acreage restrictions opens the door to further demands next year for greater marketing allotments and so the cane sugar situation would be further aggravated.

When sugar legislation was before the Congress in 1962, there were many conflicting proposals advanced. Seeking to attain a workable measure, the Department of Agriculture sponsored a series of meetings resulting in a compromise with which the diverse segments of America's sugar industry could live.

The stability and duration of the understanding were integral and fundamental parts of the agreement.

Domestic provisions, it was agreed, would continue in effect without amendment through calendar year 1966. Only because of this understanding were Members of Hawaii's congressional delegation and the Hawaiian sugar industry able to support the compromise Sugar Act of July 1962.

This compromise included very sizable increases in the quotas for both the beet and mainland cane sugar interests, as well as an increased share in the annual growth for both groups.

About three-fourths of Hawaii's raw sugar, approximately 750,000 tons, is refined each year at the Crockett, Calif., refinery, the industry's cooperative agricultural marketing association. The refined sugar is then sold throughout the States west of the Mississippi.

This is a market which Hawaiian sugar has helped develop, has grown with, and has served in war and in peace, good times and bad, for well over half a century. It is the closest and most natural market for Hawaiian sugar.

The increased beet production allowed under the 1962 Sugar Act in this market necessitated revised marketing practices in the traditional Hawaiian sugar markets. As the 1962 Sugar Act fixed quotas for a 5-year period, the Hawaiian sugar industry was willing to go along with the 1962 compromise.

Now just 2 years later, the beet industry proposes a tremendous increase in its marketing allotment and is unwilling to agree to any acreage restrictions, so that, instead of stability, the domestic sugar industry would face substantial yearly upheaval.

It requires 22 to 24 months for cane sugar to mature in Hawaii. Under these circumstances, it is impossible for the Hawaiian sugar industry to adjust to frequent fluctuation. Reasonable duration of domestic sugar provisions is vital to the progress and well-being of Hawaii's sugar industry and its thousands of employees.

In behalf of Hawaiian sugar producers and workers, I must vigorously oppose any changes in the domestic provisions of the Sugar Act amendments of 1962.

I should like to point out that responsible west coast organizations in Hawaii's prime market areas such as the Solano County Central Labor Council, the Contra Costa Central Labor Council, and the Contra Costa Board of Supervisors in California likewise have also come out against changes in the domestic provisions of existing law.

On June 23 this year, the San Francisco World Trade Association—after intense review and study of sugar legislation and after hearing both cane and beet sugar representatives—adopted a resolution opposing changes in the domestic features of the 1962 Sugar Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

RESOLUTION BY THE SAN FRANCISCO AREA WORLD TRADE ASSOCIATION

Whereas the San Francisco Area World Trade Association subscribes to the policy of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, and to the view that the long-range best interests of California, of the United States of America, and of the world community as a whole, are best served by the expansion of international trade; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the San Francisco Area World Trade Association, after study, that the proposed amendments to the Sugar Act of 1948 incorporated in S. 2657 and H.R. 10565 are contrary to the policy of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; would, if enacted, result in a contraction in international trade and, in particular, in restricting the present and future exports to the United States of America of a number of friendly foreign nations many of whom are located in the Western Hemisphere and with whom this country enjoys a substantial favorable balance of trade and incidentally, in reduced Federal receipts from duties and excise taxes on imported sugar and increased Federal expenditures from subsidies on domestic sugar; and will, in the long run, prove inimical to the overall interests of California and of the United States of America, as well as of the world community; it is therefore

Resolved, That the President make known the above views of this asociation in an appropriate manner.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the domestic beet interests have been sponsoring bills in the Congress to increase their sugar quota by 750,000 tons or more in 1964 and to increase the mainland cane quota by 250,000 tons. Having failed in this effort, the current drive to obtain authorization for extra marketings above their present quota is a last minute effort to get a part of their desired quota increase now, preparatory to their efforts to again seek the larger increase next year.

These proposed increases would replace imports of equal amounts of raw cane sugar from foreign countries. We are talking about an annual value of $124 million or more.

This cutback will have a telling impact on the economies of the foreign suppliers of raw cane sugar. Earning the dollars needed to pay for American products they import is no simple matter for these lesser developed nations. They have a limited number of products to offer. They must rely on sugar and

a handful of other products to earn most of their dollars.

In 1962 these nations earned $501.3 million by exporting sugar to the United States. Sugar accounted for a large share of the dollars they earned. For example, the Dominican Republic earned 62.8 percent of its dollars from sugar, the Philippines 46.8 percent, and Peru 31.4 percent. These are the countries we are concerned with in foreign aid, the Alliance for Progress, and so forth.

The attempt to replace our purchases from these countries with domestic production can be summed up as forcing the United States further into a position of "aid, not trade."

This substantial loss abroad would be matched in the United States. Total U.S. exports to these nations in 1962 were valued at $5.2 billion, and we had a favorable balance of trade with these nations of $713.2 million. U.S. export industries would lose an equivalent amount of sales, and transportation and material handling industries would also suffer. To move a million tons of sugar to this country would require over 100 ships, whose employment would be lost if foreign quotas are reduced. In addition, the ports and the hundreds of thousands of persons who derive their livelihood from port and maritime services would be immediately affected.

The ports of Los Angeles and San Francisco will certainly feel this loss. Total values of exports from their customs districts to sugar producing countries in 1960—latest year for which data are available—was $76.1 million and $145.6 million, respectively. These values are 17.1 percent and 22.7 percent, respectively, of the total export volume of these customs districts for that year—significant amounts, and worthy of our concerted efforts to protect.

Another direct result of an increased beet quota vitally affects trade with Hawaii. General commodities worth an estimated $105 million were moved through the port of Los Angeles to Hawaii in 1960. The local maritime industry in San Francisco moves approximately 800,000 tons of Hawaiian raw sugar into San Francisco Bay annually. On the return haul, general commodities valued at $191 million are moved through bay ports. To the extent the Hawaiian economy is injured by increased beet sugar production, its ability to purchase this volume of goods is curtailed, and all segments of the local shipping and maritime communities will suffer accordingly.

To protect against loss of a substantial volume of foreign and domestic commerce through the ports of Los Angeles and San Francisco, I urge rejection of the Bennett proposal to increase beet and mainland cane sugar quotas. Other major ports along all our seacoasts would be similarly affected, and statistics could easily be developed to show these effects just as specifically as in the case of Los Angeles and San Francisco. In fact, the damage would be even more severe in the case of some of the great east coast and southern ports.

BENEFITS TO ORGANIZED LABOR

Raw cane sugar ranks in tonnage among the most important commodities imported through many U.S. ports—first in New Orleans and Galveston; second in New York and Boston; third in Philadelphia and Savannah; fifth in Baltimore. It is one of the leading inbound cargoes in San Francisco. In 1962, 6,322,000 tons of raw sugar moved into these ports requiring over 630 ships.

This raw sugar imported in 1962 was valued at over $816 million. Recent studies show that this amount of imported sugar generated an estimated $379 million more in business for these areas.

Cane sugar refiners have played an important role in the progress of these business communities for many years. In the eight cities listed above, for example, they provide direct employment for about 14,250 individuals and maintain annual payrolls which total approximately $88,850,000.

Other segments of the economy also benefit from importation of raw cane sugar. For example, each year almost 13 billion pounds of sugar products move out of refineries in these cities by truck and rail, providing many man-hours of employment to transportation workers.

Housewives buying small packages of sugar; the industrial users—bakers, confectioners, canners, bottlers, ice cream manufacturers and other food processors located in States where cane sugar refineries are located and in nearby States—rely heavily on these refineries to fill quickly their divergent sugar needs at reasonable prices. These States are important sugar consuming markets.

HIGH PAY JOBS VERSUS LOW PAY JOBS

What would be the direct impact on business and organized labor in these areas if 500,000 tons of sugar quota were taken away from the foreign suppliers?

First of all, there would definitely be a reduction of jobs at U.S. cane refineries. It is true that the sugar taken away from the foreign suppliers and given mainly to the beet producers would provide additional employment for the beet industry. But this would be a poor exchange for organized labor, especially the cane refinery workers who would lose their jobs to the beet sugar industry.

The proposed 500,000-ton reduction in the foreign sugar quota represents 16 days of work or 2 million man-hours for the entire cane refining industry and a loss of more than $6 million in refinery workers' wages alone.

U.S. cane refinery workers are among the highest paid and receive some of the highest benefits in American industry. They are also assured of year-round employment. In contrast, the beet processing factory jobs are seasonal, at lower pay, with lesser benefits.

For example, cane refinery production workers average around $3 an hour and fringe benefits are in the neighborhood of 75 cents an hour. Government studies for 1961, the latest year for which figures are available, show that beet production workers received an average of $2.20 an hour on a seasonal basis, primarily during a 4-month period—October through January. Field laborers earned an average of $1.16 per hour. U.S. production workers as a whole are paid an average of $2.49 an hour, according to reports of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

DROP IN EXPORTS CUTS BUSINESS AND JOBS TOO

Many segments of the economy would suffer by reduction of raw cane sugar imports. The sugar-producing nations must sell their products to the United States to obtain dollars—dollars needed to purchase goods produced in the United States.

U.S. exports of everything from machinery and chemicals to wheat and vegetables provide hundreds of thousands of jobs and millions of dollars in factory wages and farm income. For example, in 1961, New York and New Jersey exported an estimated $455 million worth of manufactured and farm goods to sugar-producing nations. These exports from this area alone provided an estimated 50,000 jobs and $275 million in wages and farm income.

Nationally, studies show that 1 out of 10 factory jobs and, in port areas, 1 out of every 4 jobs, are dependent on foreign trade. The harvest of 1 out of every 5 acres goes abroad.

I urge my colleagues to reject the ill-timed, ill-advised Bennett amendment, which will be very disruptive to the sugar industry in America and lead to undesirable long-term sugar difficulties.

This 11th-hour amendment proposes a raid on the sugar markets. It has far-reaching ramifications which in these remarks I have only touched upon.

It has not been studied nor considered by the Senate Finance Committee. We have no hearings of the committee to consult to obtain all viewpoints. We have no committee report nor recommendations to guide us.

The amendment has not been recommended by the administration. The administration has requested only a 6-month extension of the foreign quota provisions, without amendment.

It would be most unwise to act upon this far-reaching amendment now, in the haste and confusion of these closing days of the session.

It is only 3 months until a new Congress will convene.

It would be far better to consider sugar legislation after public hearings have been held and everyone has had an opportunity to express his views and we who legislate have an opportunity to give thorough study and consideration to the entire matter.

I strongly urge rejection of the Bennett amendment.

I support the amendment of my colleague [Mr. INOUYE], which I am pleased to cosponsor, to strike the 500,000-ton increased marketing allotment for beet sugar and to extend existing foreign provisions of the 1962 Sugar Act.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the Bennett amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out section 3 of the amendment to eliminate the addition of

a new paragraph (3) at the end of section 202(a) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. INOUYE. I ask unanimous consent that my senior colleague from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] may be listed as a cosponsor.

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

How much time does the Senator from Hawaii yield himself?

Mr. INOUYE. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, the amendment would merely strike section 3 of the so-called Bennett amendment to H.R. 12253. It has but one purpose—to conform his amendment to the Sugar Act, presently before the Senate, to the bill submitted to the Congress by the Department of Agriculture on September 25—on last Friday. This is the position of the administration.

Charles Murphy, Acting Secretary of Agriculture, pointed out in his letter of transmittal to the Congress, that the provisions of the Sugar Act relating to quotas for the domestic areas and the Philippines do not expire until 1966. The only part of the Sugar Act that will expire on December 31 of this year is that part pertaining to foreign quotas.

If my amendment to the pending amendment is adopted, the remaining sections, namely sections 1 and 2, would deal only with those provisions of the act which will expire on December 31 of this year. Thus the foreign quota provisions of the Sugar Act would be extended for 6 months to preserve the sugar quota structure beyond December 31. The amendment would then preserve the status quo—no more, no less. It would not diminish or increase any of the rights of any groups affected by the Sugar Act. It would not give any special group any preferential rights they do not now have.

Unless the amendment before the Senate is amended, as I have proposed, certain domestic areas will be favored at the expenses of other domestic producing areas, the domestic cane sugar refining industry and its workers, and our foreign friends in Latin America who provide us with raw sugar under the present Sugar Act.

The amendment of the Senator from Utah in its proposed form, unless amended, is so one-sided that it is bound to create controversy that will keep us in session for many more days. The Department of Agriculture recognized that any bill, other than a simple bill to preserve the status quo, would create a controversy which cannot be settled in the final days of the present session of Congress. We must also recognize this fact.

This is a very simple amendment. It would merely strike out section 3 of the Bennett amendment. I hope Senators will support it.

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

Mr. INOUYE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall take some time of my own, which I hope the Senator will yield to me, to state my reasons why I think the consumers should support the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii.

I should like to ask the Senator a question. Is it a fact that the beet and cane sugar farmers, who will get an increase in the quota, themselves have the benefit of agricultural adjustment laws of the United States, so that the Treasury supports the price for them as it does for other farm commodities?

Mr. INOUYE. Yes; these are compliance payments.

Mr. JAVITS. This proposal would give them an additional call upon the Treasury for more price subsidies?

Mr. INOUYE. The 500,000 tons, it has been estimated, would cost approximately $35 million a year.

Mr. JAVITS. In this kind of underwriting which we give the farmers generally?

Mr. INOUYE. Yes.

I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii, for two reasons.

First, as has been pointed out by the Senator from New York, the amendment of the Senator from Utah, if it is adopted without the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii, will cost the Treasury a substantial amount of money.

Second, from the standpoint of our industry in Massachusetts, it is my understanding that we use about 10 million tons of sugar a year. Six million tons are from domestic production in the beet sugar industry. The remainder, 4 million tons, comes from abroad and from the Philippines. The Philippines, as I understand, bring in approximately 1 million tons. This amount would not be subject to the terms of the bill. The remainder of 3 million tons is subject to the discretion of the Department of Agriculture at the present time.

The amendment of the Senator from Hawaii merely leaves the status quo for 6 months, and does not try to change the status quo in the last few months of the congressional session without the benefit of any hearings on the subject.

Let me show how it would affect us in Massachusetts. In Boston, according to the latest available statistics, we imported 418,000 tons of raw sugar. This was valued at $54 million. It generated $25 million more in business. It required 70 ships to bring this production into the Boston area.

Our Boston refining industry has about 1,000 employees. The annual payroll is $7,500,000. If the amendment of the Senator from Utah were adopted, much of the refining would be eliminated or reduced.

In addition, we send approximately $75 million worth of exports from Massachusetts. The port of Boston is involved in bringing in $54 million worth of sugar and exporting approximately $75 million worth of goods to our sugar-producing neighbors in the various Caribbean and Central American countries.

This would be substantially eliminated without an opportunity for hearing, without an opportunity to determine what would be the result.

I believe that for the next 6 months the domestic beet sugar-producing States will not suffer. The Department of Agriculture has discretion to carry on with 3 million tons. Therefore, I believe that the Senate should adopt the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii. I say this in the national interest and also from the standpoint of lowering the cost to the consumer, and from the standpoint of imposing a lighter burden on the Treasury so far as subsidies are concerned. From the local point of view, the port of Boston and our refining industry would be affected. The amendment of the Senator from Hawaii should be adopted, and the matter should be left in status quo for the next 6 months. I hope the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii to the amendment of the Senator from Utah will be adopted.

Mr. INOUYE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii. I heard with the greatest interest and the greatest enlightenment his speech, and also the speech of my colleague from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] with respect to the whole situation.

My main support of the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is based upon the impact of this situation on the consumers. This would be my main feeling. In addition, the question of the foreign policy of the United States also is involved.

The port of New York is the largest center of cane sugar refining in the world. Raw cane sugar ranks second in tonnage among the commodities imported through the port—by far the most important food product. In 1962, more than 1,500,000 tons of sugar moved into New York, requiring some 150 ships.

This sugar was destined for five of the Nation's largest refineries—the Brooklyn plant of the American Sugar Co.—Domino Sugars; the Long Island City plant of the National Sugar Refining Co.—Jack Frost Sugars; the Brooklyn plant of SuCrest Corp.—SuCrest Sugar; the Yonkers plant of Refined Syrups & Sugars, Inc.—Flo-Sweet Sugars; and the liquid sugar plant of the Pepsi-Cola Co. in Long Island City.

The raw sugar imported into the port of New York was valued at more than $190 million. According to the latest studies, the 1½ million tons of sugar imported generated an estimated $80 million more in business for the New York area.

New York's sugar refining industry has played an important role in the progress of the business community of the city for more than 300 years. The five refineries, alone, provide direct employment for nearly 5,000 individuals and maintain an annual payroll of approximately $25 million. In addition, there are hundreds of home office employees of sugar companies whose jobs depend on the importation of sugar.

Another segment of New York labor also benefits from imports of raw cane sugar. For example, each year over 3 billon pounds of sugar products move out of these refineries by barge, truck, and providing many man-hours of employment to transportation workers alone.

Housewives buying small packages of sugar; the industrial users—bakers, confectioners, canners, bottlers, ice cream manufacturers, and other food processors—located in New York, New Jersey, and the other surrounding States rely heavily on New York sugar refineries to fill quickly their divergent sugar needs at reasonable prices. New York and New Jersey, with a total sugar consumption of more than 2.6 billion pounds annually, is the Nation's most important sugar consuming market.

What would be the direct impact on business and labor concerned with the importation of sugar into the Port of New York if 500,000 tons of sugar quota were taken away from the foreign suppliers?

First of all, there would be a loss of incoming cargo. Second, there would be a loss of outgoing cargo due to a reduction of exports. Here is why:

The sugar-producing nations depend on the sale of raw sugar to the United States to help earn the dollars needed to import manufactured and agricultural goods from the United States. These goods, $4.2 billion worth in 1962, must flow out through U.S. ports.

Any drop in U.S. imports of raw sugar will, most assuredly, be followed by a decrease in U.S. exports to sugar-producing nations. Sugar is the third most important dollar earner for all of Latin America.

New York and New Jersey, in 1961, exported an estimated $455 million worth of manufactured and farm goods to the sugar-producing nations, most of it through the Port of New York. These exports of everything from highly intricate electronic equipment to clothes and malt provided an estimated 50,000 jobs and $275 million in wages and farm income.

There would definitely be a reduction of jobs at the five New York cane refineries. It is true that sugar taken away from the foreign suppliers and given mainly to the beet producers would provide additional employment for the beet industry. But this would be a poor exchange for organized labor, and especially for east coast cane refinery workers who would lose their jobs to the beet industry mainly in Western States.

The proposed 500,000-ton reduction in the foreign sugar quota represents 16 days or 1,720,000 man-hours of work for the entire cane refining industry and a loss of more than $6,200,000 in refinery workers' wages alone.

The harmful consequences of lopping 500,000 tons of sugar from the foreign quota can be graphically measured in stark terms if the full impact were to be concentrated on the Port of New York. Such a cutback in importation would be enough to eliminate approximately one-half of the business and job-stimulating activities of the fleets carrying sugar to the port, and to wipe out two or three of New York's cane sugar refineries, some 2,500 refinery jobs, and the $12,500,000 in annual payroll.

Of course, New York would not by itself suffer the full impact of a reduction in foreign sugar quotas. Nonetheless, it is fair and factual to state that New York's share of the sugar import loss would result in a serious reduction of jobs in the five new York refineries.

U.S. cane refinery workers are among the highest paid and receive some of the highest benefits in American industry. They are also assured of year-round employment. In contrast, the beet processing factory jobs are seasonal, at lower pay, with lesser benefits.

For example, cane refinery production workers average around $3 an hour and fringe benefits are in the neighborhood of 75 cents an hour. The New York plants provide steady employment throughout the year. According to the latest Government studies, beet production workers receive an average of $2.20 an hour on a seasonsal basis, primarily during a 4-month period—October through January. U.S. production workers as a whole are paid an average of $2.49 an hour, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports.

The replacement of cane sugar by beet sugar also will result in higher prices to the unionist as well as to all consumers. Besides being one of the most highly subsidized farm commodities, beet sugar must be shipped into the highly populous east coast by truck and train from the western beet States. This combination—high subsidies and freight costs—results, in times of normal supply, in a higher cost of sugar to the housewife and the industrial user.

As to the foreign policy aspect, we are always inclined, as we were when we discussed this subject yesterday, with respect to another tariff matter, to look at these things through the wrong end of the telescope. We are fighting a battle with Europe with respect to the rationalization of Europe's farm production. We say to Europe, "Do not produce wheat and other farm products uneconomically. Buy them from us economically." This stimulates trade both ways, because the European cost of production is infinitely greater than ours. Yet we are now asked to turn completely around and engage in the very same protectionist device we are asking Europe to avoid, by asking our people to produce more sugar, which we know is more expensive to produce than it is in the places from which we import it. The more we encourage American production on an expensive economic level, the more we are encouraging the building up of agricultural subsidies and price guarantees, against which so many of us have been inveighing for years, and which, in my judgment, have dragged down American agriculture to a position of almost constant depression.

In my judgment, from the point of view of the most rational approach to the totality of the United States, the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] should be adopted. The very most we should do is to extend the situation as it exists today for an additional 6 months.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I approve and agree with what the Senator from New York has said. However, is there not one further point? If the amendment of the Senator from Utah were adopted in full, it would cut down an industry which is refining and importing, and thus giving cheaper supplies to our consumers.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is absolutely correct. The New York area receives some 150 ships a year. I heard the Senator from Massachusetts say that Boston receives 70 ships a year. For New York, this is an important industry, directly employing 5,000 persons. I would not be justified in arguing this case upon that ground alone, any more than I feel it is justifiable to argue the case on the other side in terms of increasing domestic production merely because to do so would provide American farmers with more work to do. What we must have in America is rational farm production based upon what, in economic terms, is the best and most economical for us to raise.

We are not dealing with a problem of national security. It cannot be said that if we did not give this authority to the American farmer, the security of the United States would be imperiled. We are dealing with no shortage of supplies of sugar. The Department of Agriculture has withheld 500,000 tons from the quota. The effort is to latch on to that 500,000 tons in a way which, in my judgment, and with all respect to those on the other side, is uneconomical to the American taxpayer, as the Senator from Massachusetts has emphasized.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Would it not be more economical, based on the argument the Senator from New York has made, to import all the textiles we use? We could buy textiles from Japan cheaper than they can be made here. We could buy beef and electrical equipment cheaper from abroad. Would not the same argument pertain to all the other articles that American consumers need?

Mr. JAVITS. That is not the case, because it is a fact that many textiles—the overwhelming volume of textiles—are made better and cheaper in the United States and to the greater satisfaction of the American consumer.

Actually, American electrical appliances are the most highly desired in the world. Although they are somewhat higher in price, they are one of our best export commodities because of their quality.

We are talking about sugar, which has been traditionally a large import commodity. I am arguing against breaking the balance which has existed for many years. What is sought to be done now is to shift that balance more to American production. That is what I am arguing against.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. In the construction of the huge hydroelectric dams in the United States, foreign companies have sought to furnish the big generators, which can be bought much cheaper in foreign countries. Should we buy such equipment from them and put our own people out of work?

Mr. JAVITS. I have dealt with that question before. In that case we have a national security situation. We should buy a reasonable proportion abroad, but we should not put our domestic industry out of business. In this instance, it is proposed to do something which has not heretofore been the case.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Is there not more of a national security problem connected with sugar? In the event of another war, we would not have the benefit of acquiring Cuban sugar.

Mr. JAVITS. We have managed to get our sugar very heavily from Latin America, and that is exactly the source that would be discriminated against if we did what the Senator from Utah wishes us to do by his amendment.

Let me say, however, that I am not at all unmindful of the desires and needs of the farmers of my State. I fought hard and succeeded on January 10, 1964, in obtaining the allocation of 29,500 acres from the national sugarbeet acreage reserve for 1965, 1966, and 1967, to farms in counties in central New York, yielding 50,000 short tons of sugar. This development is very important to the economic well-being of the eight counties in central New York involved and I am glad that I have played a role in making this possible.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I am about to suggest the absence of a quorum. Before doing so, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah desire to use his time before the call for a quorum?

Mr. BENNETT. I shall use it after the quorum call.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Hawaii is granted. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUYE. 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. INOUYE. Mr. President, on my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes from the time on my amendment rather than on the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii.

During his introductory remarks, the Senator from Hawaii made some interesting references to my statement, calling it "allegations." I confess that I was not able to write them all down, but one or two things need to be straightened out.

The Senator from Hawaii in all of his discussion of the proposal spoke only of the beet producers, as though it were only the beet people who would benefit from this proposal. Under my amendment, the amount which could be allotted to the sugarbeet industry is 275,000 tons, which is approximately 10 percent of its current allotment. The amount that could be allotted to the mainland cane producers is 225,000 tons, which is better than 20 percent of its total. The mainland cane producers have a far more serious problem than do the beet producers. Their oversupply, the weight of their surplus inventory, is percentagewise much heavier than that of the beet producers.

As I said earlier, the names of four Senators from mainland cane-sugar-producing States are included as sponsors of the amendment I have submitted. So I hope that no Senator will think that this is only an attempt of the beet-sugar producers to take care of their situation. This is a program to take care of all the mainland sugar producers; and, as I say, the need of the mainland cane producers is relatively much more drastic than the need of the mainland beet producers.

The Senator from Hawaii ridiculed my statement that the administration encouraged the production of domestic sugar. I have, and shall offer for the RECORD, a letter addressed by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman to Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives, dated December 20, 1963.

Attached to that letter was a resolution which the Secretary asked the Speaker of the House to have introduced for consideration. Let me read the resolution and the letter to the Senate:

DECEMBER 20, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Transmitted herewith for the consideration of the Congress is a proposed joint resolution to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to permit unlimited marketings of sugar by the domestic sugar producing areas during the calendar year 1964. Under the Sugar Act the U.S. sugar market is divided by a quota system among various groups of suppliers—the domestic beet sugar area, the mainland cane sugar area, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, individual foreign countries and foreign countries as a group which supply sugar under the global quota.

Early this year, when it became clear that world supplies of sugar would be tight, all acreage restrictions on domestic producers for this year and next year were removed. Both beet and sugarcane producers in the continental United States are harvesting all-time high record crops. Beet sugar production is expected to be 20 percent and mainland cane 40 percent above last year's levels. It is estimated that sugar production in the continental United States from the current crop could be as much as 500,000 tons more than the sum of the mainland beet and cane quotas for 1964.

The world price for raw sugar as of November 26 was 11 cents per pound as compared to 8.10 cents at the end of September. The rapid rise has been attributed primarily to reports of disappointing crops in U.S.S.R. and Poland and to damage to the Cuban crop by hurricane Flora. The price for raw sugar imported into the United States is substantially below the world price. For instance, on November 26 it was 3.4 cents lower than adjusted to reflect duty and freight, but still 2 cents above the price reference in section 201 of the act. Our market is separated from the world market because of the large import commitments that we have this year.

The proposal to permit our domestic areas to market all available sugar next year would result in lower imports of sugar from the world market and would lessen upward pressures on prices which are far above normal.

The Department recommends the adoption of the proposed resolution.

To the extent that this resolution reduces imports of sugar into the United States and eventually increases the production of domestic sugar, tariff revenue to the Treasury will be reduced by $12.50 per ton of sugar and direct Government payments to producers of mainland sugar crops increased by about $15 per ton. Thus, if imports are curtailed by 250,000 tons in 1964, tariff revenue would be reduced by $3,125,000 in that year. In future years, if domestic stocks of sugar are replenished by a corresponding quantity, Government payments to domestic producers would be increased by $3,750,000.

On the other hand, the proposed resolution would not only provide additional assurance to sugar consumers against high prices in the period while world stocks are being replenished but would substantially benefit our balance-of-payment accounts. A reduction of 250,000 tons in our imports in 1964—calculated on the basis of the domestic c.i.f. price of November 26—would amount to $42 million. Calculated in line with the price referred to in section 201 of the act, the savings would be $31 million. Furthermore, to the extent that the proposed resolution would lower the price of that sugar which is imported, both sugar consumers and the balance-of-payment accounts would benefit. Such benefits would be many times the cost referred to in the preceding paragraph.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed joint resolution from the standpoint of the administration's program.

A similar letter is being sent to the President pro tempore of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

JOINT RESOLUTION TO SUSPEND DURING THE CALENDAR YEAR 1964, RESTRICTIONS ON MARKETING OF DOMESTICALLY PRODUCED SUGAR UNDER THE SUGAR ACT OF 1948, AS AMENDED

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, the quantity of sugar produced from sugarbeets or sugarcane grown in the continental United States, and the quantity of raw sugar produced from sugarcane grown in Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands may be marketed during the calendar year 1964 without regard to any quotas, penalties or other restrictions provided for in such Act.

Mr. President, what did the Speaker of the House do with that letter? He placed it in a pigeonhole and forgot it.

It may be just coincidence that he also comes from Boston where there are many large sugar refineries and he was not anxious to see the proposal of the Secretary of Agriculture adopted.

Let me read to the Senate from President Johnson's agricultural message to Congress of January 31, 1964—this year:

[From President Johnson's agricultural message to Congress, Jan. 31, 1964]

4. Sugar: The rise in sugar prices in 1963 reflected a reduction in world supplies. The Cuban crop was about one-half the pre-Castro level. Europe had two poor sugar-beet crops. But the fears voiced last year that the United States would be unable to obtain sufficient sugar proved groundless.

