

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:  
H. Res. 644. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Public Law 272, 88th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:  
H. Res. 645. Resolution authorizing the employment of additional personnel on the Capitol Police force by the Sergeant at Arms; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 646. Resolution authorizing the employment of four additional mail clerks by the Postmaster; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 647. Resolution authorizing the employment of five additional doormen by the Doorkeeper; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BUCKLEY:  
H.R. 10261. A bill for the relief of Nicola, Vera, Franco, and Ezio Milella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMERON:  
H.R. 10262. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CONTE:  
H.R. 10263. A bill for the relief of Karim Youssef Bou-Semaan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:  
H.R. 10264. A bill for the relief of Dr. Masashi Kawasaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:  
H.R. 10265. A bill for the relief of Chester (Abramczyk) Hill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:  
H.R. 10266. A bill to provide for the free entry of two bells for the use of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Kansas City, Kans.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEALEY:  
H.R. 10267. A bill for the relief of Joyce Zohelyn Manderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

741. By Mr. CAMERON: Petition of sundry organizations and individuals recommending the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously to President John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

742. By Mr. HANNA: Petition of Garden Grove Junior Women's Civic Club regarding nondenominational observances in all American institutions supported by public funds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

743. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Milo W. Holsveen, North Dakota State Water Commission, Bismarck, N. Dak., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting favorable consideration on the bill H.R. 3846; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

744. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting the Committee on House Administration to have published 100,000 copies of the history of the Peloponnesian War, by Thucydides, etc.; to the Committee on House Administration.

745. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to combine the pictures of the Members of Congress appearing in the pictorial Pocket Directory in the next printing

of the Congressional Directory; to the Committee on House Administration.

746. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to permanently pigeonhole, and hence defeat the bill H.R. 10181; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

747. Also, petition of Akira Okamura, Kinson, Okinawa relative to solution to pre-peace-treaty compensation problem; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 1964

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 26, 1964)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. METCALF].

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

O God, our Father, in all the confusion and perplexity of these convulsive days, our faith looks up to Thee who dost overarch our fleeting years with Thy eternity and dost undergird our weakness with Thy strength.

Standing in these epochal days in the valley of decision, strengthen our will always to choose that which is morally excellent, rather than that which is politically expedient. May we never hesitate when the choice is between honor and calculation—

"God the all-righteous One,  
Man hath defied Thee;  
Yet to eternity standeth Thy word.  
Falsehood and wrong shall not tarry  
beside Thee.

Give to us peace in our time, O Lord."

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 3, 1964, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, 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. 1153) to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 10199) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30,

1965, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 1182. An act for the relief of Willy Sapuschnin;

H.R. 1295. An act for the relief of Edith and Joseph Sharon;

H.R. 1384. An act for the relief of Areti Siozos Paidas;

H.R. 1455. An act for the relief of Ewald Johan Consen;

H.R. 1520. An act for the relief of Jozefa Trzcinska Biskup and Ivanka Stalcer Vlahovic;

H.R. 1521. An act for the relief of Lovorko Lucic;

H.R. 1723. An act for the relief of Agnese Brienza;

H.R. 1886. An act for the relief of Valerino T. Ebreo;

H.R. 4284. An act for the relief of Chrysanthos Kyriakou;

H.R. 4682. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred T. Winfield;

H.R. 5144. An act for the relief of Doyle A. Ballou;

H.R. 5617. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Renee Louise Gabrielle Huffer;

H.R. 5982. An act for the relief of Pasquale Florica;

H.R. 6092. An act for the relief of Alexander Haytko;

H.R. 6313. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Kuryj;

H.R. 6320. An act for the relief of Walter L. Mathews and others;

H.R. 7235. An act to amend sections 671 and 672 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the clerk and the marshal of the Supreme Court;

H.R. 7347. An act for the relief of Teresa Elliopoulos and Anastasia Elliopoulos;

H.R. 7821. An act for the relief of Wladyslaw Pytlak Jarosz;

H.R. 8085. An act for the relief of Roy W. Ficken;

H.R. 8322. An act for the relief of John George Kostantoyannis; and

H.R. 8507. An act for the relief of certain medical and dental officers of the Air Force.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 10199) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message

from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Rutherford M. Poats, of Virginia, to be Assistant Administrator for the Far East, Agency for International Development, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

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

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

#### UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United Nations.

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

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

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

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

#### PROTOCOL BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND GREECE, FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from a protocol with Greece on double taxation and estate taxes, transmitted to the Senate by the President of the United States today—Executive A, 88th Congress, 2d session—that the message and protocol be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

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

The message from the President is as follows:

#### *To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the protocol between the United States of America and Greece, signed at Athens on February 12, 1964, modifying and supplementing the convention of February 20, 1950, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect

to taxes on the estates of deceased persons.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the protocol.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 4, 1964.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. First, Mr. President, I must apologize to Senators whom I notified yesterday that the Burdick-Humphrey amendment on wheat would be offered and would be voted on prior to the close of yesterday's business. Of course, sometimes, circumstances develop which cause a change in the forecast; yesterday the result was that Senators who remained on the basis of the statement by the Democratic leadership that votes would be taken, found toward the end of the evening that such was not the case. For that, I assume full responsibility; and to Senators who proceeded to cancel engagements, and so forth, I offer my apologies.

However, it is the intention of the leadership—if the Senate concurs—to have the Senate remain in session until a reasonable hour tonight; that consideration and disposition will be had of the pending Williams tobacco amendment, as well as the Burdick-Humphrey amendment on wheat. There is at least one more amendment to be offered by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]; there is a very important amendment to be offered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], having to do with beef quotas; and there are also other amendments.

It would be my hope that on the basis of this statement, if it meets with the approval of the distinguished minority leader, the Senate would be prepared to remain in session until a reasonable hour this evening, so that it may get on with this measure, which is most important, and, in doing so, keep commitments—at least implied—in connection with taking up other measures in the very near future.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield? Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I must assume a large share of the responsibility for what happened in connection with the Burdick amendment.

In the first place, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota was asking for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment.

Second, I knew that a great many Senators had commitments last night. I had five, and I could not keep any of them; but I did come to the Chamber and particularly urged the Senator from North Dakota not to call up his amendment last night, since he wanted a yea-and-nay vote on it, because the situation

which would then have developed would have been embarrassing to a great many Senators. We did not know where to find them; and I had some responsibility for telling them that other amendments, noncontroversial, might be taken up, if they could be quickly disposed of.

So there was that colloquy, and such an understanding was arrived at.

I can understand the difficulty, because of the feeling which sometimes develops because of changes in plans; but I support the majority leader, and I accept my share of the responsibility for that situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am not finding fault because of what happened, because I know there was a good reason for it.

The point I make is that when the leadership makes a statement, it makes it in good faith, and Senators take the word of the leadership, and thus give up or cancel engagements which otherwise they might fulfill. Sometimes that situation becomes quite embarrassing. For example, I recall that 2 days ago the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] was on the floor, and was assured by me that amendments would be called up that day and votes would be taken. However, as the situation developed, no amendments were called up that day until late in the evening, and no votes were taken; and a very important engagement in Rhode Island which he had made 3 or 4 months ago had to "go by the board," because of the assurance I gave him.

I am trying to develop a procedure which will insure the safety of Senators and their engagements, and will also assure them that when they are told that a certain course will be followed and that the Senate will remain in session until an approximate time, they can place some reliance on the statements which are made by those of us who are charged in some degree with that responsibility.

#### AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1964—THE COTTON AND WHEAT PROGRAM

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton (and wheat) to maintain the income of cotton producers to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 449, offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

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

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

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

**CITATION OF SENATOR McCLELLAN BY THE PHILADELPHIA-CONTINENTAL CHAPTER OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION**

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 22, Washington's Birthday, February 22, Washington's Birthday was celebrated by the Philadelphia-Continental chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution. The commemorating program had as its setting exercises at Independence Hall, and the luncheon at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel. The address on this occasion was given by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], who was awarded the annual Gold Medal of Good Citizenship.

The citation to the Senator was as follows:

During your 30 years of dedicated service to the people of your home State of Arkansas and of the United States, your many distinguished contributions to the welfare and progress of this country include—

1. Improving the efficiency of Congress through your work on the Hoover Commission, leading to the adoption of many of its recommendations;
2. The enactment of the community property income tax law;
3. The exposure of corruption and tyranny in labor unions;
4. Long and constructive service on the Senate Committee on Appropriations;
5. Strong advocacy of flood prevention and development of the Nation's water resources;
6. Continuous warfare against the insidious forces of communism;
7. Untiring efforts to unmask the evils of gangsterism and corruption; and
8. Your patriotism and statesmanship and devotion to those high principles of freedom and humanity upon which this Nation was founded; principles which this society has actively sought to perpetuate—

Now therefore under the authority granted me by the board of management of the Philadelphia-Continental chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution, it is my privilege to present to you our highest award, our Gold Medal of Good Citizenship. We bestow it upon you with our sincere admiration and esteem.

HAMILTON COCHRAN,  
President.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., February 22, 1964.

At the time of the presentation our Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, paid the following tribute to the senior Senator from Arkansas:

After being related to the Senate for 20 years my appraisal of the Member of that body is not a superficial one. Out of my personal knowledge and the esteem in which he is held by his colleagues and by the Nation, may I say that in my judgment you could not have selected an American more worthy of this recognition than Senator

JOHN L. McCLELLAN. He is a true Son of the American Revolution. On the flag under which he marches against foes of America at home and abroad is the inscription the first Sons of the Revolution inscribed on their banner—"Don't tread on me."

In the herculean task of turning the searchlight on rampant evils which threaten the very life and future of the Republic this great American has rendered, and is rendering, a service of vital importance to his Nation. Without fear or favor he and his committee trace rottenness to its slimy lairs. I do not know any person in public life who more perfectly fits the frame J. G. Holland has fashioned:

"God give us men. A time like this demands Strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands;

Men whom the lust of office cannot kill;  
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;  
Men who possess opinions and a will;  
Men who have honor, men who will not lie;  
Men who can stand before a demagogue  
And damn his treacherous flattery without winking;

Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog  
In public duty and in private thinking."

And may we add that in all his attitudes and achievements he is aided and backed by his lovely lady, Mrs. McClellan.

**AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1964—THE COTTON AND WHEAT PROGRAM**

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton (and wheat), to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the pending amendment proposes to repeal the price support program for tobacco. Recently the Surgeon General issued a rather strong report condemning the use of tobacco on the basis that it was injurious to the health of American citizens. Thus we now have two contradictory programs; one agency of the Government has suggested that the use of tobacco is injurious to health while another agency of Government last year spent approximately \$40 million to support and encourage the production of this same commodity.

Why should the Government spend \$40 million annually to subsidize the production of tobacco, a commodity so strongly criticized by the Surgeon General?

In fiscal 1963 under the price support program we spent \$16,070,133. In that same year under Public Law 480, title I, we sold \$23,296,365 worth of tobacco for so-called soft currencies while we distributed another \$1,606,882 worth under title IV. Of course, as we all know, sales for soft currencies are in effect gifts to those countries. The American taxpayers are the ones who pay. Therefore, we have a total \$40,973,000 which was spent last year to support and encourage the production of tobacco, a commodity which has been declared by the Surgeon General to be injurious to the health of American citizens.

This contradictory program should be repealed. The pending amendment would not in any way restrict the use

of tobacco or interfere with its production. That is a subject which can be taken care of by the agencies on later recommendation, or by the States if they see fit. This amendment does not deal with that question. All I am suggesting is that we stop the present practice of having the U.S. Government spend \$40 million of the taxpayers' money to support a commodity which no one has said would be of benefit to the health of America but which the Surgeon General and the best medical authorities in the country have determined would be injurious to our health.

I hope that the pending amendment will be adopted.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Many other Senators from tobacco-producing States desire to be heard on this subject, and I shall speak briefly.

I cannot believe that the Senate will adopt the amendment. I am very sorry that the Senator has seen fit to offer the amendment. It is a radical approach to propose the destruction of the tobacco program, and without any consideration by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or by any other committee of Congress.

As background for my statement against his amendment, I shall discuss, first, the scope and purpose of the tobacco program; second, the report on smoking and health to which the Senator has referred; and third, I may make a few comments on the morality of the amendment because, it seems to me, the Senator from Delaware is offering the amendment as a moral amendment.

I am sure I share the position of all Members of the Senate in that I am interested in this question from two viewpoints. I am interested in it from the viewpoint of the health of our people, and admittedly, I am interested in the economic effect this amendment would have upon my State, Kentucky, and its thousands of small farmers, as well as the economy of our country.

I will speak first of the tobacco program. Tobacco is grown by approximately 750,000 farmers in 21 States of the Union, including Kentucky. It is the fifth largest cash crop among agricultural products. In export value, it stands third. Generally, our exports of tobacco are sold for cash. For example, in 1963 the total value of all tobacco exports was \$378,500,000. Only \$21,600,000 of that amount was sold, under the Public Law 480 program, for local currencies.

Several types of tobacco are produced in the 21 States in which it is grown. The largest volume of tobacco, Flue-cured tobacco, is produced in the State of my colleagues from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN and Mr. JORDAN]. The second largest tobacco crop is burley tobacco, of which my State, Kentucky, is the chief producer. Dark tobacco is also grown in many States, including Kentucky.

After I complete my statement, I shall ask to have inserted in the RECORD tables indicating the different types of tobacco produced, the States in which

they are produced, the number of allotments, and acreage of tobacco grown in each State; a table showing the value of tobacco exports, and other related information.

The Senator from Delaware has spoken of the cost of the tobacco program. I have a table, containing figures which have been published by the Department of Agriculture, which shows that, over the life of the tobacco program, since 1933, its total cost has been less than \$40 million. More than \$2 billion has been loaned by the Government—advanced to growers to support the price they receive for their tobacco at the annual auction sales—but almost all has been repaid. The total loss to the Government has been only about 2 percent of that amount, or as I have said, less than \$40 million.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not a fact that the tobacco program has worked more efficiently, with the least cost to the Government, than any other farm program in effect today?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. That fact will be admitted by anyone who knows anything about the tobacco program. The tobacco program has been the least costly of all our farm programs. There is a question whether it has cost anything at all. When one considers that over the entire life of the program the cost to the Government has been less than \$40 million, and I know that in the case of burley tobacco that cost has been on interest and has not been a loss on principal; and when one considers that tobacco has been the third crop in value so far as agricultural exports are concerned, and therefore has had a significant impact on preserving a favorable balance of trade, in gross trade; and when one considers that the crop has provided to the Federal Government more than \$2 billion a year in revenue, and an additional \$1.2 billion to the States, I doubt if it can truly be said that there has been any loss so far as the tobacco program is concerned.

In addition to the growers, many industries are concerned with tobacco. I have been informed that, directly and indirectly, about 17 million workers in this country have some part in the total tobacco industry.

What is the program that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware would abolish? He says it is a program to encourage the production of tobacco. Actually, this program—commenced in 1933, enacted in approximately its present form in 1938 and amended in 1948 and 1949—is designed to control the production of tobacco, and to provide fair prices for growers.

The tobacco program is designed to allocate acreage for tobacco production to farmers. The farmers themselves vote upon the program and accept controls. No group of farmers in the United States has been more willing, or has better demonstrated the ability to limit their own production, than the tobacco farmers.

The program also provides for Government supervision of grading, which helps to secure quality tobacco and good

tobacco, instead of cheap types of tobacco.

There is a price support factor involved. The price support, of course, is the compelling factor which encourages farmers to limit production.

In 1948, I was in the Senate for a 2-year term when the first farm program after the war was adopted, the late Senator Barkley—our former Vice President with whom I had the honor of serving in the Senate—and I introduced an amendment to the law which has prevailed ever since, and which provides for tobacco a fixed support price equal to 90 percent of parity.

There is a sound reason for this support price for tobacco. The primary use of tobacco is for smoking, with other minor purposes. It is purchased by a few companies. There is no normal market for tobacco; so it is imperative that there be a fixed price support for otherwise prices would drop to a very low level.

I am very happy about the fact that in 1948 both Democrats and Republicans joined in adopting the amendment which Senator Barkley joined with me in offering, and which has prevailed ever since.

I have spoken of the economic background of the tobacco program. I summarize by saying that it affects more than 700,000 farmers in this country, in 21 States. It is the fifth largest cash crop. It is the third crop in value of exports. The farmers themselves have policed the tobacco program very carefully. Instead of an increase in the acreage of tobacco in this country, there has been a steady reduction.

I should like to comment on the report, "Smoking and Health." I said the other day, when the Senator from Delaware submitted his amendment, that I had read the report. I spent an entire day reading it and I have studied it since.

I am not here to derogate the importance of the report. We are all interested in health and the report must be given attention. But it should be known that the Commission, under the leadership of Surgeon General Luther L. Terry, made several important declarations.

First, the report declares that its findings are not based upon new research and that the Commission examined reports and memorandums which had been prepared from past research, and that upon an evaluation of those reports and memorandums it made its findings.

The Commission also admitted that its findings were largely based upon the principle of statistical association, but it did declare that upon its estimate and judgment of statistical correlations it made the finding of causality.

The Commission further stated that at first it considered an encyclopedic approach to its studies. That is, that it would consider not only the effects of smoking but also related factors such as air pollution. The Commission later determined that it could not make such an exhaustive study. It admitted that there could be—and probably are—many other factors which have relation to the health problems the report discusses.

Among other things, the Commission stated that there were some conclusions in the report which were hard to explain; for example, that the same factors

which it thought had influence upon causation of disease in men did not have the same influence on women. It could not explain that distinction.

To show how the report has been misinterpreted, I point out that immediately after the report was filed, the news media—and I do not blame them for this, because the stories were based on a statement made by an assistant of Dr. Terry—reported that filters had no value. To the contrary, the report said that further research in filters is very important.

After the report was filed, I wrote Surgeon General Terry and asked him if it was not correct that further research was needed, particularly research on filters. He replied that my statement was correct. I stood on the floor of the Senate commenting on the report, and placed General Terry's statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

My point in speaking about the report, as I said, is not to derogate it, but to point out that the report itself makes clear that the findings are not final, and that much more research is needed.

Research is in progress.

In my own State, at the University of Kentucky, a research center on tobacco has been established, financed by the State and by Federal funds. Measures are now before Congress to provide funds for additional research.

For nearly 10 years, the tobacco industry has engaged in research at a cost of millions of dollars. Independent scientists have also engaged in much research.

I believe I am correct in saying that the report indicates that the tobacco leaf itself has no factor in it which causes or is related to the diseases which the report specified, but it is the oxidation of any vegetable matter, the inhalation of smoke, with which the report is largely concerned.

Why do I take time to talk about the report and the importance of the tobacco industry? I do so to say to the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and to other Senators, that I believe it would be a mistake, and rather arrogant on our part, to assume that we know more about this subject, and know more about what should be done, than the various commissions, agencies, and scientists engaged in the study of this question.

For example, the Special Commission which was appointed by the Surgeon General at the suggestion of the late President Kennedy, was appointed to conduct its studies in two phases.

The first phase has been completed. It involved a study of past research and produced findings based upon the study of research which had been conducted in past years.

The Surgeon General states in the introduction to the report that a second phase will be undertaken by the Public Health Service.

The second phase will be conducted by another group, to determine what steps should be taken to implement the first phase of the report. The second phase, so far as I know, has not yet commenced.

There are other measures before the Congress to determine how the report

might be implemented, but they do not suggest that the tobacco program be abolished, as does the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

I do not know what authority the Federal Trade Commission has, but at least it will hold hearings to consider measures to implement the report.

I return to my point that even considering the long studies which have been made, and which led to the report, "Smoking and Health," the Commission did not feel itself qualified, until the second phase had been undertaken, to make recommendations of any character.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield at that point?

Mr. COOPER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from Kentucky is a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I ask him if the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] was submitted to that committee and considered by its Members.

Mr. COOPER. No; it was not.

Mr. ERVIN. Therefore, there has been no opportunity to conduct an investigation into this question, and we must discuss it initially on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is absolutely correct. That is the reason I have spent some time developing the facts regarding the economic importance of tobacco and also commenting upon the report "Smoking and Health." I do not believe the offering of such an amendment can be justified.

I believe it would be wrong for the Senate to adopt such an amendment to a farm bill which has come to the Senate floor, when no careful consideration can be given to this important problem. It is wrong for us to try to pass judgment upon that subject, with all the aspects that are involved, in the kind of short debate that we can have in the Senate today.

Therefore I urge, with all my energy and strength, that the Senate not adopt the amendment.

I wish to speak for a moment on the question of morality, which, of course, is the basic reason for the offering of the amendment by my friend from Delaware. It is a subject on which many of us could have different views. It is a philosophical subject, and a religious subject.

First, even from the moral viewpoint, we would have to consider the effect of the amendment on the question of smoking and health. I can tell the Senate what the effect would be if the amendment were adopted. I do not believe it will be adopted, but if it should be adopted the tobacco program would be destroyed. The first result would be unlimited production of tobacco throughout the country. Today production is controlled and limited. If the amendment were adopted, tobacco production would mount, and the result would be cheap tobacco, at disastrous prices to our farmers.

The second result would be the end of supervision of the quality of tobacco, for Government grading would end.

Trashy tobacco would be produced. I am not talking about "trash," which is a good quality of tobacco. That is a word which is used in the trade.

Who would benefit by this amendment? The manufacturers would buy cheap tobacco. They could produce, if they desired to do so, a cheaper package of cigarettes. Even from the standpoint of the argument made by the Senator from Delaware, the effect would probably be to promote the sale of cigarettes rather than to reduce it.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. In my opinion the adoption of the amendment would increase the smoking habits of millions of people, because cigarettes would probably be produced at half price. Cigarettes would be cheaper, and a great many more people would smoke. The price of 35 cents a package prevents many people from smoking. That would not be the case if the price of a package of cigarettes were 15 cents.

If what the Senator from Delaware is trying to do is to stop people from smoking, he will not accomplish it with his amendment. He would really increase the smoking habit. Of course, that would suit us fine, so long as the support price were not taken off tobacco. He is evidently defeating the very result he wishes to bring about.

As my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] pointed out, we are members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. No question of this kind has ever been brought before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for study; nor has the subject even been suggested. It would be unwise and foolish to adopt a proposal of this magnitude without any study or hearings on it. I hope the Senate will not go into this matter blindly merely because an amendment is offered on the floor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I do not wish to take up much more time. I shall conclude very quickly. I was discussing morality, and I was saying that the effect of the amendment would be to increase the production of cheap tobacco, and that it would be a manufacturers' bill. The only group in our country which would be ground under, if the amendment were adopted, would be the 700,000 farm families who produce the tobacco.

The Senator's amendment would strike at one group, namely the growers, and impose a penalty on them. I do not believe that is right.

With all due respect, if the Senator believes that it is so important that something be done, there are two ways he could approach the matter. The more direct way of dealing with the question would be to do what was done under the prohibition amendment to the Constitution—prohibit the production, manufacture, distribution, and use of tobacco. I am not for this approach, the Senator does not propose it, and I know no one who does. The President's Commission does not recommend this; nor is it recommended by anyone else.

The second way to approach the question directly would be to remove all the taxes on tobacco. It brings about \$3.3

billion a year in Federal, State, and local taxes. If it is immoral for the Government to spend \$40 million, for price supports on tobacco, it is immoral for it to collect \$3.3 billion a year from the production of tobacco. I suggest to my dear friend that he propose an amendment to remove the excise taxes on tobacco.

At some point, after there has been sufficient debate and if my colleagues from tobacco States agree, I expect to make a motion to table the amendment, for the reasons I have given. The subject, important as it is, has not had any consideration by the Committee on Agriculture on which I serve or by any committee of Congress. Consideration of the tobacco economy must be given. The report "Smoking and Health," which I have not derogated, but which I have tried to place in its proper scope and perspective, has noted that there are other phases in the advisory committee's work which must be concluded. I believe very strongly that this amendment is an improper approach to the matter. It would strike at 700,000 farm families in 21 States, who cannot be blamed for any situation which may have arisen because of the report.

I believe the Senator will finally have to base his proposal upon the ground of the moral aspect of the Federal Government supporting a program which the Senator believes has been conclusively and finally determined, as a program which is adverse to health—although that is not correct. However, I appeal to Senators to reject the amendment. It would be ineffective; it would be unjust to tobacco farmers; it would be an attempt on our part to assert an omniscience which we certainly do not possess.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have told this story in the Senate before. I will tell it again, because it illustrates the unreliability of inferences based on statistics. An old mountaineer down in my country bought his groceries on credit. When he went to the neighborhood grocery store to pay his bill, the grocer informed him as to the amount of the bill. The old mountaineer thought it was out of proportion to what it should have been, and entered a vigorous protest. The grocer got out his account books, laid them on the counter, and said, "Here are the figures. You know, figures don't lie." The old mountaineer said, "No, figures don't lie, but liars sure do figure."

Liars are not the only ones who figure. On the contrary, honest men figure, and any man resorting to figures to prove a point can prove anything.

For example, one might say that the people of the United States smoke more cigarettes than the people of any other nation on the face of the earth. The span of life in the United States is longer than in any other land. This proves that smoking cigarettes, instead of causing death, prolongs life.

I have before me statistics which were used in a speech before the Cancer Society, with some tables used by the speaker. One table shows that if a person smokes cigarettes, he will probably

live to be some 69 years of age, and that he is far more likely to die at age 69 or thereafter if he smokes cigarettes than he is likely to die at age 50.

Let us consider, first, what economic impact the adoption of the amendment would have upon one of the leading agricultural and manufacturing activities in the United States. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] desires to abolish price supports on tobacco in order to save a possible Federal expenditure not exceeding \$40 million a year. The Senator's economics are much worse than those of the man who killed the goose that laid the golden eggs, because after the man had killed the goose, he still had the flesh of the goose to eat, even though he had lost the golden eggs of the future.

Tobacco users pay \$3.3 billion a year directly to the Federal, State, and local governments for excise taxes alone. Of this sum, approximately \$2,034 million is collected by the Federal Government in excise taxes. In addition, the Federal Government undoubtedly collects many other billions of dollars in Federal income taxes on incomes derived from the sale or the manufacture of tobacco and its products. Further, the States and the local subdivisions of those States collect many millions of dollars as ad valorem taxes upon the lands used for the growing of tobacco, upon the factories which manufacture tobacco, and upon the activities of those who sell tobacco and tobacco products.

In the United States, 750,000 farm families obtain their bread, in whole or in part, by growing tobacco; 96,000 persons obtain bread for themselves and their families by working in the plants which process tobacco. We have had sad experience with this subject in the past, prior to the establishment of the program for tobacco which the amendment would abolish. We saw that those engaged in the growing of tobacco were usually in a state of extreme depression. Prior to the establishment of this program, their homes were sold by the thousands, under foreclosures of mortgages. If the amendment were adopted, it would not only have a tendency to deprive the Federal Government of a substantial part of the \$2 billion in excise taxes the Federal Government collects upon tobacco products, and of decreasing in a substantial manner the excise taxes of more than a billion dollars paid to States and local subdivisions of States upon such products, but it would result in the virtual bankruptcy of thousands of tobacco growers. It would do more to bring depression upon this country than any other single amendment that could be offered in the Senate or adopted by Congress. All of this would be done for the purpose of saving about \$40 million a year.

I respectfully submit that the Senator from Delaware is being penny wise and pound foolish in offering an amendment of this nature.

Let us consider the question of whether we are going to accept a condemnation of tobacco upon a report issued by some physicians who, according to the picture which appeared in a contemporary tele-

cast, were sitting in a smoke-filled room, at the time they considered the report. The picture revealed that at least one-third of them were smoking cigarettes and another third were smoking pipes or cigars at the time they approved the report. Evidently they had read the statistics used by the speaker before the Cancer Society which indicated that a cigarette smoker is more likely to live to the age of some 69 years rather than to die prior to that time.

As the Senator from Kentucky so well pointed out, the report was not based on research by the members of the committee; instead, it was based on statistics gathered here, there, and yonder. The same statistics have been considered by other physicians, who, in many cases, had drawn different inferences from them.

Before I mention the conclusions which other men have drawn from these statistics, I should like to corroborate the statement made by the able and distinguished Senator from Kentucky, to the effect that in the report of the committee it was admitted that the conclusions were far from established, but that, on the contrary, they constituted, at the most, inferences drawn from statistics.

Other men had considered these statistics, and had drawn different conclusions from them.

I hold in my hand a copy of the Cancer Bulletin for May and June 1963, in which it is said that some important medical statisticians do not subscribe to the theory that there is any causal relationship between smoking and lung cancer. This issue of the bulletin contained an article by Dr. Joseph Berkson, whom the bulletin calls the acknowledged dean of American medical statisticians. The bulletin states that Dr. Berkson holds both an M.D. degree and a doctor of science degree, and has served as head of the Division of Biometric and Medical Statistics of the Mayo Clinic, for many years and as a professor in the medical faculty at the University of Minnesota since 1932, and is a member of numerous statistical societies. The bulletin declares that Dr. Berkson's opinion is important, and recommends that the readers of the magazine consider the other side of the coin, by reading what Dr. Berkson had to say.

In his article in the May-June 1963 issue of the Cancer Bulletin, Dr. Berkson sets forth in lucid language his conviction that the theory that there is a causal connection between smoking and lung cancer has not been proved by the available data.

The article tells of Dr. Berkson's experience and study in this field and of his analysis of the available statistical information. It points out that some of this statistical information merely indicates, at the worst, that death from lung cancer among those who regularly smoke cigarettes is only 13½ percent greater than among nonsmokers. In other words, this particular statistical data simply indicates that for 100 nonsmokers who die of lung cancer, 113½ cigarette smokers die of lung cancer. Dr. Berkson asserts that in his opinion and that of others this difference in the incidence of death was due to the differ-

ence between the constitutions of the smokers of cigarettes and the constitutions of the nonsmokers of cigarettes involved in the data.