Action by the Department of Agriculture assured sugar users an adequate supply and helped halt the price increases that attended heavy buying in anticipation of shortages.

However, the experience of the past year—and the fact that foreign sugar quotas expire at the end of 1964—highlight the need for some action at this session of Congress to assure ample supplies of sugar to consumers at fair prices.

I recommend the removal of marketing restrictions on the sale of domestically produced sugar during the calendar year 1964. This legislation will relieve the pressure on world market supplies at a time when these supplies are short.

The effectiveness of our present arrangements for foreign sugar procurement are under intensive study. On the basis of this study I shall—early in this session—make recommendations for remedial legislation.

I do not know how anyone could obtain a stronger statement as to the position of the administration than this statement made by the President and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

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

Mr. BENNETT. If the Senator from Louisiana will yield himself 10 minutes of his own time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If I recall correctly, the amendment the Senator is offering is the amendment being proposed by the Johnson administration, as the answer made by the Secretary of Agriculture. My understanding is that this is what the Department of Agriculture believes is needed, in order to alleviate a serious situation which exists for the sugarcane producers and the sugarbeet producers in this country, based on their performance and relying upon the word of the Secretary of Agriculture; is that not correct?

Mr. BENNETT. The record shows that in December of last year the Secretary of Agriculture sent up a resolution asking for its consideration. It was ignored by the Speaker of the House and the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. Less than a month later, it was followed up by a statement from the President himself recommending that the marketing allotments be eliminated for the year 1964.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So that we understand the Senator correctly, the position of the Senator—as he stands on the Republican side of the aisle—is the position of the administration—that is, this Democratic administration. It is an administration-supported measure which he is offering as an amendment. This is what the Secretary of Agriculture and the President feel is needed to fulfill the commitments they made to the sugarbeet producers and the sugarcane producers, when they told them to go ahead and produce sugar. Now they find they have a surplus running out of their ears, we might say. They have sugar everywhere. They need a market for it, and thus they need a quota to sell it. What the Senator is trying to get agreement on is not only what the producers need but also what the administration is asking for.

Mr. BENNETT. The administration certainly asked for it in December 1963, and January of this year.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Louisiana is on limited time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me make just one reply. As I understand it, 1964 is the year the administration was asking for, not 1965.

Mr. BENNETT. No. This bill allows increased marketing quotas only for the remainder of 1964. There is no request in my amendment for an increase in quotas beyond December 31, 1964. I am happy to correct the impression the Senator from Massachusetts may have.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield, on my own time?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. INOUYE. For the RECORD, I should like to state that last Friday the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Murphy, submitted a message to the House and the Senate, with a copy of a bill; and this was the administration's position, and this was the administration's bill. That bill provided for one simple thing: a 6-month extension from the quota section of the Sugar Act of 1962. It had nothing to do with increased tonnage or acreage restrictions. It was simply a 6-month extension.

Mr. BENNETT. I am making the point which the Senator from Hawaii discussed earlier, that a year ago the administration was encouraging the production of mainland sugar. In addition that was not the full administration proposal. I cannot think of anything more encouraging than the statements which were made in December and January.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As I understand it, at the end of this crop year, our producers will have on hand a million and a half tons of sugar for which they have no quotas. What we are trying to do is allow them to sell some of their sugar, because they need to be able to sell it. Some of the producers are new concerns which were financed by money borrowed from the Government, in some instances—also co-ops trying to find ways to sell their sugar, having raised and produced the sugar at the urging of the U.S. Government at a time when sugar was 13 cents a pound.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the problem. I am going back to another part of the discussion of the Senator from Hawaii. The Hawaiians produce raw sugar which has to be refined. Most of it is refined by the California & Hawaiian Sugar Co. on the west coast. The statement has been made by the Senator from Massachusetts, I believe, that those who are opposed to the Bennett amendment are fighting for lower prices on sugar, and that if the amendment should be adopted, the price will rise, and that beet sugar prices are always higher than the prices of sugar made from cane.

I hold in my hand the annual report of the California & Hawaiian Sugar Co. for 1963. I read from the president's statement, and it is interesting material:

Under terms of the beet purchase contract, the price that beet processors pay for sugar beets is determined by the price at which they sell refined sugar thus, even in such a period as we experienced in 1963, beet processors were able to hold down the price of their principal raw material simply by not raising the refined price.

* * * * *

Beet processors took full advantage of the situation. Despite the necessity of higher cane refined prices, some beet processors chose to continue to supply customers at close to former prices. At times during May, the beet price in the northwest was $40 per ton below California and Hawaiian prices in the same areas, and $71 per ton below prices in the northeast.

Mr. President, I believe that the blanket charge that beet sugar is always more expensive than cane sugar has been blown out of the water forever by this statement.

The president of the company goes on to say:

We attempted to keep our refined prices in reasonable relation to raw quotations. To achieve this, California and Hawaii were forced to lead in every west coast price increase except one, and still we were only partially successful.

Except one.

Continuing to read:

Our pressure to increase prices was a calculated risk with the negative consequences being a serious strain on customer relations and a loss of some business to competitors.

For a long time, the beet industry has been held up as the "bogeyman" responsible for the high price of sugar to all consumers.

We have gone through an experience which indicated that this is not so. And there was, as the result of this situation, the ability of the beet industry and the mainland cane industry to produce sugar and sell it at prices below the price of foreign sugar in 1963, that led to the Secretary's recommendation and the President's mention of a need for unlimited marketing quotas in the year 1964.

The Senator from Hawaii and I had an argument about what happened in the House Committee on Agriculture on yesterday. I have a joint news release released by Representatives CATHERINE MAY and DON SHORT, both of whom were present at that meeting. It makes very interesting reading. I should like to read part of it. It reads:

Immediately after an executive meeting of the committee this noon, Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, reportedly had told newsmen, "We called the meeting to see who was going to kill cock robin, now we know. It was the beet producers."

The May-Short statement said:

"We don't wonder that the chairman used the cock robin analogy in referring to the committee hearings, because both the perfunctory open hearing and the abruptly

adjourned executive meeting which followed were strictly for the birds.

"It came as a great surprise to us, after all these months of delay, that the chairman called any open hearing at all. But when he did, he broke committee precedent on hearing witnesses in an even more surprising way. He didn't even show the common courtesy of asking the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State witnesses who were present to testify on the bill that their own administration had proposed. Then, out of a room packed with representatives from all portions of the industry, he called only two witnesses—one for the beet producers and one for the mainland cane producers. Both of these witnesses gave execellent and convincing reasons why our American growers should be permitted to market part of the sugar which their own government had asked them to produce as a means of stabilizing the chaotic sugar market last year. Following these statements, the chairman summarily dismissed all the others who had come to testify and announced there would be an immediate executive session.

"In other words we were not permitted to hear the administration's justification for proposing an extension of the Sugar Act without any relief for the American sugar producer. Nor were we permitted to question the cane sugar refiners' representatives. Perhaps the leadership on the committee felt that such questions would result in some feathers being ruffled, maybe even a few being plucked.

"But in the executive session that followed it became clear that it was the influences of refiners of foreign cane on the committee leadership—and the threat of that influence on the House leadership—that made sitting ducks of those of us who sought relief for the American sugar farmer."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to yield additional time to himself? The 10 minutes have expired.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator will yield himself 3 additional minutes. The time being limited, I ask unanimous consent that the entire news release be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

RELEASE FROM THE OFFICES OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE CATHERINE MAY AND REPRESENTATIVE DON SHORT

WASHINGTON.—The arguments swirling around Capitol Hill today as to "who killed cock robin"—two sugar bills, subject of brief House Agriculture Committee meeting this morning—by late afternoon stood 3 to 1 in favor of blaming U.S. refiners of foreign cane sugar.

Congresswoman CATHERINE MAY, Republican, of Washington, and Congressman DON SHORT, Republican, of North Dakota, issued a joint statement agreeing in essence with an earlier verdict by Congressman HARLAN HAGEN, Democrat, of California, that the committee failed to report out a bill because of possible blocking action in the House by cane refining interests.

Immediately after an executive meeting of the committee this noon, Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, reportedly had told newsmen, "We called the meeting to see who was going to kill cock robin; now we know. It was the beet producers."

The May-Short statement said:

"We don't wonder that the chairman used the cock robin analogy in referring to the committee hearings, because both the perfunctory open hearing and the abruptly adjourned executive meeting which followed were strictly for the birds.

"It came as a great surprise to us, after all these months of delay, that the chairman called any open hearing at all. But when he did, he broke committee precedent on hearing witnesses in an even more surprising way. He didn't even show the common courtesy of asking the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State witnesses who were present to testify on the bill that their own administration had proposed. Then, out of a room packed with representatives from all portions of the industry, he called only two witnesses—one for the beet producers and one for the mainland cane producers. Both of these witnesses gave excellent and convincing reasons why our American growers should be permitted to market part of the sugar which their own Government had asked them to produce as a means of stabilizing the chaotic sugar market last year. Following these statements, the chairman summarily dismissed all the others who had come to testify and announced there would be an immediate executive session.

"In other words we were not permitted to hear the administration's justification for proposing an extension of the Sugar Act without any relief for the American sugar producer. Nor were we permitted to question the cane sugar refiners' representatives. Perhaps the leadership on the committee felt that such questions would result in some feathers being ruffled, maybe even a few being plucked.

"But in the executive session that followed it became clear that it was the influences of refiners of foreign cane on the committee leadership—and the threat of that influence on the House leadership—that made sitting ducks of those of us who sought relief for the American sugar farmer.

"It was well known by all members of the committee that the refiners of foreign cane sugar would not support legislation that would authorize relief marketing for the domestic sugar producers. Nevertheless, a majority of the committee felt that additional marketing authorization should be included in any sugar bill the committee might report. We felt all Members of Congress should have a chance to decide, after full and open debate on the floors of both Houses, whether our domestic sugar farmers could market this extra sugar, or whether they should be penalized through having to pay burdensome storage charges on the sugar they produced at the request of the U.S. Government.

"But our request for an opportunity to vote on this issue was denied. After much discussion by some members of the committee on the possible action of the cane sugar refiners' votes in Congress, the meeting was abruptly adjourned."

Congressmen SHORT and MAY then added, "We're not confused by cock robin stories. American sugar farmers won't be confused either. The determination of our chairman to refuse any increase in marketing was the arrow that shot down their bluebird of hope."

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I wish to read these particularly important words:

It was well known by all members of the committee that the refiners of foreign cane sugar would not support legislation that would authorize relief marketing for the domestic sugar producers. Nevertheless, a majority of the committee felt that additional marketing authorization should be included in any sugar bill the committee might report. We felt all Members of Congress should have a chance to decide, after full and open debate on the floors of both Houses, whether our domestic sugar farmers could market this extra sugar, or whether they should be penalized through having to pay burdensome storage charges on the sugar they produced at the request of the U.S. Government.

But our request for an opportunity to vote on this issue was denied. After much discussion by some members of the committee on the possible action of the cane sugar refiners' votes in Congress, the meeting was abruptly adjourned.

Congressmen SHORT and MAY then added, "We're not confused by cock robin stories. American sugar farmers won't be confused either. The determination of our chairman to refuse any increase in marketing was the arrow that shot down their bluebird of hope."

I repeat that this bill would help the domestic cane producers more than the domestic beet producers, in the proportion of 2 to 1. The bill would not provide automatic quotas. It would merely allow the Secretary to authorize additional marketing quotas up to the figures that I have given. I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii will be rejected.

Mr. President, I have had a request from the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to yield 5 minutes to him out of the time allowed on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STADIUM CONTRACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on Monday on the wire service:

Acting Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach said yesterday that Bobby Baker will be treated like any other "potential criminal * * * because that's the way President Johnson wants it."

Katzenbach said the Justice Department would ask for an indictment against the former Senate majority secretary if there were evidence "we can show in court." But he said that the Department does not now have such evidence.

This is a shocking admission on the part of the Acting Attorney General that he is discussing the question of criminal prosecution in the case of Mr. Bobby Baker with the President of the United States. The Attorney General of the United States is supposed to enforce the laws on the basis of equality to all men and not on the basis of how well the individual involved may know the President.

I strongly question the propriety of the Attorney General in making any such statements, especially when his Department is supposed to still be investigating this case upon orders of the President.

Furthermore, Mr. Katzenbach's statement that his Department as yet has no evidence with which to seek an indictment means that the Attorney General sees no violation of the law:

First. When an individual, especially an employee of the U.S. Government, accepts kickbacks or payoffs from contractors doing business with the U.S. Government.

Second. For an individual, especially an employee of the U.S. Government, to keep $40,000 to $50,000 in $100 bills

always readily available in a file drawer in his office—apparently no questions are to be asked either by the Departments of Justice or Treasury as to how he got this money.

Third. When an individual applying for a Government loan files a false financial statement.

Fourth. When an individual or company filing its tax returns forges the name of a responsible accountant as having prepared such returns.

Fifth. When an employee of the U.S. Senate enters into business arrangements financed by Mr. James Hoffa of the Teamsters Union while at the same time a Senate committee and the Department of Justice are investigating Mr. Hoffa's activities.

Sixth. For an employee of the Government to file a false statement with the Federal Housing Administration in order to obtain attractive living quarters for his secretary.

Seventh. For an employee of the United States to use his official position to encourage the enactment of legislation and then in turn accept kickbacks or profitable arrangements from the individuals benefiting.

Eighth. When an employee of the U.S. Senate accepts a $600 or $800 stereo set as a gift while serving as an employee of the U.S. Government.

Ninth. When an employee of the U.S. Government helps a company in a foreign country to get its inspection certificate and then accepts a brokerage on all meat imported from that country.

Tenth. When an employee of the Senate accepts kickbacks from the salaries of his subordinates.

Eleventh. When an employee of the Government helps a company get a special ruling from a Government agency and then in turn buys stock in that company for approximately 10 percent of the prevailing market price.

Twelfth. When an employee of the Senate charges his personal as well as his business long-distance telephone calls to the U.S. Government.

Thirteenth. When an employee of the Senate charges to the American taxpayers a substantial part of the cost of the grand opening of his motel by using the facilities and equipment of the Senate restaurant at a very low fee.

Fourteenth. When an employee of the Senate arranges with an airline which is seeking Government contracts to furnish free transportation for 80 public officials from Washington to Nevada to attend a Democratic fundraising dinner—that company later got its contracts.

Fifteenth. When a Senate employee for a payment of only $4,600 accepts stock with a quoted market value in excess of $30,000 from a Washington lobbyist who has a special interest in the legislation proposals being dealt with by the Senate.

Sixteenth. When an individual, especially an employee of the U.S. Government, charges off on his income tax returns several thousand dollars annually under the label of expenses for doing business without providing any itemized breakdown whatsoever.

And finally—

Seventeenth. When any individual—particularly an employee of the U.S. Government—pyramids his net worth from $80,000 to $2¼ million in a 4-year period, creating very little if any tax liability with no questions asked.

Of course, as I outline the above items to point out just what the Attorney General's statement means as to how the law will be interpreted for Mr. Robert Baker I should call one important point to the attention of all other American citizens before they try to get away with this same procedure; and that is, to be very sure that just as in this case the Attorney General has first cleared their cases with higher authorities.

Mr. Katzenbach's statement clearly establishes that the administration is determined to whitewash the Bobby Baker case, and after reading his statement, I can now understand why his representatives, in a most recent conference in my office, were more interested in where I was getting my information than in the information itself.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12253) to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah wish to yield back his time?

Mr. BENNETT. Does any Senator wish time on the amendment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BENNETT. Just a moment. Is this in favor of the amendment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, under the unanimous consent agreement, I reserved the right to yield as much as 10 minutes to any Senator.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, before the Senate votes on the question, I hope that Senators will consider carefully what is proposed. A very serious situation might result from the proposal. The statement has been made that the bill is an administration bill. It is not an administration bill at all. The position of the administration is clearly outlined in the letter of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. A 6 months' extension has been requested. The administration does not desire the quota question to be brought into that subject. Comity between the two Houses of Congress is involved.

We know what the proposal is designed to do. It would permit the bill to go to the Ways and Means Committee of the House, even though we know that proposed sugar legislation has always been handled by the House Committee on Agriculture. The amendment is intended to short circuit the House Committee on Agriculture.

It is a frightful proposal. If the Senate wishes to remain here for the remainder of the year, this is a good way to be sure that it will. The chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Mr. COOLEY, is in a similar position in relation to his committee in the House as is the Senator from New Mexico in relation to the committee of which he is chairman. Mr. COOLEY is the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. How would Senators like it if the next time a sugar bill should come up, it would be tacked on to an agriculture bill of the House, so that it would go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, thus taking away jurisdiction of the subject from the Senate Finance Committee? Senators would shriek about how awful it was to take it away from the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, a man whom I greatly revere and respect, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. That would be a horrible thing to do. But some Senators believe that it would be all right to take the subject of the bill from HAROLD COOLEY if he does not agree with the position of certain Senators.

Mr. President, I believe the proposal is disgraceful.

If the Senate wishes to pass a measure which would extend the act for 6 months, fine. But let us not use the proposal as a vehicle to short circuit the Agriculture Committee of the House. The Agriculture Committee of the House has thought about it, has considered it, and has turned it down. Never mind how, why, or anything else. It has taken action. I hope that we shall not try to do something here which would violate the comity which exists between the two Houses of Congress.

If Senators wish to imply or state that the bill is an administration bill, I suggest that they state what the administration has asked for. Do not tack on something that the administration does not want at this time. The administration has asked for all it wanted. If it wanted more, representatives of the administration know how to write the English language and they could have submitted their request. But they did not. The message of the administration which was sent to the Congress did not include that last paragraph. It should not be foisted on the Senate as an administration program because it is not in accordance with the expressed desire of the administration. I think we should say so frankly and not discuss the question in any other way.

Mr. President, I do not like the Sugar Act. Many Senators know that I do not like the Sugar Act. I do not believe that it is proper legislation at all. But proper revision should be made by the appropriate committees of the Congress, which are the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. The Senate committee has not considered the question at all.

A great deal has been said on the floor of the Senate about the fact that a health care bill came to the Senate with-

out a recommendation from the Finance Committee. At least we know that it was considered by the Finance Committee. The committee had an opportunity to vote on the measure. The Finance Committee voted it down. But it is now proposed that the Finance Committee shall not have an opportunity to look at the amendment.

Mr. President, it would be a horrible thing to do. I have tried to defend the rights of the committees of Congress in relation to agricultural subjects. The measure should go to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in the House. I would not like it if Members of the House cooked up a scheme which would short circuit the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, whose chairman is the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. President, that is what the proposal would do. We might as well call it what it is.

It is a device to get around the ordinary rules of parliamentary procedure to keep an agriculture committee from getting its hand on a bill which rightfully belongs to that committee.

Mr. President, it would be a great mistake.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The question as to whether the members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House or the members of the House Committee on Agriculture should be the conferees on the bill is a matter for the House to decide. It is not the privilege of the Senate. The Senate has no power to tell the House whom the House shall name as conferees on a bill. That is a question which the House of Representatives will decide for itself. The Speaker of the House, the Parliamentarian, and the Representatives in the House will assist in making that decision.

The Senate Committee on Finance has jurisdiction over the Sugar Act. The Sugar Act involves a tariff. It involves a quota. It involves a tax. It is a question for the Senate Finance Committee, and we must wait until a bill comes from the House involving our jurisdiction in order to attach to such a bill an amendment of the type proposed, because the whole thing is a tax-tariff-quota arrangement, all of which is within the jurisdiction of the Senate Finance Committee.

If other Senators can come to the floor of the Senate and offer amendments, as they have done in good conscience and in good faith, the senior member of the Finance Committee can come here and offer an amendment on a Finance Committee bill.

A large number of senior members of the Committee on Finance support the amendment. Why did the administration not ask for something in the way of a marketing quota? Because over on the House side Mr. COOLEY has taken the side of the refiners as against the side of the producers. I do not blame him. The people whom he represents do not produce sugar. They refine it. On the other hand, on the Finance Committee are Senators who need to save sugar producers from a dire situation that will happen if the act expires. These people wish to sell the sugar they produce under the urging of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Tax and tariff bills must originate in the House. The only bills that we can amend in the Senate are House-passed tax bills. So far as committee jurisdiction is concerned, we must amend a bill that comes from the Senate Finance Committee.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. If no proposed legislation were enacted, what would happen to the beet quotas that have been assigned to the States of Maine and New York? I believe 40,000 acres were assigned to Maine and a number of acres to New York? Would those States not lose those quotas?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not believe that the proposal would have any effect on those quotas.

Mr. AIKEN. Would it have no effect?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Not on the quotas, but I am advised that the price of sugar would collapse. The price of sugar to producers in my State and elsewhere would be cut drastically.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. The measure would bear on sugar which was produced last year and would have no bearing on sugar produced this year. It would have no bearing on the new acreage which has been allotted.

Mr. AIKEN. What would happen to the sugar produced on the new acres?

Mr. McCARTHY. Those acres would go into production.

Mr. AIKEN. In 6 months it will be too late to plant beets in the Northern States.

Mr. McCARTHY. They will have an allocation, and they will have a market.

Mr. AIKEN. Would they plant just the same whether or not there was a law on the subject?

Mr. McCARTHY. They have authority to plant now. The measure would have no bearing whatsoever on their operations. In effect, it is stated that 500,000 tons of the domestic market quota that would otherwise go to the global quota would be reserved for American production. If that were not done, it would mean that in addition to the excess supply which we now have, we would bring 500,000 additional tons into the domestic market from foreign sources. That action would unquestionably have a depressing effect on the market price, which I believe would be depressed in any event.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Minnesota is from a beet producing State.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; my State is an important beet producing State. Between North Dakota and Minnesota a new plant will be going into effect. So if the proposal were in anywise to disadvantage that plant, we would have to weigh the situation.

Mr. AIKEN. They would not be able to get the maximum benefit from the new quotas unless proposed legislation were enacted.

Mr. McCARTHY. They could obtain a full quota. The problem we have is that assigned acreage was expanded because of the sugar situation last year. What we are dealing with is excess production which came from acreage allotments—acreage which was not in the ordinary allocation, but expanded acreage.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the quota which was assigned to New York and Maine would not be dependent on the allocation of new acreage to beet production. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. When these areas came into production, as they certainly would, if they came in in 1965, the prices that the producers would receive would be somewhat improved by virtue of the action proposed to be taken today. They would have their acreage and their market. The refiners would take their production, and they would have a production in a market which would have, in addition to what it now has, an additional 500,000 tons.

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah is prepared to yield back the remainder of his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having either expired or been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] to the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted "nay."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator that the senior Senator from Vermont has voted. The rollcall will proceed.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. COTTON (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. METCALF (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from California [Mr. SALINGER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea";

if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from California [Mr. SALINGER], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 34, as follows:

[No. 589 Leg.]

YEAS—27

Anderson	Gore	Proxmire
Bartlett	Inouye	Randolph
Brewster	Javits	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Dodd	McIntyre	Saltonstall
Douglas	Monroney	Sparkman
Ervin	Nelson	Talmadge
Fong	Pastore	Walters
Fulbright	Pell	Williams, N.J.

NAYS—34

Aiken	Hart	Mundt
Allott	Hickenlooper	Pearson
Bayh	Kuchel	Prouty
Bennett	Lausche	Robertson
Bible	Long, Mo.	Simpson
Boggs	Long, La.	Smathers
Byrd, Va.	Mansfield	Smith
Carlson	McCarthy	Stennis
Cooper	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	Mechem	
Ellender	Morse	

NOT VOTING—39

Beall	Hayden	Metcalf
Burdick	Hill	Miller
Cannon	Holland	Morton
Case	Hruska	Moss
Church	Humphrey	Muskie
Clark	Jackson	Neuberger
Cotton	Johnston	Salinger
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Dominick	Keating	Symington
Edmondson	Kennedy	Thurmond
Goldwater	Magnuson	Tower
Gruening	McGee	Yarborough
Hartke	McGovern	Young, Ohio

So Mr. INOUYE's amendment to Mr. BENNETT's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator from Louisiana has only 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My understanding was—and there might be some misunderstanding about this—that I would be privileged to yield as much as 10 minutes to any Senator. I had in mind a Senator who might wish to say something about a pending amendment, inasmuch as no time was allotted under the bill. Therefore it was my understanding that I could yield 10 minutes, as the Senator in charge of the bill, to any Senator who might feel that perhaps he had been prejudiced because he could not get an adequate allocation of time. That is what I had in mind when I asked that I might be permitted to yield 10 minutes to any Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 2 hours be allowed on the bill, to be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to inquire whether the Senator from Illinois now proposes a unanimous-consent request concerning time on the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is a unanimous-consent request to allow 2 hours for debate on the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. To be equally divided.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield me half a minute?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield 30 seconds, on the bill, to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, my colleague from Washington, the junior Senator [Mr. JACKSON], if present, would have voted "nay" on the Inouye amendment, and would vote "yea" on the Bennett amendment. I would have done the same thing. However, I received a personal call from the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who wished to be recorded on the amendment. As a matter of courtesy I felt that I should pair with him. I want the RECORD to show that Senator would have voted "nay" on the last vote. He could not obtain a pair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to advise the Senator from Louisiana that he was not occupying the chair at the time the unanimous-consent agreement was entered and did not understand that the agreement as to yielding additional time was as the Senator from Louisiana stated. Therefore, without objection, the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York.

ADELA: A PARTNERSHIP FOR FREEDOM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today's announcement from Paris that the ADELA Investment Co.—Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America—is now organized and open for business is one of the most historic and important developments since the end of World War II in the struggle to accelerate the development of the industrially underdeveloped areas of the free world. ADELA is concerned with Latin America, but its effects could be worldwide.

The company gives substance to the principle that the resources and technical know-how of private enterprise in the Atlantic Community and elsewhere must be effectively organized and coordinated and used if the free world is to win its struggle to develop the nonindustrial areas of the world in accord with the principles of freedom.

ADELA is the first major effort of leading elements of private business and banking in Europe, the United States, Japan, and Latin America, to come to the aid of the private enterprise system in the underdeveloped areas of the free world. It signals a partnership between private enterprise of the industrially developed and the underdeveloped countries which, I am convinced, holds within itself the key to success of the free world in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia.

ADELA is a multinational, private investment group with shareholders representing 51 industrial firms, banks, and financial institutions in Western Europe, the United States, Canada, and Japan. In the words of Marcus Wallenberg, Sr., of Sweden, who has just been elected chairman of the ADELA board, this effort will be widely recognized as a "model" for similar efforts in other parts of the world.

It is interesting to note that the ADELA concept was first initiated in November 1962 by the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, of which I am Chairman. To me, it is an outstanding example of the effective cooperation that can be made for freedom and for an effective policy to win over communism by the legislators and private sectors of the free world nations.

I call attention to the fact that ADELA will cooperate with private enterprise in Latin America as well as with international private and public agencies, not only in seeking projects attractive from an investment standpoint, but most importantly, projects that promise to be useful and significant for the economic development of Latin American countries.

This organization, which starts with an investment capital of $16 million—and will be capitalized at $20 million by the yearend—should be tremendously encouraging to the people of Latin America. They should know that private enterprise is the best means of attaining higher standards of living and victory over their age-old enemies of disease, poverty, and ignorance. The list of ADELA subscribers, including some of the leading banks and industrial concerns in the free world, gives assurances of the potential effectiveness of ADELA's action, of the tremendous technical assistance it can provide, which itself far overshadows the investment capital involved. The list of subscribers also reflects great credit on the willingness of the private enterprise system to undertake a monumental project in the public interest.

The people of the United States and the world should be grateful to the industrial and banking leaders who have been at the forefront of this effort. They include: Howard C. Petersen, president of the Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co., who was elected vice chairman of the ADELA Board; Emilio G. Collado, director of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and George S. Moore, president of the First National City Bank of New York, directors of ADELA, and Dr. Giovanni Agnelli, of Italy, vice chairman of Fiat, both members of the ADELA Executive Committee; and Ernest Keller, of Peru, managing director of ADELA. For the last 9 months Mr. Collado and Mr. Moore, together with other associates, including Forrest Murden and Jack Bennett, both of New York, have devoted themselves indefatigably to the details of organizing ADELA.

This activity followed a meeting in January in Paris, which marked the transition of the ADELA project from the research and exploratory stage to a practical working company. A debt of gratitude is also owed to the three executive directors of the project, who carried on the tremendous labors of the research and exploratory phase: Dr. Aurelio Peccei, of Rome, was loaned to the project by Fiat, of Italy; Warren Wilhelm, of New York, loaned by the Texaco Corp.; and Julio del Solar, of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Between November 1962 and this January the work of organizing ADELA was carried on by myself, as chairman of the Working Party of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, who at my invitation, acted with me. We received financial help from the Ford Foundation and other benefactors.

Now that ADELA has been formally launched, with the active support of so many of the free world's major firms, I believe its successes will exceed even the hopes of those who helped it on its way. I believe that ADELA will be a model for the private sectors of the free world, providing the base for formation of similar groups to bring the vitality and initiative of the private enterprise system into the monumental task of building the basis for free institutions in the underdeveloped nations of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the press release announcing the organization of ADELA.