I have studied the report of the Committee. In my opinion, it does not give proper consideration to many very significant factors. Many physicians and medical statisticians concerned with research in cancer state, in effect, that there is no real basis for the conclusion that lung cancer is on the increase. Dr. Berkson points to investigations made by a distinguished British physician in this field, a Dr. Ellis, as I recall his name. Dr. Ellis investigated the vital statistic records of London, which antedate by many years the vital statistic records in the United States. Such investigation led Dr. Ellis and others to reach the conclusion, based upon this study of the vital statistics records of London, that before the present methods of diagnosing lung cancer evolved, a large percentage of those whose death was attributed to pulmonary tuberculosis had actually died of lung cancer.

Other studies in this field indicate that since the medical profession has learned to arrest tuberculosis and prolong the lives of those who would otherwise have died from this dreaded disease of former days, many deaths from lung cancer occur in later years among those having arrested cases of tuberculosis.

These researches suggest that although medical science is able to arrest active cases of tuberculosis in multitudes of persons, these persons often have tubercular scars, and that in subsequent years they die of lung cancer which forms at the tubercular scars, regardless of whether they smoke or do not smoke.

These researches also indicate that smoking is often beneficial to persons of nervous temperament who have arrested cases of tuberculosis in that smokers are more likely than nonsmokers to escape a recurrence of the disease in active form as a result of the relaxation which smoking affords.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me? The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to his colleague?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I am very glad my colleague has brought out that point; I think he is highly correct in doing so.

We realize that only a few years ago, practically every county in the United States had a tubercular sanatorium. Now such sanatoriums are practically extinct; but a great many persons have been cured in them, and millions of those persons are still living. When they leave the sanatoriums, they have tubercular scars.

Furthermore, as my colleague has said, in the past, many cases were diagnosed as consumption or tuberculosis, whereas no doubt many of those persons had lung cancer, and no doubt many persons who actually died of lung cancer were said to have died of tuberculosis.

Until a few years ago I never heard of lung cancer to any great extent. It is

something new. I believe it has been overplayed badly, or else the medical profession has defined what it is in contrast to what we used to know about it.

Mr. ERVIN. I have the highest respect for doctors. I do not believe, however, that they can tell us what causes cancer in virtually any area. I doubt whether the medical profession can really tell us what cancer is, much less what causes it. I make that statement with all due respect to the medical profession.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I dislike to see anyone charge lung cancer in the United States to smoking cigarettes or tobacco of any description. I happen to know of three people who died of lung cancer who never in their lives smoked. I was sitting in the Chamber thinking about the subject.

Mr. ERVIN. I also know a number of persons who would answer to that description.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. They had never smoked in their lives. One was violently opposed to tobacco in any form.

Mr. ERVIN. When I hear people talking about our sins and what they do to us, I am reminded of the story of a prominent citizen who lived to be 96 years of age. On his 96th birthday the newspapers sent their reporters out to interview him. One of them asked, "To what do you attribute your long life?"

The old man replied, "I attribute it to the fact that I have never taken a drink of an alcoholic beverage or smoked a cigarette in all my days."

At that moment they heard a noise in an adjoining room that sounded like a combined earthquake and cyclone. One of the newspaper reporters said, "Good Lord, what is that?"

The old man said, "That is my old daddy in there on one of his periodic drunks."

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

Mr. ERVIN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I invite attention to the statement made by the Senator from North Carolina about the favorable effects of smoking. I know that some may smile at that suggestion. But I mention the subject to advert to the point I made a few minutes ago that people have not read the report.

In the report is a section upon the favorable effects of smoking. It proves again that people have made judgments on the basis of the report which are not justified. The amendment, which is based upon a report which is not complete, points out further reasons why the conclusion is premature.

Mr. ERVIN. In illustration of what the Senator from Kentucky has said, I invite attention to Rudyard Kipling's poem "The Betrothed," in which, in poetic language, he said:

And the gloom of my bachelor days is flecked with the cherry light stumps that I burned to Friendship, and pleasure, and work, and fight.

He stated this truth in this poem, which described in jesting guise a man's controversy with his sweetheart, Maggie,

who wanted him to give up smoking. The man made this oft-quoted assertion:

And a woman is only a woman, but a good cigar is a smoke.

I believe that if my good friend the Senator from Delaware would read a little poetry and get a little bit of romance in his soul, he would come to the conclusion that there is a great deal of pleasure and a great deal of good in smoking.

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

Mr. ERVIN. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. WALTERS. I ask the distinguished Senator from North Carolina if the Senate does not have before it a bill pertaining to agriculture; and if health bills ought not to be considered at a different time.

Mr. ERVIN. I agree with the able and distinguished Senator from Tennessee in his observation. This is not the time or the place for an amendment of the character proposed. The purpose of the bill is to promote agriculture, and not to drive it into bankruptcy. Thousands of farmers who engage in agriculture would be plunged into bankruptcy if this amendment were adopted.

Mr. WALTERS. I ask the distinguished Senator if in the Appalachian areas of West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and North Carolina there are not many small farmers whose only cash income results from their tobacco crop.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator is absolutely correct. Many people in the States which he has named, and particularly in the mountainous areas of those States, could not buy shoes for their children if it were not for the money they obtain from the sale of the burley tobacco which they grow on small acreage allotments.

Mr. WALTERS. That is about the only cash income that they have.

Mr. ERVIN. It is the only way they have to get money.

Mr. WALTERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ERVIN. Many factors that must be considered to reach a correct conclusion have been omitted from the data underlying the report. For example, those who have studied the question have found that there are more deaths from lung cancer in congested urban areas than there are in rural areas. We all know that in congested urban areas carbon monoxide is injected into the air, and noxious vapors and fumes are emitted from manufacturing plants of one kind or another. What is the relationship, if any, between these things and lung cancer? What is the relationship, if any, between diet and cancer? What is the relationship, if any, between scores of other factors and cancer? The report does not tell us. Many things must be evaluated by research before a reliable conclusion can be reached.

At one time doctors noted that in areas of the country in which the people ate a great quantity of corn or corn products pellagra was widespread. Instead of conducting research—as ought to be done in the case of tobacco—the doctors said, "Pellagra is caused by eating corn." That was a public statement of position made at that time. That is what the

departments of health stated. Some doctors refused to accept this apparently obvious conclusion and insisted that there should be research into the question of the diet of people suffering with pellagra. As a result of the research that followed it was found that pellagra was not caused by eating corn but, on the contrary, it was caused by not eating green vegetables containing niacin. Yet those who had assumed the original medical position based their assertion that pellagra was caused by eating corn on statistics as reliable as the data on which the report of the Surgeon General's Committee was based. I make this statement because I have read about everything I could find on the subject that is available to me.

For a long time doctors noticed that people who suffered from malaria lived in the neighborhood of swamps. So they came to the conclusion that the decomposition of vegetable matters in swamps caused bad air or miasma. So to the disease was given the name "malaria," which was derived from two Latin words which mean "bad air." Publicly, in committee meetings, and in medical conventions the doctors declared with absolute assurance that malaria was caused by breathing bad air generated in swamps by the decomposition of vegetable matter. Later research demonstrated that there is no relationship whatever between malaria and breathing bad air generated in swamps. It revealed that malaria is caused by the bite of a female anopheles mosquito which has previously bitten an infected person.

As the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, the report does not purport to be conclusive; it suggests that further research is needed.

Some time ago the Wall Street Journal published an editorial in which it was stated:

The fact is that nobody has yet proved any case against cigarettes to our satisfaction. We'd suppose that cigarettes are bad for some people and not for others, but much the same statement may be made about crossing the street.

We do think, though, that until there is conclusive proof one way or another the State health departments would be wise to restrict their endeavors to research and stay out of the missionary campaign business.

Let me refer once again to the article by Dr. Joseph Berkson, who was described by the Cancer Bulletin itself as the acknowledged dean of American medical statisticians. Dr. Berkson stated that a relatively short time ago he was in London, where there was a symposium on this question attended by him and one of the physicians connected with the U.S. Public Health Service. After the symposium ended, Dr. Berkson put this question to a distinguished British medical statistician:

Really now, all semantics and subtleties aside, what do you think?

He got this reply:  
We are not within a thousand miles of understanding the explanation of these complicated findings.

Dr. Berkson adds:  
That is the opinion of the distinguished English statistician, and it is equally the

opinion of this undistinguished American statistician.

Then he puts in this footnote at that point:

Personally, all relevant available facts considered, I think it very doubtful that smoking causes lung cancer.

That is the statement of a man who has studied all these data. That is the statement of a man who is a statistician at the Mayo Clinic. That is the statement of a man who is a professor at the School of Medicine at the University of Minnesota.

His statement can be multiplied by the statements of other physicians.

The U.S. Public Health Service should adopt the advice contained in the editorial from the Wall Street Journal and confine its activities in this field to conducting research, and should not attempt to enter into the missionary campaign business.

I yield the floor.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, although I have every respect for the integrity of the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware and his motives for introducing this amendment, I think the amendment might best be called "the poverty amendment." It might logically be considered as the converse of the President's antipoverty program. Certainly that is what it would mean to the tobacco producers of this country if it were adopted and the tobacco price-support program eliminated.

Let us take a look at the tobacco industry, particularly from the producers' standpoint, and see just who would be affected if this amendment were adopted.

Including tenants, approximately 700,000 farm families depend upon tobacco for their principal cash income.

There are some 570,000 farm allotments for tobacco in the United States at present, and there were some 1,195,700 acres planted last year.

The average acreage per farm, however, is only 2.1 acres. Therefore, it is easy to see that we are talking about the little man when we look at who is being protected by the tobacco price-support program. By way of contrast, the principal tobacco buyers can be counted on the fingers of one hand.

Farmers receive about \$1.3 billion a year for their tobacco, and consumers spend approximately \$8 billion a year for tobacco products.

Federal, State, and local taxes on tobacco products amount to about \$3.3 billion a year.

Tobacco is our fourth largest agricultural export commodity and it makes a substantial contribution to our balance of payments, since most tobacco exports are sold for cash.

The tobacco price support program which we are discussing has been in existence from some 18 years and has proved to be one of the most successful of any of the farm commodity support programs—past or present. Since its inception, the U.S. Government has loaned \$2.3 billion to producer cooperatives in support prices to tobacco growers. The losses on the principal during those 18 years amounted to only about 2

percent, and this loss was due mostly to off-quality tobacco in the 1955 and 1956 crop years.

During the last year or two, there has been some surplus problem, and as a result the producers will take a 10-percent acreage reduction for the upcoming crop year.

This 10-percent acreage reduction will strike a severe economic blow at the farmers who are among the lowest per capita income people in America. Their acreage allotment amounts to only 2.1 acres throughout the entire United States.

I think the tobacco producers have demonstrated their willingness to take the necessary steps to keep supplies within demand so that a sound price support program can be carried out.

I do not wish to enter into the tobacco-health controversy, but irrespective of how this issue is resolved, I think we will have a very substantial tobacco industry in this country for many years to come. As long as this is the case, I do not think that anything will be accomplished by taking away the price support program which has worked so well in the past and which helps provide the livelihood for so many people in this country.

This amendment has not been considered by any committee. No hearings that I know of have been held on it by any legislative committee of the Congress.

I hope the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware will be overwhelmingly rejected.

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

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from Georgia just mentioned the impact this amendment might have on our balance-of-payments problem. According to information which I have, more than 28 percent of the tobacco leaf sold in the free world market in 1963 came from the United States, and it was worth \$405 million. In addition, cigarettes which were exported from the United States to other countries were valued at more than \$105 million. If this is true—and I have no reason to doubt its accuracy—if the exports were abolished there would be an impact of more than \$500 million on our balance-of-payments problem.

Mr. TALMADGE. I have not checked the figures in detail, as has the Senator from North Carolina, but tobacco is our fourth largest export commodity; and the amendment would have a tremendously adverse effect on our dollar deficit, which is already, in my judgment, one of the most serious and perplexing problems that is facing our Nation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator has pointed out that 700,000 farmers are engaged in the production of tobacco, and that the average acreage on those farms is approximately 2 acres; is that correct?

Mr. TALMADGE. It is 2.1 acres.

Mr. COOPER. And the effect of this amendment, if adopted, as so many Sen-

ators have argued, would be to crush the tobacco farmer?

Mr. TALMADGE. It would be a poverty program. It would crush those farmers, who receive the smallest income of any group in the country today.

Mr. COOPER. As the Senator has so wisely pointed out, it would have little or no effect on the consumption of tobacco.

Mr. TALMADGE. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. And it would have no effect upon the report, "Smoking and Health."

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I suggest as another aspect of the income of the tobacco farmer, that on a package of cigarettes the Federal excise tax represents 8 cents of the cost of the package. The farmer's share of that package of cigarettes is approximately 4 cents.

Mr. TALMADGE. It is much less than the excise tax.

Mr. COOPER. And the work of the tobacco farmer that goes into that package of cigarettes represents approximately 1 year.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator also spoke about our exports and their importance to the balance of payments. I believe it is valuable in two aspects: First, as to volume, with respect to which I believe the United States is either third or fourth—

Mr. TALMADGE. Tobacco is the fourth largest export of an agricultural commodity.

Mr. COOPER. It was \$378,500,000 last year. And a small percentage went into Public Law 480.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator from Delaware himself stated that Public Law 480 sales were either 16 or 23 million, I have forgotten which, but it was infinitesimal. Virtually all exported tobacco is sold for dollars, which contributes substantially to our dollar income.

Mr. COOPER. We are all agreed that a healthy tobacco economy is important to the country as well as to the farmers. Both the Senator from Georgia and I agree that the amendment would have no effect upon the report "Smoking and Health" to which the Senator from Delaware has addressed himself.

Mr. TALMADGE. It would have no effect on the problem of health, but it would have a disastrous effect on the problem of income to the small tobacco farmer.

I thank the able Senator from Kentucky for his contribution to this debate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my senior colleague from North Carolina, as well as the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Georgia. They have all presented very fine and most effective facts. I believe the facts presented completely do away with any reason why anyone should want to vote for the amendment that is before the Senate today.

However, I should like to comment briefly. I do not believe it is necessary



to speak at length on the subject. The only reason I wish to speak at all upon it is that tobacco is a vital part of the economy of the United States. It is particularly vital to the State of North Carolina.

North Carolina raises more tobacco than any other State in the Union. It is our No. 1 cash crop. There are more than half a million tobacco farmers in North Carolina who earn approximately \$500 million in income. It does not take into account the fertilizer dealers who manufacture and sell fertilizer. Tobacco is a crop that requires a great deal of fertilization. It is planted usually in sandy soil and requires a heavy fertilization. So that puts many people to work and provides additional income from that source.

In addition, tobacco planting and harvesting machinery is expensive, as well as the tractors and other types of machinery that are needed. Tobacco production provides a livelihood for the entire economy of the area which is devoted to the growing of tobacco. Practically every county in the State of North Carolina raises some tobacco—of course, more in the eastern and central part of the State than in the west, but the southeast grows fine burley tobacco which is used extensively in pipe-smoking tobacco as well as in cigars and cigarettes.

As has been pointed out most forcefully by Senators who have discussed this subject, tobacco is one crop that is grown in small allotments. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Kentucky if I am not correct that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] pointed out that most tobacco farms are about 2½ acres in size?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Of course, there are some tobacco farms that are larger than that.

Mr. COOPER. Many tobacco farms have allotments smaller than 2½ acres.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Some tobacco farms are as small as half an acre. Do I understand correctly?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct—even smaller.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Even smaller than that.

Mr. COOPER. Most tobacco is grown on small allotments of less than 1 acre—at least in Kentucky.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That indicates why there are 700,000 tobacco farmers. The acreage would have to be small, distributed among that number.

Tobacco is the cash livelihood of a great many farmers. As the Senator from Georgia has pointed out, they would be completely dependent on the so-called war on poverty bill that the President has talked about lately, if anything happened to destroy their livelihood.

More people are employed in manufacturing tobacco in North Carolina than in any other State of the Union. Tobacco companies in the State I represent have done a magnificent job in manufacturing tobacco, in advertising it and selling it, not only to America, but all

over the world. They pay a good price for tobacco. Tobacco is sold at auction. Tobacco companies go into the tobacco markets and bid for the tobacco. The tobacco companies buy all the best tobacco they can get, and it brings considerably above the support price; which indicates that the tobacco companies are not out to buy cheap tobacco. They wish to buy only good tobacco and are willing to pay a good price for it.

Another fact about tobacco companies is that they have long been cognizant of the fact that tobacco has been accused of many things of which it should not have been accused, such as causing lung cancer and other diseases. Tobacco has been accused of doing a great many things which have not yet been proved.

The tobacco companies have spent millions of dollars in research. I ask the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] if I am not correct in that statement.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. Approximately \$10 million has been spent, or will be spent.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. In addition, this year they have initiated a program to spend another \$10 million to find ways of producing cigarettes, cigars, and smoking tobacco—but largely cigarettes—with the removal of anything that can be proved to be injurious. Most of the claims are directed against smoking cigarettes. Most of the tobacco that is grown is used in the manufacture of cigarettes.

The tobacco companies have not been unaware of the fact that cigarette smoking has been accused of being the reason for causing a great many things, particularly lung cancer, and they are desirous of finding out whether or not that is true.

Instead of doing away with tobacco, which the amendment of the Senator from Delaware proposes to do—and which it is absolutely certain would break the tobacco farmer—if those who have been zealous in issuing reports on the dangers of smoking and its effects on the human body would spend a little more time and a little more money in research to find out if there is anything harmful in tobacco. If such existed, I am sure it could be eliminated through continued research. The Senator from Kentucky knows as well as I do that the nicotine content in tobacco can be raised or lowered by techniques in breeding the plant.

Mr. COOPER. For many years many people considered nicotine in tobacco to be very harmful. Yet the report to which I have referred makes the statement that nicotine has no harmful effect so far as the diseases that have been mentioned are concerned. This shows how continuing research removes some of the ideas that have been held in the past, and how much it offers for the future.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It shows what great differences exist among scientists. My senior colleague from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is fond of telling humorous stories on the floor. One of his stories concerns the man who became ill and sent for a doctor. Apparently the doctor did not get to his bedside fast enough, so he sent for

another doctor. As it happened, both doctors showed up at the same time. That did not make either doctor very happy. So they said, "One of us will get on one side of the bed and the other on the other side and we will reach under the covers and feel the patient's pulse."

That is what they did. However, when they reached under the covers, they took hold of each other's wrists, one said "Mumps," and the other said, "Pneumonia." [Laughter.]

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

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the Senator heard the story of the doctor who was examining a patient. He thought the patient had pneumonia, and said he could not do anything for the patient if he had pneumonia.

The family said, "Why is that?"

The doctor said, "I am not an expert on pneumonia. If you can throw this fellow into fits, I know how to cure them."

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The smoking problem is throwing a great many people into fits.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, if I were permitted to tell a story at this point, I would tell the one about the doctor and the lawyer who got into a heated argument on the question of whose profession was the more ennobling. As is usually true, the more these two men argued, the angrier they became with each other. Finally, the doctor said to the lawyer, "You have to admit that practicing law does not make angels out of men."

The lawyer said, "No; we leave that to the doctors."

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It has been forcefully brought out in the debate that tobacco that is exported has a great value. One-third of the entire crop of tobacco grown in the United States is exported. That brings the tobacco farmer about \$450 million a year. That does not take into account cigarettes, chewing, and smoking tobacco, cigars, and other things that are manufactured from tobacco.

It has already been brought out that more than \$3 billion is collected every year in taxes on cigarettes and other tobacco products.

Much of this debate reminds me of what happened a few years ago in the State so ably represented by the distinguished Senator from Delaware, when the Du Pont Co. brought out nylon, one of the finest products ever made. However, it was found that it gave many women a rash; it caused them to break out in a rash from wearing nylon stockings. Some resourceful manufacturer made some nylon diapers, and they gave babies diaper rash. Mr. President, it was not decided to destroy the Du Pont Co., or to put them out of business. Du Pont went to work on research and removed the chemical or whatever it was that was causing the rash. Du Pont was not put out of business. The percentage of people in the United States who get lung cancer is still very small.

My senior colleague from North Carolina pointed out that people are living longer than they ever did. As one prominent doctor said:

Something will have to kill them. Old age will not get them all. They have to die of something. If doctors cannot kill them, old age will.

Therefore we cannot blame all of it on smoking.

I hope the Senate will vote against the amendment. I do not understand how it would do anyone any good, but I can see how it could do thousands of people a great deal of harm, depriving them of their livelihood. We have enough problems with poverty now, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] pointed out a while ago, without adding to the problem.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO LIMIT DEBATE ON WILLIAMS AMENDMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to discuss the situation relating to this amendment with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and with Senators who are speaking in opposition. However, a number of our colleagues are at the White House at this moment in a very important discussion on another commodity; namely, wool, and will not return to the Chamber for some time.

I wonder whether a unanimous-consent agreement could be made, setting the amendment aside, with the understanding that debate would be resumed on it at 2:30 p.m., with 10 minutes of debate allowed on each side following the resumption of the debate.

I inquire of the Senator from Delaware if that meets with his pleasure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is agreeable to me. As the Senator says, several of our colleagues are downtown on official business. His suggestion is perfectly acceptable to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest that the distinguished acting majority leader set the time as near to 2:30 as possible. My understanding is that our colleagues are engaged in a rather extended conference at the White House. Quite a number of Senators are participating in that conference. If the Senator will set 2:30 as the beginning—

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to set 2:30 as the starting time. Then there would be at least 20 minutes of debate before the vote. Before the vote there would be a quorum call, and that would bring about a vote at 3 o'clock.

Mr. COOPER. I suggest that it be made at 3 o'clock, with 15 minutes to a side.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well; 15 minutes of debate on each side.

I ask unanimous consent that the Williams amendment be laid aside, that discussion of it be resumed at 2:30 p.m., and that there be 15 minutes of debate on each side. That will bring a vote at 3 o'clock.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the Williams amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, No. 447, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 30, line 4, after the word "not" it is proposed to insert "less than 65 per centum or".

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, on the amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the proposed legislation before the Senate today is a voluntary wheat production control bill. Farmers who are willing to control their production would receive certain price supports. Farmers who did not care to participate would not receive the benefits of the bill.

The supports for H.R. 6196 are based in two categories. One category is for certificates for grain consumed domestically. The other is for certificates for export grain.

From page 29 of the bill, line 22, I read the definition of price support certificates for domestic consumption:

(1) Price support for wheat accompanied by domestic certificates shall be at such level not less than 65 per centum or more than 90 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines appropriate, taking into consideration the factors specified in section 401(b).

In subsection 2 at the top of page 30, the following language appears:

(2) Price support for wheat accompanied by export certificates shall be at such level not more than 90 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines appropriate, taking into consideration the factors specified in section 401(b).

In other words, the parity range for domestic wheat is between 65 and 90 percent, but the parity range for export wheat is from 0 to 90 percent.

For more than 25 years, Congress has adhered to the principle that there should be some parity floor—at least for wheat. I consider this proposal to remove the floor for export wheat a very serious matter.

Records show that domestic consumption is about 500 million bushels a year. I believe the exported wheat this year will be in excess of 700 million bushels. Therefore, the greater portion of the farmers' production will find its way into the export market.

I have no idea of what the Secretary will do about this provision. It has been informally announced that Secretary Freeman intends to permit a 25-cent export certificate payment. That seems to be common knowledge in the Chamber. However, under the language of the bill there need be no floor at all.

This is the first time in 25 years that no floor has been provided for a substantial portion of the farmers' production.

The amendment is simple. It would make subsection 2, which appears at the top of page 30, read the same as subsection 1, which appears at the bottom of page 29.

If the amendment were adopted, the language would be the same. In other words, wheat for domestic consumption would be at the parity range of 65 to 90 percent of parity. Wheat used for export would be in the same parity range, 65 to 90 percent. That does not mean that the Secretary would have to use the same price for domestic wheat as for export shipments, but it does mean that there would be a floor for both categories.

The Secretary might set a higher price for domestic consumption than for export shipments. However, all this amendment would do—and I think it is necessary—would be to put a parity floor under the portion of the wheat sold for export as well as the portion of the wheat used domestically.

In my area, farmers would take a loss under the bill. Having supported farm bills and farm legislation for the past 25 years, I feel that the amendment would provide an important protection, an important safeguard, to give the farmer a parity floor, even though it be only 65 percent of parity.

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

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. I know the Senator from North Dakota is aware of this fact. However, he just suggested that if the bill passes, the wheat farmers will take a loss. I assume the Senator is referring to a loss from their 1963 income. Is it not true that if we do nothing at all, if we fail to pass the bill, the farmers will not only take a loss, but a loss some \$450 million greater than the loss they will be faced with if the bill is passed? The bill now before the Senate, even without the Senator's amendment, would prevent a drop in the income of wheat farmers of approximately \$450 million. Is that not correct?

Mr. BURDICK. The Senator is absolutely correct. If some legislation is not passed by Congress, there will be a precipitous drop. I would expect the price of wheat to drop to \$1.25 or \$1.30. There would be a \$600 million loss to the farmers. We must prevent that by all means. The point I am making is that the bill, which I hope to support, would involve a drop in prices to the farmer, a drop in income compared with the 1963 bill. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes.

Mr. BURDICK. If no legislation is enacted, there will be a steep drop. This is more a matter of the protection of principle than of income. If my amendment were adopted, 65 percent of parity at the present time would be around \$1.63, which would amount to about 8 cents in excess of what I understand the certificate level would be. It would add some income to the farmers. It would

add about \$40 million in income, but it would place a security floor under the price of wheat, and would not constitute a departure from legislation that has been on the books for the past many years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am very happy to be associated with the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] on this amendment. We submitted it on March 2, as a very much needed improvement in the bill as reported from the committee.

The pending wheat bill differs from the previous wheat legislation in at least two important respects: First, this bill is voluntary, not mandatory; second, the bill has provision for two types of certificates. One would be for the domestic production of 500 million bushels; the other would be the so-called export certificate for the share of the crop that moves into the export markets. The value of the certificate for the domestic portion of the wheat production would be 70 cents; I believe that is about the figure which has been announced. So the amendment would make it possible, at a world price of a little more than \$1.30 a bushel, to have \$2 wheat for the portion of the crop which is customarily utilized in the domestic market. The value of the certificate which is to be applied to the so-called export wheat would be approximately 25 cents. We do not need to be too greatly concerned about that value, because under the International Wheat Agreement, which I believe will run for another 3 years, there is a minimum of 25 cents which we have to pay in order to participate in the International Wheat Agreement.

The point I seek to make is that in previous legislation involving a certificate as a means of compensation or a type of payment to the wheat producer, there has been only one certificate—a sort of balanced certificate, which covered all the production up to a certain bushelage. I believe last year it was 1 billion bushels, under the mandatory wheat program.

Under our proposal there would be twin certificates—one for the domestic portion of the wheat production; the other for the export portion—with a price differential of 70 cents for domestic use and 25 cents for export.

The Senator from North Dakota has spoken principally of the so-called price support scale—from 0 to 90 percent for the so-called export wheat, and from 65 to 90 percent for the domestic, rather than primarily the effect of the certificates on income.

I see no reason why there should not be a floor under the price support schedule for export wheat, as in the case for domestic wheat. I am not asking that the price be the same, even though I think that argument could be amply justified; but I am asking that the power of discretion which is extended to the Department of Agriculture and to the Secretary of Agriculture be limited.

The present Secretary of Agriculture is exceedingly able. He comes from my State, and he is a personal friend and a longtime political associate of mine. I have faith and trust in him, and I know

he will do what is right. I do not speak in criticism of him in any way. When I have criticism of him, I speak to him personally. However, if I have criticism of a policy or a program, I speak of it here in the Senate or from a public platform.

But we are not legislating for the present administration or for any particular Secretary of Agriculture. Instead, we are legislating for an agricultural program; and I have attempted to maintain a policy of consistency in connection with these matters.

As a U.S. Senator, I strongly resisted the efforts of the previous Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, to establish a flexible price support schedule of 0 to 90 percent. I said, "No." Again, that is not a matter of trust; it is only a matter of denying complete discretion to any administrative officer—in this instance, the Secretary of Agriculture.

I came to Congress opposed to the whole concept of flexible price supports. However, things have changed greatly: Production has changed; marketing has changed; economic conditions have changed. And one must make changes in his thinking, in light of those obvious changes. However, I do not think one needs to go from one end of the scale to the other, when the changes which have occurred do not necessitate that.

Therefore, this amendment, No. 447, which is sponsored by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] and myself, and which I submitted on March 2, merely provides that on page 30, in line 4, after the word "not", there be inserted the words "less than 65 per centum or", so that that portion of the bill would read as follows:

(2) Price support for wheat accompanied by export certificates shall be at such level not less than 65 per centum or more than 90 per centum of the parity price—

And so forth. This is standard legislative policy. I know the argument against the amendment will be, "but we do not intend to have the Secretary of Agriculture lower those supports to disastrously low levels. We must trust the Secretary. He has given us his word. We have the testimony before the House committee and we have the testimony before the Senate committee, and we can rely on the Secretary."

I agree that we can rely on Secretary Freeman. But suppose there comes a time when he no longer holds that position—perhaps because something happened to him or because he moved to another position—or for any one of a dozen other reasons, with the result that someone else took that position.

Furthermore, this legislation is to apply for 2 years. If it were to be similar to the cotton legislation, this measure should apply for 4 years. However, it is a 2-year measure; and since we are dealing with legislation which goes beyond the immediate present, I believe we should have written into the law a protection which I do not think anyone will deny would be helpful.

I realize that there is another reason for opposing the amendment. The first legitimate argument will be that the amendment is not needed. It will be

said, "We know what the export certificate will be, and we know that the Secretary of Agriculture under this administration would never lower the supports to 40 percent or 30 percent or 20 percent or even 50 percent of parity."

Mr. President, I can accept that on face; but I point out that when we write laws we should not put all our emphasis on the concept of faith and trust. Instead, we should also have a written law.

The other argument is that if the price support is from 65 percent to 90 percent of parity—as is the price support on the domestic certificates—the cost to the Government will be great, and it might amount to as much as \$35 million or \$40 million, largely depending on what the world price is. It is very difficult to calculate these matters exactly, but we know that very likely the world price will be higher, because there is a heavy demand on the wheat stocks, and therefore the cost of the certificate is always less.

The estimates which have been made are based on a world price of around \$1.30 a bushel. It is my view that that world price will go up. There is every reason to believe that it will go up, causing a shortage of supply in many areas of the world.

The other day I pointed out that on a world basis we have only 2 months' wheat in reserve, not 2 years supply. That is a dangerously low level.

We would very much like to see the export section of the bill receive the same treatment as the domestic section. The cost may be an additional \$35 million or \$40 million. I believe it will be less, but I am willing to go along with that figure. That means that the additional income would go to the farmer. He would spend it. He would use it. He would put it to productive use.

Someone may tell us, "The proposal would violate the budget estimates."

I am cognizant of the budget estimates. I wish to respect those budget estimates. But every provision in the bill is based upon certain calculations that are rather uncertain—weather, projected production, acreage, world market conditions, and a host of other uncertainties—but they are sufficiently certain to give us some reasonable estimate of what will happen.

We can paint a picture that we cannot calculate or to which we cannot look ahead with some degree of certainty. But again we are proposing a program for the good of the farm producer. The export certificate will mean money in the bank. It will mean help to the farmer. It will ultimately mean help to the Government, because if a farmer can make a profit, or at least remain in business and by some other activities make a profit, he will pay taxes. If he does not, he will go out of business, and he will pay no taxes. So I join with the Senator from North Dakota in strongly recommending the proposed legislation.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the senior Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the statements that have been made by the acting majority leader, the

Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the sponsor of the amendment, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], in which they have proposed to establish a base on export certificates from 65 to 90 percent. On at least one or two occasions during the debate I have said that I was not satisfied with the income that would result from the pending wheat bill. The proposal would add \$45 million, or thereabouts, to the \$440 million, or \$450 million, which would be helpful. I believe Secretary Freeman stated that this year the farmers stood to lose \$600 million from the reduction of wheat prices. I sincerely hope that the amendment will meet with the approval of the Senate. It would be helpful in assuring farmers a fair share of our national income. Farmers are entitled to it. That is all they are asking. We are now offered an opportunity to be helpful. I hope the amendment will be accepted by the sponsor of the proposed legislation, and adopted by the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the senior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by my colleague from North Dakota. I prefer to see no export subsidy, but full parity for domestic consumption by way of wheat certificates. But applied to the pending bill, as the amendment would be, the proposal would represent an improvement. It would increase farm income. I believe it is one of the most important things that we could do today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota.

I fully recognize the position of the committee and the Senator in charge of the bill; namely, that many amendments have been submitted, and if we start opening the book, so to speak, we do not know where the process will stop.

With all due respect, I wish to say in respect to that argument—and I think I have looked into most of the amendments—that the amendment before the Senate would not be troublesome. It is an amendment that I am confident would be accepted in the other body, because a year ago the other body proposed such a provision in the law. I believe it is an amendment to which no one in the administration could object. I make that statement most respectfully, because the position taken has been a traditional administration position.

I believe the provision of 0 to 90 was inserted in the bill inadvertently. I believe there is some basis of fact to justify that conclusion. The difference between the price support levels about which we are talking is 5 points of parity. The wheat certificate at 25 cents amounts to 60 percent of parity. We are talking about 62½ percent of parity. That is what the bill contemplates. I am merely asking my warm-hearted, reasonable, fairminded, enlightened, pro-

gressive-minded, humanitarian friends in the Senate—and, of course, that includes all Senators—to accept that little extra.

More importantly, I think the point that needs to be made is that we would have a floor below which we would not drop. The International Wheat Agreement requires us to pay the 25 cents, so we have to pay 62½ percent under the IWA. But I think we ought to write the provision into the law.

If it was good enough for Eisenhower and Ezra, it is good enough for Orville and Johnson. I make that statement will all respect. One should not speak in such light vein about distinguished public servants, but I stood in the back row too many years getting after Mr. Benson when he tried to advocate a provision for 0 to 90. I can remember my good friends on the Republican side of the aisle standing shoulder to shoulder with me, even when they had to break with their own administration. I feel now that I would look rather like one adopting a role of political expediency if I did not say that what was good for the Republican goose is now good for the Democratic gander. We must keep agricultural terms in this situation.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator from Minnesota has convinced me. As the Senator will recall, I have been voting against all the other amendments offered, remaining with the bill as proposed. But I will vote for the 2½ percent increase.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is only a tiny increase.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Only a tiny increase.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sorry that the Chamber is not filled with fine, enlightened Senators who would join with my enlightened friend from South Carolina. Since I have his vote, I shall yield the floor, for otherwise I may lose it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] had a very concise answer to the "bread tax" charge against the wheat provisions of H.R. 6196 which was published in today's issue of the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### TAXING FLOUR USERS

The "bread tax" or "flour tax" charge leveled against the wheat certificate plan in a letter on March 1 is based on an erroneous, first paragraph assumption that "this tax of course will be passed on to consumers." The certificate plan will actually recapture a prospective windfall to middlemen.

Wheat has been bringing the farmers around \$2 per bushel at the farm. Unless new legislation is enacted, price support for wheat will drop to \$1.26 per bushel on July 1, involving a loss of about 75 cents per bushel in farm income, or \$600 million.

When the "No" vote triumphed in the wheat referendum last May, creating the prospect of the big drop in wheat value, both the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal interviewed bakery officials and reported that there would be no reduction in

the price of bread. The bakers pointed out that the cost of wheat in a 21-cent pound loaf of bread is only 2½ cents and said that the decline in cost of such a minor factor in total bread price would not bring consumer savings.

The wheat certificate plan now before the U.S. Senate, at which Sunday's letter to the editor was aimed, provides that when wheat price support drops to \$1.26 to \$1.30 per bushel, farmers shall also get a certificate worth 70 cents per bushel which millers must have when they process wheat into food. This will maintain the present \$2 per bushel return to farmers on wheat used in food products. It will maintain the present wheat-bread price relationship and not impose an additional cost.

The following chart (not printed in the RECORD) prepared for me by the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service shows how wheat prices have fallen since 1947-49 from an index value of 100 to about 91. In the same period bakery product prices have climbed from 100 to an index of 144. There has been a tremendous widening of the farm-consumer price spread on wheat foods. The certificate plan only forestalls another great jump in that spread.

I have a bona fide concern about the plight of less fortunate citizens, including the farmers who have net incomes of only 55 percent of the national average per capita income. If it is possible to prevent a \$350 million further decline in farm income from wheat used in bakery products without injury to consumers—as the certificate proposal will do in relation to domestic food wheat—we should adopt the preventative.

GEORGE MCGOVERN,  
Senator From South Dakota.

WASHINGTON.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I hope that, when the time comes, the Senate will see fit to adopt the amendment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his kind words. I especially appreciate them because two of my warmest—long-time friends have put me in a very difficult position today. I know they did not intend to do so. What they have done today is the same thing that they have always done. That is to fight for a stronger farm program. The distinguished assistant majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], knows that for as long as I have been in public life, he has been a great inspiration to me, not only on the subject of agriculture, but on a good many programs that I think are designed to create a better America. The same thing is true of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]. He is always out in front, particularly on legislation that would affect the great wheat-producing area which, in part, he represents.

But those Senators also know that the committee held long and careful deliberations to reach a judgment on the kind of bill we thought it was possible to pass in time to be effective for the 1964 crop. There is not very much time left. This bill should have been enacted a week ago to give farmers sufficient time to make their plans. The planting season is on us now. It is not something off in the future. The spring planting season is with us right now; every day of delay on this bill decreases the chances of its being effective for the 1964 crop.

So, along with most of the members of our committee, I reached a judgment

some time ago that we could not accept any significant amendment to the bill that might increase the dangers of controversy, particularly in the other body.

The legislation which I introduced last July, providing for a voluntary certificate plan which the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] cosponsored, and which the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] also cosponsored, provided for a single certificate, set at about 70 cents, which would have given the producers about \$2 per bushel for both domestic and export wheat. That was a stronger bill than even the bill as it is proposed to be amended by the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from North Dakota.

They are attempting to restore the bill a little closer to the level which we proposed last July.

The bill as originally introduced would have prevented all of the predicted \$600 million drop in farm income. That legislation was considered by the administration, by the Budget Bureau, by the White House, and by the Department of Agriculture. Hearings were held before the Subcommittee on Wheat in the House of Representatives. On the basis of those deliberations, a judgment was reached that the export certificate could not be higher than 25 cents a bushel and still stay within the budget guidelines laid down by the President and the administration.

The House committee also added another provision, which limited the amount of export certificates to 500 million bushels of wheat.

When we took up the proposal in the Senate committee, a serious effort was made in the committee to restore the single certificate formula. It was established there beyond any doubt that we could not accomplish that result within the committee.

After that effort was made, we successfully struck out the 500 million bushel limitation on certificates for export wheat. So there is no limitation on the number of certificates the Secretary of Agriculture may issue for export wheat short of the actual amount exported.

If we assume that exports are going to be about 700 million bushels this year, as the Department predicts, it means, in effect, that we have added to the Secretary's authority to issue certificates for 200 million bushels of export wheat beyond what was provided in the House bill, the so-called Purcell bill. That in itself adds another \$50 million increase in income for the wheat farmers of the Nation.

As a result of the committee's action we now have before us a bill that would prevent a drop of approximately \$450 million. This is what it would save the wheat farmers of the United States.

If we added the amendment suggested by the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Minnesota, it would probably add another \$50 million, both to the cost of the program and to the income of the wheat farmer.

I would like to see that happen. It would still be below the level of what I

proposed in the original bill and urged in the committee. But I am convinced that if we begin to accept amendments of this type to the committee bill, no matter how desirable they may seem to be, if we accept the amendment on wheat, the golden eagle amendment, the tobacco amendment, and all the other proposals offered here, we shall end up with no wheat legislation in 1964.

It is not at all clear in my mind that we have time even yet to pass this bill in time to protect farm income from this year's crop.

Much as I would like to accept the proposal, I, speaking only as one Member of the Senate, shall vote against any amendment that I see as a possible delaying amendment. I know that the Senators did not offer the amendment with any idea of delaying the bill, but I am afraid that if this amendment is successful and the bill goes to the House with an amendment or amendments of this kind, no matter how desirable they may seem to be, we shall find a decrease in the chance of passing the bill in time to affect the 1964 crop.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. The bill as it has been reported by the committee would result in a considerable saving to the Federal Government over the cost of the program in 1963; would it not?

Mr. MCGOVERN. That is correct. It would save several hundred million dollars over the 1963 program—probably \$300 million.

Mr. BURDICK. Is that the precise figure?

Mr. MCGOVERN. It is pretty close to \$300 million, as against the cost of the program now in effect.

Mr. BURDICK. When we compute the additional cost which may result from this amendment, we get a figure of about \$40 million. In other words, if the amendment were adopted, the program would still cost \$260 million less than last year's program.

Mr. MCGOVERN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from South Dakota is very fine. I can well understand his position. If there ever was a time when I did not want to be in opposition to one of my colleagues, it is now. I am not in opposition, really. I understand his predicament as the Senator in charge of the bill. In making this statement, I hope I shall be considered as acting as an individual Senator, and not as majority leader, and in this sense trying to muster votes to save the bill as reported by the committee in this particular form.

The Senator understands this very well. The bill which the Senator from South Dakota has presented to us is a good bill. It is an improvement over the existing situation. As we said some time ago, it is not as good as the Senator from South Dakota or the Senator from North Dakota or the Senator from Minnesota would have liked it to be, but it is a sound, constructive bill.

My main interest is to remove from the bill the idea of zero to 90 percent of parity. I do not like that kind of legislation. I recognize that one could approach the problem by adjusting the parity rates so as to result in a floor at least better than zero to 90 percent. The reason for the suggestion of 65 to 90 percent is that it is on the domestic certificate, and it provides a little better income protection.

I know the argument about budget estimates. I want to respect as much as I can the budget estimates. But those budget estimates are being violated every day, not necessarily by increases to any extent, but by decreases in expenditures and appropriations, which are desirable.

I have no evidence that the other House will reject the bill because of this type of amendment. Amendments could be added to the bill which would cripple it. Because of that fact, some of us who have strong feelings about the matter have withheld such amendments, or have offered them only for discussion, and then withdrawn them. I have done so in a couple of instances, even though I thought they would not have caused any real embarrassment in the other House. I shall say nothing more.

Mr. President, let me first yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] and then I will yield to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. MCGOVERN. I give the Senator from Minnesota my assurance that if the committee bill passes with the language as the bill now stands, I will join the Senator from North Dakota and other Senators in doing everything I can to persuade the Secretary of Agriculture to use the flexibility and authority that he would possess under the bill to set the export certificate as high as is feasible and as high as we reasonably can. It is a 90-percent ceiling, and we should not forget that fact. The 25-percent export certificate is not made compulsory. The Secretary can make it more.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Theoretically, the Secretary of Agriculture has the power to set certificates at a much higher level than 25 cents. I would be more than happy to join the Senator from Minnesota and whatever support we can muster to accomplish the establishment of a higher export certificate value by administrative action.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senator from South Dakota made note of the authority in the bill and the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. This debate should not be interpreted as denying the Secretary the authority to set those export certificates at whatever price he deems wise, prudent, and reasonable, taking into consideration our obligations under the International Wheat Agreement. That does provide, in a sense, a floor for at least the next 2 years.

I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. After that, if there is no further debate, I believe we are ready to vote on the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator from New Jersey will withhold for a moment, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am glad to withhold.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I did not hear all of the debate—

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from South Dakota did very well.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am certain he did. The reason for more flexibility was to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to fix the support price so as to conform with the President's budget.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have complete faith in the distinguished Senator from Minnesota—I mean the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. How about the Senator from Minnesota; does the Senator have any faith in him?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course I do. I am certain that the Secretary of Agriculture will use his discretion wisely, and I am certain that since it is his belief that the income of the wheat growers should be raised to some extent, he will give them all that the traffic will bear.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. The Senator has been such a good teacher to me on these price support ratios that it is difficult for me to go down to zero when the Senator from Louisiana always used to make it not less than 75 percent. I have "capsized" down to 65 percent, but I cannot see myself going far down the scale.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]. 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.

Mr. McNAMARA (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote

"yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 60, as follows:

[Leg. No. 56]

YEAS—30

Aiken	Gruening	Metcalf
Allott	Hruska	Morse
Bartlett	Humphrey	Moss
Burdick	Jackson	Mundt
Carlson	Johnston	Nelson
Church	Kuchel	Pearson
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Proxmire
Curtis	Magnuson	Symington
Dominick	Mansfield	Yarborough
Douglas	McGee	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—60

Anderson	Hart	Pastore
Bayh	Hartke	Pell
Beall	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Bennett	Hill	Ribicoff
Bible	Holland	Robertson
Boggs	Inouye	Russell
Brewster	Javits	Saltonstall
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Simpson
Cannon	Keating	Smathers
Case	Kennedy	Smith
Clark	Long, La.	Sparkman
Dirksen	McClellan	Stennis
Dodd	McGovern	Talmadge
Eastland	McIntyre	Thurmond
Ellender	Mechem	Tower
Engle	Miller	Walters
Ervin	Morton	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Muskie	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Neuberger	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—10

Cotton	Hayden	Monroney
Edmondson	Lausche	Randolph
Goldwater	McCarthy	
Gore	McNamara	

So the Burdick-Humphrey amendment was rejected.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators AIKEN, ALLOTT, CARLSON, CURTIS, DOMINICK, HICKENLOOPER, HOLLAND, JORDAN of Idaho, KUCHEL, MECHEM, MILLER, MUNDT, PEARSON, SIMPSON, TOWER, EDMONDSON, MCGEE, SMATHERS, CANNON, BIBLE, and GOLDWATER, I call up amendment No. 434 to H.R. 6196, an act to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, after line 13 it is proposed to add the following new title:

TITLE III—IMPORT QUOTAS ON CERTAIN LIVESTOCK AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS

SEC. 301. (a) The total quantities of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef, veal, mutton, and lamb which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during any period of twelve months shall not exceed the average annual quantities of such products imported into the United States during the five-year period ending on December 31, 1962: *Provided*, That for the year beginning January 1, 1965, and for any year thereafter, the President by proclamation may provide for an increase in such quota by a percentage not greater than the percentage increase in estimated population of the United States over the estimated population for 1964.

(b) The annual quota for the unexpired portion of the calendar year in which this title becomes effective shall be a quantity

equal to such average annual quantity reduced by an amount equal to one-twelfth thereof for each calendar month or part thereof that has expired in such year prior to the effective date of this title.

SEC. 302. Whenever the President determines that the imposition of import quotas on cattle or sheep, or on any products thereof other than those referred to in section 301, is necessary in order to maintain reasonable prices on cattle or sheep, or on beef, veal, mutton or lamb products, he is authorized to issue a proclamation prescribing the total quantities of such cattle, sheep, or products which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the period or periods specified in such proclamation, and the total quantities so entered or withdrawn during such period or periods shall not exceed the quantities so prescribed.

SEC. 303. The President is authorized to allocate any quota imposed by or pursuant to this Act among exporting countries on the basis of the amounts supplied by such countries during a previous representative period or periods, or upon such other basis as he may deem to be fair and reasonable.

SEC. 304. This title shall take effect as soon as practicable on a date to be specified by the President in a notice to the Secretary of the Treasury following such negotiations as may be necessary to effect a modification or termination of any international obligation of the United States with which the amendment might conflict, but in any event not later than sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Hruska amendment be temporarily set aside; that I may offer an amendment; and that after my amendment has been disposed of, the consideration of the Hruska amendment may be resumed.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 452, which is offered on behalf of myself, my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, but that the amendment 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 a new title as follows:

"TITLE III—ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON REVISION OF FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL LAWS AND PROGRAMS

"Declaration of policy and purpose

"SEC. 301. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to promote the effective utilization of the agricultural production of the United States so that (1) the markets for United States agricultural commodities, insofar as possible, will be competitive in the markets for such commodities in the world, (2) the present and future requirements for such agricultural commodities in the United States and the world can be fully met, (3) the interests of taxpayers and consumers may be fairly safeguarded, and (4) the producers of agricultural commodities in the United States will receive a return on their investment and labor commensurate with their contribution to the national welfare. It is further declared to be the policy of the Congress to promote programs recognizing the necessity for consumers in this country to be assured an adequate supply of agricultural commodities of the best possible quality and at the

lowest possible prices. It is, therefore, the purpose of this title to provide for a study and investigation of the Federal laws and programs pertaining to agriculture with a view to revising and modernizing such laws and programs in order to achieve the policies stated above.

"SEC. 302. In order to achieve the purpose set forth in section 301 of this title there is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Revision of Federal Agricultural Laws and Programs (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission').

*"Membership of the Commission"*

"SEC. 303. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of twelve members as follows:

"(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life.

"(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life.

"(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

"(b) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—Of each class of two members mentioned in subsection (a), not more than one member shall be from each of the two major political parties.

"(c) VACANCIES.—Vacancies in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

*"Organization of the Commission"*

"SEC. 304. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

*"Quorum"*

"SEC. 305. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

*"Compensation of members of the Commission"*

"SEC. 306. (a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(b) MEMBERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—Any member of the Commission who is in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate salary not exceeding \$22,500; and he shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(c) MEMBERS FROM PRIVATE LIFE.—The members from private life shall each receive not exceeding \$75 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

*"Staff of the Commission"*

"SEC. 307. The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

*"Expenses of the Commission"*

"SEC. 308. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

*"Expiration of the Commission"*

"SEC. 309. Sixty days after the submission to Congress of the report provided for in section 310(b), the Commission shall cease to exist.

*"Duties of the Commission"*

"SEC. 310. (a) INVESTIGATION.—The Commission shall make a comprehensive study and investigation of all Federal laws and programs pertaining to agriculture with a view to revising and modernizing such laws and programs to achieve the aims set forth in section 301 of this title. In carrying out such study and investigation the Commission shall consider such matters relating to agriculture as it deems necessary or appropriate, but shall specifically consider, with regard to the various agricultural commodities produced in the various regions of the United States, (1) effectiveness of price support and production controls, including acreage allotments and production and marketing quotas, which may be in effect for such commodities, (2) the future requirements of the United States and the world for such commodities, (3) suitable uses for land which may not be needed at the present time for the production of such commodities, but which may be needed for such purpose in the future, (4) methods for effectively coordinating domestic agricultural policies with the export opportunities for such commodities, (5) the effective utilization of such commodities in support of our foreign policies, (6) the problems of rural economic opportunity in the United States, and (7) the national requirements for stockpiling of strategic agricultural commodities. The Commission shall also give particular attention to the formulation of programs to facilitate the economic adjustment of agricultural producers who decide to transfer to other occupations. Such programs may include, but shall not be limited to, retraining programs, relocation allowances, assistance in obtaining alternative employment opportunities, early retirement, and provision for minimum compensation for land, dwellings, and equipment which such producers no longer want or need.

"(b) REPORT.—The Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress on or before February 1, 1965, and may submit interim reports prior thereto.

*"Powers of the Commission"*

"SEC. 311. (a) (1) HEARINGS.—The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out its functions and duties, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee may deem advisable. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman or Vice Chairman, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, or such member.

"(2) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued under paragraph (1) of this subsection, any district court of the United States or the United States court of any possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is being carried on or within the jurisdiction of which the person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Attorney General of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or a subcommittee thereof, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or

there to give testimony touching the matter under inquiry; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

"(b) OFFICIAL DATA.—Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions under this title."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the amendment provides for the appointment of a Hoover-type commission to give consideration to basic questions affecting this country's agricultural policy. The amendment was discussed last night by me and by my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] in connection with an amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], which the Senator from Minnesota withdrew.

I should like to address a question directly to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER], who is always most generous about affording hearings to Senators who have a serious interest in bills. In view of the fact that quite a number of Senators are interested, would he feel disposed to grant a hearing at a propitious time on legislation which has been introduced, to establish such a commission? I am hopeful that it may be quite soon. The committee might then give the proposal the considered judgment which I believe it deserves.

I should like to take a minute, pending the arrival of the Senators who have cosponsored the amendment with me, to explain the amendment.

The Commission sought to be appointed under this amendment is a Hoover-type commission consisting of 12 members. It is proposed that there be members from the executive branch, Members from the House of Representatives and the Senate, and members from public life, who, we assume, would include those deeply concerned with questions of agriculture. I emphasize the term "Hoover-type commission," because the idea would be quite outside the normal operation of the great Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which, of course, considers these matters constantly; the Department of Agriculture, which has this subject under constant consideration; and other agencies of the Government, such as the Council of Economic Advisers, which deal with economic policy. Further, it is proposed to take the matter out of the normal channel in which it would generally be confined, where we believe in great sincerity there is a tendency, because the situation is so complex and so difficult, to continue programs in accord with agricultural philosophy of the Nation now incorporated in existing agricultural legislation.

It is proposed to take the subject out of that jurisdiction and entrust it to a representative group for the purpose of seeing whether new answers can be provided.

The amendment which is before the Senate proposes that we consider present

and future requirements for agricultural commodities in the United States and in the world, determine whether and how best they can be fully met. The amendment also endeavors to deal with the whole problem of the shift of the farmer from the farm to the city. As we all know, this represents a great development over what is occurring in a world with a diminished farm population. There is a necessity for economic adjustment for the farmer who may desire to shift to another sector of the economy.

The junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] are now in the Chamber. They have introduced bills to the same effect. So has Senator HUMPHREY, who dealt with the subject last night.

I ask the chairman of the committee whether, in pursuance of his usual generous practice, he feels that he could provide for a hearing on these measures—my own, introduced with my colleague [Mr. KEATING] and Senators TOWER and BEALL, and measures introduced by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]—at some appropriate time which would fit in with the other work of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can give that assurance, provided the hearings on the measures referred can fit in with the other work of the committee; and I understand that is the course contemplated.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly so.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under those circumstances, I would be glad to have the hearings held as soon as possible.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the Senator from New York will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. I expect to do so.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. In conversations with the Senator from Minnesota, he suggested—and I think it will be in the general interest—that some of us confer on his proposal and on our proposal, and endeavor to reach a common ground of agreement as to the desirable thing to do, so that when we come before the Senator's committee, all of us will be of approximately one mind.

Mr. ELLENDER. That would be very helpful. If the proponents of these amendments and the proponents of the bill reach such an agreement as to what should be done, that will be very helpful to the committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I also express my appreciation to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his remarks. I shall certainly seek to do what he has suggested. I hope the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] will join us in the effort to arrive at a common bill.

At this time I express my appreciation to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] for his courtesy.

I now withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New York is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 434

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, my pending amendment (No. 434) would impose quotas on imports of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef, veal, mutton, and lamb at a level equal to the average imports of these products during the 5-year period 1958 through 1962. The quota would be a global quota; that is, it would not be divided among the countries supplying us; but the amendment does contain the authority for the President to allocate the quota among those countries—Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, Mexico, Argentina, and so on—in his discretion.

My proposal would also incorporate a growth factor for these foreign supplying countries, in the form of authority for the President to permit imports to increase at a rate equal to our increase in population, which means 1.5 percent per year or thereabouts. The amendment also authorizes the President to impose quotas on imports of these meats in other forms, or on the live animals, in case such quotas are necessary, in his best judgment in order to maintain a reasonable price structure on meat or on livestock.

For example, if supplies of meat excluded by the quotas were to be canned abroad and if an attempt were made to bring it in as canned beef in order to evade the limitations of the quota on fresh and frozen beef, the amendment gives the President authority to prevent such a trend by the use of any such loophole.

The proposed amendment would provide for imports in 1964 of about 540 million pounds—product weight—of fresh, chilled, and frozen beef and veal, in addition to quantities of mutton and lamb. This 540 million pounds would stand as against some 920 million pounds—product weight—of fresh, chilled, and frozen beef and veal, plus uncertain quantities of mutton and lamb, which would come in under the general pattern set by the Australia-New Zealand agreements if it were applied to all other countries shipping meat to us.

In other words, under this amendment the comparison would be between 540 million pounds, product weight, and 920 million pounds, under the formula established in the Australia and New Zealand agreements, if the same formula were applied to all other countries which export beef to the United States.

Mr. President, I am very unhappy to report that the Australia-New Zealand pattern has already been broken by the agreement with Ireland. In the Irish agreement we have already agreed to an upward modification of that agreement—in the form of a quota for Irish beef and veal about 4 percent above the record high level of 1963. Imports from Ireland were 71 million pounds in 1962,

and 73 million pounds in 1963, but are to be 76 million pounds in 1964 and greater quantities in subsequent years.

This is a rather odd development, because in the announcements made jointly by the State Department and the Department of Agriculture when the Australian and New Zealand agreements were disclosed, one of the chief points made in those releases was that this is a rollback of approximately 6.4 percent from the high level of 1963, inasmuch as the imports in the years 1962 and 1963 were averaged, and the average was used as a base for the Australian and New Zealand agreements.

Curiously enough, when a meeting was held in Shenandoah, Iowa, only the day before yesterday—March 2—after a telegram had been sent to our Secretary of State, asking him to participate in the meeting, he sent, in reply, a telegram in which he expressed his regrets; and he stated, further, that the recently negotiated voluntary agreements with Australia and New Zealand would cut back even the imports this year. I do not have before me the text of the telegram; however, I have a general idea that the reporter for the New York Times, Donald Janssen, would have set forth the further fact, if it were a fact, that in the telegram it was also stated that the agreement with Ireland was not a rollback and was not a reduction from last year's imports, but that under it there was an increase. Certainly if that were the case, it would have been set forth, because that would have been very significant.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Can the Senator from Nebraska state whether the agreement with Ireland has the same defect that the Australian and New Zealand agreements have? The Senator from Nebraska will recall that the agreements with Australia and New Zealand exempt from the application of the agreements canned and cured beef exports. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is my understanding. I understand that except as to quantities, the tenor of the agreement with Ireland is generally the same as those reached with Australia and New Zealand.

Mr. MILLER. The defect in the Australian-New Zealand agreement to which I referred is that whereas the agreement exempts from application of the agreement canned and cured items, when it came to computing the base—namely, the 1962-63 average of imports—the negotiators forgot to take out canned and cured items.

Mr. HRUSKA. On that score the Senator from Nebraska is not informed. I would be happy to defer to the judgment of the Senator from Iowa if he made research on that particular point.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa made research on that item at the time that the Australian-New Zealand agreement came out. I was, of course, curious in determining how the agreement



would apply with respect to the major problem, which, of course, is chilled, fresh, and frozen veal, beef, and mutton. On its face the agreement provides that the average for 1962-63 of imports will be the limitation for 1964. But when the 1962-63 figures are used, we find that they used all the figures of all the imports, whereas they should have used only the figures of chilled fresh and frozen beef and veal for 1962 and 1963. So in order to get a higher base for chilled fresh and frozen beef, veal, and mutton, they go to the 1962-63 import totals for chilled, fresh, frozen, canned, and cured beef, veal, and mutton as well.

Mr. HRUSKA. Establishing thereby a higher base on which to set import limitations.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is correct. Then they turned around, "having their cake and eating it, too," by providing that the agreement would not even cover canned and cured items. As the Senator from Nebraska has pointed out, the press release issued on the agreement indicated that there would be a 6-percent reduction on imports. That might be true if we should take the 1962-63 average and should make that the 1964 quota, because that would be indeed 6 percent under 1963. But the agreement exempts canned and cured items. So all our friends from Australia and New Zealand have to do is to comply with the agreement and cut back their chilled, fresh, and frozen imports to us by 6 percent from 1963, and then make up the difference, and make it up many times over, in canned and cured items. I am afraid that many people have not had that fact brought to their attention.

In view of the criticism that a number of us made of this defect that was in the Australian-New Zealand agreement, what I was concerned about was whether, in the face of that agreement—and certainly in the face of having it brought to the attention of the administration—they went right ahead and negotiated an agreement with Ireland with the same defect in it—namely, using the 1962-63 average of all imports, including canned and cured items—and then turned around and exempted canned and cured items from the coverage of the agreement.

I was hoping that possibly my friend from Nebraska would know whether that was done.

Mr. HRUSKA. The poundage in the Irish agreement is roughly 34,000 long tons. That comes to about 76 million pounds. The agreement is limited to beef and veal, fresh, frozen, and chilled.