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

ADELA HOLDS FIRST BOARD MEETING—MULTINATION INVESTMENT GROUP FOR LATIN AMERICA REPORTS SUBSCRIPTION OF OVER $16 MILLION

PARIS, September 30.—The ADELA Investment Co.—a unique multination private investment group for Latin America—held its first board of directors meeting here today, selected a chairman and officers and reported that more than US$16 million has already been subscribed.

ADELA, which was incorporated in Luxembourg on September 24 with an authorized capital of US$40 million, will provide private enterprise in Latin America with equity capital and technical and managerial resources on a sound investment basis.

The group's shareholders are 51 important industrial companies, banks and financial institutions in Western Europe, the United States, Canada and Japan (see list of subscribers attached).

At the first board meeting today Marcus Wallenberg, Sr., of Sweden was elected chairman. Howard C. Petersen of the United States was elected vice chairman. Dr. Wallenberg is vice chairman of the Stockholms Enskilda Bank. Mr. Petersen is president of the Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co.

ADELA will be active in those Latin American countries which maintain a favorable investment climate with reasonable political, economic and monetary stability and furnish adequate assurances for the development of private enterprise. It will cooperate with Latin American entrepreneurs and with national and international industrial, banking and financial institutions in projects which are attractive from an investment standpoint and at the same time promise to be useful and significant for the economic development of Latin American countries. Consultation with interested Latin American international and national institutions has indicated that this effort is being well received.

The company has been developed over an 18-month period, and during the last 9 months was under the direct supervision of an international organizing committee under the cochairmanship of Dr. Giovanni Agnelli, of Italy, vice chairman of Fiat, and Mr. Emilio G. Collado, of the United States, director and vice president of Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. The newly formed ADELA company confirmed the $500,000 equity investment made earlier in its name in Forjas de Colombia, a new forge plant in Bucaramanga, Colombia. This investment was made in collaboration with the International Finance Corporation, and with Colombian and German investors.

Dr. Wallenberg called the formation of ADELA "a historic undertaking in the field of international private enterprise." He said that ADELA's multinational character, its large number of participants and the substantial financial, technical, and managerial resources they are able to bring to Latin America are unprecedented.

"Every one of ADELA's shareholders expects ADELA to participate in sound business investments on a realistic basis," Dr. Wallenberg declared. "ADELA, therefore, is a vote of confidence in the future of private investment in Latin America. We hope it will be a model for similar investment projects in other parts of the world."

Dr. Wallenberg added that by the end of the year he expected a number of additional shareholders to join ADELA, bringing the total amount subscribed to more than $20 million. It is anticipated that additional companies, including several from countries not now represented, will join ADELA in the coming months, and directors from these will be chosen at a special shareholders' meeting of ADELA in early 1965.

At today's meeting the board also elected an executive committee including the chairman and vice chairman, Dr. Giovanni Agnelli, of Italy, Emilo G. Collado, of the United States, and Ernst Keller, of Peru. Mr. Keller, a Swiss national, was formerly managing director and chief executive officer of Peruinvest, a private, multinational investment banking company in Lima, Peru, and senior partner, Ernst Keller & Associates, S.A., management consultants and consulting engineers. Mr. Keller was also elected managing director and chief executive officer of ADELA.

Other officers experienced in Latin America and in the field of development financing will be appointed at later meetings of the executive committee.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS, ADELA INVESTMENT CO.

Belgium: Petrofina S.A., Sybetra S.A.

Canada: Bank of Montreal, the Bank of Nova Scotia, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, the Royal Bank of Canada.

Denmark: The East Asiatic Co., Ltd.

Germany: Deutsche Bank A.G., Dresdner Bank A.G., Dr. August Oetker (Einzelhandelsfirma).

Italy: Banca Commerciale Italiana, Fiat, Istituto Mobiliare Italiano.

Japan: Bank of Tokyo, Ltd., the Fuji Bank, Ltd., the Industrial Bank of Japan, Ltd., the Mitsubishi Bank, Ltd., the Sumitomo Bank, Ltd.

Luxembourg: Kredietbank S.A. Luxembourgeoisie.

Netherlands: Amsterdam-Rotterdam Bank N.V.

Sweden: Allmanna Svenska Elektriska AB, Rederi AB Nordstjernan (Johnson Line), AB Scania-Vabis, Skandinaviska Banken,

Svenska Handelsbanken, AB Svenska Kullagerfabriken (SKF), Telefon AB L M. Ericsson, Trafikaktiebolaget Grangesberg-Oxelosund, AB Volvo.

Switzerland: Nestlé Alimentana Co. (S.A.), Swiss Bank Corp.

United Kingdom: The Shell Petroleum Co., Ltd.

United States: The Battelle Development Corp., Caterpillar Tractor Co., the Company for Investing Abroad (affiliate of Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co.), Continental International Finance Corp., the Dow Chemical Co., First National City Overseas Investment Corp., Ford Motor Co., Gulf Oil Corp., IBM World Trade Corp., Insurance Company of North America, Irving International Financing Corp., Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co., Manufacturers-Detroit International Corp., Northwest International Bank, Pullman, Inc., Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Ltd., Inc., Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, Wells Fargo Bank International Corp., White Weld & Co.

ADELA Investment Co. Directors

Chairman: Marcus Wallenberg, Sr., vice chairman, Stockholms Enskilda Bank.

Vice chairman: Howard C. Petersen, president, Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co.

Directors (in addition to chairman and vice chairman):

Herman J. Abs, managing director, Deutsche Bank A.G.

Giovanni Agnelli, vice chairman and managing director, Fiat.

Robert B. Bennett, treasurer, the Dow Chemical Co.

William Blackie, president, Caterpillar Tractor Co.

Edgar M. Bronfman, president, Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Ltd., Inc.

Tore Browaldh, chief general manager, Svenska Handelsbanken.

Emilio G. Collado, director and vice president, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

Ransom Cook, president, Wells Fargo Bank.

Henry Ford, II, chairman, Ford Motor Co.

G. Arnold Hart, president, Bank of Montreal.

Gilbert Edward Jones, president, IBM World Trade Corp.

Ernst Keller, managing director, ADELA Investment Co., S.A.

Armand Kemps, executive vice president, Sybetra.

David Kennedy, chairman, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago.

John Hugo Loudon, managing director, the Shell Petroleum Co., Ltd.

Neil J. McKinnon, chairman and chief executive officer, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce.

Roland A. Mewhort, president, Manufacturers National Bank of Detroit.

Kunio Miki, managing director, Bank of Tokyo, Ltd.

George S. Moore, president, First National City Bank.

Oskar Nathan, managing director, Dresdner Bank A.G.

F. William Nicks, chairman and president, the Bank of Nova Scotia.

Samuel Schweizer, chairman, Swiss Bank Corp.

Bradford Smith, Jr., president, Insurance Co. of North America.

Alexander de Takacsy, European representative, the Royal Bank of Canada, and president, the Royal Bank of Canada (France).

B. D. Thomas, president, Battelle Memorial Institute.

Lars-Erik Thunholm, managing director, Skandinaviska Banken.

Antonio Tonello, U.S. representative, Istituto Mobiliare Italiano.

W. K. Whiteford, chairman, Gulf Oil Corp.

Laurent Wolters, president, Petrofina S.A.

[From Business Week, Sept. 26, 1964]

International Outlook

Private Fund for Latin Development

Fifty major banks and big industrial companies in the United States, Canada, Europe, and Japan are pooling some of their resources to boost private investment in Latin America.

Their unique venture, scheduled to be formally set up this week, could set a pattern for joint investment companies in other developing areas of the world.

Giants Will Help

Latin America, though, will be the one to benefit from the plans of ADELA Investment Co. ADELA's shareholders come from 12 countries and include such major companies as Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, Ford, IBM, and First National City Bank, from the United States; Deutsche Bank and Dresdner Bank, from Germany; and other stars like Swiss Bank Corp., and Petrofina.

ADELA's first stockholders will put up $15.5 million. More participants are expected to join and capital is likely to reach $20 million by yearend.

A top European banker is slated for election as ADELA's board chairman at a directors' meeting in Paris next week.

Aim of the project is to strengthen private investment in Latin America by using ADELA's leverage to mobilize several times its own capital for joint ventures with local business in manufacturing, commerce, and agriculture.

Extra financing is likely to come from the World Bank's International Finance Corp. and the Inter-American Development Bank.

Already, ADELA's interim organizing committee has put $500,000 into one project—a $14 million steel forging plant in Colombia.

Those Who Behave

From such deals, it's hoped, will come a better climate for private investment in Latin America.

That climate has been sour during the 5 years of political instability that followed the Cuban revolution; it is only just beginning to recover.

But ADELA won't be stepping too far off the beaten path: It will put its money in countries where conditions are most favorable for private investment. This may well encourage other Latin American countries to ease their policies in order to attract some of the new capital.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12253) to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I oppose the Bennett amendment. I do so not in behalf of the cane sugar, the refiners, or other producing interests, but rather in behalf of the American consumers and taxpayers. We sometimes forget how much the cost of sugar subsidies increase the cost of living of the American people. I have calculated that the direct subsidies paid to American producers of sugar in the last 30 years amounted to $1.7 billion. In the last year, they amounted to $91 million. The subsidies are about evenly divided among the beet sugar, on the one hand and the mainland cane, and the oversea cane producers on the other. These subsidies are paid by the American taxpayers. In addition, of course, indirect subsidies also are paid by American consumers.

With the exception of 16 months during the last 30 years, the world price of sugar has been markedly below the domestic price. The domestic price of sugar has been kept up by the low quotas given to foreign sugar and the relatively high quotas given to domestic sugar.

On the average, over the past 30 years, with the exception of those 16 months, the domestic price of sugar has been about 2 cents a pound above the world price. That comes to $40 a ton. Americans consume approximately 10 million tons of sugar a year. So there has been an indirect subsidy of around $400 million a year to be added to the present $90 million cash subsidy. At present the difference between the world and the domestic price is about 2½ cents a pound (6.25 minus 3.7) or $50 a ton or at the rate of $500 million a year.

This is a very high price to pay, indeed, in a rational world; and I know it is hard to transpose a somewhat irrational world into a rational world. In a rational world, we would get the bulk of our sugar from the Caribbean. It would be relatively low-cost sugar, and it would help the American consumer. The American consumer and housewife would pay less than she now pays. The purchasing power she would save would then be used to purchase other commodities and services, and thus build up a demand for American goods in fields where we would have a comparative advantage.

At the very least, we should do what the Senate some 3 years ago started to do at the suggestion of some of us; namely, such sugar as we import should come in not at the domestic price, but at the foreign price, and a tariff should then be levied upon it equal to the difference between the domestic price and the foreign price and this should be paid into the Treasury. In all probability, this would net something like $150 million a year. This savings would not go to the consumers, but it would reduce the burden upon the taxpayers.

This proposal to increase the quantity of beet sugar produced domestically can only result in higher prices to the American consumers.

It can only result in making it more difficult to overthrow Castro. He has behaved abominably toward American interests, toward our Government, and toward the American people. We wish the Cuban people to overthrow Castro, but it will be hard to have him overthrown if the Cuban people know that their market in the United States will still be shut off. There must be some hope held out to them that if they throw him out they can then recover the American market.

For all these reasons, because I believe the program as a whole is very bad, because it would penalize American taxpayers and American consumers, because it would directly operate against a more rational world and serve to keep Castro in power, I oppose the Bennett

amendment. For it makes a bad matter worse.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the direct Sugar Act payments or cash subsidies for the years 1933 to 1963 be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

Sugar Act payments [1]

[Millions of dollars]

	Beet	Mainland cane	Hawaii	Puerto Rico	Virgin Islands	Total
1933	2.6					2.6
1934	19.6	8.9	4.7	12.8		46.0
1935	9.5	3.4	8.6	1.7		23.2
1936						
1937	17.1	5.4	4.2	9.5		36.2
1938	22.1	6.3	8.6	8.9		45.9
1939	21.4	5.4	9.0	10.6		46.4
1940	23.3	3.9	8.9	9.6		45.7
1941	19.0	4.6	8.6	11.2		43.4
1942	29.8	7.0	8.1	13.1	0.03	58.0
1943	17.6	7.4	8.3	12.2	.1	45.6
1944	18.6	6.6	8.2	13.1	.04	46.5
1945	22.9	6.8	8.1	13.3	.1	51.2
1946	27.7	6.5	6.6	15.1	.1	56.0
1947	32.3	6.3	8.1	15.5	.04	62.2
1948	23.2	7.2	7.6	17.7	.1	55.8
1949	26.6	7.1	8.4	17.5	.1	59.7
1950	33.7	7.8	8.5	17.1	.1	67.2
1951	25.9	6.5	9.1	18.9	.1	60.5
1952	24.7	8.0	9.4	17.0	.1	59.2
1953	30.0	8.6	10.2	16.7	.2	65.7
1954	33.2	8.1	9.9	16.2	.1	67.5
1955	29.1	7.6	10.5	16.0	.1	63.3
1956	31.3	7.3	10.2	14.7	.2	63.7
1957	36.4	7.3	10.1	13.5	.2	67.5
1958	36.2	7.4	7.4	14.9	.1	66.0
1959	38.9	7.9	9.3	14.2	.2	70.5
1960	39.3	8.2	8.8	14.9	.1	71.3
1961	42.4	10.9	10.0	13.6	.2	77.2
1962	44.5	11.5	10.2	13.5	.1	79.8
1963 [2]	50.8	15.0	10.1	15.0	.2	91.1
Total	829.7	214.9	249.7	398.1	2.5	1,694.9

[1] Includes abandonment and deficiency payments.
[2] Estimated.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Do I understand correctly that the Senator said the sugar program has cost the American taxpayers approximately $1.7 billion?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I said that over 30 years the cost has approximated $1.7 billion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is approximately $91 million in 1 year. That is the direct cost. Then there is the indirect cost of a higher price of approximately 2 cents or 2½ cents a pound, or $40 or $50 a ton on 10 million tons, or approximately $400 million a year which now comes out of the consumers' pockets. It may run as high as $500 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So the $400 million additional cost is an annual cost?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. The cash subsidy is now $90 million on an annual basis.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would it not make it more difficult for those struggling for freedom in Cuba to overthrow the Castro regime if this amendment should pass?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct, because it would serve to shut off the American market which otherwise would be theirs because of their low production costs.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I congratulate the Senator from Illinois from the standpoint of the taxpayer, from the standpoint of the consumer, and from the standpoint of patriotic Americans, those who love freedom and wish to see the Castro regime overthrown. It seems to me that the Bennett amendment should be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, when I arrived this afternoon, I had three amendments to propose to the Senate. A few moments ago we resolved the first amendment.

Mr. President, I am a practical man. It is obvious from the vote that the opponents of the Bennett amendment just do not have enough bodies in the Senate today.

However, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the two amendments and the explanations.

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

AMENDMENT TO BENNETT AMENDMENT TO H.R. 12253 PROPOSED BY SENATORS INOUYE AND FONG

At the end of section 3 of the bill, insert a colon and add the following as a proviso to section 202(a)(3) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended:

"*Provided*, That the Secretary shall authorize the marketing of such sugar in excess of established quotas only if: (i) the amount so authorized is necessary to meet the requirements of consumers in the calendar year 1964, and (ii) the domestic price for raw sugar is higher than the level which would fulfill the domestic price objective set forth in section 201 for a period of at least seven consecutive days in the thirty days immediately preceding any such authorization. If marketing of sugar by any area in excess of its established quota is authorized pursuant to this paragraph (3), the Secretary shall not permit constructive or warehouse deliveries to be charged against such area's 1964 quota or authorized marketings in excess of such quota, nor shall the Secretary permit similar devices to be used as a means of charging deliveries in 1965 against 1964 quotas or authorized marketings in excess of such quotas."

EXPLANATION

The amendment I am offering simply adds a proviso to section 3 of the amendment of the senior Senator from Utah. My proviso would establish certain criteria to guide the Secretary of Agriculture in making a determination whether to permit marketings in 1964 in excess of the established quotas of the domestic beet sugar and the mainland cane areas. The amendment offered by my colleagues, in its present form, leaves the matter within the absolute discretion of the Secretary without any guide whatever.

My proviso provides that overquota marketings should be authroized only to meet the requirements of consumers and only if the price objective of the act is being maintained. Finally, if overquota marketings are authorized, this proviso would prohibit the use in 1964 of artificial marketing devices which permit deliveries in 1 year to be charged to the quota in a prior year.

The limitations the proviso imposes on action by the Secretary are necessary if the integrity of the Sugar Act quota system is to be maintained. Unless the consumer needs the additional sugar, overquota marketings will be dumped in the market to the detriment of other segments of the industry. The quota system is based on a critical balance of supply and demand and any marketings of sugar not required by consumers will necessarily wreak havoc on the sugar program.

If the demand for sugar increases and the target price for sugar established by section 201 of the act is achieved, then, and only then, should additional sugars be permitted to be marketed. If such marketings are permitted in the face of ample supplies the quota system will become ineffective.

Finally, the proviso contained in my substitute will protect the quotas for 1965 from being raided in 1964 by means of constructive deliveries. Such deliveries and similar devices have been used in the past to permit areas with overly large quotas to fill their quotas by using deliveries physically made in the next year. If overquota marketings are permitted there is no excuse for the use of such devices, because the marketing relief being granted is to take care of surplus sugars on hand this year.

The quota system established by the Sugar Act must not be emasculated by indirection. Unless section 3 of my substitute is adopted, the sugar program will suffer and the future of the program will be imperiled.

The beet and mainland cane producers have asked for 500,000 tons of marketing relief in 1964. Section 3 of my substitute would give them such relief and still preserve the sugar quota system established by the Sugar Act.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO BENNETT AMENDMENT TO H.R. 12253 PROPOSED BY SENATORS INOUYE AND FONG

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following sections and renumber sections accordingly:

"The Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended as follows:

"'SECTION 1. That section 202(c) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended (relating to quotas for foreign countries) is amended by striking out "1963 and 1964" in each place it appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "1963 through the first six months of

1965", and by adding a new subparagraph (7) at the end thereof as follows:

"'"(7) The quantities established for the first six months of 1965 shall be one-half of the annual quantities provided for in the other subparagraphs of this subsection (c)."'

"'SEC. 2. Section 213 of such Act is amended (1) by striking from section 213(c) the language "during the years 1962, 1963, and 1964, which fee in each such year shall be respectively 10, 20 and 30 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "during the years 1962, 1963, 1964 and the first six months of 1965, which fee shall be 10 per centum in 1962, 20 per centum in 1963 and 30 per centum in 1964 and the first six months of 1965"; and (2) by striking from section 213 (c) the language "during the years 1962, 1963 and 1964 shall be respectively 0.1, 0.2, and 0.3, of one cent per pound" and inserting in lieu thereof "during the years 1962, 1963, 1964 and first six months of 1965 shall be in 1962 0.1 of one cent, in 1963 0.2 of one cent, and in 1964 and the first six months of 1965 0.3 of one cent per pound."

"'SEC. 3. The following new paragraph (3) is added at the end of section 202(a) of such Act:

"'"(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the domestic beet sugar area and the mainland cane sugar area may be permitted to market in 1964, as determined by the Secretary, in addition to the quota established for such area in 1964, a quantity of sugar not exceeding 275,000 short tons, raw value, and 225,000 short tons, raw value, respectively, and such additional quantities of sugar shall be deducted from the quantities of sugar which otherwise may be authorized for purchase and importation in 1964 pursuant to section 202(c)(4)(A) of this Act: *Provided*, that the Secretary shall authorize the marketing of such sugar in excess of established quotas only if: (i) the amount so authorized is necessary to meet the requirements of consumers in the calendar year 1964, and (ii) the domestic price for raw sugar is higher than the level which would fulfill the domestic price objective set forth in section 201 for a period of at least seven consecutive days in the thirty days immediately preceding any such authorization. If marketing of sugar by any area in excess of its established quota is authorized pursuant to this paragraph (3), the Secretary shall not permit constructive or warehouse deliveries to be charged against such area's 1964 quota or authorized marketings in excess of such quota, nor shall the Secretary permit similar devices to be used as a means of charging deliveries in 1965 against 1964 quotas or authorized marketings in excess of such quotas."

"'SEC. 4. Section 302(b)(1) of such Act (relating to farm proportionate shares) is amended by adding the following language at the end thereof: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph in regard to when proportionate shares for farms are to be established, the Secretary shall establish proportionate shares for farms in the domestic beet sugar area and in the mainland cane sugar area for the 1965 crop of sugarbeets and sugarcane. The total acreage of proportionate shares established for the beet sugar area for the 1965 crop shall be not more than 80 per centum of the acreage planted to sugarbeets of the 1964 crop. The total acreage of proportionate shares established for the mainland cane sugar area for the 1965 crop shall be not more than 85 per centum of the acreage of the 1964 crop of sugarcane planted in such area prior to May 1, 1964."'"

EXPLANATION

This proposal consists of four sections and does four separate things.

Like the amendment under discussion, my proposal would extend for 6 months those provisions of the Sugar Act relating to quotas for foreign countries. It would extend the foreign quota provisions as they now exist in the act from December 31, 1964, through June 30, 1965.

Second, like the amendment for which it will serve as a substitute, it extends the import fee for 6 months. During that 6-month period, the fee on global quota sugar would represent a 100-percent recapture of the difference between the world price and the domestic price. The import fee on quotas assigned to specified countries, other than the Philippines, would be extended at the 1964 level; namely, 30 percent of the global quota fee or, to put it another way, 30 percent of the difference between the world price and the domestic price as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Third, the amendment would authorize the Secretary under certain conditions to release for consumption in 1964 up to 275,000 tons of beet sugar over and above the quota set in the 1962 Sugar Act amendments for the beet sugar area. It would authorize the Secretary under the same conditions to release up to 225,000 tons of Louisiana-Florida sugar in excess of the 1964 quota established in the 1962 Sugar Act amendments for that area. I will explain the conditions under which the Secretary would be permitted to release this sugar for consumption in 1964 at a later point in my remarks.

Fourth, my substitute amendment would require the Secretary to establish proportionate shares on the 1965 crop—would require the Secretary to impose acreage restrictions—and to prevent further overproduction by these two mainland areas. In the case of the beet area, acreage restrictions would be established at no more than 80 percent of the acreage planted in that area in 1964. In the case of Louisiana-Florida, acreage restrictions would be established at no more than 85 percent of the 1964 crop of sugarcane planted in that area prior to May 1, 1964. I'll have more to say about this later in my remarks.

I call attention to the fact that the first two sections of my substitute are identical in content to a bill sent to the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate on Friday, September 25, by the Department of Agriculture. The first two sections, therefore, represent the Department's recommendations on sugar legislation at this session of Congress. These two sections represent the bill sent to the Congress by the Department of Agriculture in an effort to avoid the impasse which had been reached as a result of the breakdown in negotiations within the domestic sugar industry itself—after 9 months of effort to reach an agreement.

Section 3 of the amendment I am offering simply adds a proviso to the amendment of the senior Senator from Utah. My proviso would establish certain criteria to guide the Secretary of Agriculture in making a determination whether to permit marketings in 1964 in excess of the established quotas of the domestic beet sugar and the mainland cane areas. The amendment offered by my colleague, in its present form, leaves the matter within the absolute discretion of the Secretary without any guide whatever.

My proviso provides that overquota marketings should be authorized only to meet the requirements of consumers and only if the price objective of the act is being maintained. Finally, if overquota marketings are authorized, this proviso would prohibit the use in 1964 of artificial marketing devices which permit deliveries in 1 year to be charged to the quota in a prior year.

The limitations the proviso imposes on action by the Secretary are necessary if the integrity of the Sugar Act quota system is to be maintained. Unless the consumer needs the additional sugar, overquota marketings will be dumped in the market to the detriment of other segments of the industry. The quota system is based on a critical balance of supply and demand and any marketings of sugar not required by consumers will necessarily wreak havoc on the sugar program.

If the demand for sugar increases and the target price for sugar established by section 201 of the act is achieved, then, and only then, should additional sugars be permitted to be marketed. If such marketings are permitted in the face of ample supplies the quota system will become ineffective.

Finally, the proviso contained in my substitute will protect the quotas for 1965 from being raided in 1964 by means of constructive deliveries. Such deliveries and similar devices have been used in the past to permit areas with overly large quotas to fill their quotas by using deliveries physically made in the next year. If overquota marketings are permitted there is no excuse for the use of such devices, because the marketing relief being granted is to take care of surplus sugars on hand this year.

The quota system established by the Sugar Act must not be emasculated by indirection. Unless section 3 of my substitute is adopted, the sugar program will suffer and the future of the program will be imperiled.

The beet and mainland cane producers have asked for 500,000 tons of marketing relief in 1964. Section 3 of my substitute would give them such relief and still preserve the sugar quota system established by the Sugar Act.

Earlier in my remarks I stated that section 4 of my substitute deals with proportionate shares—acreage restrictions—on the 1965 crop in the beet and mainland cane sugar producing areas. Let me elaborate.

The amendment stipulates that proportionate shares (acreage restrictions) shall be established for the beet sugar area for the 1965 crop at not more than 80 percent of the acreage planted to sugarbeets for the 1964 crop. It stipulates further that the total acreage of proportionate shares established for the mainland cane sugar area for the 1965 crop shall be not more than 85 percent of the acreage of the 1964 crop of sugarcane planted in that area prior to May 1, 1964.

The net effect of this part of my substitute amendment, in the sugarbeet area would be to insure that in 1965 sugarbeet growers do not produce sugar in excess of their 1966 quota. Unless this amendment is adopted, the sugarbeet industry will again produce in excess of its quota and again that industry will be coming to the Congress crying crocodile tears that they must be bailed out of the mess they will have created for themselves.

The net effect of this amendment on the mainland cane sugar area would be to insure that their plantings this fall will be reduced to a point where they can by further restrictions in 1966 be brought within the quota allotted to them under the 1962 amendments to the Sugar Act. My proposal is to require the mainland cane area to get back within its quota in two steps. The amendment would require the beet area to get back within its quota in one step.

The amendment draws a logical distinction between the two areas. Let me explain.

Beets are an annual crop. All a beet farmer has to do to get back within his proportionate share is to refrain from planting sugarbeets next year. He can utilize the land taken out of sugarbeets for whatever crops he grew prior to the time he diverted those acres to sugarbeets. My amendment would require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish proportionate shares for the 1965 crop thereby insuring that each farmer in the Nation growing sugarbeets in so-called "old areas" take his proportionate share of this acreage reduction.

It's true that farmers growing sugarbeets for the new plants that were authorized in the 1962 Sugar Act amendments would not be cut. I call the attention of my colleagues, however, to the fact that the sugarbeet in-

dustry, itself, agreed to exempt new growers for new plants from acreage reductions for a specified period. This is a bed, therefore, which the industry, itself, has made—a bed which the beet industry itself must lie in.

In the case of sugarcrane, the situation is different. The nature of the crop makes it different. Normally, three cuttings of sugarcane in the Louisiana area are made before replanting is required. Most sugarcane growers in the mainland cane areas, therefore, replant about one-quarter of their acreage each year. If the cane growers were required to take their acreage adjustment in a single year, it would work some hardship. Certainly, however, they can and should make the adjustment in two steps.

Now, the basic fight within the sugar industry throughout this whole year has centered around two things. First, the beet and mainland cane areas have sought to obtain the privilege of marketing sugar in 1964 and in 1965 in excess of the quotas established for them in the 1962 Sugar Act amendments. By agreement within the domestic sugar industry, concurred in by the administration and the Congress, the beet and mainland cane quotas were established through 1966. Those quotas do not expire this year. They are a part of the statute. They are set by law. Nonetheless, as I said earlier, the two areas have sought to obtain privileges of marketing sugar in excess of their legal quotas.

The second point in the sugar industry fight centers around acreage restrictions. The rest of the domestic sugar industry has been willing to grant some marketing relief to the beet and mainland cane areas provided these two areas were willing to adjust their 1965 crops to the quotas provided for them in the Sugar Act. The rest of the industry, in effect, has said: "If you want marketing relief for your 1964 overproduction, then reduce your 1965 crop—reduce your 1965 acreage—so you will not repeat this overproduction in the coming crop year." This seems a reasonable position, and my amendment is designed to insure against overproduction again in 1965.

The Sugar Act controls the supply of sugar in the U.S. market. Each producing area is assigned a quota. If one area produces in excess of its quota and markets in excess of its quota, all other areas are penalized. If the beet area produces and markets more sugar, cane areas market less sugar. If one area expands, such expansion must come at the expense of some other area. If a domestic area expands, foreign imports are reduced. If more beet sugar is sold in the country, the tonnage must be taken away from the cane sugar refining industry. If one group of businessmen is favored, another group of American businessmen is penalized. This is the way a quota system works, and my friends here from beet and cane growing States know that as well as I do.

Now it seems to me that those who benefit most from the quota system should have the greatest stake in preserving it. The beet area—the beet industry—gets more out of the quota system than any other single segment of the domestic sugar industry. First, the beet growers get direct payments from the Federal Treasury at the rate of almost 90 cents per 100 pounds of refined sugar they produce. This amounts to about $18 per ton. If they produce 3 million tons of sugar, these direct payments amount to about $54 million. Second, the beet industry gets tariff protection—as do other U.S. sugar producers—of about 67 cents per 100 pounds on a refined sugar basis. This amounts to approximately $13 per ton. Third, they get the benefit of a price which, at the present time, is approximately $2 higher than the world price. This protection amounts to about $40 per ton.

At the present time, the difference between the world price and the U.S. price is $2 per 100 pounds or $40 per ton. This is on a raw sugar basis.

The duty on imported sugar on a raw sugar basis is 62½ cents per 100 pounds or $12.50 per ton.

The payment received by beet growers is approximately 85 cents per 100 pounds on a raw sugar basis or about $17 per ton.

If we add these together we get a total of approximately $69. The significance of this figure is that every ton of sugar transferred from the global quota to the beet area costs the Treasury, in one form or another, almost $70 per ton.

Direct Treasury payments received by the mainland cane area are slightly less than those made to the beet area, but if we average the two they come to about $65 per ton.

The amendment some of my colleagues are proposing would transfer 500,000 tons of sugar from the global quota to the beet and mainland cane areas. The cost to the U.S. Treasury and to the American taxpayers and consumers would be almost $35 million. This is a tidy sum.

Now I know that we must pay something to keep the sugar industry alive in this country. I doubt that any beet sugar and very little cane sugar could be grown domestically without the Sugar Act—without the quota system. If we are going to have such a system, all producers must live within it—and all segments of the industry must live within it. We certainly are not justified in asking the consumer and the taxpayer to pay the higher cost the quota system entails without, at the same time, insisting that all areas live within that system.

I now go back to my amendment. It is designed to insure that we don't have a repeat performance in 1965 by the beet area and that the mainland cane area take the first step toward preventing a repeat performance on its part. If there is to be any marketing relief for the overproduction these two areas have experienced, then, in my humble judgment there must be acreage restrictions to bring them back within the quota pattern.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Does the Senator from Hawaii yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. INOUYE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to be recognized for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Illinois, and add that I realize, after some 15 years of trying to thwart the sugar organizations of this country, it is a rather hopeless undertaking, because we have tried to do so on many occasions. I shall vote against the Bennett amendment.

I intend to vote against the bill because of the amendment.

In the last days of Congress, it is too bad that bills are being loaded down with amendments which have not been duly considered by the proper committees, or brought out in the regular manner. No doubt they could bring out some kind of bill—as they always do; but it is improvident and unwise to add such an irrelevant amendment to a bill which should be enacted.

I regret very much the action of the Senate in rejecting the amendment offered by the Senator from Hawaii, which I believe would have made the amendment acceptable.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In the vote against the Inouye amendment, the argument is interesting. The argument is interesting because it means that we should not have a sugar industry. The Senator from Hawaii comes in with an amendment to the bill. I come from one of the principal sugar-producing States in the Union. His supporters get up and say that there should not be any sugar bill, that we should go out of the sugar-industry business. The State of Hawaii could no more produce sugar than Louisiana if it had to sell it at the world price.

This is a very unusual argument to be made by a Senator who comes from a State where sugar is the principal crop. If we are for the sugar industry, and wish it to stay in business, we should be against the Inouye amendment.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me say further that my friend, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], has always had the idea that we should not produce sugar in America.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will yield, I have not had any such idea——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator will permit me to complete my statement first, then I shall be glad to yield to him and we shall find out what his reply will be.

Let me point out to my good friend the Senator from Arkansas, that he stated that we should benefit the rice producers, that we should not produce sugar in America, that we should produce rice and send it to Cuba; and Cuba would, in turn, sell us its sugar.

Suppose we had followed the program of the Senator from Arkansas—and I heard him advocate his position relative to rice producers. We were paying 13 cents a pound last year for sugar. We would be paying 50 cents a pound for sugar today under the Fulbright program, if we had followed his advice.

We need a sugar industry. Every country in the world protects itself with enough sugar, because it is an essential, basic commodity and requirement of life. We have to protect the sugar industry, if we wish sugar producers to thrive. This is a bill to provide that sugar producers will be treated fairly, just as we would try to treat every other American businessman fairly.

I do not know what is in this amendment. I suspect it is something the refiners wish, in their fight to try to depress the price of raw sugar and depress the price of beets, so that they can bring the producers to their knees and make them meet the terms of the refiners. That is what the amendment is all about.

If we are for the farmer out in the beet fields using his hands, if we are for the cane farmer who is working hard at low pay, we should vote against the amendment and in favor of the farmer.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. INOUYE. I should like the distinguished Senator from Louisiana to know—as he does—that the people of Hawaii support the Sugar Act. We were happy with the results of the 1962 negotiations between mainland cane and mainland beet sugar refiners—Hawaiian cane—Puerto Rican—the Virgin Islands—the industrial users—this was the result of many, many months of negotiations. We believe in this law. We know that this is a law which has made it possible for housewives to purchase sugar at reasonable prices. It has supported workers' employment. That is why I submitted the amendment, because I felt that the Bennett amendment would wreak havoc with the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

Those who oppose the Bennett amendment are those who really love the Sugar Act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield me 1 minute?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas 1 minute, on my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have never said anything at any time to the effect that we do not wish any sugar industry in this country.

The rice and sugar discussion, to which the Senator from Louisiana is referring took place 15 years ago. This was before Castro—as the Senator well knows. The biggest customer for rice was Cuba. They sold us sugar at reasonable prices; is that not true?

I took the position that artificially expanding an uneconomic industry in this country at the expense of another industry—and at that time I was speaking of rice—would be a great mistake. It was not that I wished to destroy what was already in being, but that I was opposed to its expansion—as I am at present.

The sugar industry is not an economic industry. There are other things I believe which can be done. As the Senator from Illinois has pointed out, we have poured out almost $2 billion in subsidies which is far more than cotton, tobacco, peanuts, or any other crop.

This has been the biggest boondoggle of all boondoggles. I suppose we could grow bananas and coffee in this country if we wished to put up enough money. I only said that this was an uneconomic industry, and I thought that the legitimate rice producer should be allowed to stay in business, because he was not getting anything like this kind of money, rather than be squeezed out by the action taken at that time. But as I said a moment ago, the sugar producers are so well organized, there is so much money in this industry available for lobbying and influence, that I have given up trying to defeat it.

I merely express my opinion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. If we had followed the Senator's program at that time, we would not have expanded sugar production in America. We would have curtailed sugar production in America. Then, when Castro took over Cuba, as he did, the situation would have been different. Last year, we did not have enough sugar. The price went to 13 cents a pound. We would have had much less sugar. Furthermore, as far as I know, almost every advanced nation on earth stockpiles larger supplies of sugar than this country does. All those countries have a program to protect themselves by the production of domestic sugar.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator compare the domestic and the world prices of sugar? I have here a copy of the New York Times for this morning. Would the Senator from Louisiana be interested enough to compare the prices?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have no doubt that sugar would be substantially cheaper if we did not have a tariff and the Sugar Act. Last year, if we did not have that protection, we could not have bought any sugar at all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since the Senator has made the general admission, perhaps he would be interested in the specific facts. I quote from the New York Times of this morning, at page 66, the commodity cash price of sugar, world price, 3.7 cents; while raw, domestic sugar is 6.25 cents. That is a difference of more than 2½ cents a pound, or $50 a ton, or 10 million tons at a cost of $500 million a year, plus the $90 million cash subsidy out of the pockets of the American taxpayers. Where is free enterprise which the advocates of this amendment like to talk about?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

Last year the world market price was 13 cents on sugar. We could not have obtained it at 13 cents.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was the only year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We could not have obtained it on the world market if we had not had domestic prices.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was the only year out of 33 years in which the support price was in excess of the domestic price.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to my colleague.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I did not intend to enter into the debate. But my good friend, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has stated that in a period of over 30 years, the entire cost of the sugar program was $1,600 million. This year, we shall spend $1,200 million as a subsidy for corn and other feed grains. That figure is for merely 1 year.

I do not want to get into the area of comparative market prices. Regardless of contentions to the contrary, the Sugar Act has saved the people of America much money. Last year sugar prices skyrocketed. It was thought that there was a shortage. The Department of Agriculture notified the growers in this country that there was not a world shortage, but that it was difficult to get the sugar in here because of a lack of ships. So the prices went up. Speculators gained control.

Last year, as my distinguished colleague pointed out, the Department of Agriculture was desirous of permitting the sale of at least 500,000 tons of sugar. The administration recommended the removal of all marketing restrictions for 1964.

The message from the President indicated that producers should be allowed to sell all they produced during 1964. But, finally, a 500,000-ton increase in the domestic allottment was agreed upon. That bill was not even submitted to the Senate. I believe that if the bill had been submitted and passed, it would have affected the then high price of sugar.

I recall that Congress did not take action to permit us to dispose of all the sugar that we now have on hand. Unless this legislation is enacted, on January 1, a flood of sugar from abroad will cause a surplus of sugar and work to the great detriment of the beet and sugar cane growers of our country.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the bill is enacted, it will give the Secretary of Agriculture the privilege, if he sees fit, to dispose of 500,000 tons of sugar derived from mainland cane and sugarbeets.

I believe the bill should pass. I do not believe that the price of raw sugar will be very high this year. I doubt that it will be over 6 cents, 6¼ cents, or 7 cents. I believe that is a very reasonable price to pay for raw sugar.

I am very hopeful that the amendment will be agreed to. I hope that next year we shall be able to sit around the table with the proper committees in order to go into the entire question of foreign and domestic allotments. I am very hopeful that we shall be able to do that in January.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, when sugar shortage was imminent last year and sugar prices threatened to skyrocket, domestic beet and cane producers answered the call of the Secretary of Agriculture to produce more sugar to alleviate this situation. The Secretary removed acreage limitations, and unlimited marketings were recommended by

the President in his agricultural message, January 31, 1964. Based upon these actions by the administration the domestic sugar industry in good faith planted and produced sugar in excess of its quota. However, on September 14, 1964, marketing quotas were reestablished on domestic beet sugar at the 1962 level in spite of the fact that the sugarbeets were already in the ground and were nearly ready to be harvested. This will leave the beet sugar processors with a surplusage of approximately 800,000 tons, which surplusage has resulted directly from emergency actions taken by the administration. Similar action is contemplated with regard to mainland cane sugar producers. Failure to grant this extra marketing authority to help relieve the domestic producer would be nothing less than an act of bad faith on the part of the Government. It is my understanding that there is a surplusage of 800,000 tons of beet sugar and 600,000 tons of cane sugar, for a total of about 1,400,000 tons. This legislation would only authorize 275,000 tons for beet sugar marketings and 225,000 tons for mainland cane marketings, for a total of 500,000 tons of additional marketings in 1964, and has no effect upon marketing quotas in future years.

Without the extension of foreign quotas and the continuation of the import fees on the global quotas as provided by this amendment, not only will our trade relations be jeopardized, at least to some extent, by leaving this important economic factor of many of the importing countries in a state of limbo, but may very well cause the United States to become a dumping ground for excess foreign sugar that has no other home. This could have a disastrous effect upon the domestic price of sugar, causing severe damage to an industry that not only has had a tremendous stabilizing effect upon American agriculture as a whole, but has also proved its responsiveness to the needs of the consumer and the Nation in a time of crisis.

In conclusion, there is no agricultural act of any kind in this country that has ever been as successful as the Sugar Act. A search through the entire list of commodities produced in the United States will not disclose a single commodity that has experienced as relatively low an increase in price as sugar has over the years. It is a bargain even at 12 or 13 cents a pound.

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, this is a far better bargain than we can show with respect to any other commodity, no matter which commodity it is, whether raw material or manufactured material.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Last year, as a result of the Sugar Act and the patriotic actions of the domestic producer, there was a constant supply of sugar, which otherwise we would not have had. We must not turn our backs upon the domestic producer now that the crisis is over.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a telegram from Dennis O'Rourke, president of the Holly Sugar Corp. This telegram urges passage of the amendment.

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

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.,
September 30, 1964.

Hon. GORDON L. ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Understand Senators MCCARTHY and BENNETT will today offer amendment to tariff reclassification bill, H.R. 12253, so as to extend foreign provisions of Sugar Act for 6 months and to provide extra 1964 sugar marketing rights of up to 275,000 tons for beet area and 225,000 for mainland cane area. This of vital importance to beet industry and will be very important to future production plans. Respectfully and earnestly request you join with Senators MCCARTHY and BENNETT in this endeavor and that you urge other Senate friends of domestic sugar industry to do likewise.

Best regards.

DENNIS O'ROURKE,
President, Holly Sugar Corp.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the question now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah, on which question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has stated that if the Bennett amendment is rejected, foreign sugar will flood American markets. I advise Senators that two provisions in our laws—first, section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act; and second, section 403 of the Sugar Act—provide for such emergencies. For example, section 22 of the act authorizes the President of the United States to restrict the importation of commodities—which in this case would be sugar—by quota or by tariff, if such importation interferes with the successful operation of a domestic agricultural program.

So if Senators are fearful that failure of the adoption of the amendment might jeopardize the program, I assure them that the most eminent attorneys in Washington, D.C., have assured me that such will not happen.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BENNETT. While it is true that, under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, such action would be possible, does the Senator believe that the President of the United States would infuriate our friends by imposing quotas in such a situation? I doubt it very much. Instead, I believe that they would do what they could to persuade him otherwise.

I think we shall find the same situation existing that existed once before. Ships will stand offshore waiting until midnight, December 31, to get their cargoes of sugar into the United States before the President would have an opportunity to act.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I am glad to note that the Senator from Utah has seen fit to express this fear. The amendment that I proposed would prevent what the Senator has spoken of. I, too, was afraid that the Bennett amendment, if adopted, would infuriate our friends in South America, because it would take away from them 500,000 tons of the sugar quota. I am happy to note that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] does have some concern for our friends in South America.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BENNETT. There are 500,000 tons of the quota reserve which have never been assigned to our friends abroad. To say that by allocating any amount of that quota to the domestic producers we would actually take something away from a country that feels it is entitled to that quota is, to the Senator from Utah, quite a stretch of the imagination.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield to my friend the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BENNETT. 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 Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. COTTON (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. JAVITS (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a live pair with the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. PELL (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from California [Mr. SALINGER], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay" and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. SALINGER]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay" and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] has been previously announced.

The pair of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 23, as follows:

[No. 590 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Aiken	Ellender	Mundt
Allott	Hayden	Pearson
Bayh	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Bennett	Kuchel	Robertson
Bible	Lausche	Simpson
Boggs	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Byrd, Va.	Long, La.	Smith
Byrd, W. Va.	Magnuson	Sparkman
Carlson	McCarthy	Stennis
Church	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Cooper	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Dirksen	Mechem	
Eastland	Morse	

NAYS—23

Anderson	Gore	Randolph
Bartlett	Inouye	Ribicoff
Brewster	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Dodd	McIntyre	Saltonstall
Douglas	Monroney	Talmadge
Ervin	Nelson	Walters
Fong	Pastore	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	Proxmire	

NOT VOTING—40

Beall	Holland	Morton
Burdick	Hruska	Moss
Cannon	Humphrey	Muskie
Case	Jackson	Neuberger
Clark	Javits	Pell
Cotton	Johnston	Salinger
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Dominick	Keating	Symington
Edmondson	Kennedy	Thurmond
Goldwater	Mansfield	Tower
Gruening	McGee	Yarborough
Hart	McGovern	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Metcalf	
Hill	Miller	

So Mr. BENNETT's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

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

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill, insert the following:

"Section 205(a) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended by inserting after the third sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'The Secretary is also authorized and directed in making such allotments of the quotas for the mainland cane sugar area for 1964, 1965, and 1966, to take into consideration, in lieu of or in addition to the foregoing factors of processing, past marketings and ability to market, the need of establishing an allotment which will permit such marketing of sugar as is necessary for reasonably efficient operation during the calendar years 1964, 1965, and 1966 of any new sugarcane processing mill or factory that for the first time in 1964 begins the production of sugar from sugarcane: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized and if necessary shall reopen any hearing and amend any order alloting the 1964 quota in order to effectuate the provisions of this sentence.'"

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this amendment would not affect anyone except the producers of sugar in Louisiana and Florida.

It will be recalled that during this debate, quotations were given from the President's message of last year on sugar, wherein he recommended the removal of marketing restrictions on the domestically produced sugar during the calendar year 1964. As all of us know, there was a shortage of sugar then.

Relying on the statement of the President, a sugarcane cooperative was organized in Louisiana. It was composed of 220 farmers, who had a long history of sugarcane production.

Included were 160 sugarcane farmers in Iberia Parish and 60 farmers in St. Martin Parish, who had pledged 320,000 tons of cane and invested $1,300,000 in class B stock to finance their own sugar mill. Four hundred and fifty area businessmen invested $700,000 in class A stock. The sugar production is estimated to be 30,000 to 32,000 tons.

At least 95 percent of the cane pledged to the co-op is proportionate share cane and already has a historical background for allotment, a large portion of which was processed in 10 sugar mills outside the home parish in 1961–63.

These producers had been selling to mills which had a marketing quota. It was expected that a quota would be allotted to the new mill to which these 220 farmers had contributed construction funds. This expectation was based on the statement made by the President, to the effect that there would be no marketing restrictions for the 1964 crop.

I would like to quote the pertinent part of the President's January 31, 1964, farm message:

Sugar: The rise in sugar prices in 1963 reflected a reduction in world supplies. The Cuban crop was about one-half the pre-

Castro level. Europe had two poor sugarbeet crops. But the fears voiced last year that the United States would be unable to obtain sufficient sugar proved groundless. Action by the Department of Agriculture assured sugar users an adequate supply and helped hold the price increases that attended heavy buying in anticipation of shortages. However, the experience of the past year—and the fact that foreign sugar quotas expire at the end of 1964—highlight the need for some action at this session of Congress to assure ample supplies of sugar to consumers at fair prices. I recommend the removal of marketing restrictions on the sale of domestically produced sugar during the calendar year 1964. This legislation will relieve the pressure on world market supplies at a time when these supplies are short.

In addition, I would like to point out that, in the event the co-op is unable to market in 1964 a substantial portion of its sugar as it is produced, it shall be unable to pay for the 320,000 tons of pledged cane as it is delivered. The result would be, not a hardship, but an economic disaster to the co-op, its investors, creditors and the entire community.

My amendment merely permits the Secretary of Agriculture to take into consideration certain necessary matters in order to ascertain the quantity of sugar that should be allocated to the new mill in an effort to be fair and equitable to all concerned.

I realize that there is a little difference of opinion among the producers of sugar with respect to the amendment. I have discussed the question with my good friend from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and my distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. They are agreeable to taking the matter to conference, in the hope that something can be worked out in connection with this very equitable case.

There is a similar situation in another part of Louisiana, and another one in the State of Florida. Mills were constructed, and the sugarcane being ground at these new mills is sugarcane that would have been sent to other factories in those States to which a marketing quota was allowed.

As I said, the amendment simply gives the Secretary the right to adjust the quota in the hope that the new mills that had been constructed during 1964, and are in operation in 1964, will be entitled to a marketing quota.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the understanding of the Senator from Utah correct that the amendment will not increase the total of 225,000 pounds?

Mr. ELLENDER. It will not.

Mr. BENNETT. It will not increase it?

Mr. ELLENDER. It will not.

Mr. BENNETT. It gives the Secretary power to distribute it differently than it might have been done without the amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, that is what we discussed. It will be in conference. It will be left to the conference committee to make that decision.

On the other hand, the amendment as drafted would permit the Secretary to allot a certain amount of tonnage in the sugarcane quota to Florida and Louisiana.

As I said, in conference this matter will be worked out. I am very hopeful that it will be done to the satisfaction of everyone.

Mr. BENNETT. So far as the Senator from Utah is concerned, this is a problem in which only the producers of cane sugar are involved. I certainly believe it would be an excellent idea to take the matter to conference, to see if the details can be worked out.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The amendment does not increase the amount of sugar that can be sold. So far as the consuming States are concerned, it makes no difference whatever; it is irrelevant. However, it makes considerable difference in the States of Louisiana and Florida as to which mill will grind sugar and which will not grind sugar.

In Louisiana, if I recall, in the New Iberia area about 267 farmers got together and built a mill. They wish to grind their cane in that mill.

In the meantime, the mill which had previously ground the sugar planted more sugar, anticipating it would lose these old customers.

If the amendment is not agreed to, these farmers who own the cooperative, built with money borrowed from the Federal Government——

Mr. ELLENDER. To some extent.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. These farmers would be left in the situation where they would not be able to grind their cane. We have tried to work out simple justice for the people in Louisiana. The people in Florida, to some extent, have a different problem. I have a tacit understanding with the Senator from Florida that we will try to work it out in conference, to do the fair and just thing, and that if we can solve the local problem in Louisiana, we will not create a parallel problem in Florida. The Senator from Florida is aware of that situation.

This does not involve the question of whether we should have a sugar act or no sugar act, or how many tons should come into the country. This is a matter as between the sugarcane producers as to what should be done for the people who find themselves in this situation, particularly with the old mill increasing its product, to take advantage of the fact that it had lost some of its old customers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I have the assurance of both Senators from Louisiana that the adoption of the amendment will not result in an increased production of high cost domestic cane sugar and a corresponding loss of low cost imported sugar?

Mr. ELLENDER. Ninety-five percent of the growers who are selling cane to the new mill were selling it to the old mills.

Mr. DOUGLAS. With that assurance, I will not oppose the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I speak not only for myself, but also for my senior colleague, who is unavoidably absent today. He vigorously supported the Bennett amendment. He recognizes, as I do, that there is considerable merit in the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

However, as the amendment pertains to our State, and as it pertains to other cane producers as well, in the form in which it is drafted, we cannot help but feel that inadvertently it would encourage people who are not now in the sugar business to get into the sugar business in some fashion or other, in the belief that eventually the Government would finally bail them out.

We talked this matter over, as the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana has said. We have talked about amending or modifying the amendment to some extent.

That seems to be agreeable. We in Florida and the people in Louisiana have a common problem. I believe we can arrive at a satisfactory adjustment. I hope the manager of the bill will be willing to take it to conference.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and myself, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendments, offered by Mr. PROUTY for himself and Mr. AIKEN, as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"SEC. 75. SPRING-TYPE CLOTHESPINS.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF QUOTA.—The headnotes for schedule 7, part 13, subpart A (p. 397) are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new headnote:

" '3. The quantity of articles specified in items 790.05 and 790.06 which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during any calendar year shall not exceed 650,000 gross.'

"(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 1, 1965."

On page 2, line 13, strike out "and 70 (b)" and insert "70(b), and 75(b)".

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the amendments offered by me and my distinguished senior colleague from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] again proposes to establish a quota for spring-type clothespins. The amendment provides that

imports of this type of clothespin should not exceed 650,000 gross a year.

Mr. President, a curious and difficult situation confronts the spring clothespin industry. On September 10, 1957, the U.S. Tariff Commission determined that spring clothespins were being imported in such increased quantities as to cause serious injury to the domestic industry. It recommended imposition of an annual import quota of 650,000 gross as the only possible means of remedying such injury.

Section 225(b) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 requires that an article as to which such a Tariff Commission determination has been made must be reserved from negotiation if "the Tariff Commission finds and advises the President that economic conditions in such industry have not substantially improved" since the date of the finding of injury.

On April 22, 1964, the Tariff Commission, after a hearing and investigation, filed a report with the President in which three of the Commissioners found that economic conditions in the domestic spring clothespin industry had not substantially improved since September 10, 1957, and three found a substantial improvement in such conditions.

Under this three-to-three split of opinion the President is free to authorize, without qualm of conscience, the negotiations of trade liberalization on spring clothespins.

In a floor speech on April 24 of this year, I pointed out this curious facet of our tariff laws and noted that it would be prudent "in any situation where the Tariff Commission is unable to agree on any industry's ability to withstand further trade relaxations, to give the industry the benefit of the doubt—a presumption of inability to brave the onslaught from new trade liberalizations—particularly where, as here, the industry is an amalgam of small businesses located in areas of substantial unemployment."

Mr. President, to my way of thinking it is an extremely significant factor that this industry was able to persuade three members of the Tariff Commission that there still was likelihood of substantial injury to the industry.

I doubt that there is a Member of the Senate who could say in good conscience that the Tariff Commission is a protectionist body. To my knowledge, since the enactment of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 there has not been a single escape clause proceeding in which a majority of the Commission has found the likelihood of injury to a domestic industry because of trade concessions. To my mind there has been not a single instance in which the Commission has granted adjustment assistance under the provisions of that act.

The fact that the Commission was evenly divided on the question of the likelihood of continued injury to the spring clothespin industry is a point of greatest significance. The Commission does not lightly arrive at such conclusions.

At this point the spring clothespin industry finds itself in an extremely difficult position. It is a small industry, a small business. It has become smaller with the impact of imported spring clothespins. It is clearly the kind of industry that we ought to protect in our concern for the preservation of small business. It is an industry whose fate is in the hands of others. With the fell swoop of a pen this industry can be destroyed.

If Congress is to be concerned with the maintenance of a sound free enterprise system in which small business flourishes it must be prepared to back away from absolutist principles of free trade in an eventuality such as this where a small business, operating under the strictures of the American labor and merchandising market, meets the pains and penalties of foreign competition thriving under a different system.

Another congressional policy stands to be thwarted by our failure to act affirmatively on this amendment. We have constantly sought to improve the employment pattern of our small towns and rural communities. Under the Area Redevelopment Act we sought to alleviate the pressures of unemployment in areas already undergoing the ravages of jobless people.

Five plants, survivors of the loss of 25 percent of the domestic market to imports, are located in Mattawaumkeag, Dixfield, and West Paris, Maine, and in Waterbury and Montpelier, Vt. A man does not just leave his job in these areas and find new work. If his place of employment closes, he faces insuperable problems. Is he too old to move his family, sell his house, find a new job in a marketplace seeking young skilled workers? Is he to try and eke out a living from the land itself? Where is he to go? What is he to do? How is he to eat? What will his family wear?

The spring clothespin industry provides jobs to a substantial percentage of the employable in these small towns. In addition, many hundreds of farmers in both Maine and Vermont are entirely dependent upon these plants as a market for wood cut from their farms. Their sales of wood to the clothespin people provide them with money to buy plows, tractors, food, and clothing.

If we were not to adopt this amendment substantial harm could come to what remains of this industry. Three members of the Tariff Commission agree. The fact that three disagree with them ought not to be controlling. We face the evenly divided possibility that this difference of opinion may result in the ultimate destruction of a small business operating primarily in areas of substantial unemployment.

The mere possibility of such an occurrence ought to be reason enough to cast a presumption in their favor and offer them what assurances we can, that, within the quota recommended by the Tariff Commission, they will not be destroyed.

I offer the amendments in the hope that this small business, this small industry, can be kept alive to maintain employment for a relatively few American workers.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I commend my colleague from Vermont for his able discussion of the situation in which the spring clothespin industry finds itself. As usual, my colleague is fighting for the small industries of America—in this case, for a particular small industry peculiar to New England.

The industry may be small in the eyes of many people. Probably it furnishes employment to not more than 1,000 or, at the most, 1,200 persons in the shops and on the farms; but it is very important to those people. I know some of them. I know that this particular industry employs people who would find it difficult, if not impossible, to obtain another job should it close down.

For several years, the clothespin industry has had to struggle for its existence. It had to fight against competition which in some cases has bordered on the unfair, such as the misleading labeling of packages. It has had to struggle against cutthroat pricing. But with the help of the Tariff Commission, or of some of the members of the Tariff Commission, it has been able to exist up to now, and it still furnishes employment to a good many people in the small towns.

This is only one small industry; but it is small industry in the aggregate that determines whether we shall have a prosperous or a depressed economy in the United States.

I fully support what my colleague from Vermont has said. Again, I commend him for his alertness, his watchfulness, and his willingness to go to bat for the small industries of our area.

Mr. PROUTY. I appreciate the pertinent observations of my colleague from Vermont. As he has so well said, this proposal concerns not only the employees of the industry, but also the farmers in the area.

We find that 1,200 persons, including farmers, are involved. I invite the attention of the Senator from Louisiana to this fact. In 1955, this industry employed 437 individuals. The man-hours worked in that year were 874,000.

Mr. AIKEN. That is in the plants alone.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct. I am talking about the clothespins plants.

In 1963, the figure had dropped to 363 workers employed, and 502,000 man-hours of work. Therefore, there is a trend downward. This small industry is not going to survive unless it has some protection, which I believe is most important.

This year, imports from abroad are at the rate of $2,135,024 gross. This is a significant figure. If it continues, this small industry will be put out of business.

I hope very much that the Senate will look with favor upon my amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is with great regret that I must oppose the amendment of the Senator from Vermont. We all have the highest opinion of both the junior Senator and the senior

Senator from Vermont, but the amendment which they have just offered is another example of logrolling on the tariff bill which we thought we had eliminated when we passed the Hull Tariff Act of 1934 or 1935.

The act which is really before us is a Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act. It is now being loaded down with measures which would diminish low-cost, low-price foreign imports from foreign countries and lead to the production of additional quantities of high-cost, high-priced domestic articles which will increase the cost of living to hard-pressed American families.

I well understand the pressures which operate upon Representatives and Senators to protect specific, local industries. I have no words of reproof whatsoever for the two Senators from Vermont; but I remind the Senate of certain obvious facts; namely, that when we shut off imports we also automatically shut off exports. If we do not import from other countries, or if we reduce the amount of money which they have to buy from us, we hurt our exports. So, while we may think that we are protecting clothespins—and perhaps we are—saving on 70 jobs in Vermont, nevertheless, we are restricting exports from abroad—possibly from Canada. What we are doing is encouraging high-cost and high-price domestic industry to flourish and discourage the low-cost and low-price domestic industry to export. In addition the hardworking housewife who does her own washing will have to pay more for hanging up her clothes.