Mr. MILLER. So canned and cured items are exempt all over again.

Mr. HRUSKA. Canned and cured items are not included in the 76 million pounds that are permitted. When I say that there is a 4 percent increase over the levels of 1963, I make the statement on the basis that in 1963 the imports from Ireland were about 73 million pounds in fresh, chilled, and frozen beef. Of course, Ireland would therefore actually have permission to import into

America a larger quantity by some 3 million pounds than it did in 1963.

Mr. MILLER. Of chilled, fresh, and frozen.

Mr. HRUSKA. Of chilled, fresh, and frozen; that is correct.

Mr. MILLER. They can compound that amount by exporting canned and cured items, which are exempt under the agreement.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLER. I thank my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. PEARSON. I understood the Senator to say that the amendment was global in nature. The Senator also referred to the recently executed Australia-New Zealand agreement, and also to the agreement with Ireland.

I invite his attention to the fact that it is my understanding that the tax on export of beef in Mexico has recently been cut by 50 percent. Is there a series of agreements with various potential or existing exporters into this country? Does the Senator know whether we have an agreement with Mexico?

Mr. HRUSKA. There is no agreement with Mexico. It is my understanding that one is in the process of being negotiated, but at the present time we do not have any agreement limiting imports from Mexico. There are only three such agreements in existence. They are all under section 204 of the Agricultural Act as amended.

Mr. PEARSON. But the amendment is global in nature.

Mr. HRUSKA. The amendment is global in nature in the sense that there is an average of the years 1958 to 1962, inclusive. The average imports in this area are the important limitations in beef and veal, and beef and veal products. The total of imports is to be divided among the countries which export to America under a formula that will be devised and signed by the President of the United States.

Mr. PEARSON. That would be within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture or the President?

Mr. HRUSKA. The President would do it. He may assign the duty to the Secretary of Agriculture, but I doubt it very much, because the Secretary of Agriculture has been frozen out of most of the negotiations that have taken place. The State Department has represented our Nation in the making of those agreements. We do not know who has represented the American people in the negotiations in the sense that the farmers are highly dissatisfied with it—not only cattle raisers and cattle feeders, but farmers generally, as I shall point out later. They are asking the question as to who, in the negotiations with Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland, represented American agriculture and the American economy.

It will be up to the President to choose whomsoever he wishes for the purpose of devising this allocation of the import total among the number of countries

which are importing beef and veal into this country.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. The Senator referred to the fact that there are three existing agreements.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PEARSON. If the Senator's amendment, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, were adopted by the Congress and is enacted into law, what effect would that have on the existing agreements with the three or four nations mentioned?

Mr. HRUSKA. I would expect the law to supersede the agreements. I would hope that it would supersede them. I do not know what entanglements our country has gotten into by reason of having made an executive agreement of that kind. However, the agreement is cancellable at the wish of either party upon 6 month's notice, as I remember the terms of the contract. But I would hope that if the elected representatives of the people of our Nation should work their will on the subject in such a way as to result in enactment of the amendment into law, it would be enforced as such.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from Kansas for bringing out the point to which he has referred.

Mr. President, the meeting on March 2 to which I referred was attended by approximately 5,000 cattle feeders. That will give some indication. The organization is a voluntary organization. It is a voluntary Cattle Industry Committee for Legislative Action. It is not a formal arrangement, but it is a sort of ad hoc arrangement, and comes about because of the great hue and cry, on a justifiable basis, by all farm folk because of the beef import situation.

Getting back to the business of the pattern which would result in the import of some 920 million pounds in product weight under the pattern set by Australia and New Zealand, and its violation by the treaty with Ireland, the additional poundage of 3 million awarded to Ireland is not important in itself, but if a pattern is set of granting quotas 4 percent higher than in 1963, other countries, such as Mexico, with whom we are negotiating, may demand the same treatment. Australia and New Zealand may demand that we go back and renegotiate the agreements they have just made. If that should happen, if the Australia and New Zealand quotas and all other quotas were to be placed on a basis of 4 percent above actual imports in 1963, it would mean total imports in 1964 from all countries of over 1,000 million pounds of beef and veal. Of course, that figure would be contrasted with 920 million pounds, product weight, we have figured under the Australia and New Zealand formula.

The quotas proposed in the Hruska amendment are not unreasonably low or restrictive. They represent a moderate cutback—not nearly as much of a cutback as most of my mail has suggested. It is not nearly as much as the cutback

that was suggested at a meeting held in Shenandoah, Iowa, by the Cattle Industry Committee for Legislative Action. For example, the National Livestock Feeders Association recommended quotas on the basis of imports in 1960. That was on the same basis as recommended at Shenandoah, Iowa. It would be much lower than I have suggested.

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

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa is also among those who recommended that the 5-percent-of-domestic-production figure be used, which would be based on the 1960 figure. The idea behind that recommendation was that it would be a percentage limitation; that as our own domestic consumption grew, the 5 percent would remain the same, but the poundage within the 5 percent would grow, so that Australia, New Zealand, and other exporting countries could share in the increased domestic consumption of the United States.

I joined my friend from Nebraska in this amendment because I believed that, basically, the same approach was used. While I recognize that the average of 1958 to 1962 was a little higher than the 1960 figure, still I felt it was a practicable one and one which most of our livestock people could live with.

If the Senator from Nebraska will permit, I should like to go back to what was referred to a moment ago in connection with the agreement with Ireland. With respect to the agreement with Ireland, I notice in the Department of State press release dated February 25, 1964, No. 84, on page 3, a statement with respect to the text of Ireland's note to the United States. It reads as follows:

The Government of Ireland shall limit exports from Ireland to the United States upon the understanding that Ireland will not be adversely affected by such limitation in relation to the position of other substantial suppliers in the U.S. market and so long as Ireland's access to the U.S. market for beef and veal is not limited by an increase in the duties on these products.

I find that this recital by the Government of Ireland is identical with the recital by the Government of Australia, which is set forth in Department of State press release, dated February 17, No. 66. On page 3 it states:

Australia undertakes to limit its exports to the United States upon the understanding that Australia will not be adversely affected by such limitations in relation to the position of other substantial suppliers in the U.S. market and so long as Australia's access to the U.S. market for beef, veal, and mutton is not limited by an increase in the duties on these products.

This recital is identical with the recital by the Government of Ireland, except the recital by the Government of Ireland does not refer to mutton.

I am wondering now if the recital of the Government of Australia does not mean that, as a result of the more favorable treatment given to Ireland, Australia will be in a position to call off the application of this agreement.

Mr. HRUSKA. If there is in fact a violation, and if there is in fact a pref-

erence given to Ireland over Australia, conceivably that could be ground for rescission or denunciation of the treaty or agreement. I assume the State Department would be in the best position to tell us whether or not the bases used in the Australian and the Ireland agreements are the same.

Mr. MILLER. As I understood the Senator from Nebraska, in 1964 the Government of Ireland will increase its exports to the United States.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct. I do not know whether the formula by which they arrived at the increase of 3 million pounds of fresh, frozen, and chilled beef was based only on those products, or whether it included, as the Senator has suggested, other products. If the latter is true, and if that same formula was used as the basis for the formula contained in the Australian and New Zealand agreements, there will be no preferential treatment; but whatever the agreement means, Ireland will be authorized in 1964 to bring in 3 million pounds more than it exported into the United States in 1963.

Mr. MILLER. And the result would be that the position of Australia with respect to exports to the United States was adversely affected, because it would then be obtaining a smaller percentage of the market in the United States in 1964, in relation to Ireland, than it had in 1963.

Mr. HRUSKA. Very likely that would be true, if the basis for ascertaining the quotas in that case were different.

Mr. MILLER. We hope the State Department will shed a little light on this question, because from what the Senator from Nebraska has been pointing out to us and from a plain reading of the State Department's releases and the recitals of the Governments of Australia and Ireland, it seems to me that the premise that Australia will not be adversely affected in its position as an exporter to the United States has been broken. That being the case, Australia, and probably New Zealand along with it, is in a position to break off the agreement because I believe the two agreements were negotiated simultaneously.

Mr. HRUSKA. Of course, there are other grounds on which both Australia and New Zealand may predicate breaking the agreement. One is that if the United States decides to raise duties on cattle products, they may cancel the agreement. Also, if we were not to cooperate with the Government of Australia in the matter of the negotiations being conducted under the GATT, coming up next May, in using all our good offices to see that barriers to importing countries were reduced, if we did not give them the desired degree of cooperation in that respect, New Zealand or Australia might conceivably have another ground for cancellation of the treaty or agreement.

Mr. MILLER. I am glad the Senator from Nebraska made that last point, because I note on page 4 of the press release from the Department of State regarding the Australia-New Zealand agreement, that negotiations in GATT shall be conducted on arrangements

leading to expanding access in meat-importing countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2:30 having arrived, pursuant to the previous agreement, the Chair lays before the Senate the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, 15 minutes will be allocated to each side.

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

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

Before the Senate considers the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, the Chair reminds the Senate that under the unanimous-consent agreement 15 minutes will be allocated to each side.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Delaware should be rejected. I am familiar with the plight of the growers of tobacco before the present tobacco program was adopted. The growers of tobacco lived on either a feast-or-famine basis—and usually it was on a famine basis. Since this program has been adopted, the tobacco farmers of America have been able to stabilize the growing of their tobacco in such fashion that it has brought prosperity to them and their families.

If this amendment were adopted, it would introduce chaos in the tobacco industry.

The tobacco industry is an industry which brings to its farmers 8 percent of all the cash they receive for crops. Farmers receive \$1.3 billion a year from tobacco; 750,000 farm families in America grow tobacco; 96,000 persons are engaged in the manufacture of tobacco. Users of tobacco spent over \$8 billion in 1963 in payment for tobacco products, and the excise taxes levied on them. Of this sum, \$3.3 billion went to the Federal Government, the States, and local governments in the form of excise taxes.

In addition to paying \$3.3 billion in excise taxes, growers, processors, and sellers of tobacco pay additional billions of dollars in income taxes to the Federal Government on the income derived from tobacco and from tobacco products.

If this amendment were adopted, it would introduce chaos in the tobacco industry, and bring economic ruin to a substantial portion of 750,000 farm families in America which grow tobacco in 21 States of the Union.

As the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has declared, there is nothing in the report of the Surgeon General's

Committee, which is conclusive in nature. The Committee merely took much old data and drew inferences from it which are inconsistent with the inferences drawn from it by many other competent men. Indeed, the Committee itself says that the problem calls for further research.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. ERVIN. Many other men in the medical field have studied the problem. The Cancer Bulletin for May and June of 1963 contained an article on the subject written by Dr. Joseph Berkson, a medical statistician from the Mayo Clinic and a professor of the School of Medicine at the University of Minnesota. He said flatly that from his study of the problem, he did not believe the proposition was effectively established that any causal connection existed between smoking and lung cancer.

Dr. Berkson sets out data in his article indicating that at the worst the excess of deaths from lung cancer of those who smoke cigarettes with regularity over nonsmokers is 13.5 percent. He suggests that this discrepancy is probably due to a difference in the physical constitutions of the two groups.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall speak briefly and summarize the points I wish to make. If any votes are to be given to this amendment, because of concern following the report entitled "Smoking and Health," I should like to advert to what the Senator from North Carolina has said.

I do not derogate the importance of the report. Nevertheless, the report itself admits that it is based on past research, not on new research. It also asserts that much more research is necessary. So my first point is that I believe it would be harmful for the Congress to attempt to implement the report in this radical fashion when the Commission itself is directed to continue its work and to suggest a means of implementation.

Further, if it is intended that adoption of the amendment would have anything to do with smoking, or the reduction of smoking, it is absolutely a foolish idea. The result of adoption of the amendment would be to encourage increased production of tobacco at a very low price for the farmer. It would reduce the price of tobacco to manufacturers.

We must consider whether the amendment is just. To crush 750,000 tobacco farmers, who cultivate an average acreage of approximately 2 acres, who work all year to harvest their product, who contribute \$3.2 billion in revenues to Federal and States treasuries, and who furnish the third or fourth largest dollar volume of exports, is to attempt to destroy a good farm program before final judgment is made on the health subject—if one can ever be made. The

amendment would destroy the livelihood of tobacco farmers of the country; it would have no effect on health.

The subject is not as simple as has been made out. I therefore urge Senators not to take such drastic action without the best consideration being given to this whole subject. The amendment should be defeated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Record include at this point the following tables: First, returns to farmers from tobacco for the years since 1945—including acreage, production, exports, and average price. Second, the pounds of tobacco production and value received by U.S. farmers; the production and value of Burley tobacco, grown principally in Kentucky; and the value of all tobacco produced in Kentucky, including Dark-fired and Dark Air-cured tobacco. Third, the kinds and acreage of tobacco grown by States, to which I referred earlier. Fourth, excise revenues from tobacco products, received by the Federal Government last year, and also revenues received by the

States. Fifth, the value of tobacco exports, both sales for dollars or "hard" currencies, and Public Law 480 sales for "soft" or local currencies.

Finally, because it has been referred to several times, I ask that the Record include the cost of the price support programs for tobacco and the other basic commodities, since the beginning of these programs 30 years ago. This table also shows the sales of farm products abroad for local currencies, under Public Law 480, to which the Senator from Delaware has referred. It is taken from a rather long table in the annual fiscal report of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and I point out that the column of total costs for each commodity includes programs in addition to the two shown, and that the bottom totals include nonbasic commodities which have been supported, in addition to the basic commodities and dairy products programs shown.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tobacco: Acreage, yield, production, disappearance, price and crop value, United States, for specified years (farm-sales weight)

Crop year	Acreage	Yield	Production	Disappearance <sup>1</sup>			Average price per pound	Value of crop
				Total	Domestic	Exports		
Average:	1,000 acres	Pounds	Million pounds	Million pounds	Million pounds	Million pounds	Cents	Million dollars
1925-29	1,756	773	1,356	1,357	787	600	18.7	253
1935-39	1,647	883	1,460	1,358	900	458	19.6	278
1945	1,821	1,094	1,991	1,928	1,334	594	42.6	848
1946	1,961	1,181	2,315	2,012	1,355	657	45.1	1,044
1947	1,852	1,138	2,107	1,850	1,413	437	43.6	918
1948	1,554	1,274	1,980	1,922	1,417	505	48.2	955
1949	1,623	1,213	1,969	1,951	1,420	531	45.9	905
1950	1,599	1,269	2,030	1,975	1,452	523	51.7	1,049
1951	1,780	1,310	2,332	2,072	1,488	584	51.1	1,191
1952	1,772	1,273	2,256	2,055	1,557	498	49.9	1,125
1953	1,633	1,261	2,059	1,995	1,480	515	52.3	1,076
1954	1,668	1,346	2,243	1,935	1,419	516	51.1	1,147
1955	1,495	1,466	2,193	2,068	1,410	648	53.2	1,166
1956	1,364	1,596	2,176	1,929	1,373	556	53.7	1,169
1957	1,122	1,486	1,668	1,921	1,393	528	56.1	936
1958	1,078	1,611	1,737	1,923	1,388	535	59.9	1,040
1959	1,153	1,558	1,796	1,928	1,425	503	58.3	1,048
1960	1,142	1,703	1,944	2,030	1,463	567	60.9	1,186
1961	1,174	1,755	2,061	2,051	1,461	590	63.8	1,315
1962 <sup>2</sup>	1,225	1,890	2,314	2,005	1,474	531	58.9	1,363
1963 <sup>2</sup>	1,175	1,933	2,272					

<sup>1</sup> For Flue-cured and Cigar-wrapper, year beginning July 1; for all other types, Oct. 1.  
<sup>2</sup> Preliminary.

Source: Tobacco Situation, December 1963, ERS, USDA.

Production, value, and number of allotments (by crop years) for U.S. tobacco production

	1961	1962	1963
U.S. tobacco production..... pounds	2,061,000,000	2,314,000,000	2,272,000,000
Value received by farmers.....	\$1,325,873,000	\$1,363,079,000	\$1,314,287,000
Number of allotments.....	573,070	572,462	570,153

Production, value, and number of allotments for U.S. burley tobacco production

	1961	1962	1963
U.S. burley production..... pounds	580,335,000	674,658,000	750,000,000
Value received by farmers.....	\$386,094,000	\$394,878,000	\$435,500,000
Number of allotments.....	328,600	348,572	348,910

Production, value, and number of allotments for Kentucky tobacco production

	1961	1962	1963
Kentucky tobacco production..... pounds	415,340,000	493,515,000	547,639,000
Value received by farmers.....	\$266,999,000	\$277,856,000	\$313,584,000
Number of allotments.....	173,184	173,457	172,327

1963 tobacco allotments by States—Burley, Flue, Fire, Air, Sun, Maryland, Cigar-binder, and Cigar-filler and binder

FLUE-CURED<sup>1</sup>

State	Number of allotments	Acreage allotted
Alabama	255	504.43
Florida	6,881	15,091.00
Georgia	25,901	72,057.57
North Carolina	119,665	467,453.32
South Carolina	25,588	82,284.72
Virginia	22,908	71,097.95
<b>Total</b>	<b>201,198</b>	<b>708,488.99</b>

<sup>1</sup> Average size of flue-cured allotment, 3.52 acres.

BURLEY<sup>2</sup>

State	Number of allotments	Acreage allotted
Alabama	39	32.95
Arkansas	79	59.45
Georgia	215	98.58
Illinois	12	5.47
Indiana	9,679	8,728.78
Kansas	53	100.76
Kentucky	143,849	226,265.37
Missouri	1,660	3,551.34
North Carolina	18,213	11,574.39
Ohio	10,882	11,192.67
Pennsylvania	2	2.25
South Carolina	9	5.03
Tennessee	93,152	71,561.69
Texas	2	0.30
Virginia	17,380	12,495.86
West Virginia	4,617	3,235.19
<b>Total</b>	<b>299,843</b>	<b>348,909.99</b>

<sup>2</sup> Average size of burley allotment, 1.16 acres.

FIRE-CURED (TYPES 22, 23, AND 24)<sup>3</sup>

State	Number of allotments	Acreage allotted
Illinois	1	0.10
Kentucky	9,124	15,473.16
Tennessee	8,754	17,370.50
<b>Total</b>	<b>17,879</b>	<b>32,843.76</b>

<sup>3</sup> Average size of fire-cured (types 22, 23, and 24) allotment, 1.84 acres.

FIRE-CURED (TYPE 21)<sup>4</sup>

State	Number of allotments	Acreage allotted
Virginia	7,284	9,037.27

<sup>4</sup> Average size of fire-cured (type 21) allotment, 1.24 acres.

DARK AIR-CURED<sup>5</sup>

State	Number of allotments	Acreage allotted
Indiana	117	40.73
Kentucky	19,354	13,446.83
Tennessee	4,785	2,273.60
<b>Total</b>	<b>24,256</b>	<b>15,761.16</b>

<sup>5</sup> Average size of dark air-cured allotment, 0.65 acres.

SUN-CURED<sup>6</sup>

State	Number of allotments	Acreage allotted
Virginia		3,756.84

<sup>6</sup> Average size of sun-cured allotment, 1.64 acres.

CIGAR-FILLER AND BINDER<sup>7</sup>

State	Number of allotments	Acreage allotted
Illinois	3	5.30
Indiana	2	1.27
Iowa	1	7.24
Minnesota	120	182.99
New York	71	49.76
Ohio	1,589	4,622.13
Pennsylvania	121	192.58
Wisconsin	6,443	15,636.86
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,360</b>	<b>20,698.13</b>

<sup>7</sup> Average size of cigar-filler and binder allotment, 2.48 acres.

CIGAR BINDER<sup>8</sup>

State	Number of allotments	Acreage allotted
Connecticut	1,312	5,299.58
Massachusetts	961	2,684.40
New York	1	.07
Vermont	1	4.45
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,275</b>	<b>7,988.50</b>

<sup>8</sup> Average size of cigar-binder allotment, 3.51 acres.

1963 tobacco allotments by States—Burley, Flue, Fire, Air, Sun, Maryland, Cigar-binder, and Cigar-filler and binder—Con.

MARYLAND<sup>9</sup>

State	Number of allotments	Acreage allotted
Delaware	1	0.13
Maryland	6,689	48,193.75
Virginia	92	25.79
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,782</b>	<b>48,219.67</b>
<b>Grand total</b>	<b>570,153</b>	<b>1,195,704.31</b>

<sup>9</sup> Average size of Maryland allotment, 7.11 acres.

NOTE.—Average size of all tobacco allotments, 2.10 acres.

Excise taxes on tobacco products, fiscal year ending June 30, 1963

Federal excise tax on tobacco products (96.7 percent from cigarettes)	\$2,079,237,000
Total State excise tax on tobacco products (98.2 percent from cigarettes)	1,196,958,000
Local excise tax on tobacco products (98.5 percent from cigarettes)	40,931,000
<b>Total, all tobacco products (97.3 percent from cigarettes)</b>	<b>3,317,126,000</b>

(NOTE.—48 States tax cigarettes; 16 States tax other tobacco products; North Carolina and Oregon do not tax cigarettes.)

State gross cigarette taxes (fiscal year ending June 30, 1963)

Alabama	\$18,910,000
Alaska	2,105,000
Arizona	3,771,000
Arkansas	11,314,000
California	72,274,000
Connecticut	20,574,000
Delaware	3,888,000
District of Columbia	3,863,000
Florida	37,527,000
Georgia	22,196,000
Hawaii	2,074,000
Idaho	4,133,000
Illinois	59,041,000
Indiana	20,471,000
Iowa	12,759,000
Kansas	10,282,000
Kentucky	9,734,000
Louisiana	30,366,000
Maine	8,293,000
Maryland	23,495,000
Massachusetts	44,045,000
Michigan	68,810,000
Minnesota	27,823,000
Mississippi	15,031,000
Missouri	23,155,000
Montana	6,742,000
Nebraska	7,184,000
Nevada	4,988,000
New Hampshire	4,733,000
New Jersey	62,567,000

Price support and related program costs, basic<sup>1</sup> and selected commodities, Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1963

Commodity	Price support	Title I, Public Law 480	Total <sup>2</sup>
Feed grains	\$3,720,168,638	\$706,861,565	\$4,427,030,203
Corn, and products	(2,677,970,358)	(372,570,765)	(3,050,541,123)
Wheat, and products	1,946,885,787	6,290,015,767	8,237,901,554
Rice	213,048,348	702,686,980	915,735,326
Tobacco	32,148,895	257,594,152	289,743,047
Cotton, upland	1,061,152,409	1,441,662,763	2,502,815,172
Dairy products	2,799,997,955	102,599,590	2,902,597,545
Oils and oilseeds	558,023,856	724,024,790	1,282,048,646
Peanuts	(238,094,611)	0	(238,094,611)
<b>Total<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>11,400,633,989</b>	<b>10,388,390,128</b>	<b>21,789,024,117</b>

<sup>1</sup> Basic commodities: Corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, cotton, peanuts.

<sup>2</sup> Includes realized losses from price-support related programs, and cost of other programs operated under specific statutory authority for separate reimbursement, in addition to price support losses and title I, Public Law 480 costs shown.

<sup>3</sup> Does not include \$1,813,440,480 acreage diversion payments.

<sup>4</sup> Does not include \$1,308,091,920 under International Wheat Agreement.

<sup>5</sup> Does not include \$333,729,168 acreage diversion payments.

<sup>6</sup> Includes commodities in addition to basic commodities and dairy products shown.

Source: Commodity Credit Corporation Report of Financial Condition and Operations, June 30, 1963.

State gross cigarette taxes (fiscal year ending June 30, 1963)—Continued

New Mexico	\$7,508,000
New York	127,795,000
North Dakota	3,980,000
Ohio	65,840,000
Oklahoma	19,461,000
Pennsylvania	90,972,000
Rhode Island	7,505,000
South Carolina	10,739,000
South Dakota	3,820,000
Tennessee	20,625,000
Texas	91,771,000
Utah	2,784,000
Vermont	3,646,000
Virginia	15,384,000
Washington	20,896,000
West Virginia	11,891,000
Wisconsin	27,102,000
Wyoming	1,834,000

Total, all taxing States. 1,175,701,000

EXCERPT FROM A PUBLICATION OF THE TOBACCO TAX COUNCIL OF THE UNITED STATES

Federal tobacco excise taxes have been permanent components of the tax structure of the Federal Government since the Civil War. In the intervening century, Federal tobacco tax collections have increased from \$3.1 million in 1863 to approximately \$2.1 billion in 1963. More than \$2 billion of the yield was derived from the 8 cents per package tax on cigarettes. During the 12-month period ending June 30, 1963, specific Federal, State, and local excise taxes levied on all tobacco products aggregated \$3.3 billion of which \$3.2 billion came from cigarettes.

The tobacco growers receive an average of slightly less than 3¼ cents for the tobacco contained in a package of cigarettes. The Federal and State government together impose cigarette taxes the weighted average of which is 13 cents per package, or four times as much as the growers receive. No other product in America so widely used by the Nation's citizens bears a burden so oppressive.

Value of tobacco exports (sales for dollars and for local currencies, by years)

Fiscal year	Value of all tobacco exports	Value of tobacco exports, title I, Public Law 480	Title I sales as percent of total exports
	Millions	Millions	Percent
1955	\$306.4	\$4.0	1.3
1956	379.5	55.8	14.7
1957	340.1	36.3	10.7
1958	342.9	25.5	7.4
1959	350.2	30.5	8.7
1960	341.9	30.9	9.0
1961	385.1	29.5	7.7
1962	407.5	19.3	4.7
1963	378.5	21.6	5.7

Principal markets for tobacco: United Kingdom, West Germany, Japan, Netherlands, Ireland, Australia.  
Principal markets for Public Law 480 commodities: Developing countries.

Mr. COOPER. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, my senior colleague from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TAMMADGE] in the remarks they have made in speaking against the amendment. As has been pointed out, the adoption of the amendment would completely destroy the tobacco farmers, not only in North Carolina, but in every State of the Union which grows tobacco.

There is no selfish motive on my part. Although North Carolina grows more tobacco than any other State, it does not grow as much as all the other States combined. Tobacco is grown in my State. It is also grown in Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, Kentucky and Maryland. It is grown all over the country.

As the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has pointed out, tobacco is grown largely on small farms. Some of those small farms are in North Carolina. There are more of them in North Carolina than there are in any other State. There are about one-half million tobacco farmers in our State. The income that they receive is about \$500 million.

It can be seen how much this crop means to our farmers.

As I pointed out before, most of the tobacco companies are located in North Carolina. They pay good wages, and they employ thousands of people. They do not go out looking for cheap tobacco. They do not want cheap tobacco. They want good tobacco, in sufficient volume to take care of their needs. We produce a third more tobacco than we can consume in this country, and that amount is sold in export.

As the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, tobacco is our largest dollar market, because Public Law 480 sales of tobacco are very small. They are practically nothing compared with other commodities that are sold under Public Law 480.

It would be foolish to deprive the farmers of support merely on the ground of a report issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which states that perhaps lung cancer is caused by cigarette smoking.

Sir Walter Raleigh started the fad, I am told, and that was a long time ago. If it were as harmful as it is reported to be, I do not see how anyone could be alive today. Smoking has increased year after year. Deaths have gone down year by year. That indicates that we cannot lay the blame for lung cancer at the door of smoking. It has increased because there are more people alive today.

Therefore, I hope that the Senate will see fit to vote against the amendment, which, as the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, has never been considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment and hope it will be

rejected. There is one point which I should like to emphasize. My State is the principal producer of burley tobacco. The average size of the allotment is just over 1 acre. Sixty percent of the total allotments are less than seven-tenths of 1 acre. We are not dealing with big farm operations, or with thousands of dollars in payments to any individual farmer. We are dealing with the war on poverty. We are dealing with the small producer, who receives a substantial part of his cash income from seven-tenths of 1 acre of tobacco. This point has been made very clear by Dr. Robert W. Rudd, of the University of Kentucky, in a paper entitled "Evaluation of Agricultural Programs in Terms of Economic Growth, Foreign Trade, and Political Feasibility: Tobacco."

I ask unanimous consent that the paper may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. It is a very comprehensive discussion of the subject.

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

EVALUATION OF AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS IN TERMS OF ECONOMICS GROWTH, FOREIGN TRADE, AND POLITICAL FEASIBILITY: TOBACCO  
(Presented at the National Agricultural Policy Conference, Lincoln, Nebr., September 11, 1963, by Robert W. Rudd, University of Kentucky)

#### INTRODUCTION

To many people tobacco has represented the epitome of workable farm programs during the last three decades. It has achieved relative price stability for producers; it has improved incomes for tobacco farmers; it has generated little, if any, complaints from processors or consumers for the favorable prices created under the program. It has been relatively inexpensive for the taxpayers as farm programs go; and understandably, it has been quite favorably received by tobacco growers.

Some of these tributes, however, are more directly associated with peculiarities of tobacco in production and use than with cleverness in the design of the program. Consider the advantages which some of these peculiarities provide. Tobacco is a product which has no close substitutes in use. It requires only a very small land area for production and it makes extensive use of farm labor in areas which have chronic agricultural underemployment. Traditionally, it is not stored on farms from season to season. Almost all tobacco is sold through a single channel, the auction warehouse. It is taken under close view after sale by the Federal Government because of the heavy excise taxes on tobacco. Further, over the long trend, per capita consumption of tobacco has moved upward in contrast to the picture for the food and fiber complex of agriculture generally which has declined in physical volume of use per capita. Add to these features tobacco's ability to increase in value in storage for up to 5 years and you have some important reasons for program workability in tobacco. Grower contentment with the program, too, is helped by the countervailing power it affords to over one-half million producers in dealing with the handful of large-scale processors whose purchases are the very heart of the market.

My comments relate mainly to the cigarette tobaccos which represent about 90 percent of the domestic production of tobacco. I will largely ignore, for reasons of time, the cigar types, the dark tobaccos, and exotic types such as Perique. Further, my comments will apply most directly to the major cigarette types—flue-cured and burley—with lesser reference to Maryland tobacco

where intermittent program participation by growers has left marked differences in experience as compared to flue-cured and burley and the traditional geographic limitations for production areas have remained rather firm.<sup>1</sup> Also largely abstracted from this consideration will be the health issues surrounding tobacco usage. Consequently, it will be presumed that the status of an economic good is accorded to tobacco like other products of agriculture by continuing demand in the marketplace.