We cannot have it both ways. I thought we had realized these facts when the Hull Act was enacted. I thought we had realized it when we passed the Trade Expansion Act 2 years ago, which was intended to increase the total volume of international trade.

I know that it is easy to make a general declaration of purpose and to swear off a bad habit in general, but when each individual temptation comes along, we yield to it.

I believe that we have gone rather far this afternoon. I regret that this has been done. I do not believe that we should compound the error and further hamper international trade and the exchange of commodities and services between nations. For that enables each nation to specialize in the articles which it can best produce.

Therefore, Mr. President, I must regretfully oppose the amendment of the Senators from Vermont—much as I esteem them.

Mr. PROUTY. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that this is an unusual situation. As I pointed out earlier, in 1957 the Tariff Commission recommended that this quota be established. This year, by a vote of 3 to 3, they were evenly divided. The three who voted in favor must have found sufficient evidence that this small industry could not exist without assistance of this kind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Vermont. I do not blame him in the slightest. We are all exposed to these difficulties. However, the fact, that in 1957 the Tariff Commission recommended that a quota be established should not be controlling, because the Tariff Commission in that year was a high Tariff Commission. President Eisenhower had many virtues, but he packed the Tariff Commission with high tariff men. They tended to view each industry by itself and not consider the general interest. I know that it is hard to rise above local interests when specific measures are before us, but it is all too easy to think of the effect upon a specific industry—in this case, the clothespin industry and to disregard the effect on trade and production of the country as a whole.

Mr. AIKEN. I am consumed with curiosity. I am wondering whether the Senator from Illinois can tell us where the clothespins imported into the United States are manufactured?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I assume they probably come from Canada.

Mr. AIKEN. Not a single clothespin comes from Canada. They come from countries which have favorable trade balances with this country. None comes from our Canadian neighbor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then I would make the same point in connection with them that I made in connection with Canada, that if we shut off imports from those countries we also automatically shut off or restrict our exports. This is one of the simple rules. We are trying to expand trade, trying to produce a situation in which each country can do its best absolutely or comparatively and so that the total gross national product for the world will therefore be increased by greater freedom of trade, which it is now proposed to be restricted.

Mr. PROUTY. I point out that a substantial amount of the imports of clothespins comes from Hong Kong and Poland. There are some from Belgium, Sweden—I believe a few from the Netherlands—but the volume is so small that it would have little if any economic effect in those countries abroad; but it would put this small industry out of business at home.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We all remember Washington Irving's story of Rip Van Winkle who would swear off drinking, but whenever a drink was placed before him he would take it and say, "I won't count this time." But that was the way he became steadily more alcoholic.

The clothespin industry is a relatively small industry. This is not an issue of great magnitude, but I should say that we have been taking too many potions of protectionist drink; and if we really wish to swear off, the time to do it is now.

Mr. PROUTY. It is a matter of great magnitude to the people working in this industry and to the farmers who supply the raw material. It is a matter of life or death to them, economically speaking.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask the Senator from Illinois if he does not believe that the time to swear off, as he has suggested, would have been before the added protection was given to the whiskbroom industry, which is a subject in which the Senator from Illinois seems to be very much interested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I voted against the broom proposal, and——

Mr. AIKEN. It was a voice vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I voted against it in committee also.

Mr. AIKEN. That would have been the time to have sworn off.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I also voted against it on the floor of the Senate.

I do not pretend to be perfect in consistency. I frequently am inconsistent. However, in this particular instance, my friend, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], has not caught me in an inconsistency, because I was one of the two members on the Committee on Finance who voted against the restriction on brooms. I believe, in general, the Senator will find that on the Finance Committee almost without exception I vote for lower tariffs.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his explanation, which points up the fact that there might be a divergence of opinion within his home State——

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true, but when there is a divergence——

Mr. AIKEN. So far as whiskbrooms are concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As regards such matters, I should like to be consistent. I do not say I have perfect success. But in general I have voted for the national interest and for consumers as a whole even when producers in my own State are involved. So I can, with perfect consistency, oppose the clothespin amendment which our friends from Vermont are trying to foist upon the public. But we should also realize that while consumers tend to be inarticulate because their interests are different, they also need to be represented. They are ignored too often on the floor of Congress.

It is always much easier to be consistent in relation to the other fellow's product than on one's own. But I have taken this medicine myself, I can assure the Senator.

Mr. President, I have no illusions about the general interest being contrary to the specific interest. I want the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], whom I feel are excellent Senators, to know that there is nothing personal in my expression of opinion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the committee has not had an opportunity to study the amendment. I say to the Senator that I earnestly wish he had offered his amendment before the committee so that the committee could have studied it, looked into the merits, and decided whether they thought relief was appropriate.

From what I have been able to determine, this is not a situation in which relief is called for. To provide relief now would violate our trade agreements. The Tariff Commission split on this measure 3 to 3. Three members of the Commission were strongly in favor of the proposal and the other three were equally strongly opposed to it.

The Senator could have presented the amendment to our committee if he had wished to do so. I understood that he did not wish to do so.

If the Senator desires to seek relief in this area, I wish he would come to the committee when Congress meets next

year. I wish he would base this proposal on its own merits. This is a bill that needs to be acted upon.

I hope that the Senate will not insist on making a snap judgment on a matter of this sort and vote in a quota provision which, as I understand, does not even provide for any importation beyond a certain quota, even if they pay a higher tariff.

I believe it would be most unwise to act on this kind of proposal or make a snap judgment on it.

I believe it is a bad precedent to act in this case, when the measure could be presented in an orderly fashion, carefully considered, and recommendations brought to the Senate. In that event, we could have the advice of the executive branch of our Government at the time we act on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. (Putting the question.)

The "ayes" appear to have it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

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

The PRESIDIING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from California [Mr. SALINGER], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], are absent because of illness.

I also announce that if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 32, as follows:

[No. 591 Leg.]

YEAS—22

Aiken	Dodd	Prouty
Allott	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bartlett	Magnuson	Simpson
Bennett	Mansfield	Smith
Boggs	McIntyre	Sparkman
Byrd, W. Va.	Mechem	Young, N. Dak.
Cotton	Mundt	
Dirksen	Pearson	

NAYS—32

Bible	Inouye	Nelson
Brewster	Javits	Pastore
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Pell
Church	Kuchel	Proxmire
Douglas	Lausche	Ribicoff
Eastland	Long, Mo.	Russell
Ellender	Long, La.	Stennis
Ervin	McClellan	Talmadge
Fong	McNamara	Walters
Gore	Monroney	Williams, N.J.
Hayden	Morse	

NOT VOTING—46

Anderson	Goldwater	McCarthy
Bayh	Gruening	McGee
Beall	Hart	McGovern
Burdick	Hartke	Metcalf
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Miller
Cannon	Holland	Morton
Case	Hruska	Moss
Clark	Humphrey	Muskie
Cooper	Jackson	Neuberger
Curtis	Johnston	Randolph
Dominick	Jordan, Idaho	Robertson
Edmondson	Keating	Salinger
Fulbright	Kennedy	Scott
Smathers	Tower	Young, Ohio
Symington	Williams, Del.	
Thurmond	Yarborough	

So Mr. PROUTY's amendment was rejected.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—POSSIBLE ADJOURNMENT PLANS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader, insofar as he knows, about the program for the remainder of the week and what he can say with respect to the session next week. I am informed that the House Rules Committee has cleared a rule providing for a continuing resolution relating to appropriaton bills yet either unpassed or unsigned, to endure for a period of 10 days. That would certainly encompass all of next week. From that, one might readily divine that Congress would be in session perhaps for another week. I presume the distinguished majority leader has current information on this matter.

The reason I ask the question is that I have been the target of inquiry from ever so many Members with respect to engagements they have in the field. I am willing to confess to the Senator that I am going to Phoenix, Ariz., win, lose, or draw. I shall be back Friday noon. I shall have to be available on Tuesday, in order to try to avoid what is becoming a frightfully embarrassing and awkward situation, not only for the cancelor but the cancelee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I ask whose side this time is coming from?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No one's.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So I now supplicate and fairly entreat the distinguished majority leader to give us some words of comfort, because I had nurtured the hope that at the end of the week we could get hold of the curtain, pull it down, and say, "That is the end of the 2d session, 88th Congress."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the fount for my information is the distinguished minority leader, who informed me a short while ago that the Rules Committee in the House had reported favorably an extension of the remaining appropriation bills. I, too, had hoped we could complete our business by this Saturday night, but in view of the development just noted, it would appear that the prospects are that we shall be in session all of next week if we remain.

A number of Senators on this side of the aisle are absent, and evidently they are not alone. Other Senators told me they intend to return to their home States this weekend. I always take a Senator at his word.

At the present time in conference are the coffee agreement, the foreign aid authorization bill, and the social security health care bill; and out of conference, the NDEA conference report, on which

the House will act first and on which there seems to be some difficulty at the moment.

The following bills have passed the Senate and are awaiting House action: Appalachia, ARA, water pollution, and water resources.

The following appropriation bills are awaiting Senate action: The supplemental appropriation bill, which will at least be laid before the Senate tonight, and very likely disposed of tomorrow; and the foreign aid appropriation bill, which will not be taken up until the authorization bill now in conference is agreed to by both Houses.

I should like to ask the distinguished minority leader and other Members of the Senate what their reaction would be to recessing next Saturday, going home, and coming back on November 15.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the minority leader long ago learned to adapt and adjust himself to the conditions and requirements of the situation. However, I advanced this idea only as something that was in the air when we held our policy meeting on Tuesday morning. The air was about to take on a slightly blue cast as a result. From that, one can divine that there was no great felicity or happiness among the Members as they contemplated coming back after election. But I have come back after other elections. I recognize the responsibility of the majority leader always, because he is the conductor of the business of the Senate; and whatever the exigencies require, I adjust myself accordingly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I make the suggestion without any enthusiasm, but in the realization of what confronts us at the moment and what may confront us in the days, if not weeks, ahead.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I know the majority leader is trying to do his best to get us out of here. Would he amend his request so that the Senate might adjourn on Saturday and not return until January 3?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a request that I think is a perfectly legitimate request? With the consent of the majority leader, I state that since August 24 I have canceled some 15 or 20 speaking engagements and meetings in my home State, every one of them nonpolitical in nature. Since I have made this sacrifice, I ask the consent of the Senate to be absent from noon next Monday until noon of the Monday following, so that I may keep about six other engagements which I have not canceled, all of which are nonpolitical engagements. Two or three are REA meetings; there are a couple of dairy meetings; and some others. I feel obligated to keep the other engagements. I would not be able to go out of the State. I would do the best I could to explain the intricacies of the Senate and the reason we are what we are. I assure the Senate that they would be entirely nonpartisan.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Nonpartisan political meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none——

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. If there is a bottleneck at all, I think the bottleneck is in the other branch of Congress for reasons it knows better than we do. I notice that the distinguished majority leader has said that the Senate will consider during this week the supplemental appropriation bill, but that it will not consider the foreign aid appropriation bill until such time as the authorization bill is agreed to. I hope the majority leader will reconsider that statement. After all, the House passed the appropriation bill before there was agreement on the authorization bill, and sent it over to the Senate.

I assure Senators that the foreign aid appropriation bill reported by the committee is in the same amount, and not in a larger amount, as the authorization passed by the Senate. The amount is under the authorization amount passed in the House and under the appropriation amount passed in the House. So the Senate could safely act upon the appropriation bill, send it to the House, and then await the action of the House, without delaying any procedure, and without offending the House of Representatives in any way.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The usual procedure, however, is to wait until the authorizations have been attended to.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; but the House did not do that. We waited until after our authorization bill. We passed our authorization bill. The appropriation bill that we have agreed to is lower than our own authorization bill. It is lower than the House authorization bill. It is lower than the House appropriation bill.

We could pass the appropriation bill and then leave it until such time as the authorization bill is agreed to. We could then forget about the continuing resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The two Houses are independent bodies. There is no way for the Senate to coerce the House into any kind of action. They are preparing to do this, so I am informed. That means, as the majority leader well says, that we shall probably be here most of next week. With an election coming on, one can readily understand the necessity for action, as Senators wish to get back home.

I am doing this only in order to gain some assurance as to what the schedule will be. Then if they know, they can determine for themselves whether or not to be absent, whether to cancel a meeting, or whether to be present.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator knows that from time to time, when we have been held up in the Senate, the House has taken long recesses, awaiting action by the Senate.

Only three important bills remain here. They are the tariff bill, the supplemental appropriation bill, and the foreign aid appropriation bill. If we get those out of the way, we can recess and go back and meet our engagements, and await action by the House. That is all I am saying. We could do the work we have to do. We can do our job and go back home and build up our fences while the other body dillydallies.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Some conference reports remain to be disposed of. I should like to ask the majority leader one more question. I should like to ask him whether he seriously entertains, and whether he knows whether the other body seriously entertains, the idea of a recess on Saturday of this week to last, let us say, until November 15, or any other time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. My answer would be in the affirmative.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That it is under serious consideration?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The majority leader very thoughtfully and cooperatively asked for expressions of opinion, not only from the leadership, but also from this side of the aisle. Therefore, I feel at liberty to express an opinion.

There was a policy meeting on last Tuesday, attended by almost all the Republicans who were in the city.

I believe I can say without fear of contradiction that while Senators on this side of the aisle rather frequently disagree in some degree or measure on their voting and in their opinions on certain matters, at no time have I ever seen more nearly complete unanimity expressed against a recess until, say, November 15, or any other time after election.

I am bound to say to the majority leader that there will be some vocal expressions of objection if it is proposed to recess the Congress until sometime in November. The reason why it was discussed was that, with all due respect to everyone, and the desire of Senators to get away, most of us have failed to see any sustainable reason for a delay in the adjournment of Congress, up until now.

I assure the majority leader that I am in accord with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. I am on the conference that is meeting on the foreign aid authorization bill. That conference, in my judgment, can be completed tomorrow afternoon.

I do not know what the parliamentary situation is or what points of order are involved, but I do know that the House has passed an appropriation bill subject to passage of the authorization bill. The appropriation bill cannot come into effect until the authorization bill has been passed. While there is a little hassle in the other body about the appointment of conferees on the authorization bill, I believe that problem has been straightened out. I believe the conferees in the House will be officially appointed early tomorrow afternoon, under a rule. We have met informally with the House conferees, even though they have not been officially appointed. Pleasurably, some very fine and distinguished Members of

the other body have been acting in a totally unofficial capacity as conferees. However, we have been conferring. As soon as they become official conferees, the two or three items which are still to be resolved can be resolved with considerable speed. I am hopeful that the conference will come to an agreement if we can have a meeting tomorrow afternoon. We shall meet the conferees of the House unofficially tomorrow morning. We may come to a tentative agreement, awaiting only the official confirmation of the appointment of conferees. I see no reason why the conference cannot come to an agreement tomorrow.

On the other hand, and agreeing with the Senator from Rhode Island, unless there is a parliamentary situation here that I do not know anything about—the Appropriations Committee, which has already arrived at its conclusions, with a bill that is below the House figure and below the Senate figure—they know what the figures are, and have arrived at them unofficially—I see no reason why the appropriation bill cannot be passed in any event. I believe these matters can be expedited. I see no reason why we cannot get out by Saturday night, if there is a will to get out.

I am not talking about the will of the majority leader. I know he is anxious to get out. We all know that. I am not trying to assess where the fault lies. We have been asked for an expression of opinion. That is what I am giving. I have stated the unanimous opinion of our meeting. It is a unanimous objection. I am not being quite as parliamentarily diplomatic as our beloved minority leader in the answer he gave. I say to the majority leader that there will be vociferous objection to any dilly-dallying, for one reason or another, which many of us believe to be inexcusable, and that will force us to come back on November 15. I can only say to the majority leader what I feel to be the honest answer to the question he asked of us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As always, I appreciate the Senator's frankness.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it comes perhaps with poor grace from any Senator who is not a candidate for reelection to be too vociferous about staying here and causing Senators on both sides of the aisle embarrassment in their engagements.

I know that the majority leader is doing everything in his power in this matter. So far as the senior Senator from New Hampshire is concerned, whatever the majority leader determines, he will get the full cooperation of the Senator from New Hampshire, and not criticism. But one thing we do know is that if we recess until November 15 and return on that day, human nature being as it is, we shall be in session until the next Congress convenes in January. That is just as certain as that day follows night.

Many persons have said, perhaps quite aptly, that if we did not have air conditioning in Washington, the sessions of Congress would stop in the spring. There is one great motivation forcing Congress to adjourn, and that is that every Member of the other House and many Members of this branch are in a campaign for reelection and want to get home to campaign. With that as a lever, it seems to me—and I am not suggesting, as did the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], that the session should end on Saturday night—that the proposal by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is an exceedingly thoughtful, cogent one. I hope that the leadership will give it careful consideration.

Once we let some of the controversial issues go over until after the election, we shall debate them and bring in many other measures and be here until the next Congress convenes.

While it may not be so important, it sets a bad precedent, because the purpose of the Norris amendment to the Constitution was to put an end to lame-duck sessions. That is what we shall be starting again if what has been proposed takes place. It is easy for Senators not running for reelection to say, "I will come back next week or after election." I do not want to say that. It is not fair to Senators who are running. But it seems to me that if we followed the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island, that we do what we have to do now and make our speeches, and not wait until the House has acted, we might avoid being stuck here the whole fall, and would not have to return until next January.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has spoken well and ably on this subject. I appreciate his remarks. I shall give careful consideration to the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island. Although it is a bit unusual, I would hope we would not encounter any difficulties in so doing.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW; AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION TO MEET DURING THE MORNING TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to make a unanimous-consent request having a double proviso.

First, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

I also ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be permitted to meet during the morning tomorrow, regardless of the convening of the Senate at 11 o'clock.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Chair inform the Senate if the precedents of the Senate would allow the passage of the foreign aid appropriation bill before the conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill has been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). The parliamentarian informs the Chair that it would be in order to take up the foreign aid appropriation bill, as suggested by the Senator from Montana, and cites paragraph 1 of rule XVI as authority for his statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the ruling of the Chair, and with the concurrence of the Senate as a whole, the leadership will endeavor to have the supplemental appropriation bill followed by the foreign aid appropriation bill, but with the hope, in light of what the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has said, that the conferees on the foreign aid authorization bill will get together as expeditiously as possible and report as quickly as possible an agreement which will be attested to by both the House and the Senate.

I further assure the Senate that before any action of any kind having to do with an adjournment or a recess of Congress is undertaken, there will be a conference with the distinguished minority leader, so that, insofar as it will be possible to do so—and it always has been so far—we shall act in accord with one another's views.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12253) to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment not be read but that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"SEC. — ROUGH IRON CASTINGS

"Schedule 6, part 4, subpart A, is amended by striking out item 661.95 (p. 311) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" '

661.92	Other: Cast-iron (except malleable cast-iron) parts, not alloyed and not advanced beyond cleaning, and machined only for the removal of fins, gates, sprues and risers or to permit location in finishing machinery	3% ad val.	10% ad val.
661.95	Other	11.5% ad val.	35% ad val.

" "

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is a cosponsor of the amendment.

Under the Tariff Schedules of the United States of 1963, the net effect of various changes is that rough iron castings are now regarded as "parts" of the various machines in which they will ultimately, after machining and other treatment, be used. Under this new approach, the great bulk of imports of castings has become dutiable at the rate of 11.5 and 12 percent, which are the rates applicable to filtration and clarification equipment and pumps. This represents an increase of almost 300 percent.

At no time has the Tariff Commission or Congress issued a statement of explanation or other indication concerning an intention to increase the duty rate applicable to rough castings, although such explanations were published in the case of many other articles involving much less significant changes in rate. It seems evident that neither the Tariff Commission nor Congress intended that the rate of duty on such castings be increased. My amendment would restore the original duty. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, my understanding is that the amendment would merely restore the old tariff structure, for fear the new structure would damage someone. I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, my able colleague from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] has explained why this is a fair and a necessary amendment, so I will be brief.

It simply restores the tariff on imported, unfinished, or rough castings to the lower rate which has been in effect for some years.

The Customs Bureau has held recently that these unfinished castings are "parts" with the result that a higher duty would have to be charged without some clarification in the statutes.

Our amendment will result in substantial savings to companies that import these products in quantity and we are grateful to the distinguished floor manager of the bill, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], for agreeing to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I call up an amendment which is at the desk and ask that it be read. The amendment is offered in behalf of myself and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. HART.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

On page 15, strike out lines 1 through 17 (section 21 of the bill).

Renumber succeeding sections.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the issue in this amendment is the removal of the duty on the importation of limestone from Canada. The present law imposes a 20-cent duty against the importation of limestone into the United States.

I ask the chairman to allow me to have placed in the RECORD a tabulation of the importance of this business to the Great Lakes States. By the Great Lakes States I mean Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin.

When the bill was before the Committee on Finance, it did not contain a provision to remove the duty against the importation of limestone from Canada.

In the Committee on Finance, an amendment was adopted making provision for the importation of what are called fragments and finds of limestone.

It seems that in the State of Washington two companies have a situation that is unique. They are in the business of processing limestone and are separated by a river from a limestone quarry in Canada. If they were to buy limestone in the United States, it would have to come from southern Oregon or southern California or from areas in the Great Lakes States.

I should like to be of aid to companies in the State of Washington, but I cannot do so if to be of aid to them means imposing a penalty upon the limestone quarries in the Great Lakes States.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is in the Chamber. I should like to inform him that his State mines 36 million tons of limestone a year. It is a $54 million business in Illinois. Only the State of Pennsylvania exceeds Illinois in the quantity of limestone which is mined.

I should like to help companies in the State of Washington, but I cannot do it at the expense of the Ohio quarries which are engaged in the business of mining limestone.

The duty imposed upon the importation of limestone from Canada is 20 cents a ton; and 20 cents a ton means approximately 14 cents ad valorem tax. If we allow this importation, what the impact will be upon the industries in the Great Lakes area, I cannot foretell.

Vermont is also deeply interested, as is the State of New Hampshire—in fact, all of the States along the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Ohio understand that hearings were held on the proposal to eliminate the tariff on limestone?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not believe that any hearings were held in the Finance Committee. There was a limited discussion about it. I make this statement on the basis of the request I made: No one seems to have any recollection of a solidified, combined discussion leading to a judgment on what should be done.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Ohio will yield further, I should like to state what the limestone industry means to my small State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In 1962, 1,141,508 tons were produced. In 1963 it went up 50,000 tons, to 1,194,379 tons. The 20 cents protection would mean approximately $250,000 a year. That is only one small State—one small area. If we lost that protection, it would mean that with the price of limestone being competitive, as it is, and agricultural lime being competitive——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe that——

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Excuse me.

Mr. AIKEN. Limestone is used for a variety of purposes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the principal use of limestone?

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that its principal use is in the steel industry. Republic Steel buys a great deal of limestone, because it considers it to be of high quality for its purposes. If there could be some way to transport it from the quarries to the Great Lakes more economically than can be done at present—in other words, we need the Champlain waterway approved so that it could be transported more cheaply, and business would increase vastly. But it is about 1,100,000 tons a year, exclusive of agricultural limestone.

I do not know what the effect of the amendment would be. That is why I am willing——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Neither do I.

Mr. AIKEN. I am willing to support the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, hoping that we would have an opportunity before next winter to find out what its effect will be. Perhaps we sell it to Canada. I do not know. There has not been time to obtain the information.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me say, in response to the Senator from Vermont, that the perplexing problem confronting me is that I do not know what the exact impact will be, because of the rather precipitate notice that was given about what the Finance Committee has done. Let me further say that in 1960 the duty was 25 cents a ton. In 1961, it was 25 cents a ton. In 1962, it was reduced to 22½ cents a ton; in 1963, to 20 cents a ton.

We propose to eliminate all of the duty.

Let me say to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] that I wish to be of help to him, but I cannot do so at the expense of my State, or the States in the Great Lakes region. I do not know what the impact will be; hence, I feel that the amendment should be considered.

The Senator from Washington made some compromise proposal to me, and I wish that my associate Senators in the Great Lakes region would listen to it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this has been a matter which has been discussed in the Committee on Finance on three or four occasions. Paragraph 203 of the present act was enacted approximately 40 years ago, solely for the protection of two quarries at Puget Sound, which are now extinct.

Two other quarries now exist in that area, one a very small one, the other not of great size. In its report, the Department states that it is negligible. Up there, the limestone is on one side, the processing is done on the other side. It amounts to very little, in toto.

All the executive departments—the State Department, the Commerce Department, the Treasury Department, the

Interior Department, the Labor Department, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Tariff Commission—merely stated that they had no objection. I was corrected, and rightly so, by the Senator from Ohio. They do not make recommendations.

What we are trying to do is to change this 40-year-old paragraph 203 which came into existence in the old logrolling days for two quarries in Puget Sound, and to make it reasonable so that those people can operate.

One of the reasons we have to do this—as was well pointed out by the Senator from Vermont—is that we cannot transport limestone very far today unless water routes are available. With the opening of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway, I can say that there might be some great effect in that area if a better way to transport crude limestone can be found.

Limestone mined in the Puget Sound area can be used only for cement. I do not know of any other purpose for which it is used. Limestone is a great source of fertilizer. We could use more of it. But this is used only for cement, so far as I know.

The operators of one quarry in Baker, Oreg., objected to the amendment, and we received some letters from them. They have since withdrawn their objection. Everyone in the Senate would agree that if they still objected, there would be Senators in the Chamber to talk about it. But they withdrew their objection. I have, therefore, talked with the minority leader, the Senator from Ohio, and two or three other Senators—the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] among them—and I am suggesting this amendment. I believe that it will take care of the situation as a substitute amendment which will, in effect, be limited to the manufacturer only of cement and limit the time on it until January 1, 1966. Then we can see what effect this may or may not have. It will be limited. The amendment I suggest is: "Limestone imported to be used in the manufacture of cement."

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The persons in the Government, in a position to know, say that they ought to have about 18 months. That would run it down to about June 30.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That would be all right—18 months. That would take care of any problems we have.

I have talked to people who are involved in this problem. The Senate passed this bill once and sent it to the House. But in order to remove all possible objections to the enactment of the amendment, the proponents are willing, reluctantly, to restrict the applicability to cement.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know how the quantity of limestone used in cement manufacture compares with the quantity of limestone used in steel manufacture?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know.

The quarries that I am talking about are only for cement. They are not used for anything else that I know of. But, the chemical technology has started to do some great things with limestone deposits for fertilizer.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is used for various purposes. It is used in aggregates for highway construction purposes. It is used for fertilizer. And it is used in metallurgical work.

Mr. McNAMARA. It is also used in terrazzo.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. Some limestone is used in pulp and paper manufacture.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a substitute amendment for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 5, strike out lines 1 through 7 and insert the following:

SEC. 21. LIMESTONE USED FOR CEMENT MAKING PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part 1, subpart B of the appendix is amended by inserting immediately after item 907.88 (p. 433) the following new item:

"	909.00	Limestone provided for in items 513.34 and 514.11, when imported to be used in the manufacture of cement	Free	Free	On or before 6/30/66 "

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the date of the enactment of this act.

On page 2, line 12, strike out "21(c)" and insert "21(b)".

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, with reference to the substitute amendment, I have a perfecting proposal. That perfecting proposal is to accept the substitute amendment of the Senator from Washington, but change it to the effect that the right to import shall be limited to June 30, 1966.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is very acceptable to me. Then we can actually find out how this may or may not affect it.

I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to modify my amendment to insert that date.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington, as modified, in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in reading H.R. 12253, as reported out by the Senate Finance Committee on September 25, and which we are considering today, I notice that on page 15 the committee proposes to eliminate all tariffs on "limestone chips and spalls, and so forth." It has been called to my attention by the limestone industry around the Great Lakes area that the stone business is becoming increasingly demoralized by the importation of stone into that area.

In 1930, the duty on "limestone, crude or crushed" was $1 per ton. This has been reduced by various stages. In 1960, the duty was 25 cents per ton. This was reduced in two stages and it currently is 20 cents per ton.

Even now it is in the President's list of articles for possible consideration in trade agreement negotiations which could lead to a reduction of 50 percent or 10 cents per ton. I am opposed to any reduction in this duty which is so vitally affecting this industry, not only in my area but clear across the northern border of our country.

Let me show you what the effect of reducing this tariff has had in recent years as developed from the customs records:

Limestone crude or crushed imported to the United States, 1960–63

Year	Tons	Value	Duty per ton
1960	121,449	$269,435	$0.25
1961	286,823	440,698	.25
1962	469,897	617,875	.22½
1963	744,162	1,073,587	.20

I want to stress the fact that in 1960 when the tariff was 25 cents per ton, only 121,000 tons with a value of $269,000 were imported. In 1963 when the duty was reduced to 20 cents per ton the tonnage rose to 744,000 which had a value of $1,074,000. This represents a tonnage increase of 600 percent within a 4-year period.

If the tariff is eliminated as proposed in this bill, to what heights will the imports rise? Will they continue to increase at the rate or will they jump in proportion to the tariff reduction? In any event it will further demoralize the industry and result in putting many companies out of business; not only along the northern border of this country but will extend southward as these companies seek new markets to replace those they have lost to these imports.

The committee held no hearings on this amendment which was added to H.R. 12253 as passed by the House. This item is only 1 of about 20 changes made by the committee and it seems to me that in each case where the public has had no opportunity to express its view on how those industries would be affected, the public should be given such an opportunity.

Total limestone tonnage and sales, 1962

State	Tons	Amount
Illinois	36,360,000	$54,405,000
Indiana	17,911,000	33,998,000
Michigan	28,504,000	28,763,000
Minnesota	3,486,000	6,008,000
New York	24,035,000	37,913,000
Ohio	33,098,000	49,760,000
Pennsylvania	41,500,000	62,400,000
Wisconsin	11,662,000	13,641,000
Total	196,556,000	286,888,000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a summary of reasons for the passage of the legislation removing duty from limestone.

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

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR THE PASSAGE OF THE LEGISLATION REMOVING DUTY FROM LIMESTONE

1. Paragraph 203 of the present act was enacted approximately 40 years ago solely for the protection of one or two quarries in Puget Sound, neither of which is now in existence.

2. The economic reasons advanced for the protection of these two defunct quarries is vastly different today.

3. Due to the unavailability of limerock, commercially accessible in the Pacific Northwest for industries in that region and the necessity to import limerock from Canada, industries in the Pacific Northwest will receive substantial benefits.

4. All of the executive departments consulted, to wit: State, Commerce, Treasury, Interior, and Labor, as well as the Bureau of the Budget and the Tariff Commission have sent in reports approving the bill or indicating that they are not opposed thereto.

5. The bill is virtually noncontroversial, the only objections having been raised by the owner of the quarries at Sumas, Wash., and by the owner of a quarry at Baker, Oreg. The former has withdrawn its objection and we fail to see how the latter would be adversely affected as his operation at Baker, Oreg., has never, to our knowledge, supplied limestone to any of the large consumers in the Seattle, Portland, Tacoma or other tidewater areas. The overriding national interest and particularly the interest of the industries in the Pacific Northwest is overwhelming.

6. In order to remove all objections to the enactment of the bill, the proponents are willing, reluctantly, to restrict its applicability to cement, as a result of which the quarry at Baker, Oreg., would be unaffected.

7. Although reluctantly willing to restrict the bill to the importation of limestone for cementmaking purposes, we believe that the overall interest of American industry, including that in the Pacific Northwest and including pulp and paper companies, the metallurgical industry and others should prompt Congress to favor the broad form of the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call attention to two amendments which were inserted in the bill by the Finance Committee, and both of which relate to section 12(b). The committee report states that both amendments are designed to correct an alleged abuse of the tariff laws.

One involves the duty on fabrics of manmade fibers mixed with vegetable fibers and in chief value of vegetable fiber. Such fabrics are presently dutiable at a rate of 6½ or 10 percent.

The other relates to certain woven fabrics of vegetable fibers containing wool. Such fabrics are also presently dutiable at 6½ or 10 percent.

The committee's action on fabrics of manmade fibers is surrounded by a great deal of confusion and is based at least partially on misinformation. It should be deleted from this omnibus tariff measure by the House-Senate conferees and made the subject of hearings before any further action is taken on it.

In setting forth the reason for the drastic increase in the rate of duty applicable to blended fabrics of manmade and vegetable fibers, the Finance Committee report states that "the vegetable fiber content is increased beyond that which is needed to produce a commercially marketable product, in order to obtain the advantage of the lower rate."

This is not in agreement with the facts at my disposal. There are two known fabrics that would be affected. One is a rayon-ramie blend, as to which, I am told, there has been absolutely no manipulation. Quite to the contrary, this fabric has been imported with the same fiber composition and at the lower rate for over a decade. The importers of the other fabric apparently covered by the section—a rayon-flax blend—state that they are unaware of any manipulation of the content of their product.

The rate of duty applicable to these fabrics will be increased from 6.5 or 10 percent to an ad valorem equivalent in excess of 50 percent.

In view of these facts, this amendment should be deleted from the bill and the conflicting views should be submitted to the scrutiny of a public hearing.

I want to make clear that this amendment will not affect the provisions of the bill relating to a wool-ramie fabric that some Senators are concerned about.

In the case of the wool fabric with vegetable fiber added, I received many complaints from importers because the committee action would result in a change of duty from 6.5 or 10 percent to 30 cents per pound plus 45 percent ad valorem. Such a sudden increase in duty would be disastrous to importers who have already made contracts in good faith on the basis of the rate of tariff, the duty treatment, administered at present with respect to that type of fabric. In this instance importers have had no opportunity to present their case at public hearings.

I make this statement to alert the conferees to the fact that there are very serious and substantive questions involved in both amendments and that in all justice, before anything is finalized with respect to them in the bill, the most careful factual inquiry should be made. A determination should be made as to the charges that a protectionist device is being used under the guise of an effort to close the loophole, and that an unfairness is being perpetrated; also the fact that importers who have already made contracts on the strength of the present rate of duty in good faith would be seriously prejudiced. Both those questions should have the urgent attention of the conferees.

I am confident that the conferees would not wish to perpetrate an unfairness, especially in relation to questions which have not been the subject of a hearing before a committee, so that the parties in interest might have an opportunity to have a day in court and present the issues.

I trust that the conferees will take careful note of the statement which I have made in connection with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared for delivery by my colleague [Mr. DOMINICK] be printed in the RECORD at a point just prior to the vote on H.R. 12253, a bill to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOMINICK

Although I am not a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I have watched the progress of H.R. 12253 with interest. This bill is titled the "Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1964." As such, it purports to correct certain technical errors, inadvertencies, and oversights in the Tariff Schedules of 1962. I believe that the announcement of December 13, 1963, by the House Ways and Means Committee made these objectives clear.

Therefore, I was quite surprised to learn that some provisions of the bill, as it came from the House, were more in the nature of substantive changes in the Tariff Schedules. I am referring specifically to section 15 of the House bill. This section dealt with the tariff treatment of machinery belts and belting composed of textile materials or of textile materials and rubber or plastics. The Senate committee, very wisely I think, deleted this particular section from the bill. Quoting from the Senate report, the committee reasoned:

"V-belts—The committee deleted the amendment which would have provided a duty of 8.5 percent (rather than 16 percent) on V-belts. Although your committee agrees with the action of the House in providing a separate classification for V-belts, an important and distinctive article of commerce, it is concerned that the 8.5-percent rate passed by the House would have a substantial impact upon V-belts for industrial purposes which comprise the greater part of domestic production and which presently are dutiable at 16 percent. This 16-percent rate also applied to these industrial belts under the old tariff schedules. Importation of these industrial V-belts would be unduly advantaged if the duty were to be cut by nearly 50 percent under this bill. For this reason, your committee feels it desirable to defer action on this provision until appropriate means can be devised to preserve the tariff status of such V-belts."

I commend the committee for this action.

In order to understand the significance of this move, perhaps a few words of explanation are necessary.

In the manufacture of rubber V-belts alone, we are dealing with a $75 million per year American industry. In my State, the Gates Rubber Company, one of our largest employers in the Denver area, would be affected.

Under the Tariff Classification Act of 1962, a minimum duty of 16 percent is established for V-belts used for industrial purposes and V-belts used for automotive purposes have a duty rate of 8.5 percent. Under the original section 15 of the House bill the lower rate of 8.5 percent duty would have been used for both classifications of V-belts. The manufacture of industrial V-belts is the most important segment of the industry and is also the area where there is the most competition with foreign imports.

It has been suggested that the Customs Bureau has a difficult time in classifying industrial as opposed to automotive V-belts. However, if this is so, then any change in the duty should be thoroughly explored, allowing the affected industry ample opportunity to be heard. Such a drastic move should not be accomplished under the guise of technical or corrective legislation such as we now have pending.

I strongly concur in the committee's action in eliminating this provision from this type of a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all remaining time on the bill is yielded back. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 12253) was passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD of Virigina, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H.R. 12253) be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered; and that in the engrossment of the amendments of the Senate to the bill, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make all necessary technical and clerical changes and corrections, including corrections in section, subsection, and so forth, and designations and cross-references thereto.

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1544, H.R. 12633, the supplemental appropriations bill, be laid before the Senate.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12633) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the total recommended by the Committee on Appropriations is $1,208,213,068; $1,037,300,000—or about 86 percent—of this is provided in four items. The recommendation for the Office of Economic Opportunity is $861,550,000; $65,750,000 for the defense educational activities of the Office of Education; $60 million for mass transportation grants; and $50 million for the revolving fund of the Small Business Administration. The balance — $170,913,068 — is distributed among some 70 items. The details concerning these recommendations are found in the committee report numbered 1604, with narrative explanations covering all the items and the usual summary statistical table comparing recommendations with budget estimates and the House bill.

I shall be happy to try to answer any and all questions concerning these matters which Members of the Senate may require.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered for the purpose of amendment as original text; provided, however, that no point of order against any amendment shall be deemed to have been waived by the adoption of this agreement.

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

The amendments agreed to en bloc are are follows:

On page 2, line 6, after the word "inspection", to strike out "$1,225,000" and insert "$1,357,000".

On page 2, after line 6, to insert:

"SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

"Flood prevention

"For an additional amount for emergency measures for runoff retardation and soil-erosion prevention as provided by section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1950, $900,000."

On page 2, line 15, after the numerals "1964", to strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000", and after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the semicolon and "and in addition $10,250,000 to be transferred from funds made available for the purposes of section 32 of the Act of August 14, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), including not to exceed $250,000 to be transferred to the appropriation "Administrative and operating expenses, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation" and insert a colon and *"Provided,* That hereafter appropriations under this head shall be made in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 88–525".

At the top of page 3, to insert:

"FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

"Rural housing for domestic farm labor

"For financial assistance pursuant to section 516 of title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended by Public Law 88–560, approved September 2, 1964, $4,000,000."

On page 3, after line 5, to insert:

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $200,000, to be derived from the charges collected in connection with the insurance of loans as authorized by section 309(e) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, and section 514(b)(3) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended."

On page 3, after line 12, to insert:

"FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

"Administrative and operating expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Administrative and operating expenses', $250,000."

At the top of page 4, to insert:

"CHAPTER II"

On page 4, after line 1, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

"Operation and maintenance, Navy

"Not to exceed $860,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to the appropriation 'Salaries and Expenses', Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1965 for the operation of ocean weather stations."

On page 4, after line 7, to insert:

"OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

"Not to exceed $150,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to the appropriation 'Salaries and Expenses', Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1965 for the operation of the Marcus Island upper-air station."

On page 4, after line 12, to insert:

"RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION DEFENSE AGENCIES

"Not to exceed $990,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to the appropriation 'Salaries and Expenses', Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1965 for the expenses of the Worldwide Seismological Network Program."

On page 4, line 20, to change the chapter number from "II" to "III".

On page 4, line 26, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$17,100" and insert "$42,100".

On page 5, line 14, to change the chapter number from "III" to "IV".

On page 6, line 15, after the word "expended", to strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$60,000,000".

On page 6, line 18, after "(78 Stat. 302)", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$5,000,000".

On page 7, after line 8, to insert:

"OPEN SPACE LAND GRANTS

"For an additional amount for 'Open space land grants,' $10,000,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed $138,000 may be used for administrative expenses and technical assistance, and no part of this appropriation shall be used for administrative expenses in connection with grants requiring payments in excess of the amount herein appropriated therefor."

On page 8, after line 7, to insert:

"PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

"Administrative expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Administrative expenses', $50,000."

On page 9, line 1, after the word "Progress", to strike out "$650,000" and insert "$1,000,000".

On page 9, line 6, after "$6,500,000", to strike out the comma and "of which not to exceed $3,000,000 may be used for additional personnel".

On page 9, line 12, to change the chapter number from "IV" to "V".

On page 10, line 2, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$1,400,000" and insert "$1,530,000".

On page 10, after line 8, to insert:

"Construction of fishing vessels

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 212), as amended by the Act of August 30, 1964 (78 Stat. 614), to assist in the construction of fishing vessels, $3,000,000".

On page 10, line 19, after the word "Construction", to strike out "$825,000" and insert "$916,600".

On page 11, line 7, after the word "property", to strike out "$6,700,000" and insert "$8,984,000".

On page 11, after line 13, to insert:

"Construction

"For an additional amount for 'Construction', $146,000".

On page 11, after line 15, to insert:

"GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

"Surveys, investigations, and research

"For an additional amount for 'Surveys, investigations, and research', $160,000".

On page 11, after line 19, to insert:

"BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

"Management of lands and resources

"For an additional amount for 'Management of lands and resources', $1,000,000".

On page 12, after line 14, to insert:

"BATTLE OF NEW ORLEANS SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

"For necessary expenses of the Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission, established by the Act of September 12, 1964 (Public Law 88–591), $25,000, to remain available until expended".

On page 12, after line 20, to insert:

"SAINT AUGUSTINE QUADRICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

"For necessary expenses of the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, established by the Act of August 14, 1962 (Public Law 87–586), $25,000, to remain available until expended".

On page 13, after line 2, to insert:

"INDEPENDENT OFFICES

"PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses

"For necessary expenses of the Public Land Law Review Commission, established by Public Law 88–606, approved September 19, 1964, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $350,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 13, after line 10, to insert:

"EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

"NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

"Salaries and expenses

"For necessary expenses of the National Council on the Arts, established by Public Law 88–579, approved September 3, 1964, $100,000."

On page 13, line 17, to change the chapter number from "V" to "VI".

On page 13, after line 18, to insert:

"MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

"Farm labor contractor registration activities

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act of 1963, $350,000."

On page 14, line 5, after the word "Handicapped", to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$50,000".

On page 14, after line 9, to strike out:

"For an additional amount for 'Defense educational activities', $48,750,000, of which $10,300,000 shall be for capital contributions to student loan funds and loans for non-Federal capital contributions (not to exceed $300,000) to student loan funds, and $3,000,000 shall be for grants to States for testing, guidance, and counseling: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment of S. 3060, Eighty-eighth Congress, or similar legislation, amending the National Defense Education Act of 1958".

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

"For an additional amount for 'Defense educational activities,' $65,750,000, of which $10,300,000 shall be for capital contributions to student loan funds and loans for non-Federal capital contributions (not to exceed $300,000) to student loan funds, $10,000,000 shall be for grants to States for equipment and minor remodeling of facilities for the purposes included in section 301 of Public Law 85–864, as amended, and for supervisory and other services, $3,000,000 shall be for grants to States for testing, guidance, and counseling, and $5,000,000 shall be for transfer to the appropriation account 'Payments to school districts': *Provided,* That, in lieu of amounts heretofore specified, allotments for grants to States under sections 302(a) and 305 for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling shall be made on the basis of $70,400,000, allotments for loans to private nonprofit schools shall be made on the basis of $9,600,000, and allotments under section 302(b) for supervisory and other services shall be made on the basis of $6,000,000: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment of S. 3060, Eighty-eighth Congress, or similar legislation, amending the National Defense Education Act of 1958".

On page 15, after line 15, to insert:

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' $1,000,000: *Provided,* That this amount shall be available only upon enactment into law of S. 3060, Eighty-eighth Congress, or similar legislation amending the National Defense Education Act of 1958."

On page 15, after line 21, to insert:

"PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

"Community health practice and research

"For an additional amount for 'Community Health Practice and Research', $5,000,000."

On page 16, in line 6, after "(Public Law 88–452, approved August 20, 1964)", to strike out "$750,000,000" and insert "$861,550,000"; on page 17, line 4, after the word "months", to strike out the colon and *"Provided further,* That this appropriation shall not be available for more than 4,000 permanent Federal positions"; and in line 11, after the word "chemical", to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That $2,000,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to 'Grants to States for public assistance' to carry out existing projects authorized by section 1115 of the Social Security Act, as amended."

On page 17, line 16, to change the chapter number from "VI" to "VII".

On page 17, after line 17, to insert:

"SENATE

"For payment to Lucretia C. Engle, widow of Clair Engle, late a Senator from the State of California, $22,500."

On page 18, after line 8, to insert:

"JOINT ITEMS

"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

"Capitol Police

"Capitol Police Board

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1964, to reimburse the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for salaries of additional personnel detailed from the Metropolitan Police Department, $22,100."

On page 18, after line 16, to insert:

"CHAPTER VIII

On page 18, after line 17, to insert:

"PUBLIC WORKS

"DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

"Department of the Army

"Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Construction, General

"For an additional amount for 'Construction, general', $2,000,000".

At the top of page 19, to insert:

"INTEROCEANIC CANAL COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses

"For expenses necessary for an investigation and study, including surveys, to determine the feasibility of, and the most suitable site for construction of a sea-level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, $400,000 to remain available until expended".

On page 19, after line 7, to insert:

"BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

"Construction and rehabilitation

"For an additional amount for 'Construction and rehabilitation', $364,000".

On page 19, after line 11, to insert:

"Upper Colorado River storage project

"For an additional amount for the 'Upper Colorado River storage project', $155,000".

On page 19, line 15, to change the chapter number from "VII" to "IX".

On page 19, after line 20, to insert:

"INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

"Construction

"For an additional amount of "International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, Construction, $300,000."

On page 20, after line 2, to insert:

"THE JUDICIARY COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

"Salaries of referees

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries of referees', $60,000, to be derived from the Referees' salary and expense fund established in pursuance of the Act of June 28, 1946, as amended (11 U.S.C. 68)".

On page 20, after line 10, to insert:

"SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

"Revolving fund

"For additional capital for the revolving fund authorized by the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, to be available without fiscal year limitation, $50,000,000".

On page 20, after line 15, to insert:

"APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses

"For necessary expenses of the Federal representative and his alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission and for payment of the administrative expenses of the Commission, as authorized by law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $800,000".

On page 21, after line 1, to insert:

"GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

"Participation in Alaska Centennial Celebration

"For expenses necessary to cooperate with the Alaska Centennial Commission, and to conduct a study to determine the manner and extent of any participation by the United States in the Alaska Centennial Celebration, as authorized by law, $15,000".

On page 22, line 9, after "$295,000", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That the proviso under this heading in the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1965, shall not apply during the current fiscal year."

On page 22, line 18, after the numerals "1964", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$1,500,000".

On page 23, line 19, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 101, Eighty-eighth Congress, and", and in line 21, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$32,284,904" and insert "$33,309,898".

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, H.R. 12633, the supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1965, carries funds for many noteworthy activities. I am particularly interested, however, in the appropriation of $800,000 for the establishment of an Appalachian Regional Commission. This is the amount requested by the President to be included

in the supplemental bill, and it was my privilege to offer the amendment to add the $800,000 at the time the Senate Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, marked up the bill.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964 was passed by the Senate a few days ago and it is presently pending in the House of Representatives. That legislation will provide public works and economic development programs needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region. Eleven States will be directly affected, although the entire country will be benefited. My State of West Virginia is the one State, among the 11, which will be wholly included in the region to which the authorization bill is directed.

Title 1 of the authorization bill establishes an Appalachian Regional Commission, and this Commission will coordinate action between the States of the Appalachian region and the Federal Government. Thus will be permitted a more efficient and effective operation of the Appalachian aid program.

The Commission, according to the committee report which accompanied the authorization measure, will be a clearinghouse for expert opinion which can be shared throughout the Appalachian region. It will sponsor research and demonstration projects, and its recommendations for action will be based in part upon the information gained therefrom. It will be authorized to recommend revisions of existing laws at all levels of government in order to promote the objective of developing the economic and industrial potential of the Appalachian region. It will initate comprehensive plans for regional development and will be the principal and focal policymaking entity for such development, although it will have no authority over any other agency of government at any level.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964 authorizes an appropriation of $2,200,000 for the operation of the Commission over the next 2 fiscal years. It is imperative that the Commission be established and that it be allowed to proceed with preliminary planning and other activities at the very earliest moment following the enactment by Congress and signature by the President of the Appalachian Regional Development Act. Therefore, it was deemed necessary to include an appropriation in the bill before us which would permit the establishment of the Commission in the event the House of Representatives acts favorably upon the Senate-passed authorization bill before Congress adjourns. The appropriation of the $800,000 is conditioned upon congressional enactment of the measure.

Had this money not been added, and were the House to act favorably upon the Appalachian Regional Development Act before adjournment, there would be no money for the Commission, the establishment of which constitutes a necessary and vital first step in the implementation of the Appalachian aid program. A delay of several months would ensue before moneys could be appropriated by the Congress, inasmuch as we would have to wait until a new Congress had before it a regular or a supplemental appropriation measure. Such a delay would prove unwise and it would result in the program's getting off to a slow start. The Appalachian region and the people who live and have their homes there would suffer most, but the entire national economy would also suffer.

Consequently, it is highly important that we move ahead now to approve the measure which includes the $800,000 appropriation so that the Commission's establishment may follow quickly the enactment of the authorization bill. In my judgment, this program, like the accelerated public works program, will be highly beneficial to the communities and the people who live in areas plagued with chronic unemployment. Approval of this appropriation will, therefore, give impetus to President Johnson's program to develop Appalachia, an area which I have often referred to as a ribbon of neglect stretching from Pennsylvania to Alabama.

Also of interest to my State in this supplemental appropriation bill are the additional funds to expand the Federal food stamp program throughout the country.

The program was launched in May 1961, in McDowell County of West Virginia and has been operating on a pilot basis in that and three other counties—Logan, Mingo, and Wayne.

Mr. W. Bernard Smith, Director of Public Welfare for West Virginia, has asked that the food stamp program be extended to all 55 counties in the State. The Senate Appropriations Committee has allowed $25 million in this bill, which, when added to the $35 million in the regular bill making fiscal year 1965 appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, constitutes a total of $60 million for the expansion.

I have already seen the good effect of food purchased with these stamps and I would like to see it benefit others in my State.

As an indication of its use in my State, I would like to cite these figures. More than 31,000 persons in West Virginia took part in the program last year. In fiscal year 1964, the stamps purchased in my State amounted to $3,595,365, and bonus stamps awarded amounted to $2,396,728, making a total of $5,992,093 spent for food.

This, I believe, is the excellent evidence of the success of the program.

MR. AND MRS. HARLEY BREWER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside temporarily and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 770, H.R. 2772.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2772) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer.

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.

EXTENSIONS OF TIME FOR FINAL PROOF BY CERTAIN ENTRYMEN UNDER THE DESERT LAND LAWS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1543, H.R. 6218.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6218) to amend the act of June 29, 1960, to authorize additional extensions of time for final proof by certain entrymen under the desert land laws and to make such additional extensions available to the successors in interest of such entrymen.

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.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S BELIEF IN ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, perhaps the most important asset of President Johnson since assuming the office of Chief Executive has been his insistence on economy in Government.

The first order of business when he became President was to keep Federal spending even with or below the previous year's level. He succeeded, to the amazement of all, and he continues to hold tight rein on the budget.

His reasoning is sound. As he said, the American people must be convinced first that the Government will spend its tax dollars wisely and well before they will lend their support to the Government's efforts to solve problems and satisfy needs.

An excellent column on the President's work in economizing Federal spending and his reasons for it appeared in the Tuesday, September 22 edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

I ask unanimous consent that this article entitled "Tight Fist and Open Mind," by Joseph R. Slevin, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TIGHT FIST AND OPEN MIND

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson is keeping his Cabinet under heavy pressure to hold down Federal spending.

Government outlays are bouncing along just under $100 billion and Mr. Johnson is making it bluntly clear that he intends to produce a new budget that will stay below that magic figure.

The President spelled out his objectives in a confidential "guidelines" message that he sent to top officials last month. He gave

each agency a spending ceiling and they all add up to less than the $100 billion limit he has set for the entire Government.

"It's amazing what the attitude in the White House can do," a high official said. "The language in the guidelines message was tougher than usual. The ceilings are very tough. But no one is complaining very much or very loudly."

"I think the President has them cowed," an administration veteran declared.

Mr. Johnson made the economy issue his own immediately after he entered the White House. There still is snickering about "Light Bulb Johnson" the electricity saver. But officials also remember that there were 20 appeals pending from Budget Bureau cuts when President Kennedy was assassinated and all were quietly withdrawn during the following month.

Mr. Johnson was delighted last summer when the fiscal 1964 report showed that the Government had spent only $97.7 billion, a full $700 million less than the $98.4 billion that he had anticipated in January.

But the President is telling his Cabinet that they cannot afford to yield to the temptation to "ease up." He told a recent Cabinet meeting that the Democrats have to convince the people that they are running the Government more efficiently than any administration ever has before.

"I covet a reputation for good management," Mr. Johnson said. "I want to feel, and I want each of you to feel, that we are spending the taxpayers' money as if it were his own.

"If only the American people are really convinced on this will they approve the new programs which our Nation needs. If the Federal Government is to make its contribution to the achievement of the great society, it must first convince the American people that it is managed as efficiently as any private business. This is a high standard but one I am determined to realize."

The President had a copy of his remarks sent to each Cabinet member who had been at the White House session and to the head of each of the major agencies.

Mr. Johnson is keenly aware that he has set himself a difficult assignment. The country is growing, which means that there are mounting demands for the Federal Government to expand its existing services. Money also must be found to pay for the new programs that Mr. Johnson wants to introduce.

Maurice Stans, President Eisenhower's last Budget Director, once estimated that the Federal spending budget has a built-in rise of $2.5 billion a year. He predicted that spending will rise by this amount even if there are no new national activities.

What Mr. Johnson now is trying to do is to eliminate the built-in rise by achieving greater efficiency and by weeding out established programs that no longer are needed.

"It is not a matter of taste," a White House adviser said. "It is an arithmetic imperative."

The President told his Cabinet that he knows that it took more than "waving a wand" to achieve the savings they already can point to.

"I know that it took hard work, difficult decisions, late hours, and considerable anguish to accomplish what we did last year," he declared.

Mr. Johnson said he wants his officials to concentrate on cutting employment, on increasing productivity, reducing costs, and eliminating unnecessary reports.

"I want this administration to have a tight fist and an open mind—a tight fist on money and an open mind on the needs of America," he asserted.

SPEECH BY SENATOR RIBICOFF BEFORE THE CONNECTICUT STUDENT NURSES ASSOCIATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, there is no group more dedicated to the service of mankind than the nurses of our country. Members of a proud profession with a distinguished record of loyalty, skill, and devotion to duty, nurses are too often forgotten heroes in the exciting battles waged by modern medicine against sickness and disease.

To assure that our country will have enough nurses well trained for their exacting work is one of the great challenges before us. One of the organizations playing a major role in this effort is the Connecticut Student Nurses Association, which held its annual fall convention in Hartford last week. I had the honor of preparing an address for this organization, and I ask unanimous consent to have that speech printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, BEFORE THE ANNUAL FALL CONVENTION, CONNECTICUT STUDENT NURSES ASSOCIATION, HARTFORD, CONN., SEPTEMBER 24, 1964

Very often people read the newspapers and then write to me to give me their opinion about what they have read—and their advice.

The other day, after the announcement of my appearance before you student nurses, I received some especially sage advice.

It came from a well-known highly experienced nurse in New Britain. She wrote to a mutual friend: "I see by the paper that Senator RIBICOFF is going to address a Connecticut student nursing organization."

And she continued: "I would like to write the speech for him. I hope he will stress that nursing is rooted in the needs of humanity and founded on the ideal of service, and that it is a challenge to give equal consideration in sympathy, tact, and understanding to people of all creeds—rich and poor. * * * I could," she added, "go on and on."

Well, all I can say is that I wish she had gone on and on. She would have written this speech, and saved me the work—and—if I'm a judge of people—done a better job than I.

For she is wise. In nursing, you young people have indeed chosen an admirable profession. It is a profession of service, of compassion, of humane concern. Its challenge is compelling.

After all, when each of you is a full-fledged nurse, you will be the person—of all of those on the health team—who has the most immediate contact with a sick patient. You will be most likely to know and understand him as a human being and know his family. You will observe and report changes in his condition—his reaction to drugs—new signs or symptoms. Your services will be the key to a speedy and comfortable recovery. What work could be more important?

The health of every individual, young or old, rich or poor, is very much a concern—and of our whole Nation. As you student nurses already know well, the power of a sick man is brought low. His purpose is blunted and dissipated. His highest possibilities wait and wither—unrealized. His contribution to our society is partly or entirely lost.

Health is the Nation's business because healthy people build a nation.

But, even more important, health is the business of a democratic country because the fulfillment of the individual—impossible without good health—is one of its highest goals.

Now you are studying about the fundamental changes that have taken place—and are still taking place—in medicine as in all our society.

Medical research moves ahead with giant steps. The miracles that medicine have wrought have improved the human condition immeasurably in a very short span of time. They have conquered ancient scourges, restored strength, and eased pain.

And these medical advances have resulted in increased population. Age groupings are different. People are living longer, and so they are subject to different diseases—mental illness and other chronic ailments, for example, are more common. Thus the very patterns of health needs and of the services which should be established to meet these needs are changing.

For instance: more people than ever before are entering our hospitals to receive more complex, more effective, treatment for the well-known diseases—as well as for new and strange ailments which we did not recognize or could not diagnose until recent years. We have new knowledge and new procedures—immunization against diseases and allergies; screening for detection of tuberculosis, diabetes, glaucoma, heart disease; control procedures for communicable diseases—to name just a few. But the new knowledge—the new procedures—can be applied only through the trained minds and skilled hands of the members of our health professions. And these are in serious short supply. We suffer health personnel shortages that could make hollow victories of our other advances.