#### IMPLICATIONS FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH

Several of the effects of the tobacco programs have implications for economic growth. Prices of tobacco have moved upward markedly during the period since the beginnings of the programs in 1933. Studies have pointed to the establishment of prices with the program well above free-market equilibrium levels,<sup>2</sup> and the continuing loan-storage activity for the major types under program auspices supports this view. For all tobacco, market prices rose from 13 cents per pound in 1933 at the beginnings of the tobacco programs to 59 cents per pound last year, an increase of about 450 percent. When this is compared with the 563-percent increase in per capita consumer incomes during the same period, it is evident that the real price of tobacco at the farm level has declined, thus offering a modest contribution to economic growth. At the same time, however, this is a substantially lesser contribution to the availability of products to the consuming economy than is offered by agriculture as a whole where price gains have averaged only 345 percent between the beginnings of the programs in 1933 and 1962.

The expected income effects for producers from the favorable prices generated under the program have been somewhat modified by the influx of new producers, expanding the geography of production of the major cigarette types far from their points of origin and bringing smaller and smaller average sizes of allotments. Further, a significant share of the price benefits of the program have been capitalized into enhanced values of land allotment, with accompanying windfall gains to initial producers under the program and added costs of entry to those who follow.

In tobacco, the potential for mechanization which has revolutionized many parts of agriculture remains relatively unattainable due to the small size of acreage allotments. In burley, for example, the average size of allotment is just over 1 acre and almost 60 percent of the total number of allotments are less than seven-tenths of an acre. Flue-cured averages somewhat larger with about 3½ acres per allotment. Recent provisions for limited transferability by lease of up to 5 acres for types other than burley offer very modest improvements in the mechanization potential in tobacco. As a consequence, labor requirements for tobacco remain quite high, even today. Flue-cured tobacco, for example, requires almost 500 man-hours per acre to produce the crop. The total tobacco crop of 1961 required about the same total number of man-hours of labor as did the 1934 crop

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of the program in Maryland tobacco see G. M. Beal and Keith C. Park, "Maryland Tobacco Marketing Quota and Acreage Allotment Programs," misc. pub. No. 480, Maryland Agricultural Experiment Station, May 1963.

<sup>2</sup> Glenn Johnson, "Burley Tobacco Control Programs, Their Overall Effect on Production and Prices, 1933-50," Bulletin 580, Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station, 1950. Paul R. Johnson and Robert W. Rudd, "Effects of the Price-Support, Acreage Adjustment and Surplus Removal Programs in Dark Tobacco on Kentucky's Agriculture," Bull. 678, Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station, 1962.

and it produced about the same proportionate share of total cash receipts from farm marketings. In contrast, the food grains and the feed grains each now earn a substantially larger share of total cash receipts from farm marketings than in 1934 and each requires less than a third of the total amount of labor used to produce its 1934 crop. The small sizes of allotments and lack of full transferability continue to impede the potentials for development of mechanization in harvesting, handling, and curing tobacco.

While the development of mechanized harvesting and curing has been discouraged by the small production units which the program has engendered, the pattern of labor use in tobacco in the absence of mechanization developments probably has not been materially altered by the program. In much of the area in which tobacco is a major cash crop, the surplus resource is farm labor, and it has sharply limited alternatives in productive use.

The view long held that the tobacco program has had the effect of altering the resource combination in production toward heavier fertilization and more intensive use of the limited land through closer planting has been challenged recently by the research findings of Tolley and Hartman of North Carolina.<sup>3</sup> Their study suggests that for Flue-cured a removal of acreage controls would not alter the present fertilization practices nor the number of plants per acre, from the standpoint of highest profit combination.

The question of costs of agricultural program operation is a significant one for economic growth. In tobacco, the picture has been one of marked contrast to most price-supported crops. Through mid-1960, the Government's ability to recover its investment by disposing of tobacco taken under loan has given it a dollar-for-dollar return and no losses other than the administrative costs of the program have been sustained. A part of this success has been due to the effectiveness of the acreage control program in regulating volume of production. The upward trend in total utilization of cigarette tobaccos which gave a safety valve for increased yields brought by the program and the feature of the increasing value of tobacco in storage at least equaling its carrying and storage charges has helped significantly. The upward trend of tobacco price supports has also helped to assure relative ease in disposal of tobaccos taken under loan.

In more recent years, however, problems of disposition of crops having characteristics not desirable to the trade which have been accumulated under loan have led to some losses, not all of which show up in the accounting procedures used by the Federal Government.<sup>4</sup> As of the last of May of this year, realized losses for the price-support program in tobacco reached \$15 million which still leaves it among the least expensive among the price-supported commodities. As with other price-supported commodities, the taxpayer losses in program operation work as a net deterrent to economic growth.

#### FOREIGN TRADE EFFECTS

Two Government programs have had significant effects on foreign trade in tobacco,

<sup>3</sup> L. M. Hartman and G. S. Tolley, "Effects of Better Acreage Controls on Costs and Techniques of Producing Flue-Cured Tobacco," North Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station, Technical Bul. 146, June 1961.

<sup>4</sup> In March of this year during hearings of a subcommittee of the Committee of Appropriations of the House on U.S. Department of Agriculture appropriations for fiscal year 1964, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Duncan admitted a loss of about 25 cents a pound on the bargain price disposal of Government accumulation of 1955-56 Flue-cured tobacco recently, amounting to a total of about \$80 million, when all costs are included.

the sales program under Public Law 480 and the program of acreage allotments and price supports. Government export programs have accounted for about 13 percent of U.S. tobacco exports since the inauguration of Public Law 480 in 1954, substantially less than the proportion for all farm product exports. Of the \$323 million in export program sales of tobacco since 1954, over 70 percent has been title I (local currency) sales with the remainder going in barter deals.

Local currency sales from tobaccos under price-support loan have been mainly in Flue-cured, with lesser amounts of burley, Fire-cured and Maryland. Important recipient countries in the local currency sales of tobacco have been the United Kingdom, Egypt, Spain, Indonesia, Finland, and Italy. The mixture of "have" and "have not" nations in the list requires some comment. Sales of title I tobacco to developed nations such as Britain and Italy were not usual and came at earlier periods in Public Law 480 when either financial problems or dollar exchange difficulties in these nations made them temporarily eligible for title I.

The consensus of most studies which have been made of market effects of local currency sales of tobacco in recipient less-developed countries is similar to that reached for Egypt in a recent survey. Sales of tobacco made for local currency are net additions to the volume of tobacco we can move into export and their major significance lies in the development of market preferences in receiving countries which, hopefully, the progress of economic development will bring to later fruition as increases to commercial international trade in which the United States can share. It is recognized, at the same time, that these additions to commercial international trade in tobacco are many years away.<sup>5</sup>

It is doubtful that one can make a valid case for the contributions to economic development of underdeveloped areas of quasi-free shipments of a luxury good such as tobacco, as is usually made for program shipments of surplus food and fiber. Further, since tobacco processing and trade is often a government monopoly operation in title I recipient nations, interests in shipments of near-free U.S. tobacco may be colored with thoughts of the added tax revenue which its importation and use typically affords.

The effects of the program of acreage allotments and price supports in tobacco upon its foreign trade have come mainly through effects upon quality and the price enhancement brought by the program. Flue-cured, the largest export type, illustrates these effects. Grower pressure to increase yields of tobacco to market from their limited acreages at favorable prices has encouraged the development of higher yielding varieties which have in some instances been much less desirable to the trade (both domestic and export). While a program of support-price discounts has been introduced to discriminate against these varieties by supporting at half the usual rate, the market has received during recent years substantial quantities of this slick, heavy, less desirable leaf. The reaction of the export market to these quality shifts can be illustrated by the 1956 Flue-cured crop. Britain, a leading importer, cut its purchases 37 percent, West Germany, Australia, Belgium, and Ireland reduced their buying of U.S. Flue-cured by 15 to 30 percent. In the following year, Flue-cured varieties 139, 140, and 244 were given support prices of one-half the regular rates.

Excessive fertilization and the use of growth inhibitors for sucker control too have been declared by both domestic processors

<sup>5</sup> A. J. Brown and D. Upton Livermore, "The Market Potential for American Tobaccos in Egypt (U.A.R.)." Unpublished report of the Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station, 1962.

and export buyers to be damaging to tobacco quality and the program has encouraged these practices because of the effects of a free ride in a favorable market for production gains made by increasing yields when only acreage is controlled. While the proportion of these effects which can be charged to the program is indeterminate, the contributory role of the program in the rapid and widespread adoption of these practices is clear.

The program's quality effects on export markets in terms of volume of purchases are compounded with the price effects of the program in tobacco. Price differences between U.S. leaf and comparable types, if not quality, of leaf from other nations moving in international trade have been widening significantly during the last decade. Spreads between United States and Rhodesian Flue-cured tobaccos in export averaged 5 cents per pound during 1950-54. By 1961, Rhodesian Flue-cured was selling in international trade at prices more than 20 cents per pound below U.S. leaf. Clearly not all of the increase in price spread can be charged to the price-support program. Between 1950 and 1961 average export prices of U.S. Flue-cured tobacco rose 48 percent while price-support averages were up 25 percent and the domestic market prices climbed only 18 percent. How much of this rise in average prices of exports represents shifts among quality grades in export buying to avoid problems of declining crop quality too is indeterminate but it appears to have had some influence.

The effect of these two developments in association with the programs—declining quality and widening price spreads in export trade—has been to reduce the U.S. share of free world exports of tobacco from an average of 42 percent in 1947-51 to 30 percent in 1961, in spite of the addition of Government programs which expedite tobacco exports under Public Law 480. The increasing competition in tobacco exports from Rhodesia and its implications if and when Britain enters the European Economic Community may call for a reappraisal of price-support objectives for U.S. tobaccos entering the export market in important measure.

#### POLITICAL FEASIBILITY

The evidence of history suggests that tobacco has retained its traditionally strong persuasiveness in getting custom-tailored Federal programs. A series of monuments to this strength are provided by the unique features incorporated in tobacco programs over the years. These range all the way from the exceptional mandatory 90 percent of parity (modified indirectly by grower-sought changes in base period, and more recently by removal of tobacco from the modernized parity escalator which threatened to price tobacco out of any market in the long run) to partially transferable allotments and minimum allotments, to mention only a few.

An important contributor to continuing political feasibility of programs in tobacco has been the ability of growers of the different types of tobacco to compromise their internal differences and present a united front in requests to legislators. This solidarity has provided the tobacco programs with firm support from each of the major farm organizations, despite internal conflicts in philosophy in some instances.

While we generally think of legislation when we speak of political feasibility of programs, it should be pointed out that historically, administrative decisions in tobacco program operation have had an important bearing on program operation as it affects the grower, warehouseman, and processor. There has been in the past and there will continue to be political vulnerability for the tobacco program from pressures for particular administrative decisions regardless of the party in power. These decisions have ranged from determining total allotment

size through the stringency or laxity in applying quota formulas to levels chosen to discount support prices for tobaccos treated with growth inhibitors and they carry important consequences for all concerned with tobacco.

At present the health issue relative to tobacco probably constitutes the principal potential threat to the tobacco program. If this issue is resolved finally and irreparably against tobacco, the program will be extremely vulnerable from the political point of view. Vulnerability of the tobacco programs to unfriendly political pressures, too, could be increased if substantial losses were to be sustained by the price support operations of tobacco programs in anything like the proportions experienced by wheat, cotton, and corn in recent years. Urban taxpayers and their legislators appear to be increasingly sensitive to such losses. The \$3 billion in annual revenue to Federal and State government from excise taxes levied on tobacco is unlikely to be an adequate defense as this sensitivity mounts.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to point out that this amendment would not prohibit anyone from smoking. It does not at all deal with the question of the morality of smoking. It would not prohibit anyone from smoking if he wished to smoke. Furthermore, a vote for this amendment is not a question of approval or disapproval of the Surgeon General's report. That is not the question we are voting on, although we cannot be blind to the fact that the Surgeon General, who is a responsible official of Government, has issued an extensive report which does state, as a result of a study, he has found that the use of tobacco is injurious to the health of the American people. The amendment deals only with the question of whether the taxpayers should subsidize the production of this commodity, which the Surgeon General and other responsible physicians have said is harmful to the American people.

The question has been raised as to the true cost of this program. The cost in the past fiscal year, 1963, was a little more than \$40 million. Last year we spent \$40 million to support the production of tobacco; \$16 million of that was spent in direct price supports, and \$24 million was spent to subsidize the exportation of surplus tobacco under title I of Public Law 480. That latter amount represents sales of tobacco for soft currencies, which do not accrue to the benefit of this country; \$1,600,000 was the cost of the tobacco disposed of under title IV of Public Law 480.

Over the years a total of \$301,790,000 has been spent to subsidize the export of surplus tobacco under Public Law 480, title I, and under the direct support program. Instead of a \$40 million cost, as some claim, we have spent over \$300 million to subsidize tobacco production.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall yield in a moment. I have listened for quite a while to the opponents of the amendment, and I now want to get this record straight. I repeat, \$301 million represents the true cost of the tobacco support program. All of us know that we do not have free access to the soft currencies obtained for sales under Pub-

lic Law 480. Therefore, this is a part of the overall cost.

These soft currencies can be spent only for improvements within the respective countries. The question before us here today is—do we or do we not want the taxpayers to continue underwriting the production of a commodity which the Surgeon General has declared is injurious to the health of America? In the past fiscal year this program has cost about \$40 million.

This amendment has nothing to do with whether or not cigarettes are taxed. That is another question, one that is dealt with in the Internal Revenue Code. The amendment has nothing to do with the morality of whether one should or should not smoke. It has nothing to do with whether the Commission appointed by the President should or should not make a recommendation to restrict the use of tobacco.

The amendment does not touch any of the factors which I recognize should be dealt with by the Commission. It deals solely with the one question: Shall American taxpayers continue at the rate of \$40 million a year—better than \$3 million a month—to underwrite the cost of production of a commodity which has been said to be injurious to the health of America?

I yield the floor.

Mr. ERVIN. I thought the Senator would be willing to answer a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If I have time, I will answer a question.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield first to the Senator from Ohio, but I will see to it that the Senator from North Carolina has time yielded to him later.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The question is whether the Government of the United States contemplates being consistent. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has pointed out that he is not making any challenge about the morality of smoking. The Senator emphasizes, however, the situation under which the Surgeon General, with the help of experts, has declared that the smoking of cigarettes is harmful to the health of the people of our country, and in many instances is the cause of cancer.

If that is the fact, the Government must be apprehensive of this problem. If it is the fact, the Government must try to cure it. What is the Government doing? It suggests that we subsidize the growing of tobacco in the sum of \$40 million a year to spread and help the use of it, while at the same time admitting that it is injurious to health.

I am a cosponsor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware. I shall vote for it, and I shall vote for it on the basis that we cannot in one instance say that the smoking of cigarettes produces cancer, and then in the next instance say we will subsidize the growing of tobacco, which is in direct conflict with the responsibility of trying to cure the evil. I yield the floor.

Mr. ERVIN. I do not know whether I have any time remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina. I understand the Senator from Kentucky has about exhausted his time.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the tobacco program went into effect in 1933.

The program has been in effect 30 years—during that 30 years, it has cost the Government a total of only \$301 million.

Last year alone, the Government collected \$2.1 billion in excise taxes alone upon tobacco and its products.

The Government received billions of other dollars last year in income taxes from tobacco growers, manufacturers, and sellers. We exported last year leaf tobacco and cigarettes worth \$615 million. If it had not been for the exportation of that tobacco and those cigarettes, the deficit in our balance of payments would have been about \$600 million more than it was.

The committee of the Surgeon General did not engage in research. It took some data that others had compiled, and drew some conclusions from it. Other doctors have drawn quite different conclusions for it, that is to say, that it does not establish a causal connection between smoking and lung cancer.

I respectfully suggest that the Public Health Service should confine its activities in this field to research, and refrain from engaging in a missionary campaign until research proves that there is really a causal relation between smoking and lung cancer.

We ought to continue with tobacco research until there is some proof of such relationship; and until that proof arises we ought not to destroy one of the greatest agricultural programs of this Nation and render it difficult for 750,000 farm families to obtain bread for their children.

This amendment would introduce chaos in the tobacco industry and return such industry to the condition it was in before 1933. I thank the Senator from Delaware for yielding.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield a minute and a half to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I am opposed to the Williams amendment.

If this amendment is adopted, it will deal a death blow to the tobacco industry in the United States—an industry which affects some 750,000 farm families. The Senator from Delaware suggests that the price support program for tobacco be abolished. He justifies this action by referring to the Surgeon General's report on smoking.

I suggest, Mr. President, that the Senate cannot render an intelligent decision on this amendment. There have been no hearings before the Agriculture Committee and the Surgeon General's report fails to introduce any new evidence to support the contentions of the Senator from Delaware.

I cannot see what good can be accomplished by the adoption of an amendment which will result in unlimited tobacco production. The tobacco support

program has been a successful one and, unlike most other programs, has paid its way. As a matter of fact, the Maryland tobacco program has been running in the black and does not represent a loss of taxpayers' funds to the Treasury.

This program has curtailed tobacco production. Adoption of the Williams amendment, however, will be followed by increased production, lower prices, and will defeat the very purpose for which the amendment is offered.

Following the release of the Surgeon General's report, I outlined to the Senate the scope of the American tobacco industry and the adverse effect which might follow if hasty action is taken.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement of January 14, 1964, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

#### TOBACCO REPORT

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, last Saturday there was released the report of a special commission's study on the use of tobacco. The report leaves us with questions regarding smoking and health still in dispute—and I feel that further study is needed.

First, I would suggest that we proceed with caution in dealing with an industry involving millions of Americans—one of our largest industries and one of our largest agriculture crops. Injury to this industry could bring on economic chaos.

Some 750,000 farm families, averaging 3 or 4 to a family, in 21 States depend upon the growing of tobacco for their livelihood; tobacco is this Nation's fifth largest cash crop. In the United States, there are 578 processing plants in 30 States. These plants and the companies which supply goods and services to the industry employ some 17 million people.

Tobacco products last year provided some \$3.2 billion in taxes. This is nearly 40 times the yearly budget of the United Nations.

In our country, about 80 million people use tobacco products—well over half the adult population.

That, in brief, indicates tobacco's social and economic importance.

This is not to suggest that the tobacco industry is entitled to some kind of special privilege. But it is to suggest that before we permit damage to such an industry—damage which might upset our whole economic structure at this time—we proceed with caution.

I would say the same thing if someone wanted to damage the automobile industry on the grounds that automobiles injure and kill hundreds of thousands of people every year.

As the poet has said, there is good and bad in everything.

The history of America and the history of tobacco run parallel. Tobacco was once used here as money. And it has been smoked here for over 350 years—with satisfaction. And that, in itself, is a commentary. Who can say with assurance that we would have been better off without tobacco?

I want to make it clear that I am not a tobacco raiser, though in our State much tobacco is grown—and Maryland is noted for its high-quality tobacco.

I am not a scientist. I cannot discuss this issue on a scientific basis. However, let me interject one idea of a layman on the subject of health. Mental health is a subject much in the public mind. Psychiatry has come into its own because of the stress and strain of the present day. Most doctors will tell us, I believe, that this stress and strain accounts for much of the disability of today. Possibly we need more relaxing,

more contemplation. And may I ask, What better tool for relaxing, for contemplation, than a good smoke? Let us be sure that we do not kill one evil with perhaps a bigger one.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I urge the Senate to reject this amendment.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to correct a statement the Senator from Delaware made. The total cost of the tobacco program over its entire life has been only about \$40 million—\$32 million as shown by the last fiscal report of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I might add that, at least for 20 years, there has been no loss on the principal of the CCC loans made to the Burley Growers Tobacco Cooperative in my State, and only occasionally a loss on the interest which is paid to the Government on these loans. I do not think it is fair to talk only about tobacco in connection with the exports under Public Law 480, because under that law we have been selling all agricultural commodities for local currencies in countries which do not have dollars for this purpose. For example, there have been Public Law 480 exports of wheat in the amount of \$6 billion.

I do think the pending amendment attempts to make a moral judgment. It attempts to make a judgment before the commission has completed the second phase of its work—in regard to implementation. The amendment attempts to make a moral judgment which would grind down 700,000 farmers and their meager income.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I conclude by repeating that the cost of the program over the years, as shown by the Commodity Credit Corporation, under the "realized loss" column, is approximately \$40 million, as the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out but that is only a part of the story. The same report includes figures which show that all together in excess of \$300 million has been spent to subsidize the support of tobacco over the past several years; with \$40 million of that cost developing in the last fiscal year.

Sales under title 1 of Public Law 480 for foreign currencies, are a direct cost to the taxpayers. So there is no question that the cost of the program has been in excess of \$300 million. In the last year alone it cost \$40 million to support the program. Last year \$16 million was spent in direct price supports, and \$24,400,000 was spent under Public Law 480.

I repeat that the amendment does not go into the question of whether people should smoke. That question can be determined by the individual citizens, after consultations with their doctors.

The question before us here is whether or not we want the taxpayers to be committed to a program which last year cost \$40 million—or a little more than \$3 million a month—to support the production of a product which the Surgeon General and other medical authorities have de-

termined to be detrimental to the health of the American people.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has either been used or yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. 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.

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], who is unavoidably absent at this hour. If the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM] would each vote "yea."

The pair of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 63, as follows:

[Leg. No. 57]

YEAS—26

Alken	Hart	Pell
Bennett	Jordan, Idaho	Prouty
Boggs	Keating	Ribicoff
Case	Lausche	Scott
Church	Long, La.	Smith
Clark	Miller	Tower
Dominick	Moss	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	Neuberger	Williams, Del.
Fong	Pastore	

NAYS—63

Allott	Fulbright	McGee
Bartlett	Gore	McGovern
Bayh	Hartke	McIntyre
Beall	Hickenlooper	McNamara
Bible	Hill	Metcalf
Brewster	Holland	Monroney
Burdick	Hruska	Morse
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Morton
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Mundt
Cannon	Jackson	Muskie
Carlson	Javits	Nelson
Cooper	Johnston	Pearson
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Proxmire
Dodd	Kennedy	Robertson
Eastland	Long, Mo.	Russell
Edmondson	Magnuson	Saltanstill
Ellender	Mansfield	Smathers
Engle	McCarthy	Stennis
Ervin	McClellan	Symington



Talmadge  
Thurmond

Walters  
Yarborough

Young, N. Dak.  
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson  
Cotton  
Dirksen  
Goldwater

Gruening  
Hayden  
Kuchel  
Mechem

Randolph  
Simpson  
Sparkman

So Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware's amendment was rejected.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HRUSKA obtained the floor.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly to me?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if it meets with the approval of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the minority leader with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to query the distinguished majority leader about the program for the remainder of the day.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there will be considerable debate on the Hruska amendment, which deals with the question of meat imports into the United States. I understand that Senators on both sides of the aisle are prepared to speak on the subject. It would be my guess that the Senate will be in session to a reasonably late hour this evening—around 6:30 p.m. or 7 p.m.

Mr. PASTORE. Around 6:30 p.m. or 7 p.m. according to our experience, is rather early.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If we added another hour, that would be the end of the day.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We receive invitations, and I know a great many of them are to be accepted. The leader has received requests, not on the present occasion, but on others, from organizations asking that the Senate adjourn or recess in sufficient time so that Senators can attend receptions and other affairs.

I must say, in all honesty, that when I receive such requests, I ignore them completely, because I am sure every Member of this body agrees that our business is here when there is business to transact. But tonight it will be transacted until about 6:30 or 7 because of circumstances over which the leadership has no control.

If there are any breaks in the consideration of the Hruska amendment, I hope other Senators who may have amendments will bring them up and keep the Senate's business going.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO 11 A.M.  
TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it recess to meet at 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I express the hope that perhaps tomorrow an agreement can be reached whereby there may be some prospect of bringing the farm legislation to a decision, one way or the other.

I am informed that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], has at least two more cotton amendments. I hope that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and other Senators will be prepared, if there are any slack periods, to fill the void and offer their amendments and keep the Senate rolling as expeditiously as possible.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it possible to reach an agreement to vote on this amendment, let us say, at 6:30 or a quarter of 7?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. PASTORE. It is not possible?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. PASTORE. I take it it is not possible.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Just "No."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, so that there may be no misunderstanding, the majority leader stated early today what happened last night. I told him I would accept more than the lion's share of responsibility, because the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] was pressing his amendment and stated he wanted a yea-and-nay vote on it. That was near the close of the day. Perhaps partly because we attended the same educational institution, he was willing to relent and let it go over to today for a vote. There was a yea-and-nay vote on it. Many Members of the Senate remained available in anticipation of voting last night.

The majority leader gave no assurance that there would not be a vote tonight if the pending amendment were temporarily laid aside and the Senate were to address itself to some other amendment in the pile if a Senator asked for a yea-and-nay vote. I thought that should be made clear, in order to preclude any misunderstanding and the need for apology some time later.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the reason I could afford to be brief is that I have tried for the past 3 days, and when I say "No," that is just what I mean.

Mr. PASTORE. I congratulate the majority leader. No one admires conciseness and brevity more than does the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We thank the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Nebraska for allowing us to proceed in this way.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it would appear that within a few days there will be submitted to Congress the results of the executive branch review of foreign aid. I do not know what will be in the President's message and I am not making any prediction. But I do know that I shall continue to oppose the use of foreign aid as a crutch to support the misguided and futile foreign and military policies it has been used to support in the past.

What prompts these remarks is what appears to be an organized effort to crank up the foreign aid-Defense Department organization to advance the pretensions of the Pentagon into still another area of the world. One would have thought that there no longer remains a square foot of the earth's sea or land surface outside the Communist bloc that has not been designated as "vital to the security of the United States," and been subjected to an American military presence of some kind.

But it appears that the Indian Ocean is one area where this American military presence has not been established nearly as firmly as the U.S. Navy would like it to be.

Mr. President, I pause for order. I do not care whether anyone hears my speech, but I do not intend to speak until the Senate is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MORSE. In a recent issue of Navy, subtitled the magazine of sea-power, we hear the rationale put forward that the Indian Ocean is what an editorial writer calls a power vacuum, one that the Navy naturally assumes must be filled by itself. The articles in this issue further make the wholly fatuous assumption that frequent visits by the 7th Fleet in the Indian Ocean would deter Chinese aggression in that area.

When one looks at a map, and at the central position China occupies in relation to all the countries which frame the Indian Ocean, the China Sea, and the Pacific Ocean, it is evident that it is China that is going to dominate Asia whether the United States likes it or not, and no matter what we choose to do about it.

What the Navy thinks a few U.S. ships in the Indian Ocean would do to restrain China's desire to dominate her immediate neighbors, and to remove, Western influence and domination from her immediate borders, defies my imagination. Fifteen thousand U.S. troops in South Vietnam have not even halted the tide that is sweeping the Western Powers out of Vietnam and Cambodia.

As I said to the Secretary of State in the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday, those troops should be brought home. They never should have been sent there in the first place. American unilateral participation in the war of

South Vietnam cannot be justified, and will not be justified in American history. As I have made clear to the State Department, this administration had better be warned now that when the casualty lists of American boys in South Vietnam increase until the mothers and fathers of those boys—and, yes, the American people generally—start crying "Murder," no administration will stand.

Mr. President, let us not forget that the French people finally turned out a French government because they decided that French boys—the best of French blood—were being murdered in Indochina. I raise my first warning in this speech this afternoon, as to the position which I shall take in the historic debate that will take place on foreign aid and American foreign policy in this session of Congress.

We had better start appraising whether the United States is going to take a unilateral course of action, seeking to shoulder the burdens of those of our alleged allies in all parts of the world who have run out on us. They have run out on us in southeast Asia. In my judgment, we must keep in mind the fact that we have always considered southeast Asia to be beyond the perimeter of U.S. defense. Southeast Asia is not essential to U.S. defense. Southeast Asia may very well be essential to the defense of some of our allies, but where are they? They ran out on us.

At the moment, it may be an unpopular thesis that I am defending this afternoon, but my confidence in the judgment and the thinking powers of the American people is such that once they are given the facts about southeast Asia, they will repudiate the policy of the State Department as of this hour. They will also repudiate the policy of the Pentagon.

So, unpopular as it may be, the time has come to draw the issue on American foreign policy. I sincerely hope that my President will insist that the facts be presented to him so that he can pass a value judgment as commander in chief in respect to the demands of the military forces in this country, and of the allies, whether the United States should continue to carry the unilateral burden allegedly protecting freedom in those areas of the world in which our allies show such little interest.

China is the whole interior of the world's largest land mass. We are interested in preserving its fringes as U.S. footholds. That is as futile an effort as this country will ever embark upon. The concept of the Pacific as an American lake was possible only at the close of World War II when Japan lay temporarily prostrate. We have wasted hundreds of millions of dollars on a foreign aid program that sought to maintain for America indefinitely the domination over Asia which we enjoyed as a result of our victory in World War II.

The irony of the Navy magazine articles is that they take note of the withdrawal of Britain and other colonial powers from this part of the world, yet they assume the United States can and should step in, in addition to all our other commitments. The tenor of these articles reminds me of why one moun-

tain climber wanted to climb Everest: "Because it is there." The Indian Ocean is there, and that is enough for the Navy.

The effort to control the entire Pacific has cost us billions, and is collapsing at several places at once for reasons over which we have no control. Yet the U.S. Navy can propose only more of the same. Its pathetic attempt to portray a unity with Pakistan which does not exist in fact is set forth in one of these articles on Cento fleet maneuvers.

Centos do not exist for all practical political purposes, and Pakistan has belonged to it for only one reason—the U.S. aid she could get out of it. I have come to the conclusion that there never was a time when Pakistan would have fulfilled her Cento obligations vis-a-vis Russia. And even the most obtuse must realize by now that Pakistan's membership in SEATO is rendered totally meaningless by her close ties with China. Any possibility that Pakistan would honor any SEATO obligations vis-a-vis China has long since been dispelled.

Although some of us tried to stop it in the foreign aid bill, we are still pouring money into Pakistan, and Pakistan is undercutting us by her relationships with Red China, by entering into agreements with Red China, and she will continue to do so.

I do not intend to vote a single dollar to Pakistan. I was against it in the latest foreign aid bill, and I shall fight even harder against it in the next foreign aid bill, because Pakistan has clearly demonstrated that she is not an ally. She wishes to bargain with us, to negotiate with us for a continuation of foreign aid money. On any premise on which her national course of conduct can be evaluated, she does not deserve it.

Pakistan has belonged to those organizations for one purpose only—to get military aid from the United States that would build her forces against her one avowed enemy—India.

Not only does the United States not have any quarrel with India, but we have recently undertaken an expanded military aid program to India, a program which I believe is a mistake equal only to our heavy aid to Pakistan.

As it does in so many places of the world, the Pentagon believes that because it has a man riding the elephant's back in the form of a U.S. aid mission, it is telling the elephant where to go. But neither Pakistan nor India is interested in where we want them to go. They will string along American military men and AID officials to keep them happy, to keep the guns and money coming, but they are going to put our aid to work strictly for their own purposes and not for ours.

In Southern Asia, the purposes of India and Pakistan relate primarily to each other, and not to either Russia or China. How many more billions do our taxpayers have to waste in India and Pakistan before Congress puts an end to this folly?

I say "Congress," because neither the Pentagon nor the State Department has shown any inclination or capacity to remove an American presence from an

area where we cannot control events and where our efforts to do so meet with indifference or outright hostility.

I say to the Pentagon: "Instead of propagandizing for an expansion of the 7th Fleet into the Indian Ocean, you should be undertaking a review of how quickly our military aid to Pakistan, India, and other Indian Ocean countries can be terminated." The rivalry between them far transcends any U.S. interest, military or otherwise.

#### U.S. INVOLVEMENT ON ASIA MAINLAND COSTLY MISTAKE

Much the same is true elsewhere in Asia. Japan is and always will be a strong and important influence there. Before long, Taiwan will be a small but independent country, joining the Philippines, the Vietnams, Cambodia, Ceylon, Thailand, and the Koreans in the community of small nations of Asia.

As a country of some 700 to 800 million people, China will have a growing interest and influence upon these neighbors of hers. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that China will embark upon the kind of aggression that Imperial Japan embarked on in the 1930's and 1940's, futilely seeking an outlet for her population and for her ideological designs.

But that is a contingency that the United States cannot possibly prevent with foreign aid programs, military missions, by "showing the flag" with a few ships or even with 15,000 troops.

All we are doing with these palliatives is allowing ourselves to be used by the recipients for their own nationalistic purposes, most of which have little to do with China at all. These countries play upon the American fear of China for the benefit of our military and aid officials for what they can get out of us.

Yet the reality is that Asia is a continent of ancient rivalries that antedate by far the very existence of the United States. Their problems of population growth, economic development, nationalistic and religious animosities are never going to be harnessed by the United States from 7,000 miles away, no matter how much money we spend in the effort to do so. There is little community of interest among the countries of Asia vis-a-vis China. Most of them are only interested in using her, as they use us, to advance their own national interests.

The effort to continue dominating the western shores of the Pacific, not to mention any part of the Indian Ocean, will be increasingly costly to us in blood and money. I am flatly and completely opposed to any expansion of our commitments there, and to increasing the scale of our participation in the Vietnamese war.

#### U.S. WAR IN ASIA WOULD BE NUCLEAR

I am opposed to it because American involvement in any Asian conflict is going to be a nuclear involvement. I am satisfied that there is no other way this country could meet the manpower and geographic advantages that a Chinese-backed force would have over us.

I am permitted to say, within the bounds of secrecy and in my capacity as a member of the Foreign Relations Com-

mittee who individually has passed a judgment upon American foreign policy in Asia, that we cannot win a land war in Asia with American conventional ground forces. That is fully recognized by outstanding military experts.

I cannot think of a greater mistake that this country could make than to seek to escalate the war in South Vietnam by using conventional American forces in North Vietnam or in any other areas to the north of South Vietnam.

Therefore I say to the American people, from the floor of the Senate this afternoon, "You have the right to ask your Government now, Do you have plans for sending American boys to their deaths by the tens of thousands in escalating the South Vietnam war above South Vietnam?"

I say to the American people, "Get that answer from your Government now. You have a right to it."

The foreign policy of this country does not belong to any administration at any time in power. The foreign policy of this country belongs to the American people. Now is the time for the American people to find out.

I listened yesterday to a briefing by the Secretary of State, which gave rise to this speech today. I say to the American people they have a right to a clarification of American foreign policy in Asia. They have a right to know what the plans of this Government are in respect to any war in South Vietnam.

I now proceed to my next point. I am satisfied that it will be recognized by all that we could not possibly win a land war in Asia with conventional forces. We could not justify the attempt.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he goes to his next point?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. What would the Senator advise that we do as to South Vietnam? Withdraw?

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will wait for me to make the remainder of my speech, I will tell him. I would give the same advice that I gave at the beginning: We should never have gone in. We should never have stayed in. We should get out.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been saying that for many years, in fact after each visit I made there.

Mr. MORSE. Our number is increasing in Congress. I say to my administration that our number is increasing by the millions from coast to coast.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been advocating such a course of action. After my last visit there, I again stated that we should never have gone in there and that we should get out. My advice was never heeded. That is my advice today.

Mr. MORSE. We tried to pick up France's mistakes.

Mr. ELLENDER. We are trying to do the same thing in Cyprus, trying to pick up the British mistakes.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. I am satisfied that this country would make the gravest mistake of its history by carrying a war, nuclear or otherwise, onto the mainland of Asia. What we might do if we were attacked was answered in World War II; but today we

have not been attacked by any Asian country. Our responsibilities toward South Vietnam are no more than those of every other member of the South East Asia Treaty Organization, consisting of Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, the United Kingdom, and the United States. What joint policy has been worked out with these SEATO members for action in Vietnam? None.

None. That is the key word of this part of my argument: "None." It is a unilateral U.S. action.

But, says the State Department, there has been some token assistance. When we pin them down and ask them to tell us how much of the burden the United States has been carrying, the answer is "97 percent."

Ninety-seven percent. Let that percentage ring out. Let the people of this country know that they are footing 97 percent of the financial bill.

But there are values to be measured in the losses which are much more precious than dollars.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator any details on the 3 percent that other SEATO nations are offering?

Mr. MORSE. I am not permitted to disclose them, but I would do so if the State Department would lift any privilege on them and disclose them. The information on it I have received is on file in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It includes the manpower contribution of other countries, which is even more infinitesimal than their financial contribution.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can disclose what I found out there.

It is a few trucks from Australia and very little military equipment. In fact we are bearing the whole burden in men and material.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

What contribution is any of them willing to make to the Vietnamese war? The answer is "none." Vietnam is not a member of SEATO at all, but a protocol to the SEATO treaty designates Vietnam as one of the areas of interest to the signatories, and about which they will consult if it is threatened with outside aggression.

That is the relationship of South Vietnam to SEATO. Its connection is only by protocol agreement. South Vietnam is not a member of SEATO. The signatories to the agreement designated South Vietnam as an area of mutual interest and would consult if it were threatened with outside aggression.

Hence our treaty obligation to South Vietnam is not unilateral. It is no more than the obligation of all the other signatories of SEATO.

I repeat my rhetorical question: Where are those signatories? They are perfectly willing to let Uncle Sam assume the burden. The time has come for the American people as a whole to decide whether or not Uncle Sam should continue to assume this costly burden.

I am not saying that there is no legal basis for our being in South Vietnam.

But I am saying that all we have ever pledged ourselves to by way of treaty is to consult with other affected nations about any threat to South Vietnam. What we have done beyond that has been entirely unilateral. The South Vietnamese Government toward which we have exercised these unilateral policies is little more than our own creature.

We constructed a government there in 1954, which we then propped up with huge amounts of aid and which we say invited American troops. The rationalization that our Government gives for American troops being in South Vietnam is that the South Vietnam Government invited them in.

There is another salient fact in this regard, for the United States had much to do, in 1954, with bringing into existence the South Vietnam Government itself. History will record South Vietnam as being very much our own creature.

But control of the South Vietnam Government has been passed around within the American-financed governing clique until its association with U.S. support is closer than its association with the people of Vietnam.

My mail reflects a growing discontent of the American people over events not only in Asia, but in Africa, South and Central America, and in the Mediterranean. I am satisfied that the foreign policy reverses that have led to this discontent are the direct result of a vast overcommitment of American interests.

#### WORLDWIDE REVIEW OF OUR VITAL INTERESTS NEEDED

We do not have any vital interests any more because we have called everything vital everywhere.

We will continue to have reverses, and a discontented people, until we refine our vital interests, confine them to our military and foreign aid commitments, and remove ourselves from those many areas of the world where we have no paramount community of interest with the local people.

I speak now not only of Asia. In Europe our policy has reached a new low when we retaliate against Britain for trading with Cuba, but do not retaliate against Spain. Of course, the reason for the difference is that Britain is such a good friend and ally that we get our bases in Britain for practically nothing. But our military aid to Spain is the rental fee for our bases in Spain. So we enforce the aid cutoff only against a friend because it will have no effect, and we fail to enforce it against a broker nation that has something we must pay for.

There once was a famous slogan of American foreign policy that said:

Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute.

We pay Spain some \$30 million a year tribute for our bases on Spanish soil, over which the American flag is not permitted to fly at all, much less together with the Spanish flag. Any time the United States has any such dependence upon a country like Spain, we are in trouble.

Fortunately, we are not really dependent upon Spain at all, any more than we are really dependent upon Turkey, or

Greece, or Iran, or Pakistan, or Indonesia, or any of the other great beneficiaries of our military and economic aid program. We find some convenience in being there, and once the military-foreign aid bureaucracy has entrenched itself in one of them, it finds new reasons to stay and to expand.

Our so-called presence in these countries is one we pay dearly for financially. And like Spain, each of them is really interested in making the best deal for itself at any given time. In recent years, U.S. aid has been the best deal they could get. But in the future, even more than in the past, they are all going to play us off against our own rivals, Russia and China, and promote their local national causes against their neighbors with or without our assistance, and Pakistan has started it.

To pursue and enforce with manpower as well as money all the interests we have designated as vital would quickly break the United States. We know that we have not really pursued them at all, and that is why we have suffered so many embarrassments in recent years. If any area in the world might once have been thought vital to this country, it was surely Cuba. Yet we have found that having a hostile government in power there is not, in itself, a direct threat to the security of the United States. When Cuba installed Soviet missiles, we found ways of coping with that threat without having to cope with the existence of the Castro government itself.

Castro and Khrushchev learned, in October 1962, that if they make the mistake of following an aggressive course of action against the United States, we will act promptly in our own national self-defense. We will remove that aggressive threat immediately. It has always been U.S. foreign policy to make clear to any power in the world that if fight we must, fight we will, and that any aggressive action against the United States will result in our taking whatever action by force is necessary to protect the integrity of this Nation. That is an entirely different thing than to spread out very thin, as we are spreading them out, American forces throughout the world, in areas that are not essential to the defense of the United States, and doing so on a unilateral basis.

This is only one example of how the realities of our policy conflict with our theories of vital interest. Most of the world is coming to know that our theories are good for cash. But they know we could not possibly stand upon all of them. They are not so afraid of Communist aggression any more, either, that they are willing to bow to our wishes.

The world has moved beyond World War II. It is beginning to move beyond the cold war. When are the foreign and military policies of the United States going to move beyond World War II and the cold war? When will the United States develop a foreign and defense policy that will recognize that every event everywhere is not vital to us, and that even if it were, we could not put out enough money and manpower to control all these events? When will we develop a sense of what is vital that we can really

stand on and defend, and follow up firmly and uniformly?

That is the foreign policy challenge that faces this administration. It is a challenge for a post-cold war, missile-age international policy. It must take into account the breakup of the two dominant world blocs, and the technological changes that have bypassed the need for far-flung bases of the kind that were once needed to carry conventional war to two continents outside the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, in the weeks and months ahead, I intend to continue to present a point of view in regard to foreign policy which I am satisfied is held by increasing millions of Americans and increasing numbers of Members of Congress.

In closing this introduction to a series of speeches that I shall make on foreign policy in the weeks and months ahead, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial and two articles published in Navy magazine for February 1964 to which I referred, and which I believe epitomize what is wrong with American foreign policy.

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

[From Navy magazine, February 1964]

NOT WHETHER, BUT WHEN?

For years, farsighted naval officers have warned about a power vacuum in the 3,000-mile-wide Indian Ocean, the waters of which reach many critically important newly independent nations. And the Navy League has persistently urged that strong American naval forces be assigned to that crucial area. One of the key resolutions adopted by the national convention of the Navy League at San Juan, P.R., last May, reads as follows:

*"Be it resolved by the Navy League of the United States, That the U.S. Navy be provided with additional modern ships, aircraft, and personnel in order that this Nation can position and maintain in the Indian Ocean a strong, balanced naval force capable of deterring or, if necessary, preventing further Communist aggression and safeguarding freedom and peace in that important region of the world."*

Unhappily, U.S. Government leaders year after year either did not recognize the developing threat or, if they did, failed to meet it.

The self-liquidating British Empire, beginning in the late 1940's, granted independence to India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and Burma and then later to Malaya, Sarawak, North Borneo, Singapore, Tanganyika, Zanzibar, and Kenya. The subsequent withdrawal of large elements of British military and naval power from east of Suez made no apparent impression on Washington. The Truman "cut-'em-to-the-bone" budgets were followed by the "massive retallation" spending policies of the Eisenhower era. The Kennedy budgets for the Navy at first glance looked better than they really were because of what preceded them, but when the increased threat was considered they did not stand up very well either. The United States, it seems, regularly spurned the tacit British invitation to fill the power vacuum in a strategic part of the world.

MULTIPLYING CRISES

Even the Chinese Communist invasion of India in the autumn of 1962 did not convince Washington, although units of the U.S. Seventh Fleet, which was already spread thin in the vast expanse of the Western Pacific, were dispatched there on an emergency

basis. Then last year, the political-military situation from one end of the Indian Ocean to the other began to deteriorate—and is still deteriorating. Consider these developments:

The truce in supposedly neutral Laos was broken several times by the Communist Pathet Lao, increasing the threat to Thailand and South Vietnam, two of our staunchest allies in the area.

President Sukarno of Indonesia declared he would "crush" the newly created nation of Malaysia and made it plain he aims to end British and American influence in southeast Asia.

Yemeni rebels who took over their country with massive military help from the United Arab Republic (Egypt) are fomenting disorders in Aden, Britain's key military base in the Arabian peninsula, one which helps guard her Middle East oil lifeline.

The Communist Vietcong stepped up their guerrilla warfare against South Vietnam. (Defense Secretary McNamara, who with Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, only last September talked in terms of withdrawing our 15,000-man military force by the end of next year, now concedes that the situation is grave. He even hinted to Congress late last month that we might have to increase our military commitment if South Vietnam is to be saved from the Communists.)

All this bad news finally had an effect on Washington. It was agreed that the United States should have a naval force in the Indian Ocean—perhaps on a temporary basis at first—to be spearheaded by an attack carrier. General Taylor visited India and Pakistan to tell the leaders of those countries what we had in mind. That was last fall.

Since that time there has been more bad news. A revolt of pro-Communist black Africans, a score or more of whom were trained in Castro's Cuba, overthrew the conservative Arab Government of Zanzibar, the Indian Ocean spice island which lies off the east African coast. Native army units mutinied in three newly independent east African countries—Tanganyika, Uganda, and Kenya, requiring the dispatch of British Royal Navy and Marine forces to quell them. Finally, Prime Minister Nehru, the only head of government India has known since it became independent in 1947, suffered a stroke. What will happen in his struggling country of 450 million people when he steps down is anybody's guess.

ACTION OVERDUE

Despite all this turmoil and unrest and the likelihood of more of it in the near future, Washington, who requires no one's permission to do so, has not even sent a naval task force to the area. What is really, and obviously, needed, of course, is a permanent Indian Ocean Fleet, including a combat-ready Navy-Marine amphibious element.

The time for talking and parleying has ended. We have a real, live four-ocean challenge. Let's meet it. Now.

[From Navy magazine, February 1964]

OUR STAKE IN SOUTH ASIA: INDIAN OCEAN AREA CALLED VITAL TO FREE WORLD DEFENSE

(By Achilles N. Sakell)

One of the things we Americans discovered when we were rudely awakened in 1941 from our dream of isolationism was that global peace and our national security are indivisible.

Reluctantly we came to accept the fact that aggression anywhere is a threat, however disguised or apparently remote, to our freedom. We learned that events in one part of the world affect every other part. We learned that, no matter how remote the fire may be, we must help to put it out, lest it consume us all.

We learned an unforgettable lesson, too—that American wealth and productive capacity has given us power and with that power has come world leadership, unsought and unwanted. These two lessons have now been driven home. They now constitute basic premises of American thought.

#### LENIN'S PREDICTION

Another historical fact, of course, is the emergence of international communism as the one great aggressive threat to the liberties of mankind. This threat is an integral part of the equation which we must solve. Some 45 years ago, Lenin said: "First we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia, then we will surround America, the last citadel of capitalism. We won't have to attack; she will fall into our lap like an overripe fruit."

Coexistence, for any length of time, is unthinkable, Lenin declared.

Nevertheless, in recent years, Premier Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders have been speaking of peaceful coexistence with a regularity which is almost monotonous. But one wonders whether all this is not merely tactics or strategy. As we all know, the word "tactics" means maneuver designed to achieve passing advantage, whereas the word "strategy" implies planning for longer range results. Tactics are conceived to win battles; strategy, to win campaigns.

As long as we do not have concrete proof of a real change of heart in the Kremlin, we must remain alert and fully prepared for any eventuality. Experience has taught us that the only thing that prevents the Communists from launching an all-out war of conquest is our strength and the strength of our allies and our determination to use it to stop aggression.

#### NAVY READY—TO BE USED

In this posture of alertness and strength, our Navy is in the forefront. Should trouble come, the fleet can quickly take its station and dominate the sea lanes. Our flat-topped islands of the sea, the aircraft carriers, have been providing the floating runways for the planes which are the eyes and the fists of the fleet. Our guided missile cruisers such as the U.S.S. *Boston* and U.S.S. *Long Beach*, with their skilled "missileers," are deterrents to foolhardy enemy action. Our slim destroyers knife through the sea-waves and bear the brunt of trouble in peace or war. Our attack submarines are always ready to fight on or below the seas. And, of course, our mighty *Polaris* submarines, the most effective of the Nation's deterrent striking forces, remain hidden and poised to deliver overwhelming destruction on any nuclear attacker.

Strategically, south Asia is of great significance. Beginning as it does at the southern end of the Near East, just south of the Suez Canal, it constitutes part of the fulcrum of three continents. Despite the development of the air age, the Suez Canal remains one of the world's key waterways because it enables the great Western naval powers to shift large bodies of troops with great saving of time from the West to the orient and vice versa.

The Near East is a most important piece of the earth's crust, lying athwart the air, land, and sea crossroads of three continents. Even its vast deserts and barren wastes of lava and limestone are strategically important. They have historically constituted one of the greatest natural defensive areas in the world. Rommel and Montgomery were only the last generals to have discovered how difficult it is to pursue the enemy into the desert.

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF OIL

The 250-mile strip of the Arabian Peninsula bordering the Persian Gulf contains oil in the most prolific quantities yet found in the world. That area is considered to have reserves equal to those of the entire United

States. It is true that we in the United States do not need that oil. But our NATO allies are in desperate need of it. We cannot look at the big picture of world oil resources and needs solely in terms of our own direct requirements at this immediate point of time. As standard bearers of freedom, we have to take the broader view of the needs and availabilities of the whole free world.

The strategic importance of that pivotal area was clearly demonstrated during the past two World Wars. The Soviet Union's intention of dominating the Near East is abundantly clear. This historic goal of Russian foreign policy was expressly stated in documents published relating to the negotiations between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union in 1940.

It is evident today in the efforts of the Soviet Union to play on the nationalistic aspirations of peoples and to stir up animosity and hatred toward the free nations of the West. It is evident in the many Soviet "technicians" in Yemen, across from Eritrea, working on airports, roads, and harbors. It is evident in Soviet attempts to achieve ascendancy in Somalia on the African horn. It is evident, too, in the pro-Communist forces which recently took over by force and violence the Government of newly independent Zanzibar, an import spice island in the Indian Ocean off east Africa. These and other signs of the times farther east point up the validity of Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery's assertion that "the center of turbulence in the cold war has shifted to east of Suez."

Soviet geographers today think that the Indian Ocean may exceed the North Atlantic in importance toward the end of the century. According to this school of thought, he who controls the seagates and the coastlands of the Indian Ocean, will control a large part of the heartland of Eurasia, in which, in Sir Harold MacKINDER's geopolitical thinking, lies the key to world control.

#### THIS IS SOUTH ASIA

The length of the Indian Ocean's sealanes is approximately 3,000 miles extending from due south of Iran to the Straits of Singapore. The land mass whose shores are washed by this huge body of water is known as south Asia. Lying along the southern rim of Soviet Central Asia, with a portion of it jutting out into the Indian Ocean as a huge peninsula, this land mass constitutes a subcontinent of 1.9 million square miles. It contains five sovereign and independent nations: Afghanistan, Ceylon, India, Nepal, and Pakistan. Within the borders of these countries live more than 575 million people, almost one-fifth of the world's population.

Along the northern rim of the subcontinent the mountain ranges of Central Asia form the borders between south Asia and the U.S.S.R., Red China, and Communist-dominated Tibet. Afghanistan, the State of Jammu and Kashmir, India, Nepal, and the two small States of Sikkim (in effect a protectorate of India) and Bhutan (almost, but not quite independent in status) border directly on Communist territory.

The colonial experience is one of the very important factors underlying the prevailing attitude of neutralism in this area. Only Pakistan is in a formal alliance with the West; the other nations prefer to avoid alignment with any bloc. Unfortunately the relations of the nations of south Asia with one another have been troubled by a number of disputes and problems. A number of these problems came into existence as a consequence of the partitioning of British India into the independent nations of India and Pakistan. The state of Jammu and Kashmir continue to be a bone of contention between the two larger nations.

#### COMPLICATIONS FOR UNITED STATES

And despite our friendship for both India and Pakistan and our position of strict im-

partiality, the disagreements between these two have tended to complicate American relations with them. Since Pakistan is a member of both SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) and CENTO (Central Treaty Organization—formerly the Baghdad Pact), the United States has granted military and economic assistance to enable Pakistan to fulfill its defensive obligations as a member of these alliances.

Our agreements with Pakistan stipulate that our military aid be used only for defensive purposes. Nevertheless, India has regarded this aid with suspicion, fearing that American arms might be used against her. When Red China subsequently attacked and violated India's northern borders in a short-lived and limited war, the United States rushed arms and aircraft to help India stop the aggressors. It was then Pakistan's turn to become suspicious.

Considerable progress, however, has been made toward settling various matters at issue between Pakistan and India, and the United States is hopeful that the relationships of these two great south Asian nations will be improved in the future.

Relations between Afghanistan and Pakistan have been strained over the status of the Pathan tribes inhabiting the mountainous areas on either side of the Afghan-Pakistan border; and the question of the status of the Indian Tamils who have settled in Ceylon is a problem of long standing between India and Ceylon.

#### A TEST FOR THE WEST

In the matter of all these issues and differences between various nations of south Asia, the United States has maintained an impartial position, seeking to encourage the peaceful settlement of their disputes.

South Asia contains vast amounts of important raw materials and has great untapped production potential. But more important than its potential power or its strategic position is the fact that south Asia is a testing ground for the free world. In this area it will be determined whether nations can surmount tremendous economic and social problems without resorting to the authoritarian system of Communist slavery.

The United States is engaged in a mutually profitable two-way trade with south Asia. The total value of this trade in 1960 amounted to more than \$850 million. In south Asia there are important markets for our agricultural products—wheat, rice, oilseeds, tobacco, and raw cotton. We sell to these nations substantial quantities of machinery, farm equipment, vehicles, iron and steelmill products, and finished textiles. From south Asia we import such important commodities as manganese, mica, jute, shellac, and crude rubber. Large quantities of our tea and spices also come from this area. And as the economic development of these nations advances, our trade with them will be increased to our mutual advantage.

#### SOVIET INFILTRATION

The United States has therefore been extending economic and technical aid to the nations of south Asia to promote the development of their economies and to help (1) create the conditions in which freedom can flourish and (2) eradicate the conditions which are conducive to the spreading of Communist totalitarianism.

In south Asia, as in other parts of the world, the Soviet Union has been extending Trojan horse economic assistance administered by thousands of "experts" and agents whose primary purpose, of course, is infiltration and subversion.

The south Asian nations, however, know that their interests and our own coincide with respect to their desire to remain independent. Indeed we want them to become strong and to remain independent so that they can work out the economic and political institutions which can best satisfy their

own aspirations. If these people were to be successfully wooed by the Communists, the Middle East and south Asia would become a strategic weakness in the common defense.

Because the area is so important in the structure of the free world, we are interested in the preservation of peace and stability there. In President Johnson's reassuring words: "This Nation will keep its commitments from South Vietnam to West Berlin."

#### NITZE SEES "VACUUM" IN INDIAN OCEAN

Secretary of the Navy Paul H. Nitze, going beyond any previous high civilian official in the Department, says that there is "evidence of a power vacuum" in the Indian Ocean area and indicates he believes the Navy should fill it.

Speaking to an audience of Navy and Marine officers stationed in the Washington area on January 9, Mr. Nitze declared:

"Today, we have the challenge of determining whether it is feasible and possible to acquire base rights to support permanent or temporary deployment in that area. If it is possible, then we must learn what these facilities should be. We have the opportunity, and the associated problems, of establishing in conjunction with Cinclac (commander in chief, Strike Command) and the State Department, a proper relationship between either a permanent or temporary naval force in that area and the countries adjacent thereto.

"There are evidences of a power vacuum in that section of the world. The mechanism in which the regional association and stability in this area may come about, based on the concept of mutual support, could well be through the stationing of a U.S. attack carrier task force and its supporting structure in the area."

[From Navy magazine, February 1964]

#### PAKISTAN JOINS UNITED STATES, BRITAIN, AND IRAN IN CENTO NAVAL EXERCISES

(By Desmond Wetter)

Late last year, more than 40 ships from 4 nations assembled at Karachi, Pakistan, at the start of the biggest exercise yet organized by the Central Treaty Organization. Spearheading the force were the American ASW carrier U.S.S. *Essex* and the British carrier H.M.S. *Ark Royal*.

The exercise was divided into three phases, the first two being devoted to such things as communications and weapon training. But the third was, from the point of view of the outside observer, the most interesting since it involved tactics. The basic aim was to sail two convoys on a roughly westerly course from Karachi. During this time the convoys were subjected to attacks by shore-based aircraft of the Pakistani Air Force, Turkish Air Force fighters and British and American submarines.

#### IRANIANS PARTICIPATE

The Pakistan cruiser *Babur* assumed a long-range missile capability and provided an ever-present surface threat. The task of eliminating her fell to Sea Vixen all-weather fighters from *Ark Royal* and later to American, British and Pakistani destroyers.

While this exercise was going on another was taking place along the West Pakistani coast involving minesweepers of the British, Pakistani, and Iranian Navies. The sweeping operations gave the small Iranian Navy the chance to participate.

In addition the ASW air support from *Essex* and *Ark Royal*, the Royal Air Force provided Maritime Air Patrol aircraft which flew from Aden to the Pakistani Air Force Base outside Karachi.

As is inevitable in exercises of this kind, there had to be a measure of unreality. The *Essex* and *Ark Royal* would not, for example, have operated within range of shore-based fighters. Nevertheless, Pakistani F-86's and

B-57 Canberras showed that operations against ships at sea presented them with no major problems and the Combat Air Patrol Scimitar fighters from *Ark Royal* often had their hands full.

#### PAKISTANI IN CHARGE

But the classic mobility and surprise elements of seapower were demonstrated early in the exercise's tactical phase when Sea Vixen aircraft from *Ark Royal* made a highly successful strike against Karachi and "destroyed" large numbers of Pakistani Air Force aircraft on the ground.

Overall command of the exercise was in the hands of Vice Admiral Khan, commander in chief of the Pakistani Navy. Tactical command at sea was exercised by Rear Adm. John Scotland, R.N., flying his flag in *Ark Royal*. Among some visitors to the ships was Adm. James Russell, U.S. Navy, NATO's commander in chief, Southern Europe.

In any peacetime exercise it is very difficult to compute "losses," but there is little doubt that *Essex* was severely damaged by submarine torpedoes and *Ark Royal* was hit by air attacks. On the other hand, *Babur* had her "missile capability" crippled by air attacks early in the exercise.

On completion of the exercise the various ships assembled at Karachi for a "washup" conference. This gave the ship's company of *Ark Royal* a chance to entertain about 1,500 officers and men from *Essex* at a concert party on the carrier's flight deck.

#### THE POLITICAL INTEREST

Politically, the exercise was of great interest in view of the large Pakistani contribution. This consisted of their only cruiser, the *Babur*, five or six frigates and destroyers and a number of minesweepers. This amounted to the great bulk of their navy.

Admiral Khan and the P.N. as a whole undoubtedly could have been susceptible to charges that they were allowing themselves to be diverted from the forces' apparent responsibility—namely preparing against an attack from India. For no matter how unlikely this may seem to British or American eyes, there is no doubt that even the most responsible of Pakistanis believe that an attack by India is, at some time, inevitable. There is little doubt that such a view is one to which even the President himself subscribes judging by the size of the country's military effort in relation to her economy.

There is also the additional factor that Pakistan must retain good relationships with other nations in the Afro-Asian bloc. Clearly, cooperating too closely with Britain, especially, and the United States could lay Pakistan open to criticism in some more warped nationalistic minds that she was a "neo-colonialist and imperialist stooge."

#### PAKISTAN PRESS MUM

Accordingly, the important Pakistani contribution to the exercise was a sign of the nation's leaders' continuing confidence in the United States and Britain and in the validity of CENTO as a bulwark against aggression.