Obviously the nurse is a vital member of the health alliance. New scientific advances are expanding her role—and the shortage of doctors has increased her burden too. She must do many things once routinely done by physicians.

Still, we do not have enough nurses—in any field or at any level. And nurses do not have enough educational opportunities. Economic and other working conditions for nurses are not, in many places and many ways, as good as they should be. And though the public demands more nursing services, it is frequently apathetic to the needs of the people who supply them. Perhaps it just is not aware of what these needs are—it takes nurses for granted.

These things were dramatically highlighted by a landmark report made last year by the Surgeon General's Consultant Group on Nursing. Incidentally, this was a group of distinguished experts, appointed, I am proud to say, while I was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Headed by Dr. Alvin Eurich, vice president of the Ford Foundation's Fund for Advancement of Education, their task was to study the Nation's longstanding, complex nursing needs, to confront problems in the field of nursing and to recommend an action program.

The group's findings were startling. From 1950 to 1962 the number of professional nurses in practice increased from 375,000 to 550,000 or from 249 to 297 per 100,000 population. However, 70,000 of the number of nurses added since 1950 were part-time workers. Also the ratio of nurses to population varies widely throughout the country ranging from 123 per 100,000 population in Arkansas to 599 in Connecticut. So, though there are more than half a million active professional nurses in the Nation—though the ranks of professional nursing have grown at a faster rate than the population—we still can by no means meet the demands for nursing services.

For example, in the approximately 6,400 hospitals in the United States, more than 20

percent of the positions of professional nurses are vacant. Again: there are 1,200 faculty vacancies in nursing schools at this time. But, only 10 percent of all employed professional nurses hold college degrees. And, though faculty members engaged in much-needed nursing research should have doctoral degrees, only about 300 nurses now have such a degree.

It's always nice to be in demand, of course. In a way this demand is a tribute to nurses—to the job you have done—on the part of physicians, hospital administrators, and just plain people and patients everywhere.

But the demand for your services is increasing. And it will continue to increase in the future. The trend in all medicine is toward the community. The emphasis is toward the continuity of care—the right service in the right place at the right time. The theme of the majority of the new health proposals is "home care"—the improvement of hospital services for those who are acutely ill—and the development of appropriate service for other patients, elsewhere, in nursing homes, in rehabilitation centers, in their own homes.

By the year 1970, the consultant group estimated, we will need 850,000 nurses if we are to have safe, therapeutically effective nursing services including 300,000 with academic degrees. This is 300,000 more than we have today. At their present strength, our nursing schools can graduate only 30,000 a year.

Government reports are numerous. Usually they are formally presented, printed with fancy covers, and pigeonholed. Not this one. The Congress took the material in this report, studied it, and acted promptly. I was proud to work and vote for the Nurses Training Act of 1964, finally completed and signed by President Lyndon Johnson last September 4.

It didn't get too much publicity—there was no controversy about it—and constructive progress without dispute often receives little attention. But, as President Johnson said, "It is the most significant nursing legislation in the history of our country. I believe that it will enable us to attract many more of our most qualified young people to this great and noble calling."

Briefly, the Nurse Training Act represents the response of an enlightened Congress to an urgent social need.

It has four chief parts:

First, it authorizes a program of grants to build and renovate nursing schools. Obviously the existing schools cannot increase the number of their annual graduates by 70 percent, as is called for by our goal for 1970, without enlarging their facilities. All three types of nursing schools—diploma, associate degree, and collegiate—will be eligible under the new bill to apply for financial help to meet costs of needed construction.

The Surgeon General's consultant group on nursing recommended that each year there be added 15,000 graduates of diploma schools—4,000 more graduates of junior college programs—and 4,000 more graduates of collegiate programs. At the same time, the number receiving master's degrees should increase from the present 1,000 to a total of 3,000 a year.

Second, the act establishes a program to help schools of nursing strengthen and improve nurse training and to help diploma schools of nursing meet the costs which will come with increased enrollment. Many of the newer teaching concepts and methods could be applied to nursing education, with teacher time and student the gainer. The shortage of teachers and the tremendous increase in the body of knowledge necessary for modern nursing make this improvement most important.

The cost of providing nursing education is substantially higher than the income received by the school from tuition and fees. Many schools, particularly hospital schools, have been forced to close because they cannot continue to take a loss on the training of nursing students. The Nurse Training Act is intended to increase the number of enrollees in these schools, and for hospital schools this will impose serious hardship. Therefore, accredited diploma schools will be reimbursed under the act to some extent for the added costs of increased enrollment.

Third, to attract into the nursing profession the numbers of students necessary to meet the 1970 goal set by the Surgeon General's consultant group, we must greatly increase the number of qualified talented applicants for admission. Studies have shown that the initial cost of the education programs are a major deterrent to young people who might otherwise undertake training for professional nursing.

So the act sets up a loan program to lower the financial barrier to entering schools of nursing and already the letters are pouring in to congressional offices and the executive branch about these loans. They began to arrive the day the bill was signed, and has been increasing steadily since. I must say this justifies the need for student loans for students of nursing.

Students who are pursuing a full-time course of study in an accredited school of nursing, and who are in need of financial assistance are eligible for loans. They may receive up to $1,000 for any academic year. Loans are repayable over a 10-year period beginning after the first year following graduation. However, a "forgiveness" clause permits students to cancel up to 50 percent of their loans at the rate of 10 percent for each complete year of service as a nurse in a public institution. This cancellation provides an incentive for nurses to continue to practice nursing following graduation. Loan funds can be established in collegiate, junior college, and hospital schools of nursing.

Fourth, the professional nurse traineeship program, which has substantially improved the preparation of nurses in leadership positions over the past 7 years, is continued and expanded for another 5 years under the Nurse Training Act. A total of 106 schools have participated in this program since its start in 1956, and traineeships for full-time study have been awarded to over 11,000 nurses. There have been more than 400 courses under the short-term program to assist nurses to update management and teaching skills, in which 14,000 nurses took part. The new act adds professional nursing specialties, "determined by the Surgeon General to require advanced training," to the fields of study for which advanced traineeships may be given.

Connecticut has already benefited from the Government's recognition of the importance of nursing. Since 1957, 178 professional nurses have been trained in our State through more than half a million dollars in Federal traineeship grants.

Since 1961, 15 public health nurses have been trained under Federal grants at the University of Bridgeport, and the university is developing—with more than $100,000 in Federal help—a program to train many more. More than $1¼ million in nursing research grants and fellowships from the Public Health Service have been used in Connecticut to produce significant new advances in the science of nursing care.

All of this will have great meaning for you students, and for other deserving young people like yourselves, who wish to enter the proud profession of nursing—and to excel at what they do.

I cannot speak before a group of student nurses without pointing out one more thing. It is something, I think, in which the nurse who wanted to write this speech for me today would be interested, and that is this:

Nurses—individually and as a group—have supported some of the most significant legislation of this century—including the Nursing Act of 1964.

Your positions on legislation have been determined by a genuine concern for the good of the patient. This is consonant with the very highest ethics of the healing professions. It is in accord with the injunction given to all of us, almost 4 years ago, by our martyred President, John F. Kennedy: "Ask not what your country can do for you: Ask what you can do for your country."

You have supported many needed measures—maternal and child health care—hospital care for the aged—expansion of community mental health centers—and assistance in the field of mental retardation. And you have spoken up for civil rights, the program to eliminate poverty, and equal opportunity in employment.

The reason that nurses support this sort of compassionate program is tied up with the work you do. For after all, your work gives you a sensitive insight into the needs of people. You see the whole man as he lives his everyday life, as he works at a job or conducts himself as a father—you just don't see a cardiogram or X-ray or a chest disease.

I wish you luck in the selfless job ahead of you. I wish you expert skills, fulfillment in your work—for yourselves and for others. Your Government has acted constructively to improve your chances—and your patients.

Make the most of your new opportunities. And as you advance as a skilled practitioner, a vital part of the health team, remain a "student" in a field that is constantly changing and moving forward.

ELIHU BURRITT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, October will mark the 100th anniversary of the appointment of a distinguished native son of New Britain, Conn., to the Consular Service of the Department of State. The man was Elihu Burritt, and he made his mark on history as "The Learned Blacksmith."

Elihu Burritt was a self-educated philosopher, scholar, and linguist, who dedicated his life to a crusade for peace and brotherhood. His crusade took him throughout the Nation and the world.

Leo Michaloski—a native of New Britain, Conn., and the deputy security officer in the Department of Justice—has written for the October issue of the Foreign Service Journal an interesting description of Elihu Burritt's career. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mr. Michaloski's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE LEARNED BLACKSMITH BECOMES A CONSUL

(By Leo J. Michaloski)

Near the end of Lincoln's first term in office, as a war-weary nation awaited election day with growing apprehension, Elihu Burritt of New Britain, Conn., was appointed U.S. Consular Agent at Birmingham, England. New Britain, birthplace of the "learned blacksmith," as he was popularly known, will mark this event this month with commemorative exercises that include the presentation to the Secretary of State of a portrait of Burritt. The painting will be hung in the State Department.

At the time of his appointment to the consular service, Burritt was 53 years old and had attained a worldwide reputation as a self-educated scholar, linguist, and crusader for peace and universal brotherhood.

Zebina Eastman, American Consul at Bristol, who had responsibility over the Birmingham consulate, went to see Burritt at Manchester on one of his stops during a foot tour of England. The tour resulted in three charming volumes of "Walks," i.e., "A Walk from London to John O'Groats" (1864), "A Walk From London to Lands Ends" (1865), and "Walk in the Black Country" (1866). Eastman persuaded Burritt to take the job of U.S. consular agent (a term once used synonymously with vice consul and referring to officers who served in the outposts of a consular district) and then dispatched a letter to the Secretary of State,

* * * * *

The Secretary of State was more than casually interested in Burritt's appointment for he was well acquainted with the Yankee blacksmith and, as U.S. Senator from New York, had introduced legislative proposals at his behest including one for "compensated emancipation of the Negro." The Secretary knew that Burritt lacked the political support so indispensable for appointment to the foreign service and even more important, he had heard disquieting rumors only a short time before that Burritt had allegedly tried to get his friend Charles Sumner, the brilliant Massachusetts solon, to lead an end-the-war movement. Nevertheless, Seward, on October 8, 1864, signed Burritt's commission. It was a magnanimous act considering the intense bitterness then prevailing against people such as Burritt whose antiwar sympathies were equated with disloyalty.

In due course, the news of Burritt's appointment reached President Lincoln's desk. He, too, was familiar with the "learned blacksmith" and his schemes for reform. One that probably appealed to Lincoln was called compensated emancipation for the Negro, which Burritt espoused in speeches and through the columns of the Citizen of the World as the sanest, safest, cheapest, and most equitable way of extinguishing slavery. He urged the sale of public lands in the West; revenue would be used to buy freedom for slaves. William Lloyd Garrison and other radical abolitionists—who advocated freeing slaves without compensation to the slaveowners—ridiculed Burritt's scheme, and Garrison sarcastically referred to it as paying a thief for stolen property. Enduring formidable hardships Burritt carried on his campaign traveling from Maine to Iowa one winter and just when it looked as if his scheme might be recognized by Congress as a legitimate proposition, another Connecticut abolitionist with more drastic plans attacked the U.S. arsenal at Harper's Ferry, Va. The attack shattered Burritt's hopes for a peaceful extinction of slavery. Oddly enough the adventurer's name lives on in song—"John Brown's body lies a-mouldering in the grave"—while Burritt's epic effort is now an obscure footnote to history. Burritt returned to his farm in New Britain a broken-hearted man who felt the keenest agony because not one bona fide offer had been made by the North to share with the South what he called the task and duty of lifting slavery from the bosom of the Nation.

Both Lincoln and the Yankee blacksmith had high hopes that the pay-for-slaves scheme would wipe out the institution of slavery. In his autobiography, Burritt called it one of the most promising labors of his life. Benjamin Quarles in his book "Lincoln and the Negro" (New York, 1962) says that of all the measures relating to the Negro the one that was closest to Lincoln's heart was that of compensated emancipation. Lincoln pressed this scheme until almost the end of the war. In February 1865, he called his Cabinet together to discuss a proposal to Congress requesting payment to the Confederated States of $400 million as compensation for the slaves. Not one of his Cabinet supported him in this last brave effort to end the war.

Lincoln interposed no objection to Burritt's appointment.

How he came to be known as the learned blacksmith was explained by Burritt in a letter:

"I was the youngest of many brethren and my parents were poor. My means of education were limited to the advantages of a district school; and those, again, were circumscribed by my father's death which deprived me at the age of 15 of those scanty opportunities which I had previously enjoyed. * * * A few months after his decease, I apprenticed myself to a blacksmith in my native village. Thither I carried an indomitable taste for reading which I had previously acquired through the medium of the social library, all the historical works which I had at the time perused * * * I completed my Virgil during the evenings of one winter * * * After some time devoted to Cicero * * * I commenced the Greek * * * Still I carried my Greek grammar in my hat, and often found a moment when I was heating some large iron when I could place my book open before me, against the chimney of my forge, and go through tupto, tupteis, tuptei."

Thus the Yankee blacksmith pursued a course of self-education during the intervals at the smithy.

* * * * *

By the time he was 30 Burritt had mastered 18 ancient and modern languages and 22 dialects. During his lifetime he wrote 30 books on a diversity of subjects ranging from the charming "Children of the Bible" to the erudite "The Year Book of Nations," as well as books for the study of Arabic, Hebrew, Hindustani, Persian, and Turkish, and the first book in Sanskrit in the United States. In recognition of his scholarship Yale University, Williams and Amherst colleges conferred honorary degrees on him. Governor Edward Everett of Massachusetts, on behalf of a group of affluent Harvard University alumni including Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, offered him a scholarship but Burritt declined the offer preferring to continue his studies in conjunction with manual labor.

But eventually, Burritt put aside his leather apron and hammer. His first public activities were as lecturer on the subject "Application and Genius" in which he argued that genius was nothing more than the result of persistent will and application. For a time he tried editing a monthly magazine, The Literary Geminae, which was made up of articles and translations from his own pen. At about that time strong drink was a matter of growing national concern and it was natural that the Connecticut reformist should join the temperance movement.

* * * * *

In 1844 Burritt started a weekly newspaper known as the Christian Citizen which voiced his views on the burning issues of the day such as antislavery, temperance, and peace. It should be mentioned that the Christian Citizen is said to have been the first American journal to devote substantial space to the advocacy of peace. When the slogan "Fifty-four Forty or Fight" echoed throughout the Union and threatened warfare between England and the United States over the Northwest Boundary, Burritt, who was alarmed at the bitterness of the controversy and the possibility that it would erupt into armed conflict, decided to try and pacify the hostile feelings. Working in cooperation with humanitarians in Manchester, England—the same group that was doing so much for social reforms in England—he launched a campaign of so-called "Friendly International Addresses." These were letters exchanged between American and English cities signed by its leading citizens "entreating their cooperation in bringing about an amicable settlement."

Eight hundred newspapers printed them. In addition Burritt took two letters bearing some of England's most prominent names to Washington where John Calhoun and other Senators expressed interest in this novel hands-across-the-ocean diplomacy. Even though historians ascribe the signing of the Oregon Treaty to other reasons it can be said with historical accuracy that Burritt and his English colleagues played a most effective role in forcing Congress and Parliament to agree on a pacific settlement of our present boundary.

In appreciation of Burritt's work in the Oregon crisis his English friends invited him for a visit. Burritt accepted. In May 1846 he sailed for England where his contemplated 3-month visit was extended to 3 years. There he found encouragement and inspiration to unfold a grand design for world peace. The first step was to organize the League of Universal Brotherhood. This took place in July 1846. Each member of the league was pledged to the task of promoting international harmony and good will between nations. Within 2 years the league had more than 20,000 members in England and about the same number in the United States.

Burritt began a campaign for lower transoceanic postal rates as an effective means of diffusing knowledge, lessening national prejudice, and getting different races and nations to see the common interest in peaceful intercourse. He traveled widely lecturing on this subject, and in addition wrote a tract entitled "Ocean Penny Postage—Will It Pay?" It is credited with pressuring Congress and Parliament into liberalizing rates for oversea mail which then were exorbitant.

Next Burritt launched his most important work, a series of international peace congresses that drew worldwide attention and earned for him the appellation "Apostle of Peace and Universal Brotherhood." The first of these conclaves was planned for Paris in 1848, but because of the February Revolution and the bloody Parisian siege in June he was forced to switch the site to Brussels, where it was held in September with the official recognition of the Belgian Government. In successive years similar gatherings were held at Paris, Frankfurt, London, and Edinburgh. It should be noted that only a man of Burritt's intrepidity would dare to undertake such a task, for we know that the French Revolution had spread its contagion to almost all of Europe. Moreover, the public's apathy toward peace manifestations was understandable as was the scorn of the legislators and national leaders, for Europe was then in the midst of a seemingly endless bloody and hopeless process of nationalism, international rivalries and armaments race. In spite of this, the Peace Congresses, which incidentally brought delegates from most of Europe, England, and the United States, were spectacularly successful and are credited with changing the moral and spiritual view toward peace, and creating a will to peace. To a large extent this may be attributed to the fact that the congresses were able to convince many of the writers, artists, scientists, and intellectuals of the world that their interests were identical and inspired them to rally behind the causes espoused by Burritt and his distinguished colleagues.

* * * * *

Some notion of the sweep of the congresses can be had from the resolutions that were adopted at the Brussels Congress. For example, the assembly approved proportionate and simultaneous reduction in armaments, the doctrine of compulsory arbitration, a Congress of Nations, a World Court, international communication, postal reform, standard weights and measures and coinage, and education toward the eradication of national prejudices.

In 1852 Burritt was again involved in historymaking diplomacy. It was during the Frankfurt Peace Congress that a delegation of Constitutionalists from Schleswig-Holstein appealed for an investigation of its dispute with Denmark. Burritt was named to a committee to endeavor to mediate the controversy. Again, just as success seemed within reach, the Austrians at Bismarck's insistence marched in and put an end to Burritt's magnificent effort to interpose pacific proposals between two embittered parties. In spite of the unhappy conclusion to this episode Burritt received the plaudits of the press and from diplomatic circles as well.

In 1847 Burritt visited Ireland during the peak of the potato famine that was sweeping that unfortunate country "to expose the depth of the distress of the potato famine, and to describe it * * * to the people of the United States." Burritt went from cabin to cabin in Skibbereen, the most hard-hit district. The result was "Four Days at Skibbereen," a poignant record of human suffering. The article appeared in his Christian Citizen and was reprinted in newspapers throughout the United States. The generosity of the Americans was overwhelming. To Burritt's great delight the U.S. Government detailed two warships (one of which had been captured from the British in the War of 1812) to carry the people's offering to Ireland. Not satisfied with this result he sailed for the United States where he personally arranged for a boatload of provisions bound for Cork which he helped to distribute. This experience got Burritt to consider establishing a permanent international organization that would provide the relief in future catastrophies. Fate, as we know, reserved this honor for Jean Henri Duhant who founded the International Red Cross a decade later.

It was in January 1865 that Burritt joined the ranks of the 487 who comprised our consular service in 36 countries.

* * * * *

Birmingham was one of 20 American consulates in England. The top ranking diplomat was Charles Francis Adams, son of President John Quincy Adams who had once served as Minister to the Court of St. James. His title was Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary with an annual salary of $17,500. Our highest ranking consular officer in England was a former Congressman, Freeman Harlow Morse, consul at London. His salary was $7,500 as compared with Burritt's $1,500. Oddly enough when President Grant ousted Morse in 1873 to make room for his friend General Adam Badeau, Morse got so irate that he refused to return to America, choosing to give up his American citizenship.

One of the main functions of the consulate was to certify the invoices of goods intended for shipment to the United States. At times the load was so heavy that Burritt and his clerk worked late into the night to get the job done, for Birmingham was then shipping about $5 million worth of goods annually to the United States.

Another task, and one which Burritt handled with aplomb, was that of ameliorating United States-English strains resulting from the so-called Alabama Claims which arose from damage to our shipping by the British-built sea raider, *Alabama*, that destroyed 60–70 merchant vessels before being sent to the bottom by the U.S.S. *Kearsarge* in July 1864.

Burritt remained in office until August 1869, when President U. S. Grant replaced him "to make room for more importunate claimants for the situation." Before his departure Burritt received many testimonials of esteem from the inhabitants of Birmingham. The one he prized most was a set of Shakespeare which was presented to him by the Vicar of Hanborne (suburb of Birmingham) with the following tribute: "We have heard with most unfeigned regret that your residence amongst us is about to terminate. During your 4 years of sojourn in the parish of Hanborne we have ever found you a kind and sincere friend, and a warm and generous supporter of every good and philanthropic work. We are only expressing our hearts' true feeling in saying that we very deeply deplore your anticipated departure and shall ever remember with the liveliest emotion your oft acts of courteous kindness."

Burritt returned to New Britain where he continued to write and teach. Despite failing health he nevertheless went on to champion the causes that were so dear to him. One in particular to which he had devoted much time and energy was the establishment of an international court as first proposed by William Ladd.

Burritt died on March 6, 1879. Tributes, like the following, were written to his memory by the press of the country:

The Philadelphia Inquirer said: "Though more widely known as the 'Learned Blacksmith' than by any other appellation, the title of Universal Philanthropist could better describe him." The Hartford Courant wrote: "Mr. Burritt was a man of unbounded and unfailing charity and true benevolence of the kindest feelings. He was everywhere a power for good * * * he was in his interest and views in every philanthropic movement many years in advance of his times. He felt that he was on the side of God and so labored with an unfaltering belief in the righteousness of his efforts."

New Britain is justly proud of Burritt. It has named streets, schools and a bank in his memory. On the walls of the city hall are painted a series of pictures and mottoes showing the highlights of his life. In addition there is a statue in his honor in a park that faces the high school.

New Britain looks forward to the centennial observance of Burritt's appointment to the consular service. It will afford its citizens an opportunity to express its admiration for his career on behalf of humanity.

THE HAGUE PROTOCOL—U.S. GOVERNMENT DISCRIMINATION AGAINST AMERICANS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, 8 months ago I called the attention of the Senate to what can only be described as an unfair, inequitable, and discriminatory situation applying to thousands of Americans flying overseas.

Then, as now, these travelers were faced with a potentially serious penalty because of our failure to ratify an obscure, little-known treaty called the Hague protocol.

The treaty, in effect, increases the value of an American life from $8,300 to $16,600. Our refusal to accept the treaty keeps the lower value in effect for Americans, despite the fact that the higher figure is already applicable to the citizens of more than 30 nations.

Most international air travel originates in or terminates in the United States, and most of these travelers are U.S. citizens. They come from the country with the highest living standard in the world. Yet, in a key aspect, their lives are worth only half as much as the life of a Frenchman, an Italian, a German, a Russia, or a Mexican.

This is the unmistakable result of our refusal to ratify the Hague protocol with its doubling of the liability of international air carriers in the event a passenger is killed or injured.

Thus our failure to ratify the Hague protocol has created for the international air traveler a situation as potentially tragic as it is currently confusing.

Here, briefly, is the situation:

Thirty-five years ago, when international air travel was new, most of the countries of the world agreed on certain standards to facilitate international movement of the air traveler and his baggage and to afford some protection for his dependents in the event of his death. The agreement is called the Warsaw Convention of 1929.

More than 70 countries signed it, including the United States, which became a party to it in 1934.

Basically, the convention provides uniformity of documentation and legal rights in international travel.

It also established a limit of $8,300 on the liability of an international air carrier in the event of a passenger's injury or death. However, in the event of proven willful misconduct by the carrier or its agents, the liability is unlimited.

Clearly, this liability limit of $8,300 on the life of a passenger is too low today, especially by the standards which have prevailed for years in the United States and other countries. Realizing this, the Eisenhower administration played a leading role in securing agreement on a modification of the Warsaw Convention raising the liability to $16,600. The new modification, known as the Hague protocol, also allows the recovery of attorney fees, in addition to the $16,600 in compensation for death or injury.

More than 30 nations, including such key airline countries as Germany, France, Canada, and Italy, are parties to the protocol, which has been in full force and effect for more than a year.

Unfortunately, however, the U.S. Government has not become a party to the Hague protocol. The Senate has not ratified it.

The strange injustice of the current situation can best be illustrated by a specific example.

Let us look at two passengers sitting side by side on the same flight.

Passenger A in Mexico buys a round-trip ticket to New York. Passenger B in New York buys a round-trip ticket to Mexico. If these passengers were later sitting side by side on the trip from Mexico City to New York and an accident occurred, passenger A, who bought his ticket in Mexico, would be covered by the $16,600 liability limit. Passenger B, who bought his ticket in New York, would be covered by the older, out-of-date limit of $8,300 and his life would legally have only half the value.

This unjust situation would exist because Mexico has ratified the Hague protocol while the United States has not. And a passenger buying a round-trip ticket originating and terminating in a country which is a party to the Hague protocol is covered by the protocol, even though he stops in a country which is not a party to the protocol.

Thus, the person whose international air flight originates and terminates in the United States, as is the case with most Americans, is severely discriminated against in terms of legal protec-

tion, and the discrimination is caused by the failure of his own Government to act.

While airline travel is safe, and accidents are relatively rare, this is still a serious matter, and one whose tragic potential is all too obvious.

Why does this situation exist? Why has not something been done about it? I do not know the full answer.

The Hague protocol was submitted to the Senate in 1959 and referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. In 1961, when the new Kennedy-Johnson administration took over, it announced that it was reexamining the Government's position with respect to the protocol and requested the committee to take no action. This reexamination was finally completed last month, when on August 7, 1964, the Secretary of State recommended ratification of the Hague Protocol.

It would not, Mr. President, be fair to conclude that it took the present administration 3½ years to decide that the life of an American was worth as much as the life of a person who lived somewhere else in the world, despite appearances to the contrary. The issue is complex. There can be valid debate about limitations of liability. But, in my view, there can be no question about the inequity and injustice of our present posture—our approval of a limit of $8,300 on the value of a life and our refusal to approve the higher amount of the Hague protocol.

In any event, the administration last month reached its decision and recommended ratification of the Hague protocol, along with the enactment of legislation requiring airlines to carry additional insurance on the lives of all their passengers. The legislation, I am confident, will be fully and promptly considered next year by the Senate Commerce Committee, to which it was referred. It has been pending before the committee for about 5 weeks.

The treaty has been pending before the Foreign Relations Committee for 5 years. It is not a myth, but a hard reality of key importance to the thousands and thousands of Americans who fly overseas every month.

Nothing can be gained by delay. The Senate can still act. It can ratify the treaty now, without impairing its right to take additional action on legislation next year.

I hope the committee will take a new look at the facts in this situation and initiate prompt steps to bring the treaty before the Senate without delay.

The interests of Americans traveling overseas demand action before the end of this session. Tragedy may be the alternative.

MEDICAL RESEARCH

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the need for a Federal program of health care for the aging has been based in part on the dramatic increase in the population of our Nation over 65 years of age.

Much of the progress in medical science which has made this possible has come as the result of medical research financed by the Federal Government. The involvement of the various departments of the Federal Government in medical research totaled $924 million in 1963, and the outlook in the future is for increased expenditures in this field not only by the Federal Government but also by industry and philanthropy as well.

At the same time estimates of the number of professional workers needed in the field have been revised sharply upward. This also means that we must have medical schools to teach many more doctors than our medical schools are now capable of graduating.

The facts for these conclusions have been summarized by the Health Information Foundation of the University of Chicago. I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the article entitled "Expenditures for Medical Research," as published in Progress in Health Services, September–October, 1964.

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

EXPENDITURES FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH

Expenditures for medical research [1] in the United States during 1963 amounted to approximately $1,470 million [2] with a further $99 million spent by the Federal Government on new buildings for research. Excluding the amount spent for construction, about two-thirds of this money came from Government funds and one-quarter from the pharmaceutical industry. The remaining one-tenth was from contributions of private foundations and other private sources.

Medical research accounts for approximately 8 percent of the total amount ($18.5 billion) spent on all research and development in the United States. The research endeavor of the Nation represents 3 percent of expenditures for all goods and services.[3] Research activities accounted for 4.7 percent, or $1,550 million, of the $33 billion [4] (5.8 percent of the gross national product) spent on health care in the fiscal year 1962–63.

Medical research has been growing in importance and expenditures have increased greatly in recent years. Expenditures for medical research in 1963 were 74 percent higher than in 1960 and about 1,600 percent higher than in 1947. If this trend continues at the rate of expansion projected by the Jones committee, annual national expenditures for medical research will be in the range of $2.8 billion to $3.3 billion [5] in 1970. Estimates by the National Institutes of Health based on these figures indicate that 77,000 scientific and professional health personnel will be needed in 1970, almost double the 39,700 such workers in 1960.

TRENDS

The Federal Government has come to play an increasingly important role. Between 1947 and 1963, medical research financed by the Federal Government increased 34 times, from $27 million to $924 million, while expenditures by all other sources increased 9 times, from $60 million to $546 million. Thus, as a proportion of total national medical research expenditures, Federal expenditures increased from 31 to 63 percent.