Nevertheless, there was a considerable degree of sensitivity about the exercise in official circles ashore. There was an almost total blackout of news about it in the Pakistani press.

On the other hand, every help was given to visiting United States and British personnel sightseeing in Karachi. Pakistani naval officers whom the writer met were intensely proud of their connections with the Royal Navy even though the more junior officers had not served in the old Royal Indian Navy before independence and therefore had had far fewer contacts with the Royal Navy. The smartness of Pakistan's rather elderly ships aroused some very favorable comments from senior British officers.

But perhaps above all, Midlink VI demonstrated to not only peoples within the borders of CENTO member nations but to those

outside, particularly in the troubled Middle East, that the alliance is no paper tiger and that at least from a military viewpoint it is of great significance.

Compared to NATO, CENTO is more remote in the minds of most Britons and Americans. However, its importance as a stabilizing factor in an area where some relatively minor trouble could trigger off a major conflict cannot be minimized. There is no question that it is in the West's interest to see that the alliance is not only maintained, but that it is strengthened whenever and wherever possible.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I cannot say that I agree with everything the Senator from Oregon said, but I agree with a great portion of it. I should like to return to that part of his speech in which he was discussing Pakistan particularly, and ask him a question.

What is the Senator's opinion as to what would occur if even now—which is perhaps 2 or 3 weeks too late, or perhaps even more than that—we should suddenly say to Pakistan: "If this is the way you wish to play the ball game, play it. We will stop our aid at this point."

Mr. MORSE. That is exactly the point I made. That was my position all along.

Mr. ALLOTT. I realize that, but what is the Senator's understanding as to what would happen at that point?

Mr. MORSE. I think Pakistan would change its foreign policy.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is the point I wanted the Senator to bring out. We seem to be engaged in running in an interminable cycle, like a dog chasing its tail. We continue to pour money into those countries. The more money we pour into them, the more the people in those countries insist that they have a right—and I have heard members of foreign parliaments and members of the cabinets of foreign countries say this—to share in the prosperity and the goods of America.

Does the Senator agree—I am sure he does, because I recall that he spoke a little on the foreign aid bill last fall—that if we were to shut down, and start a policy of shutting down, on countries that are flaunting in our face their flirtation with the Communist bloc day after day, as a result of that policy, we would very quickly force them into a situation in which they would have to change their foreign policy and stop that flirtation?

Mr. MORSE. They would either have to do that or go it alone; and anytime they wish to go it alone, "Godspeed" is my answer.

Mr. ALLOTT. Has the Senator any idea that if we should pursue such a policy of helping countries which show they have a genuine interest in developing a representative form of government, and helping to raise the standards of living of their people—a policy of helping them, and them alone—Russia and China together could not begin to carry the burden which the rest of the world would want to put on them?

Mr. MORSE. That is my case.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor.

### AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1964—THE COTTON AND WHEAT PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton (and wheat) to maintain the income of cotton producers to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] be added to the list of cosponsors of amendment No. 434, which now is under consideration.

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

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the pending amendment is a relatively moderate one. Of course, within the ranks of the cattlemen, there are those who would favor being so extreme as to advocate the shutting off of all imports; but obviously that would not be a reasonable course. Some would prefer the level of 1960; others would prefer a good deal more. Of course, the State Department has proposed a good deal more.

The pending amendment would permit the importation of approximately 540 million pounds of chilled, frozen, and fresh beef.

To give some idea of the magnitude of the amendment, I point out that the importations of these products in 1960 amounted to approximately 414 million pounds.

Other proposals have been made. Proposed legislation previously introduced by my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and now pending in the Senate Finance Committee, would impose an increased tariff on all imports above the levels in 1957. That year was before the big increase in beef imports started.

There is no quarrel on my part with either the bill introduced by my colleague [Mr. CURTIS] or the recommendation of the National Livestock Feeders or those of any of the other organizations. My amendment was deliberately drawn up in moderate terms, so the Senate would be assured that the action we favor would not be at all extreme and would not represent disruption of established trade channels. Under the amendment the imports would still be permitted at a level higher than any year prior to 1961. It is hard to see how imports at that level could correctly be called unduly restrictive or a barrier to trade.

Mr. President, up until now I have been describing the contents and the provisions of the amendment which I am advocating, and also the facts as to the levels of imports which would result if the amendment should become effective as law.

I should now like to speak somewhat of the background of the amendment, to indicate the urgency and the seriousness of the situation which is faced not only by the cattle raiser, the cattle feeder, the farmer and the farm industry, but all related activities and our entire national economy.

Farm income particularly is continuing to take a beating. Last November

sessions were held of the 41st annual National Agricultural Outlook Conference. It was disclosed there that the estimate as of that time for realized net farm income for 1963 was about 3 percent below the 1962 figure. At that conference it was also predicted that the realized net farm income for 1964 would be about 5 percent below the 1963 figure. Putting that into dollars is very simple. In 1962 the realized net farm income was \$12.6 billion.

The reduction amounts to about \$1 billion—from about \$12.6 billion to \$11.6 billion—within that very short 2-year period.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Why is that reduction in income occurring? The Senator undoubtedly will reach that point later, but I thought I would like to ask the question at this time.

Mr. HRUSKA. By sheer coincidence or otherwise, it happens that the next topic in my speech is entitled, "The Major Factor of Farm Income Reduction Is the Collapse of Cattle Prices." With the Senator's permission, I shall discuss that subject. I am very grateful for his presence and attention to the explanation of the amendment.

Beef cattle are the backbone of American agriculture. The most recent agricultural census found that out of 4 million farms, more than 2½ million had cattle and calves. They used about 1 billion acres of land for pasture and grazing purposes, and they consumed more than 70 percent of the total tonnage of our harvested crops.

In 1958 the cash return to producers from cattle and calves was higher than the combined total of sales for all of our so-called six basic crops—wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. The overall cash receipts from all farm marketings for 1963 were about \$36.25 billion.

The receipts coming from livestock and poultry were \$19½ billion, showing the immensity of the income from this source.

From cattle and calves alone, cash receipts are placed at about \$7.8 billion for the Nation. My State of Nebraska, for example, has about \$550 million from that source.

It takes no imagination whatsoever to realize that when the cattle market gets sick, as sick as it has become in these last 15 months, the entire agricultural picture is very badly and adversely affected.

Scarcely a sector of the 50 States escapes such disastrous blows as are visited by the crushing drop in the price of cattle. Those areas not affected directly feel the heavy hand of that shriveled income and the increase in farm sales and bankruptcies, because of the lessened market for products which they either grow or manufacture for the benefit of the cattle industry and its related activities.

The cattle market collapse and the import of cattle, beef, and veal products and other livestock products is not a problem solely of the cattle producer and

cattle feeder; nor even of the meat packing house; nor even of the packinghouse employees. It is a part of the general agricultural problem. It is a national problem. Few cattlemen realized a profit in 1963. The 1964 outlook is no better, possibly worse. After all, the Department of Agriculture predicts a 5 percent further drop in realized net farm income, as this Senator has already pointed out.

The entire situation poses a serious threat to the economy of the cattle industry States—which means most of the United States.

#### COLLAPSE OF CATTLE PRICES

Cattle prices today are almost down to what they were in OPA days of 1946, and that is pretty low.

They started their drastic drop about 15 months ago.

This past year has been one of great disaster for American stockmen. The year 1963 will long be known as the black year for them.

Cattle prices have fallen 25 to 30 percent during these past 15 months. For example, slaughter steers in Omaha, all grades, were \$27.72 per hundred in November 1962; during the last week reported by the Department of Agriculture, the week ended February 20, they averaged \$19.88 per hundred. This is a decline of 28 percent.

In Chicago it was very much the same story. Slaughter steers in Chicago in November 1962 averaged \$29.89 per hundred; by the latest report, they averaged only \$20.92. This was a fall of over 30 percent.

#### IMPORTS OF BEEF AND VEAL ARE CHIEF CAUSE OF CATTLE PRICE COLLAPSE

The general consensus as of now admits of no other conclusion but that the high volume of imports is the chief cause of the collapse of the cattle market.

This was not always so. Up until very, very recently it was the official position of the Secretary of Agriculture, and of the administration generally, that these imports had little, if any, impact on the cattle market. This statement will deal with this position more in detail a little later.

As of now, however, the following points can be cited as proof of the proposition that imports are extremely harmful generally, and constitute the chief cause for the collapse of the cattle market, and the most stubborn factor in preventing a recovery thereof:

First. The Secretary of Agriculture now declares that imports are harmful and must be dealt with.

Second. The administration, through its State Department and Agriculture Department, has been busily engaged in reaching agreements with exporting countries having for their declared objective the reduction of beef and veal imports.

Third. There is virtual unanimity among the cattlemen's associations that imports are the heavy and chief cause of the bedeviled cattle market—the National Livestock Feeders' Association, the American National Cattlemen Association, the National Milk Producers Association, and on down the line.

Fourth. Public opinion and political pressures have built up to a point which have forced the administration not only to a recognition of the problem and the agreements with New Zealand, Australia, and Ireland; but have induced the Department of Agriculture to announce that it plans to engage in an extensive beef buying program to bolster the market.

#### ASK THE BANKER

One way to understand the impact from imports is to realize that the cattle industry embraces many activities. Of course, the focal point is the raising, feeding, and marketing of cattle. Nevertheless, they must be fed, with feed grains and supplements manufactured and transported by a collateral industry; they must be transported either by rail or by truck, an activity which reaches into monumental proportions; they must be packed, processed, and distributed as merchandise, and of course the meat-packing industry of the Nation is one of the marvels of the present world's business activities.

In these processes, the role of the banker is important, because it is he who finances many of these operations, but particularly the cattle raiser and the cattle feeder.

The Omaha National Bank takes pride in the fact that it lends more money on cattle than any other U.S. financial institution. Its vice president, John M. Shonsey, is considered an expert in that field of agricultural finance. Here is what he said recently on the subject we are discussing:

I blame beef imports. They have knocked down prices—at least they have been the major contributing factor.

The situation is critical for the farmer-feeder. He has lost a good part of the working capital he accumulated during the past 5 years. To restore this working capital, he has had to increase the mortgage on his farm—to run up a heavy debt.

A continued downtrend will force many feeders out of business because they will not have any operating capital or any credit.

Because of the large numbers of cattle in the United States, continued large volume imports will mean, for those able to stay in business, a substantially reduced standard of living. They will buy less and they will pay less in taxes.

Mr. Shonsey concluded his observations on this subject in this way:

The industry is in serious trouble because of beef imports. There have always been cycles, ups and downs, but the industry has always recovered, responding to the law of supply and demand—up to now.

The industry could still operate under the law of supply and demand provided the Government didn't allow—and encourage—big imports of beef.

Most of the State cattlemen's associations have been very actively engaged in analyzing and appraising the impact of imports.

A presentation was made by the California Cattlemen's Association to the Tariff Commission in December 1963. As I remember, the sessions of the Tariff Commission were held for the purpose of determining whether there should be a reduction of 1½ cents a pound in the present 3-cent import duty levied on beef and veal imports, for the purpose of plac-

ing that reduction on the bargaining table during the negotiations next May at the sessions to be held on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The California Cattlemen's Association showing to the Tariff Commission in December of 1963, opposing the proposal, included this statement:

Economic analysis and contacts in the meat trade indicate that imported beef used for manufacturing purposes has depressed cow prices from \$3 to \$4 per 100 pounds. The rising volume of imports is also having a significant price-depressing effect on fed beef prices as well as slaughter and feeder cattle prices throughout the industry. An increasing percentage of imported boneless beef is being used in ground form for such beef block products as hamburger, and, as such, is being sold in direct competition with U.S. fresh beef.

On the subject of cow slaughter, the California association went on to say:

During the present expansion of the cattle cycle, a large part of the cow slaughter in the Nation has been from culling the dairy herd. The Department of Agriculture in its November 1963 livestock and meat situation report points out that in order to move as many heifers as possible through feedlots and still increase the basic cow herd, a small number of cows have been slaughtered in the past several years. This has increased the average age of the cow herd and points toward increasing cow slaughter in the next couple of years. The Department's report points out further that the prices of cows in 1964 will depend on imports of beef as well as domestic cow slaughter.

It is in the area of cow beef that the beef imports most directly compete, that is—in the category usually referred to as the canners and cutters beef—the block beef.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, which would limit the imports of beef and veal.

I have been concerned for some time over the decline in beef prices. In January of 1963, I joined several other Senators in sponsoring S. 557 with the purpose of reaching an equitable solution which would take into consideration the interests of domestic producers, foreign producers, and consumers. That bill would place increased tariffs on imports of beef and veal above the average imports during the same period that this amendment proposes. Those of us who are close to the cattle industry have been very much aware that the problem of low prices is aggravated by increasing imports despite the Secretary of Agriculture's denials that this is true. America's cattlemen feel that they have been given some bum steers which have depressed their industry.

Of course, cattlemen recognize that increases in domestic production will help to soften prices. But they are willing to accept that risk; they have been through the cattle cycle before. They know that prices fluctuate in response to supply and demand and they try to adjust their operations to these determinants of price. This they are willing to accept as part of the risk in the production of cattle.

They have not suggested that the Government peg or support or subsidize their prices in any way. In fact, it is a matter of pride to the industry that they

are able to adjust to changing conditions without crying to the Government as so many other agricultural producers have done. But when they see the equivalent of 3 to 4 million head of cattle being imported at prices below those at which they can produce, then they are understandably disturbed.

Imports of beef and veal in 1963 reached the record level of about 1.8 billion pounds, more than eight times the imports of 8 years earlier. Not only are beef and veal imports rising at an alarming rate, but they are making up an ever greater proportion of the total beef market in this country. Eight years ago, imports accounted for about 1.6 percent of domestic production. Last year this rose to about 11 percent.

To say that this tremendous increase has had little if any adverse effect on domestic prices is simply not correct. It is true that most of the imported beef is of standard or utility grade, used primarily for such products as hamburger, sausage, and prepared lunch meats. However, it still competes directly with both the cow beef and the choice beef markets because beef is its own greatest competitor. An increase in supply of any type of beef that results in a decrease in price causes downward pressure on all other beef prices. Import competition with cow beef is obvious. Competition with high grade beef results from the fact that about 25 percent of a choice steer is used for exactly the same products as is imported beef.

There is also an indication that cattlemen have been less severe in culling old cows from their herds than would have been the case if prices for cows had been greater. Instead of being culled and sold for a significantly lower price, many cows have been retained for another year in the hope that they may produce another \$100 calf. The result has been more calves, which has in turn contributed to an increase in herd size and ultimately the supply of both choice and lower grade beef.

I do not desire to take the time to discuss all of the ramifications of the decline in beef prices. I think it goes without saying that whenever any segment of the economy suffers all participate to a greater or lesser degree. There is less employment, income in cattle producing areas is less, and smaller aggregate purchases of all consumer and capital items will follow.

In Utah, the cattle industry is an important part of the State's economy. More than half of Utah's counties have greater dependency on the income resulting from the production of beef than any other economic activity. In several counties, beef production along with the secondary service industries which it supports represents almost the total economy of the area.

The margin of profit in Utah cattle production is small even in relatively good times and the decline in prices over the past 10 years has been sufficient to change what otherwise have been profitable operations into losing propositions. Whole areas have been depressed as millions of dollars of income have been lost.



In the light of this, it would have been reasonable to expect the cattlemen throughout the country to demand tight import restrictions. This however, has not been the case. Livestock producers realize that there is a need for international trade and they know that trade is a two-way street. They have not sought unreasonable advantages.

Early in January of this year, 1 year after S. 557 had been introduced, the Department of Agriculture held a briefing on the problem of beef imports. This indicated that the Department realized there was a problem. It was stated at the outset that the meeting had been called to discuss the problem and seek suggestions that might aid in developing suitable solutions. However, when the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] made a suggestion which did not agree with the Department's pre-established attitudes, he was accused of partisanship and it was claimed that he was simply trying for headlines. Representatives from the Department of Agriculture emphatically said that nothing should be done which would in any way affect the negotiations then underway with New Zealand and Australia on the question of voluntary import quotas.

The negotiations have now been completed and the results are disappointing, to say the least. Most cattlemen feel that the net result is a sellout by the Department of State. There is to be no reasonable decrease in imports; indeed foreign suppliers are guaranteed the record imports which they have had in the past 2 years plus a suggested annual increase equal to more than the estimated annual increase in beef demand in this country—3.7 versus 3.

This is a blow to the domestic producers who had hoped that an attempt would be made to reduce imports to the average of the 1958-62 period. This would not have been an unreasonably low figure, since beef imports during that period were about 6.7 percent of our domestic production and up significantly from the 1.6 percent in 1958. However, the negotiations produced a complete victory for Australia, whose imports into this country have increased until they are 29 times what they were only 5 years ago.

The increase for New Zealand, though much smaller, has also been significant. An agreement on similar terms has also been made with Ireland.

Because of the totally unsatisfactory action taken by the State Department, legislative action is necessary. The amendment which is being offered does not limit imports unreasonably, but would give our domestic producers some assurance that their market will not continue to be eroded by low-priced imports. The legislation also makes a reasonable allowance for population growth so that foreign producers can share in an increasing market. However, it does not allow for an increase commensurate with the expected rising demand for beef, and rightly so. If American producers and processors can devise ways of increasing the use of their products by the public, they are entitled to enjoy the results of these efforts. Thus, the

increase allowed for foreign imports is based on population increases rather than rising beef consumption.

I urge that the Senate recognize the serious problems that our domestic beef producers are facing and accept this amendment. As I said, producers do not desire the Government to undertake a purchase, subsidy, and storage program. That such programs have not been successful is evident from the situation we now face with respect to cotton and wheat.

Cattle producers ask only that the Government maintains a suitable environment in which they can operate their own industry. This amendment would help maintain that environment at no cost to the Government, and I urge its adoption. I certainly intend to support it.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Utah for the very sage and fine analysis he has made of the problem now before the Senate.

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the same proposition as the one in the focus of the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska; namely, the question of meat imports.

Needless to say, this question is one of paramount importance in my part of the Nation. A very large percentage of the entire agricultural activity in Wyoming is concentrated in the livestock business. One of the largest economic units in the State is agriculture—one-fourth of the gross income—and approximately 80 percent of this is derived from livestock itself. Therefore, the viability of Wyoming's economy and, indeed, its stability and prosperity, are to a large measure dependent on what happens in the livestock pricing and marketing fields.

Mr. President, whenever this body attempts to broaden the scope of the measure before it by the addition of an amendment to achieve more than was proposed in the original bill, it is argued that the purpose of the original bill would thereby be obscured and the achievement of its purpose would thereby be impeded. I am aware of that argument in connection with the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska and I am sure that there have been instances in the past of unwise additions by means of amendments to other bills. However, I am equally aware of the importance of having this amendment either rise or fall on the basis of its own merits.

I believe the pending amendment, which restricts the imports of beef, veal, lamb, and mutton, is both timely and appropriately before this body at the time when it is considering the pending bill.

As a cosponsor of the Hruska amendment, I advance two principal reasons why the amendment should be considered in connection with the pending bill. The first is that we anticipate consideration of the civil rights bill by the Senate in a short time, and the consideration of that measure by the Senate may take several weeks or perhaps even months of debate. It seems to me that in that interval of time, even greater jeopardy would confront the American beef, lamb,

and mutton producers, who could not wait that long to receive some help or redress of a very grievous situation. They cannot long endure the ruinous prices they are now receiving for their meat—a consequence, in large part, of the sudden upsurge in the imports of meat. I am quite sure that if those in the industry were forced to wait for the length of time it will take the Senate to act on the civil rights question, many of the meat producers, particularly the small ones, would find their problems solved in one quick package; namely, liquidation. I am sure some of the large operators in the cattle business would be able to survive, regardless of whatever delays might occur before this body proceeded to deal with the cattle problem. But the cattle business depends in very large measure on participation by a great many small cattle raisers. They are the ones who are the primary consideration for the urgency of Senate action at this time on the Hruska amendment. That is the first justification for Senate consideration of this amendment in connection with the pending bill.

The second factor which warrants Senate consideration of the amendment at this time is the general purpose of the pending bill—to provide certain groups of farmers with a means of keeping afloat in rather turbulent economic seas. That is a most important consideration, of course, in connection with the provision of coverage for these farm groups whose economic stability may be threatened by factors beyond their control. The same now holds equally true for the beef producers and the mutton and lamb producers, as well. All of these groups share, not a similarity of crop, but a similarity of situation. It is as logical to help any one of them as it is to help all three at the same time. I am convinced that we cannot afford to postpone taking action on this problem any longer.

All of us are familiar with the economic fact of life that a sound economy cannot endure when one segment—one measurable and considerable segment—is in distress. One of the principal reasons why the bubble of the 1920's burst was the fact that the farmer did not share in the economic well-being of those times. The economies of a great many of the States—those in the West, in particular, and especially Wyoming—are dependent upon a healthy livestock industry. Indeed, the economy of the entire Nation reflects either the prosperity of that industry or—on the other side of the coin—a depressed situation in that industry.

The problems of the beef, veal, mutton, and lamb producers have been under study for more than a year now. The problems are real. The problems are serious. It is apparent that the time for action has come.

It is not as though this problem has developed without warning—in the middle of the night, so to speak. We have been trying to live with this imports problem and to understand it and work it out in cooperation with the other forces which have an influence on stock prices. But the acuteness of the current situation requires quick and substantive action now.

The argument sometimes advanced is that this amendment runs counter to the trend of lower trade barriers and the engendering of mutual trade between nations, for the mutual benefit of all. That argument is certainly an understandable one; but trade activities in that direction must be based upon mutual benefits—meaning benefits to both sides. Certainly the existing situation does not provide benefits to the very substantial American cattle and sheep industry due to the extremely low barriers to the importation of meat, as that policy is currently operating.

All of us look forward to the day when this industry will not need protection, and, in fact, will be a strong factor in our international trading activities. In today's fast-moving world, that day may come sooner than we anticipate; but until it comes, it is imperative that the foundations of our meat-producing industry be preserved. We must maintain our capability to produce on our own continent this all-important food commodity.

I know of no segment of our economy which is more critically central to our national interest in the event of a national emergency than our meat production capability.

Perhaps it is not even necessary to add here that we do not seek at any time to exclude from the American market all foreign-produced meat. What we do seek is the proper and reasonable management of all meat entering the U.S. market. For only if that meat is measurable and manageable can we control it as a factor influencing the price structure. Only in that way can we protect the producer of livestock against the vagaries of the ups and downs of the price structure.

Several months ago, when the severity of the beef import situation and its effect on prices was becoming obvious to all, I entertained hopes that the issue might be settled without legislation—in other words, that through voluntary agreement between nations it might be possible to find a formula that would allow foreign producers some access to our market, but at the same time would not snow under the domestic producers. But it has become obvious, Mr. President, that these hopes will not become realities—at least, not soon, and perhaps not before it is too late.

A voluntary agreement has been effected. It allows Australia and New Zealand to retain the substantial increases in exports which they have developed in the past 2 years. We are not unmindful of the cooperation we receive from our friends "down under" in connection with defense and in connection with other common policies upon which we have united in the area of the development of peace in the Pacific theater.

However, it seems to me that there is real room for hard bargaining and for a mutual understanding in the critical economic sectors of our respective economies that need to be preserved in our collective self-interest.

It is also obvious that one factor in the heavy increase in exports from both Australia and New Zealand is their own foresight in anticipating some sort of

restrictions for the future and their desire to have as high a figure as possible to retreat from during any negotiations. Thus they will be able to maintain a much higher quota than otherwise would have been the case.

It is my judgment that the nature of the agreements recently concluded with Australia and New Zealand reflect such foresight on their part and lack of foresight on our own. We agreed upon an arbitrarily high import quota figure, one that was deliberately run up in the national interest of Australia and New Zealand, but not in our own national interest.

Hard on the heels of that disappointing, inadequate, voluntary agreement comes the news of another agreement—the one with Ireland. I am reluctant to take issue with our friends in Ireland, given the ancestry of so many of our own fine people. Nonetheless, I believe we must face the hard facts. The new agreement with the Irish, which gives them very favorable treatment, ignores the fact that imports from that nation have increased by more than 1,000 percent over the past 10 years.

I can see no reason for our entering into an agreement in a situation in which our national interest is being severely damaged beyond reason by such imports—a damage which allows an increase in imports of 3 million pounds of beef this year, an additional 3 million pounds next year to a total of 76 million pounds, and that to be followed by a further increase of 3 million pounds in 1966. For a nation that has already increased its exports to the United States by over 1,000 percent in 10 years, that action seems very close to spendthrift generosity on our part. Yet we have set a pattern of largess that gives indications of even further favored treatment to other nations in a continuing pattern of ever-widening doors to these imports which threaten the existence of a vital industry.

That pattern must be stopped. It must be stopped soon or it will be too late. Again I remind Senators there is not envisaged in any proposal that I support the absolute cutting off of imports from other countries. The proposal would only say that we have to protect our domestic industry with a fair and predictable percentage of the domestic market and a statement of what we will agree to allow in the quantity of foreign imports into our own country.

I am mindful also that the industry itself is a little divided over exactly what fraction of the domestic market ought to be acceptable. At the present time 11 to 12 percent of our domestic consumption is allocated to foreign imports. However, the industry is united on one thought, and that is that this percentage must be lower in the interest of a strong domestic market.

There are those who would place the figure as low as 5 percent. Others talk of 7½ percent to 8 percent. I, for one, do not intend to fix that static a percentage at the present moment. I hasten to add, however, that whatever figure we can agree upon that will still protect our industry and yet make it palatable for our proper relations around the world is a dynamic concept rather

than a static one. A beef quota or a quota affecting lamb and mutton as well would be adjusted to meet an expanding consumption. It would be adjusted to meet a growing population. Therefore, if we were to agree upon 7 percent of the domestic market, for example, it would mean that as our own consumption increases, as more and more people in our country consume more and more meats, that in itself would provide a larger import from those other countries, but it would be regulated. It would be manageable. It would be predictable. That is what is important. It is the predictability that lends an element of stability to stock prices. We seek this so that a person going into the business—a person who makes most of his livelihood from the cattle business, from the sheep business, or from lambing, in our country can know where he stands from season to season.

While I strongly support the amendment, I would caution both the Congress and those in the industry against assuming that in this simple amendment we have the solution to the basic problem of uncertain livestock prices. To believe that would be comparable to the Maginot line type of thinking that characterized the defense efforts of the French at the time of Adolph Hitler. It would be irresponsible thinking of a most dangerous sort. For although the livestock man may have memorized the word "quota," although he may have put his hat on that single peg as the best hope for his salvation, he would delude no one but himself if he were to believe that if we were to get an idealistic import quota, he would be out of trouble. There are other forces that play havoc with the livestock markets as well as imports.

Imports are outstanding at the present moment because of their sudden rise, their quick impact, and their having a very serious eroding effect on the economy base of our stock raisers in this country. The other forces that are at work, of course, need simultaneous interest on the part of this body and on the part of the country as a whole. The problem of competition with other forms of protein, the problem of overproduction here at home, the problem of the marketing practices of some of those who are deeply interested in livestock prices—all these problems must enter into the picture. Therefore, if we are to provide the domestic producer with equity in his competition from abroad, we also are obligated to provide him with equity in the domestic marketplace as well.

On several occasions I have addressed this body about my concern about the activities of some of the giant food store chains in using their great size, their mass purchasing power, and their vertical integration in order to manipulate the market to their advantage, not only in meat, but in other commodities as well. Their economic power through vertical integration and through their massive organization on a nationwide scale gives them a singular power to lower the price on whatever product they may be interested in storing up at that particular moment.

For example, a little more than a year ago the Denver livestock market saw sizable fluctuations in the purchases of meat by one of the national chains. At that same time the price to the producer dropped \$70 for an average 1,000-pound Choice steer, while the price to the packer for that same animal—dressed out to 600-pound carcass—dropped only \$54. The spread between the price paid to the producer and that paid by the consumer spread by about \$46 to a total gross spread of \$98.40.

That chain of events is ample reason, in my estimation, for a strong, hard look at the pricing practices of the chains and at the marketing participation of the food chains as well.

I submitted a resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 71, last year, that proposed to have the Federal Trade Commission examine these practices.

President Johnson has called for the formation of a special commission to examine the impact of the chain stores on our economy. I hope these two proposals—which should complement each other—will receive favorable action in the near future. This is but one example of the many problems that face the meat, livestock industry. It is really a step removed from the import question. But we cannot put all our hopes and efforts into regulating imports to the exclusion of treating other factors necessary to bring stockgrowers' prices back into balance.

Just as I am concerned with the diversity of the beef producers' problems, I am concerned also with the particular amendment of the wheat-cotton bill we are now considering.

That amendment provides a realistic formula that will give our producers their rightful place in the sun and will be a concrete step in the right direction. It will not solve all the problems of the livestock man or provide him with an easy living, or a guaranteed income. He boasts, and sometimes inaccurately in my opinion, that he is still a rugged individual, unregulated, and can stand on his own feet. But his petition here today should serve as a reminder that he is not, and should not expect to be, in a world economy that has become as intertwined and interdependent as it has. Likewise, he should understand that a large measure of his plight derives from our own so-called free market; namely, when the livestock business is good, every doctor and lawyer seems to go into the business and this results in a glutting of the cattle market. Some of them could not care less if they did not make money. Sometimes we find corporate groups going into the cattle business to use it as a way of obtaining the benefit of tax losses. By so doing, they glut the market and inevitably cause a break in the prices received by the livestock growers. Until the industry itself takes cognizance of this fluid factor in the pricing problem, it is going to continue to be uncertain.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. And it results in competition that the normal cattle raiser or feeder cannot meet when he

must compete with doctors' fees, depletion allowances, and special tax deductions.

Mr. McGEE. Yes; it is unfair to the ones who derive their principal livelihood from stock raising or feeding.