TABLE 1.—*Total and Federal medical research expenditures, United States, selected years, 1947–63*

	Total national medical research (millions)	Federal as percent of total
1947	$87	31
1957	440	52
1959	648	54
1961	1,045	55
1963	1,470	63

As a proportion of total Federal expenditures for all research and development, expenditures for medical research increased from 3.9 percent to 7.3 percent between 1947 and 1963. The 7.3 percent spent for medical research compares with 63 percent allocated for national defense [6] (Department of Defense and Atomic Energy Commission), 25 percent for space exploration (National Aeronautics and Space Administration), and 4.3 percent for research in other areas. National defense still claims a major portion of the total Federal expenditures for all research and development although its part declined from a high of 91 percent in 1953 to the 1963 level of 63 percent.

As a proportion of the Nation's total expenditures for all research and development, however, medical research expenditures changed little. The $161 million expended for medical research in 1950 was about 6 percent of the total for all research and development. By 1963 it has increased to 8 percent, or $1.5 billion of the national total of $18.5 billion.

The pattern of Federal support of medical research has shifted from research at Federal installations to grants for research conducted elsewhere such as universities. In 1947, 36 percent of the total Federal money for medical research was allocated to outside agencies; in 1963 it was 74 percent. In 1962 the Federal Government financed 61 percent of the Nation's total expenditures for medical research, but Federal agencies conducted only 19 percent of the total. Colleges and universities conducted 37 percent of the Nation's total medical research and 48 percent of the Federal total. Other nonprofit institutions performed 18 percent of the Nation's total and 19 percent of the Federal total.[7] In 1962, most of the research supported by industry was conducted under its own sponsorship. Industry performed 26 percent of the national total and expended the same amount for medical research, but approximately 14 percent of the industrial total of $336 million was allocated to outside institutions, while industry received about the same amount from the Federal Government.

[1] Defined broadly as scientific inquiry aimed ultimately at the improvement of human health and the conquest of disease.

[2] All figures related to 1963 and thereafter are estimates. Unless specified otherwise, all data are from the U.S. National Institutes of Health, "Resources for Medical Research Report" No. 3, January 1963, and No. 4, August 1963; and "Basic Data Relating to the National Institutes of Health," February 1964.

[3] The Gross National Product was $585 billion in 1963. Source: U.S. Office of Business Economics, "Survey of Current Business," February 1964, p. 13.

[4] Preliminary estimates made for fiscal year 1962–63. Hence, they differ from those for 1963. Source: U.S. Social Security Administration, "Social Security Bulletin," November 1963, pp. 10 and 11.

[5] Boisfeuillet Jones, Chairman, "Federal Support of Medical Research," report of the Committee of Consultants on Medical Research, May 1960, p. 79. The range of expenditures is from the committee's alternative projections D and E.

[6] Excluding medical research programs of these agencies.

[7] "Other nonprofit organizations" include foreign ones as well as those which do not strictly fit into the classification of nonprofit organizations.

Colleges and universities performed only 9 percent [8] of all research and development in fiscal year 1961–62. Industry accounted for 74 percent, the Federal Government 14 percent, and other nonprofit organizations the remaining 3 percent. However, support for all research and development came from sources similar to those for medical research. The Federal Government contributed 65 percent of the national total, industry 32 percent, colleges and universities 2 percent and other nonprofit institutions 1 percent in the 1961–62 fiscal year.

Grants by the National Institutes of Health last year were 33 percent of the total Federal support ($956 million) of all categories of research at colleges and universities. The Department of Defense provided 31 percent, National Science Foundation 12 percent and other Federal agencies the remaining 24 percent. In 1952 the share of the National Institutes of Health was 9 percent of the total ($151 million), while that of the Department of Defense was 70 percent.

Among the agencies with general health objectives (the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Veterans' Administration), the National Institutes of Health, a constituent agency of the Public Health Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the principal medical research agency of the Federal Government, provides 64 percent of the total Federal support of medical research—about $625 million in 1963. In 1947, less than one-third of the total Federal support of medical research was channeled through the then National Institutes of Health.[9] The proportion had increased to 55 percent in 1957 and to about 65 percent in 1961.

The medical research programs of the Defense Department represent about 8 percent of the total Federal medical research program—$81 million in 1963. Although its outlay represents a tenfold increase over 1947, Federal medical research funds allocated through the Defense Department declined from 31 percent of the total to 8 percent during the 1947–63 period. The Atomic Energy Commission has a medical research program roughly equal to that of the Defense Department in magnitude—$76 million in 1963. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration expended $38 million for medical research in 1963, about 4 percent of the total for all Federal medical research. Medical research expenditures by other Federal agencies with civilian objectives amounted to $46 million or about 5 percent of the total Federal medical research funds.

In 1963, 78 percent of the total Federal medical research program of $924 million was conducted in the medical sciences, both clinical and basic, 12 percent in the biological sciences, 4 percent in the physical sciences, and the remaining 6 percent in other fields. This distribution has remained stable since 1961 (the earliest year for which data are available). Biomedical sciences consistently commanded about 90 percent of the total Federal medical research funds.

Between 1947 and 1963, the Federal Government expended $535 million for provision of new buildings for medical research, of which 38 percent was for construction of Federal sites. Capital expenditure for medical research by the Federal Government has grown rapidly over the years, reaching $99 million in 1963 from $6 million in 1948. However, the expansion has followed a fluctuating path with the trough located in the 1953–56 period with $4.5 million spent in 1955. The distribution of funds between construction of Federal sites and others also varied widely over the years. For the construction of Federal sites, 76 to 96 percent of Federal funds were allocated during 1951–55; since 1960 the proportion has been 23 to 36 percent.

[8] All figures in this paragraph are from the U.S. National Science Foundation, "Reviews of Data on Research and Development," No. 41, September 1963.

[9] National Institutes of Health took its name in 1948 from National Institute of Health.

HISTORY

The era of private support for medical research in this country was 1895 to 1940. During this period medicine and medical research were the chief beneficiaries of the large private funds. In 1902, the Rockefeller Board (later known as the Rockefeller Foundation) was established and provided $1 million in initial endowment. Thereafter, numerous organizations followed until in 1940, 134 foundations gave $12.2 million [10] to medicine and public health. In 1963 private support other than that from industry provided $141 million for medical research or 10 percent of the Nation's total.

The first Federal support of medical research through grants extended to universities was initiated by the National Board of Health in 1879. The grant-in-aid program was, however, discontinued in 1882, and was not reinstituted until World War I, when it was used to support research in the control of venereal disease. In 1912, when the Public Health and Marine Hospital Service became the Public Health Service, Federal support of health research broadened from control of epidemic and infectious disease to study and investigation of all diseases of man.

In 1930, the Hygienic Laboratory became the National Institute of Health, thus receiving more formal recognition from Congress. The research program of the Institute continued, however, to be strictly intramural. In 1937 the passage of the National Cancer Act established the National Cancer Institute, and for the first time permanent authority was created for making grants for Federal support of medical research in non-Federal organizations. Between 1938 and 1940, the Institute considered 137 applications for grants and awarded 33 grants involving a total of $220 million.

World War II saw further impetus for medical research with the organization in 1941 of the Committee on Medical Research of the Office of Scientific Research and Development to "initiate and support scientific research on medical problems affecting the national defense." Under the guidance and advice of various advisory committees of the National Research Council, the medical research programs of the Committee were carried out by contract with universities, hospitals, and other organizations. By June 30, 1944, 496 research contracts had been executed with 120 institutions involving over $15 million. The passage of the Public Health Service Act of 1944 provided broad authority to the Public Health Service for conduct and support of all kinds of medical research.

Federal support of medical research expanded rapidly in the years following World War II. The National Institutes of Health were given central responsibility for administering research grants. Six additional Institutes were established: Heart, Microbiological (to become Allergy), and Dental Research in 1948; Mental Health in 1949; Neurology and Experimental Biology (to become Arthritis) in 1950.[11] Between fiscal years 1945–46 and 1949–50 annual appropriations to the National Institutes of Health for extramural research grants alone increased from $780,000 per year to $14 million. In 1957, for the first time, Federal money accounted for more than one-half of the Nation's total spending for medical research.

[10] Richard H. Shryock, "American Medical Research: Past and Present," New York, 1947, p. 101. "It is difficult to say how much of its [$12.2 million] went into research." Figures from before 1947 in the following three paragraphs are from the same source.

[11] In 1963, two more institutes, General Medical Sciences, and Child Health were created.

PROGRAMS OF NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

There has been a shift in Federal support of research over the last 14 years. The National Institutes of Health are now receiving a larger share of the Federal dollar than are all other health agencies combined. Excluding construction grants, the National Institutes of Health appropriation increased 19 times from $52 million in 1949–50 to $968 million in 1963–64 fiscal year, while all Federal expenditures for medical research increased 14 times between 1949 and 1963 calendar years.

Most of the growth has taken place in the research activities supported outside of the National Institutes of Health. Between 1949–50 and 1962–63 fiscal years, funds obligated for extramural research increased from $15 million to $472 million, while those for intramural research increased from $13 million to $98 million.

Research project grants have shown the greatest rate of increase and constitute the largest segment of the extramural activities of the National Institutes of Health. Between fiscal years 1949–50 and 1963–64, funds appropriated for research grants by the National Institutes of Health increased from $14 million to $529 million. In fiscal year 1963–64 55 percent of the total National Institutes of Health appropriations, including construction grants, was allocated for research grants to agencies, mainly academic ones, outside the Institutes. Fourteen years ago, in the 1949–50 fiscal year, the ratio of grants to total appropriations was 1 to 4.

For its training program, the National Institutes of Health awarded a total of $145 million in the 1962–63 fiscal year. Of this amount, 80 percent was for training grants and the remaining 20 percent for fellowships of various types. Postdoctoral fellowships comprised the largest single category—40 percent of the $20.4 million awarded for all full-time regular fellows.

The National Institutes of Health distributed its $968 million appropriations in 1963–64 fiscal year among three categories of programs: (1) Support and conduct of research through research grants, direct studies and collaborative studies (68 percent of the total National Institutes of Health appropriations); (2) development of health care resources through training awards and construction grants (28 percent of the total); and (3) other operations, such as State control programs, professional and technical assistance, training (4 percent of the total).

Colleges and universities received $292 million in research grants from National Institutes of Health in fiscal year 1962–63. This was about 73 percent of the total National Institutes of Health research grants of $401 million (excluding general research support). This proportion had been consistently maintained since the 1957–58 fiscal year. In 1962–63, hospitals received 13 percent of the research grants, nonprofit organizations 7 percent, and the rest were distributed to other institutions, including foreign ones. This pattern of distribution has remained stable over the years. Medical schools received about two-thirds of the research grants to colleges and universities in 1962–63.

The National Institutes of Health awarded $270 million as grants for medical research facilities construction during the 7-year period from fiscal year 1956–57 to fiscal year 1963–64. Half of this amount has been granted to medical schools and an additional 29 percent to other academic institutions. Private nonprofit institutions, pri-

marily hospitals, received 17 percent of the total and other public institutions the remaining 4 percent.

COMMENTS ON INCREASED MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDS

One and a half billion dollars a year is being spent on medical research in this country. Such expenditures, financed by governmental and private agencies, are 1,600 percent greater than the sums expended in 1947.

Because of the sharp increase in expenditures for medical research, there has been public concern that growth has been too rapid. Criticisms have tended to focus on whether research funds have been too easily available to be used effectively, and whether scientific personnel have been available for staffing the increased number of research projects.

Although expenditure for all research in this country increased sharply between 1950 and 1963, the portion of national research expenditure going for medical research increased only from 6 to 8 percent over the same period. Looked at solely as a proportion of the national investment in medical care, the research investment seems proper. About $33 billion is being spent annually for all types of medical care; 4.7 percent of this amount goes for medical research. The obvious importance of new medical knowledge warrants disproportionate investment in research in this field.

There may never be a surplus of qualified research scientists, but the health field would seem not to be confronted with a greater problem than is true of research generally. Attention has been given to increasing the supply of scientists by universities and Government. Currently, about 23 percent of the annual National Institutes of Health appropriation is allocated for training awards.

Concern also has been expressed that there has been a disproportionate increase in Government support for medical research, and that as a result private funds would decrease. In the past 16 years Government support of such research has multiplied 34 times, but private expenditures, rather than decreasing, have increased by nine times during the same period.

Analysis of current research expenditures, while not answering all questions raised by critics, is reassuring. Such analysis seems to support the several expert committees appointed by Government which have recommended a continuing increase in medical research expenditures.

THE WARREN REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, all of us who are concerned with freedom of the press, and accompanying responsibility for the fourth estate, must weigh the Warren report's criticisms of news coverage of President Kennedy's assassination and subsequent events. Specifically mentioned in the report were lack of "self-discipline" and "general disorder."

I understand that Miles Wolff, president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, has asked Al Friendly, chairman of the ASNE Committee on News Access, to meet with representatives of Sigma Delta Chi, honorary journalistic fraternity, the Radio-Television News Directors Association, the National Association of Broadcasters, and other press groups to consider the Warren report recommendations.

Two articles in the Washington Post yesterday offered valuable questions for our consideration. One was the conviction expressed by an editorial that the quick intelligence from Dallas, in spite of imperfections, kept the Nation on an even keel, and sufficiently satisfied the public curiosity to prevent panic. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial, "The Evil We Escaped," follow my remarks in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent for the insertion of a column by Alfred Friendly, managing editor of the Post, entitled, "On Blaming the Press." The ASNE News Access Committee, of which he is chairman, recently recommended the device of pooling newsmen in certain circumstances where the presence of unlimited numbers of reporters and photographers could prove disturbing. Friendly points out in this article, however, that when the press observes reasonable limitations, they must be set by the only people who can set them; that is, those in charge of an event being reported.

As to whether the press was too aggressive at Dallas, Friendly asks his readers whether a docile press or a demanding one is good for the country. He also questions the consequences in Dallas and elsewhere if information about the crime had not been made public as it was collected.

I agree with the Warren Commission that the news situation in Dallas was not properly handled. The TV coverage at the police station appeared more like a junior riot than an orderly dissemination of fact or information for a news story of worldwide impact.

The responsibilities and the good taste implied in the great freedom of the press must be observed and respected. Where a story of such magnitude as the assassination of a President is breaking, however, the obligation is with the source of the news to plan for an orderly flow of current fact, either by pooling or by frequent press conferences.

The heart of an alert press is the competitive effort to be first with the most about a fast-breaking story of local, national, or international interest. This competition cannot be removed, nor should either the press or the Government attempt to control it. Through the proposed discussion among the press, the bar, and law enforcement agencies, however, it will be possible to improve the standards for news reports in such emergencies.

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

[From the editorial page of the Washington Post, Sept. 29, 1964]

THE EVIL WE ESCAPED

The Warren Commission's factual recital of the news coverage of the arrest and detention of Lee Harvey Oswald is enough to persuade everyone that the circumstances in Dallas did not contribute either to orderly processes of justice or the clear information of the public.

Such confusion is likely to occur, it must be acknowledged, in the case of crimes of this nature. Some degree of confusion probably could not be avoided. Still, the news media and the authorities can do better than this and under the prodding of the report's recommendations no doubt they will.

While we struggle with the evils that we have, however, we should not forget the evils that we escaped. If the information about the crime, because of the speed with which reports were gathered and transmitted, was not wholly accurate, the understanding conveyed by the press, in reports instantly disseminated, communicated to the country a general description of events which the months-long study of the Commission has not basically changed. This quick intelligence, in spite of imperfections, kept the whole Nation on an even keel, sufficiently satisfied the public curiosity to prevent hysteria and panic, and was detailed enough to prevent rumor and suspicion that might have otherwise directed popular vengeance at innocent individuals or groups. This is a great gain and sight of it must not be lost in debate over how the news media performance could have been made better and how it could have been kept from interfering with the normal processes of justice.

No doubt the bar and the media, with proper study, can improve the standards of collection and presentation of such news; but any system that would totally preclude some confusion in a crisis of this kind no doubt would preclude the routine press coverage upon which citizens depend for the honest working of our law-enforcement agencies. To achieve the ideal functioning of officials, bar and press in an abnormal situation we must not sacrifice their proper functioning in normal times. The faults of officials, lawyers, and newsmen arising from an excessive zeal to get and print the facts are often, as in this case, disquieting. The flaws of a system devoid of that zeal might be even more alarming.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 29, 1964]

ON BLAMING THE PRESS: WARREN COMMISSION'S COMPLAINT

(By Alfred Friendly)

Those parts of the Warren Commission's report bearing on the responsibility of the news media for some of the dreadful aftermath of President Kennedy's assassination raise troublesome problems about the press in a democratic society. And the Commission's remedial proposals are only the beginning of an argument, not end of one.

A difficulty to be recognized at the outset is that all of our guarantees of freedom have reverse sides to them, full of imperfections and liabilities. Freedom of assembly can lead to riots, and privileged talk in courts and Congress leads to a certain amount of false and evil utterances; and habeas corpus can let a felon free to sin again.

So with freedom of the press. At Dallas, one consequence was an epidemic of rumors of plot and conspiracy, created by inconsistent and contradictory reports issued to the press by law-enforcement officials, and relayed by the press to the public. But is this the only ingredient to be considered in a discussion on whether to modify the present philosophy about freedom of the press?

The Commission is ambivalent about assessing the blame for the engendering of the hurtful rumors. Its harshest reproach is to the law-enforcement officials who issued the information, some true, some erroneous. And whether true or not, the Commission charges, the issuance gravely jeopardized Lee Harvey Oswald's right to a fair trial had he lived to be tried. Presumably, to the extent the press printed that information, it contributed to a denial of that right.

But the Commission's complaint about the press is not so much that it printed what it learned, but rather that it pressed so aggressively for information, even to the point, the Commission seems to feel, of bullying the police into disclosures.

The question here would seem to be what kind of a press is good for the country: A

docile one, or a demanding one. The President had been murdered. Was the press wrong to seek information about it with furious diligence? Or was this a situation where the usual—and usually desired—energy and toughness of reporters should have been set aside?

The Commission declares: "Neither the press nor the public had the right to be contemporaneously informed by the police or prosecuting authorities of the details being accumulated against Oswald * * * its curiosity should not have been satisfied at the expense of the accused's right to trial by an impartial jury."

With the legal and moral principle there can be no argument. But the question may be asked whether, in any practical, feasible way, the great principle could have been secured, at Dallas last year or any place else whenever a President is assassinated. It is also fair to ask what the consequences might have been in Dallas and elsewhere had information about the crime and the suspect not been swiftly made public as it was collected. What would have been the crop of rumors in that case? And what would have been the action taken on the basis of those rumors?

The Commission chides the press for its lack of self-discipline. The behavior of reporters and photographers was not such as to make any newsman proud or complacent or even indifferent. But admitting this, one must next ask about the existence of means by which self-discipline could have been instituted.

The press is not a licensed body, operating through legal rules or step by step through enforceable procedural regulations. It is not an entity, much less one into which admission can be controlled and where operations can be subjected to official prescriptions. For the most part, it has shown itself willing to accept reasonable limitations when they are set by the only people who can set them; i.e., those in charge of an event being reported. But the members of the press have no effective way of setting limitations, except each man upon himself; no one member has the authority to limit his brother.

The Commission points out, however, that the press did not heed repeated requests from the Dallas police to clear the corridors, and disobeying orders not to ask Oswald questions at two of his appearances.

But the question is whether the police tried very hard to keep the corridors clear, or asked for a limitation of the number of newsmen, or even checked credentials (except on one occasion, where the checking was so intense as to have permitted Jack Ruby to walk into the building, unchallenged, and kill Oswald).

There is no indication that the police proposed to install any orderly procedures, such as pooling of cameramen or regularized briefings. In the past, the press has willingly agreed to such devices particularly in situations where it was obvious that otherwise there would be chaos. It agrees on them here and elsewhere every day in the year, and abides by them.

But it is difficult, at short notice, for the press to initiate those devices, and at Dallas it would appear to have been downright impossible. If the police chief or mayor or some other official did not prescribe the rules, or give the local editors the mandate to do so, who was to organize the system? The senior correspondent of the Associated Press? Or of the United Press International? Or of CBS? Or the gentleman from the New York Times?

And lacking that, could each member of the world's press, at the scene of the most newsladen murder since 1914, voluntarily forsake the center of news information, in some epidemic of self-abnegation?

The press was not pretty in Dallas. But it may not be fair to accuse it for failure to embrace a system that was not its to prescribe nor perhaps in its ability to create.

CONSERVATION ACHIEVEMENTS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed the bill establishing the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. In so doing, this body added another distinction to this session's already distinguished record on conservation.

The earlier enactment of legislation establishing the Fire Island National Seashore and the passage of the Land and Water Conservation Fund bill were milestones in this distinguished record—to say nothing of final enactment of the long-sought wilderness bill.

Mr. President, the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands, under the able chairmanship of Senator ALAN BIBLE, deserves the congratulations and gratitude of millions of Americans of this and future generations for the foresight its chairman and its members have shown. No committee of the Congress can be said to have made a greater contribution to the future of this great Nation and the health and happiness of its citizens.

In addition to these achievements, the Public Lands Subcommittee has held a preliminary hearing on the establishment of a national seashore on Assateague Island, a presently undeveloped, but potentially priceless, national asset. The chairman of the committee has agreed to hold additional hearings on this proposal early in the next session.

Mr. President, Assateague Island represents one of the last great natural outdoor recreational areas on the Atlantic seaboard. As our Nation becomes increasingly urbanized, with a future population of perhaps 10 million in the Baltimore-Washington area alone, there will be precious few places in these United States—and especially in the eastern United States—where a man can stand on a clean beach and can fish or swim or simply lie in the sand and listen to the soft sound of the sea.

The chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Public Lands have looked clearly into the future, and have helped to provide our children and their children with the priceless heritages that still lie in our power to provide, but will not be in their power to take unto themselves in the years ahead.

The distinguished record of this Senate committee gives confidence to those of us who already have done so much to encourage the preservation of this unique natural recreation area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "The Conservation Congress," which was published in the September 20 edition of the New York Times, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I join the editors of the Times in paying tribute to the distinguished Members of the Congress whose names are mentioned in the editorial. The accolade bestowed on Secretary Udall is most deserved. Americans of succeeding generations will have reason to be grateful to him.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Sept. 20, 1964]

THE CONSERVATION CONGRESS

When President Johnson signed into law the bill creating the Fire Island National Seashore, he not only established the first such park in New York State, but also made a notable contribution to the splendid record of the 88th Congress in the conservation field. The Wilderness Act he signed earlier this month represented nearly a decade of effort by conservationists to keep a small part of our country in the primeval state our pioneers saw. As a start the law protects 9,200,000 acres in 13 States and provides, if Congress in the future agrees, for adding another 5,500,000 acres over the next 10 years.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act was a major companion piece of legislation. This law establishes for the first time a permanent fund of $2 billion in the next decade to finance the acquisition and development of land to be used for recreation and for new wildlife refuges. The fund is derived primarily from the proceeds of the existing tax on motorboat fuels and from admission and user fees to be paid by those who use camping sites and other facilities on Government-owned land. The fund's establishment underscores the interdependence of conservation and recreation. If we as a people use common prudence, a happy balance can be struck between developing some of our outdoor areas for sports and recreation and still maintaining other areas as wilderness and as game and bird refuges.

Congress in this past year also passed the Ozark national scenic riverways bill which saved the beautiful Current River and its tributary Jacks Fork, in southern Missouri from exploitation. Another bill, just made law, established the Canyonlands National Park in the magnificent mountain country of southern Utah.

One of the many unfinished tasks is the rescue of the Indiana dunes. Their fate demonstrates the importance of timeliness in conservation. Because a previous Congress failed to intervene, the Bethlehem Steel Co. has already bulldozed and irreparably destroyed some of the most beautiful dunes, a total of 2,000 acres. If the House Interior Committee moves promptly, however, there is still time for the 88th Congress to protect the remaining dune lands.

Many men and organizations share in the credit for the accomplishments of this Congress. The late Dr. Howard Zahniser of the Wilderness Society died this year before the wilderness system which he did so much to foster finally became law. The effort in Congress was bipartisan. Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat of New Mexico, and Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, Republican of Pennsylvania, and many other Congressmen worked tirelessly on these laws. A special word of tribute should go to Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall. Among his modern predecessors only the redoubtable Harold L. Ickes equaled him in zeal and effectiveness in the cause of conservation. Secretary Udall's work in this field bestows great distinction upon the Johnson administration.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12633) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The supplemental appropriations bill, 1965.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, October 1, 1964, at 11 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 30, 1964:

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP.

The following-named persons to be members of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corp. for the terms indicated:

Frederic G. Donner, of New York, for a term from September 17, 1964, until the date of the annual meeting of the corporation in 1965.

George Meany, of Maryland, for a term from September 17, 1964, until the date of the annual meeting of the corporation in 1966.

Clark Kerr, of California, for a term from September 17, 1964, until the date of the annual meeting of the corporation in 1967.

COAST GUARD

The following members of the Coast Guard Reserve to be permanent commissioned officers in the Regular Coast Guard in the grades indicated.

To be lieutenant commander

Thomas H. Rutledge.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

James F. Hunt.
Walter N. Warschun.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenants

James G. Grunwell
Robert A. Ganse
David V. Sibila
James H. Allred

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Stephen Z. Bezuk
David G. Hickerson
Gerald W. Hohmann
Richard H. Allbritton
Frank H. Branca
Richard A. Rader
William L. Newton III
Edward R. Dohrman
Christopher E. Krusa
Richard P. Williamson
Richard J. De Rycke
Allan Jenks
Ned C. Austin
James J. Lium
Bruce L. McCartney
Larry L. Lewis
Ronald K. Brewer
Jeffrey G. Carlen
David L. Des Jardins, Jr.
Gordon E. Mills

To be ensigns

William R. Klesse
Gerald M. Ward
William S. Plank
Richard V. O'Connell
Philip L. Richardson
Ralph H. Rhudy
Walter S. Simmons
Frederick G. Pualsen
Jeffrey L. Gammon
Peter K. Reichert
Ellis G. Campbell III
Gary E. Rorvig
Bobby D. Edwards
Donald R. Rich
Marshall A. Levitan
A. David Schuldt
George M. Ensign
Richard M. Petryczanko
Clifford A. Wells
Floyd S. Ito

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Help for Narcotics Addicts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, just 2 years ago, Robert J. Driver, a resident of Solana Beach, in San Diego County, Calif., organized a group of San Diego citizens to stimulate community interest and raise the money necessary to establish a center for the treatment of drug addiction in San Diego.

Driver himself is addicted only by a desire to serve his fellowman. His family background is one of active participation in the business and social communities of the city, dynamic support of their political party and of their church.

At the time of his initial interest in the potentially heartbreaking problem of narcotics addiction, Driver was 24 years old, married to his high school sweetheart and the father of two boys. He was securely employed in an insurance corporation bearing his father's name.

A pragmatically religious man, Driver says he was motivated by an interest in the dynamics of goal-directed groups, but his subsequent involvement indicates an empathy with people and a feeling of personal obligation for their welfare.

Initial investigation of the symptoms of the disease indicated to Driver that medical, penal, sociological, and neuropsychiatric authorities were generally agreed that there could be no lasting cure.

Driver, however, heard of a group of voluntarily withdrawn addicts in Santa Monica who were successfully avoiding the use of drugs or narcotics through a program of self-administered discipline and specifically adapted group psychotherapy. This movement—calling itself "Synanon"—first came to national attention through the interest and efforts of U.S. Senator THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut.

After visiting the group's headquarters in Santa Monica, young Driver was convinced that their program, though still in its formative stage, was of conceivable value to the San Diego community.

It was then that Driver organized the Sponsors of Synanon in San Diego. His first recruits were his sister, Sandra Driver, and an assistant district attorney, Norbert Ehrenfreund.

Driver organized speaking committees within the group as it grew to contact San Diego service clubs and organizations expressing interest. At first Driver filled most of the speaking engagements himself.

Interest in the Sponsors of Synanon was faltering and erratic, but enough money was raised to secure a large house in which the addicted members of Synanon could live and work toward physical and social rehabilitation.

This was a little over 2 years ago.

Today, five houses are used for the various Synanon functions in San Diego. The group has a small fleet of vehicles donated by citizens and service groups at the suggestion of the Sponsors of Synanon. One hundred and fifty addicts are undergoing treatment in San Diego.

The Sponsors of Synanon have raised better than $40,000 a year for the last 2 years to support the program. Some of San Diego's leading citizens are now members of Driver's group, among them Mrs. C. Arnholt Smith, Frank Alessio, and Councilwoman Helen Cobb.

Early next year the Synanon members, guided by the Sponsors of Synanon, will assume the full-time operation of a profitmaking goods and services facility here. They are already engaged in a small manufacturing endeavor, working toward the goal of their founder, Chuck Dederich:

It has always been the feeling that an organization whose philosophy is based on self-reliance must one day be self-reliant.

When this self-reliance occurs in San Diego and throughout the country it will be due in large part to groups like the Sponsors of Synanon, and the dedication of people like Robert J. Driver.

The Hayward Morning News Begins Publication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure and pride that I announce the beginning of publication of a fine new newspaper in California's Ninth Congressional District. I am referring to the Hayward Morning News which will serve Hayward, Castro Valley, and southern Alameda County, and is published every day except Sunday. The publisher is Mr. Abe Kofman, one of the most distinguished publishers and businessmen of California. His talented staff includes Mort Kofman, assistant publisher, and Harre DeMoro, editor.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the newspaper is especially fortunate in obtaining the