Mr. McCARTHY. Also, referring to what the Senator has said, a basic problem is implicit in the difference in spread between the price received and that charged at retail, and the differential in the price paid to the producer when the product is produced in an integrated operation, which extends from the raising of cattle until they are marketed, which operations are controlled by the large food chains that can recover any loss they may have in the retail price. It draws out of the market the purchasing power which would otherwise run against the total supply of beef on the market, isolating the small producer's own supply, limiting the demand for his supply, and resulting in a much larger supply than he otherwise would have to compete with.

Mr. McGEE. That is true. It illustrates how inefficient the individual livestock grower is who takes his chance, in a so-called free market, trying to get the best possible price for his livestock, when we find that food chains whose primary business should be that of providing foodstuffs for the housewife are going into various economic operations and participating in the supplying of that which they are going to sell, and acquiring a stranglehold on the marketing factors.

When this action is not reflected in any saving made available across the counter to the housewife, it seems to me it entitles the Congress, in the national interest, to raise its eyebrows at these practices and ask for a hard look into what is going on. If the charges made turn out to be untrue, that fact should be made known. If the charges turn out to be true, it is time that the country and the public learn how much it has been hoodwinked by this operation. So it becomes a matter of prime interest for the Congress at the present time.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. While I disagree with the parliamentary strategy behind this amendment—I think this is not the proper way to deal with the problem of beef imports and that we ought not to be writing trade policy on the floor of the U.S. Senate—I believe the Senator from Wyoming has made the most balanced, objective, and helpful speech on the whole matter of the livestock industry that has yet been made. I commend him, as one who is very much concerned about the problems that face the livestock producers, for giving the Senate, in his usually clear, lucid, and vigorous way, a superb explanation of the various factors that are causing difficulty for the livestock growers.

The Senator has very properly reminded us that, in addition to a sharp increase in imports, which have doubtless aggravated the downward direction of cattle prices, there are also other factors at work which are of great importance.

One of those factors, it seems to me, is the sharp increase in the cattle population. Six years ago there were about 91 million head of cattle in the United States. Today that figure stands at about 107 million. I believe the Senator from Wyoming would agree that this increase of some 16 million head of cattle in the domestic market of the United States has been a very important factor in helping explain the slideoff in cattle prices.

I should also like to underscore what the Senator has had to say about the pattern that has developed in the meat industry with respect to the purchase of beef and beef products. The Senator from Wyoming has said that, more and more, a small handful of food chains is dominating the meat industry and creating a situation in which it can more or less dictate the price the producer will receive.

More than a year ago I introduced proposed legislation, as did the Senator from Wyoming, to deal with this problem and at least give the Congress a look at what is happening in this very important part of the livestock industry.

I think these factors are at least as important in explaining the unfortunate drop in cattle prices as is the increase in imports.

So I say again that while I am reluctant to support this amendment, which I think might jeopardize the passage of the wheat bill should it carry, and which I think is an improper legislative procedure in the Senate, I commend the Senator for the balanced presentation he has made today.

The Senator is a sponsor of a bill introduced by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]; and if he is unsuccessful in obtaining approval of the pending amendment, I know his support can be counted on to join the distinguished majority leader, myself, and other Senators, who are pressing for hearings in the Senate Finance Committee for this legislation.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his remarks. He has long been one of the distinguished leaders on this problem in the Senate and in the House of Representatives when he was a Member in that body. His leadership is valued, and his judgment is also valued in terms of finding an intelligent, constructive policy through the maze of conflicting interests on this special question.

I hope, however, that the Senator from South Dakota will prove to be mistaken about the fate of the amendment. I hope the Senate will adopt it. Nevertheless, I do not believe adoption of the amendment will entirely solve the problem. I believe we need to turn with as great dispatch as possible to the proposal that many Senators have joined with the majority leader to initiate, in order to keep at the question of stability in cattle prices in this country.

We have a great deal of work cut out for us. The problem is not only due to imports; nor only to overproduction; nor only to whatever the unknown quantity may be about the marketing practices of

certain interest groups and economic combinations. I believe the industry itself—the livestock men themselves—have the same obligation in the matter. I have had this factor described for me frequently; namely, the feed lots where 1,700- to 1,800-pound cattle are being run. Excessively overweight cattle jeopardize the market. All this is to suggest that not only by an import quota do we put our finger on all the flies in the ointment, so to speak. The import problem is one of those things which hurts and hurts badly, but it is only one.

It is incumbent upon all Senators together to address themselves to the multitudinous forces that interplay and combine to place in such hazard the economic status of the livestock industry in our country at the present time.

Mr. President, that is all the time I wish to take.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. It may well be a live quorum. I hope the staff assistants would call the offices of Senators to notify them. An important amendment is under consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 58 Leg.]		
Alken	Hart	Morton
Allott	Hickenlooper	Moss
Anderson	Hill	Mundt
Bartlett	Holland	Muskie
Bayh	Hruska	Nelson
Beall	Humphrey	Neuberger
Bennett	Inouye	Pastore
Bible	Jackson	Pearson
Boggs	Javits	Pell
Brewster	Johnston	Prouty
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Cannon	Keating	Robertson
Carlson	Kennedy	Russell
Case	Kuchel	Saltonstall
Church	Lausche	Scott
Clark	Long, Mo.	Simpson
Cooper	Long, La.	Smathers
Curtis	Magnuson	Smith
Dirksen	Mansfield	Sparkman
Dodd	McCarthy	Stennis
Dominick	McClellan	Symington
Douglas	McGee	Talmadge
Eastland	McGovern	Thurmond
Edmondson	McIntyre	Tower
Ellender	McNamara	Walters
Engle	Mechem	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Fong	Miller	Yarborough
Fulbright	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Morse	Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have been listening to the debate on the Hruska amendment, which I have the pleasure of cosponsoring. I wish to add a few words of my own.

I know that Senators understand the importance of the amendment, and also understand that many of those in the White House and in the State Department have been telephoning Senators and have been using whatever influence they could to attempt to persuade Senators not to support the amendment.

Although I cannot produce any specific proof, I am absolutely positive that those efforts justify the forecast I made more than a year ago, at the time when, in the process of giving our support to the attempt of Britain to be admitted into the

European Common Market, Britain was faced with the question of what to do in regard to taking care of the production of her Dominions, especially Australia and New Zealand; and that was also true of Canada. I am as positive as I am sure that I am standing here today that at that time the United States made a deal in which the United States undertook to absorb, for the foreseeable future, at least the amount of the previously existing imports from those countries which would be cut off as the result of Britain's becoming a member of the European Common Market. I am equally convinced that the State Department considered that to be an obligation on the United States, even though Britain was unsuccessful in obtaining admission into the European Common Market.

I say this with conviction, because in connection with the imports of all these commodities—whether beef or lumber or whatever other commodity may be involved—the State Department of this administration has specifically gone on the side of the other countries, at the very great expense of the people of the United States themselves. As I have said, more than a year ago I forecast that this would happen; and I am convinced that this is the basic reason behind the pressure from the State Department, in its attempt to have this amendment killed.

This problem has become so serious that it has overshadowed probably any of those in connection with the other amendments which up to date have been offered to the pending cotton and wheat bill. It is so serious that when my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. ALLOTT] and I were in Colorado, a short time ago, we were asked by the livestock people to hold a meeting with our Governor, to discuss what could or could not be done to restrict the imports, particularly those from Australia and New Zealand.

At that meeting—for the first time, I suspect—almost every segment of the livestock industry was represented; and an effort was being made to form a bipartisan Governors' council to try to formulate a policy which would be responsive to the needs of the industry and to those of the economy as a whole, and to show how strongly this loss of income to the livestock industry affects the income of the entire country.

As I said in my colloquy with the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] on February 20, it is estimated that the direct loss from these imports alone to the U.S. economy amounts to \$2 billion a year; and obviously that figure does not take into account the indirect losses through the collateral industries which supply, and which are supplied by, the livestock and cattle industries.

A few other points should be made. My remarks will be brief, because I know there will be many more speeches on these problems, and they will be very carefully documented.

But there is an inequality in the position the United States has taken, insofar as its protection of its agricultural products is concerned. Secretary Freeman himself has pointed out that whereas the United States in general has protective

devices of one sort or another over its domestic agriculture, they amount to approximately 26 percent, whereas the protective devices surrounding Australia amount to 41 percent and those surrounding New Zealand amount to 100 percent. I do not have the figures for the European Common Market, but they are substantially greater than those for the United States.

What is the nature of these devices? In addition to the tariffs, they include quotas, embargoes, monopolies, preferential treatment, import licensing, bilateral agreements, and other things of that nature, which ordinarily are concerned when we consider how to restrict or restrain imports.

So the problem takes on a large perspective if it is put into that area. The problem can be simply stated in the following way: Is the U.S. Government going to make second-class citizens out of those engaged in our agricultural industry, particularly those in the livestock industry? That is what is happening at the present minute. They have entered into an agreement with Australia and New Zealand which gives those two countries a vastly preferred position in the United States.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know under what authority the United States has, without the knowledge of the Senate, entered into those clandestine agreements with the countries mentioned by the Senator?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am informed that those are voluntary restrictions entered into by Australia and New Zealand themselves, which met with a pat on the back from the State Department.

Mr. AIKEN. A voluntary agreement is not a unilateral matter. A voluntary agreement had to be approved by another party, did it not?

Mr. DOMINICK. I concur completely. I cannot give the Senator from Vermont an answer. My guess is that there is no statutory authority for that type of agreement.

Mr. AIKEN. Is not the administration possibly in a position now in which it must choose between keeping its agreement with foreign countries and not cracking down on the American farmer? The United States can keep its agreement with Australia, whether made rightfully or wrongfully. The United States can keep the agreement as long as they are unwilling to stop this unmerciful crackdown on the farmers of the United States—not only the beef producers but the producers of wheat, cotton, and other crops.

Mr. DOMINICK. I completely agree with the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. It is up to those in authority to decide whether they are for Australia or for the United States. So far the indications are that they favor Australia.

Mr. DOMINICK. I might add to the comments which the Senator made, and which I support and endorse, that it is my understanding that not only are we making first-class citizens of the people

of Australia and New Zealand, but we are also in the process of doing that with Ireland, Canada, and Mexico.

So there will be at least five or six nations which will be considered as worthy of first-class protection by our Government, but our own livestock industry will be considered as second-class. That is the type of thing that is happening through the interjection of the State Department into the field of economy in our country. It seems to me that it must be brought home to the people. The only way we can do anything about it in this body is to adopt the amendment.

Secretary Freeman himself said:

The farmers of the United States carry out their production operations with far less protection from competitive imports than do farmers of practically all other countries.

That statement was published in the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal. It refers to a statement made by the Secretary of Agriculture. I am trying to find the date of it. I believe it was in August of 1963.

In any event, what I am pointing out is that the Secretary of Agriculture himself said that before the agreement was entered into, the farmers had very little protection, and certainly after the agreement was entered into they have had far less.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator will also recall that in April 1963, the Secretary of Agriculture made a statement that the large importations of beef from other countries were not responsible for the drop in cattle prices in the United States. In other words, he made one statement in April and he made another one in August. What changed his mind I do not know. Certainly two contradictory statements were made within 4 or 5 months. I wonder whom they are working for, anyway.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct. In November, in Nebraska, he made another statement in which he tended to indicate that there was something to the problem of imports, and instead of doing anything about it, they merely took the top year of imports and inserted that as a built-in lever for those people into our own economy.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. A little while ago the Senator referred to the agreement that the State Department is working on with Ireland. The fact is that such an agreement has been consummated. It was announced about a week ago.

Is the Senator aware that while the imports in chilled, fresh, and frozen beef from Ireland into the United States were 71 million pounds in 1962 and 73 million pounds in 1963, the agreement calls for a limit of 76 million pounds for 1964? That is a rollback in reverse? It means an increase of 5 percent plus in their imports to our country.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Has either the Senator from Colorado or the Senator from Ne-

braska the figures of meat imports from Haiti, where there are 5 million hungry people living? I understand it was arranged that we should import whatever beef they had down there into the United States. Does the Senator know how much that amounted to?

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Nebraska is not informed on that subject.

Mr. AIKEN. The Committee on Rules and Administration was informed what the commission on the sales was.

Mr. DOMINICK. I have a statement that 2.7 million pounds of meat was exported by Haiti into the United States during the last fiscal year, from all of which Bobby Baker received his cut.

Mr. AIKEN. That is probably more meat than the Haitians themselves had to eat in the 6-month period.

Mr. DOMINICK. I agree.

Mr. AIKEN. They took it right out of the mouths of their own people. What there was good about that I do not know.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. In addition to the statements of the Secretary of Agriculture in April and August of 1963, does the Senator from Colorado recall that as late as November 2, 1963, when the Secretary, during his trip to the West, was asked about raising tariffs, his answer was as follows:

At this time I would say there is no reason to believe that these imports, according to our most careful calculations, are adversely affecting beef prices to any significant degree.

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes. The crucial words in there, to my mind, were "to a significant degree," because until that time the Secretary had not been willing to admit that the imports had had an impact of any kind on the situation we are in. At least he seems to indicate in that November deal that there may be a slight bit of reason in the fact that imports were adversely affecting the livestock industry.

Mr. SIMPSON. I can only arrive at the conclusion that it is either ignorance of the problem or lack of concern for it that would permit any such statement as that at the time it was made.

Mr. DOMINICK. I completely agree with the Senator from Wyoming.

Only last Sunday, I believe it was, the Department of Agriculture issued a release in which it announced, with some pride, that it was increasing its purchases of frozen boned roasts, ground beef, canned beef, and natural juices for distribution to schools and needy families. The Department implied, in its release, that this action would solve the whole problem and we would not have to worry about it any longer.

It is a very interesting thing to conjure, because a portion of the agreement with Australia and New Zealand provides for a percentage of the increase in consumption to go to those two countries. I presume this is also contained in the agreement with Ireland, although I have not yet seen it. If that is true, although meat is being purchased and

distributed to needy families and schools, while consumption is being increased, imports also are being increased and a bigger market is being made for them. So we are increasing the problem rather than doing anything to solve it.

It seems to me this is a poor way to solve a basic problem. It is a problem of principle and plain economics. The question is, Are we or are we not going to take action in this body to try to do something about one of the great natural resources of this country, to protect it to some degree at least—not complete protection, but a degree, so at least the importers will not get more of our market than the average of the 5 years preceding 1962?

Bills of this kind have already been introduced, but they have gotten nowhere up to date. This would be one method of solving the problem. It is not complete protectionism, but it provides a way of protecting the livestock industry to a certain degree.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. May I inquire of the Senator whether he received any notice about the beef purchases of which he has spoken?

Mr. DOMINICK. I did not receive any advance notice.

Mr. ALLOTT. I had inquired about this matter at the Department of Agriculture. I tried to get the Secretary of Agriculture several times. He always seems to be out of the country. I called about a week ago. He was in Paris, or at least that was the information that was given to me. I am sure he is going to be able to solve this problem in the bistros of Paris very well. He will solve it there about as well as anywhere else.

Even after making inquiry and asking to be informed about this problem, about 4 o'clock Monday afternoon I received a press release marked "For release Sunday morning," informing me that certain purchases were to be made. Either the person who made the release did not know what had been decided, or had not been decided, because there was no indication of the kind of beef that would be purchased, whether it was to be the fat beef, Prime beef, Choice beef. But the fact remains that throughout the country—and even I knew it from reading the newspapers—it was known that the purchases were to be made before notice was sent to a Senator's office when that Senator had made a specific inquiry and had had specific discussions with the Department of Agriculture about this matter.

Since I believe the Secretary of Agriculture was placed there primarily for the political power he could wield, and as he has shown no inclination to understand or have knowledge with respect to the question of meat imports, neither would I expect him or his office to show to any Senator the ordinary courtesy a Senator would be entitled to by reason of the fact that he had made inquiries of that office.

Let me express publicly my deep appreciation to him for sending me a copy

of a press release, late Monday afternoon, which was to be released to the press some time Saturday.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator for his comments. It seems to me we have a serious problem, one which has not been met by this administration with any degree of cure at least, or at least one which has not been solved in any way whatsoever. We have here, in the form of an amendment by the Senator from Nebraska, a very real method to cure this problem and put the whole matter of imports, so far as livestock is concerned, back into proper perspective.

I might add at this time that, if we succeeded in doing this, it seems to me we would also probably lay the groundwork whereby we could do something about the problem. Perhaps it would be no more than doing what has been done with respect to steel imports and for deserving people in industry throughout this country. At least we would have some sort of framework in case this Government took some action to try to preserve its own economy and not have every other country in the world using our country as a dumping ground for its own products.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, yesterday a colloquy developed on the floor of the Senate with reference to the impact of the wheat bill on the price of bread and the price of flour. That criticism of the wheat bill is perhaps the flimsiest of all arguments that have been developed against it, for various reasons. First, the wheat bill pending before the Senate does not propose to raise the price of wheat to the miller or to the consumer 1 cent above the level at which it stands today. Second, the amount of wheat that goes into a loaf of bread is worth only about 2½ cents. So even if the price of wheat were cut in half, and all the saving were passed on to the bread consumer, he would have a saving of only about 1 cent. If we can judge on past action, even that 1 cent saving would not be passed on to the consumer.

I have a table which demonstrates that in 1954, only 10 years ago, wheat was selling at \$2.24 a bushel. Today it is selling at \$2 a bushel. In other words, the price has dropped about 24 cents in that 10-year period. Ten years ago a 1-pound loaf of bread could be purchased for 17 cents. Today it costs almost 22 cents. So in the same 10-year period that the price of wheat was falling 24 cents a bushel, the price of bread was going up 5 cents a loaf. I believe those figures indicate that there is very little correlation between the price of wheat that the farmer receives and what the housewife pays for a loaf of bread.

Yesterday the Senator from Kentucky raised the possibility that those who buy flour in small quantities and bake their own bread might benefit from some reduction in the price of wheat. But there again we find that while wheat and wholesale flour prices have generally moved together, that has not been true with reference to the retail price of wheat products. There again we have the same situation that exists with reference to bread. While there has been a

drop over the last 10 years in the price of wheat, there has been an increase in the retail price of flour.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two memorandums prepared for me by the Department of Agriculture which sustain the position I have stated.

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

#### EFFECT OF WHEAT PRICES ON BREAD PRICES

Statements that the legislation pending before the Senate would increase the price of bread to consumers and that this legislation embodies a "bread tax," are incorrect.

Enactment of H.R. 6196 provides absolutely no basis for either of these charges.

First, the cost of wheat to millers, including the value of the certificate, should be about the same as for recent years. Under the proposed legislation, the support price (loan plus the value of the certificate) would be around \$2 per bushel. The 1962 support level was \$2 per bushel. The actual price received by farmers for the 1962-63 marketing year, the latest year for which complete data are available, averaged \$2.04 per bushel.

Second, over the years the cost of wheat to millers has been relatively stable. In fact, in 1953 the cost of wheat to millers required for a 1-pound loaf of bread was 2.9 cents, exactly the same as it is today. On the other hand, the retail price for a 1-pound loaf of bread in 1953 was 16.4 cents while today it is 21.6 cents.

Third, wheat is a very small part of the cost of a loaf of bread. In order to justify an increase of 1 cent in the price of bread, the price of a bushel of wheat would have to be increased by approximately 70 cents per bushel. In 1962 it would have taken a 40-percent drop in the price of wheat to lower the price of bread by 5 percent or by a single cent. Conversely, a 40-percent increase in the price of wheat in 1962 would have increased the price of bread by only 1 cent—roughly 5 percent. We have not experienced such a large change in the price of wheat in recent years.

The facts clearly indicate that the proposed bill would not result in an increase in the cost of wheat plus the certificate. That is to say, there is no basis for stating that the program would be instrumental in raising the cost of wheat to millers, raising the price of bread to consumers, or to the charge that the program constitutes a "bread tax."

The attached table provides additional details with respect to support prices for wheat, prices received by farmers, and the cost of wheat and retail prices of bread for the past several years.

Wheat and bread prices, 1951-63

Year	Support price (per bushel)	Season average price received by farmers (per bushel)	Cost of wheat to miller in 1-pound loaf of bread <sup>1</sup>	Retail price 1-pound loaf of bread <sup>1</sup>
			Cents	Cents
1951.....	\$2.18	\$2.11	2.8	15.7
1952.....	2.20	2.09	2.8	16.0
1953.....	2.21	2.04	2.9	16.4
1954.....	2.24	2.12	3.2	17.1
1955.....	2.08	1.99	3.2	17.5
1956.....	2.00	1.97	3.0	17.9
1957.....	2.00	1.93	2.9	18.3
1958.....	1.82	1.75	2.8	19.7
1959.....	1.81	1.76	2.7	20.3
1960.....	1.78	1.74	2.7	20.9
1961.....	1.79	1.83	3.0	21.2
1962.....	2.00	2.04	3.0	21.2
1963 <sup>2</sup> .....	*2.00	1.87	2.9	21.6

<sup>1</sup> Source: Marketing and Transportation Situation, February 1964.

<sup>2</sup> Preliminary.

<sup>3</sup> Includes 18 cents per bushel price-support payment.

#### THE PRICE SITUATION FOR WHEAT, FLOUR, BREAD

(By the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service)

Wheat and wholesale flour prices generally move together and over the years prices of both have declined, as shown in the accompanying chart. However, the retail prices of bread and consumer-size packages of flour have trended upward.

Following is a brief summary of some reasons why wheat prices and the prices of products made from wheat do not always follow the same pattern, as well as a discussion of the current price status of these items. The prices used in this report either are national averages or are for major markets. Therefore, they do not always fully reflect individual local market situations.

#### WHEAT

The farm price of wheat rose substantially during July-October 1963, the first 4 months of the current wheat marketing year. However, the farm price during this period averaged \$1.83 per bushel, 15 cents below the July-October 1962 average. Even with the recent increases, farm wheat prices still are just about in line with those of a year earlier.

U.S. average farm price of wheat  
(Dollars per bushel)

	1962	1963	Change from 1962
July.....	1.98	1.75	-0.23
August.....	1.99	1.77	-.22
September.....	1.99	1.84	-.15
October.....	1.97	1.94	-.03
Average.....	1.98	1.83	-.15

The pattern of wheat prices has been different this season than last, but has registered a more normal seasonal movement than in 1962. In 1962, wheat prices were steady all during the summer harvest period, but in October dropped a cent or two. In 1963, prices reached a low at harvest time, when farmers sell much of their wheat, and have risen steadily since then. Variations in year-to-year price patterns reflect current supply and demand situations for wheat as a whole, and also as it pertains to the different classes of wheat. Market prices for wheat fluctuate from day to day but are generally no higher now than a year earlier.

Rising wheat prices this year are due to several factors, including greatly increased demand for wheat in Western Europe, Japan, the Soviet Union, and the eastern European countries. Western Europe and Japan are traditional customers but because of short crops in 1963 they are buying more wheat than usual. Even if wheat were not exported to the Soviet bloc, exports from the United States in the 1963-64 marketing year still would set an alltime record and prices would be expected to continue near current levels. On the other hand, no further appreciable rise in wheat prices is anticipated as a result of the sales to the Soviet bloc. This is true because wheat prices have reached the formula resale level at which the Department of Agriculture can sell from its stocks. Since these stocks are very large, they act as an effective ceiling for wheat prices.

#### FLOUR

The Department of Agriculture does not collect price data for the different types of flour. However, reports by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, show that wholesale prices of flour at two major milling centers during June-August 1963 averaged 75 cents per hundred pounds below the same period in 1962. By September, the latest month for which data are

available, prices had risen somewhat but were still 55 cents per hundred pounds below a year earlier. The pattern of wholesale flour prices this year, as with wheat, is quite different from 1962. From June to September 1963, wholesale flour prices declined 2 cents per hundred pounds compared with a rise of 17 cents during the period in 1962. While these particular prices are for flour used by commercial bakers, which probably accounts for about 75 percent of the flour sold, they also reflect the prices of other types of flour.

*Wholesale prices of commercial bakery flour*  
(Dollars per 100 pounds)

	1962	1963	Change from 1962
June.....	5.81	5.44	-0.37
July.....	5.96	5.18	-.78
August.....	6.06	4.96	-1.10
September.....	5.98	5.42	-.56
Average.....	5.95	5.25	-.70

*Retail prices of family flour in leading cities*  
(Cents per 5-pound bag)

	1962	1963	Change from 1962
July.....	56.9	57.7	+0.8
August.....	57.0	57.2	+.2
September.....	57.3	57.3	0
October.....	57.2	56.8	-.4
Average.....	57.1	57.2	+1.1

About 15 to 20 percent of the flour sold is all-purpose or family flour. It is normally sold under advertised brand names and in small packages, usually of 5 or 10 pounds. In September, a 5-pound bag of this flour sold at retail for 56.8 cents, a slight drop from the August price. However, trade reports indicate some subsequent increase in prices from the September level.

The recent price increase announced by some millers is considered a normal adjustment to reflect flour market conditions, including some rise in wheat prices. Earlier this year when wheat prices were declining, many millers reduced flour prices. At the present time, prices of flour appear to be no higher than a year ago. No further appreciable rise in wheat prices is anticipated. Consequently, further general and significant increases in wholesale flour prices in the near future would not be expected, based on the price outlook for wheat.

However, there has been a longtime rise in the retail price of all-purpose flour and in the first 8 months of calendar 1963 the price of a 5-pound bag was 8.6 cents above the 1947-49 average of 48.4 cents. Marketing costs constitute a large share of this price and these costs continue to increase every year in spite of the downward trend in the price of wheat, the raw material. As long as marketing costs continue to rise, it appears likely that the price of this flour will continue its upward trend.

**BREAD**

The wheat and other farm-originated ingredients in a loaf of bread make up only 3.1 cents of the retail price with wheat accounting for 2.6 cents. Thus, moderate changes in wheat and flour prices have little influence on the retail price of bread. In fact, wheat prices are lower today than they were 15 or 20 years ago. However, because of the rise in other costs, consumers in the first 8 months of 1963 paid an average of 21.6 cents for a 1-pound loaf of bread, 60 percent more than the 1947-49 average. The spread between the retail price and cost of farm-originated ingredients averaged 18.5 cents in the first 8 months of 1963, 81 per-

cent more than in 1947-49. Most of the increase was in the baker-wholesaler segment of the spread.

**AMENDMENT NO. 463**

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill, H.R. 6196, and ask that it be printed, and also printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, this amendment is designed to require the labeling of imported meat, poultry, and fish, or any products therefrom, so that the purchaser, whether the wholesaler or the consumer, will know that such items have been imported into the United States or have not been produced in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 463) submitted by Mr. MILLER, is as follows:

On page 32, after line 13, add the following new title:

**"TITLE III—LABELING AND ADVERTISING OF IMPORTED MEAT, POULTRY, AND FISH**

**"SEC. 301.** Chapter IV of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

**"IMPORTED MEAT, POULTRY, AND FISH**

**"Sec. 410 (a)** No importer, processor, packer, jobber, distributor, dealer, retailer, or other person shall advertise, sell, or offer for sale any meat, poultry, or fish imported into the United States or any food products containing any such meat, poultry, or fish, unless such meat, poultry, fish, or food products, or the containers, packages, or wrappings in which they are sold, whether at wholesale or retail, are clearly marked or labeled to show that such meat or poultry were not produced in the United States, that such fish were imported into the United States, and that such food products contain meat or poultry not produced in the United States or fish imported into the United States.

**"Any such marking or labeling shall be in type or lettering at least as large as any other type or lettering on the containers, packages, or wrappings.**

**"Any advertisement of such meat, poultry, fish, or food products shall clearly state, in type or lettering at least as large as any other type or lettering in such advertisement, that such meat or poultry were not produced in the United States, that such fish were imported into the United States, and that such food products contain meat or poultry not produced in the United States or fish imported into the United States.**

**"(b)** Any meat, poultry, fish, or food products advertised, sold, or offered for sale in violation of this section shall be deemed for the purposes of this Act to have been misbranded."

**WOOLING THE FARM BLOC**

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, many Americans have been wondering why the Johnson administration, which had assigned its top legislative priority to civil rights, rather suddenly switched gears recently to rush the wheat-cotton bill through the Senate. This bill adds to the consumer's burden in his war not to become eligible for Federal cures for poverty. The answer to that question is given in an excellent editorial, "Wooling the Farm Bloc," which appeared in

the New York Times of March 3. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

**WOOLING THE FARM BLOC**

The power of the farm bloc is waning, but the administration and Congress continue to treat it with extraordinary solicitude.

A bill to provide extra income to wheat farmers is being rushed through despite Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman's decision against any new wheat legislation after growers had voted down his plan to control production. The same bill would also give a brand new subsidy to domestic textile producers, who justifiably complain that the present subsidy system for cotton growers and cotton exporters favors foreign competition. But three wrong subsidies don't make a right one—they only make matters worse.

These proposed handouts are getting priority over civil rights. According to the administration, haste is necessary because spring sowing will soon begin. But it is difficult to escape the conclusion that Washington wants to be sure that the farmers are reaping a new harvest of subsidies well before election day rolls around.

What all this means is higher costs for the consumers. The new wheat proposal will increase prices for bread and flour; the new cotton subsidy will mean higher prices for textiles. As a result, there will be increased use of cotton substitutes, so that the cotton surplus will grow; and there will be new incentives to increase the wheat crop at a time when the wheat surplus was being reduced, largely because of foreign demand, to manageable proportions.

Instead of playing politics with the farm bloc at the expense of the consumer, the administration and Congress could afford to take a fresh look at the agricultural problem. The solution does not lie in newer and bigger subsidies, which will only keep too many people sharing too little income down on the farm. What is needed is special help for those who cannot make a living out of farming and a gradual dismantling of subsidies for the efficient and profitable farmers. There can be no end to farm surpluses as long as the Government is willing to provide subsidies every time an election is in sight.

**NATIONAL STOCKPILE OF DISEASE SERUMS**

Mr. HART. Mr. President, almost a year has passed since the unexpected outbreaks of botulism caused a number of unfortunate and tragic deaths. As a Senator from Michigan, I am particularly sensitive to this problem, as our fishing industry has not yet recovered from the scare growing out of these deaths.

Although the danger from eating smoked fish from Michigan waters is gone, the memory lingers on.

Certainly, the Public Health Service is to be commended for the prompt action it has taken to insure that deaths from botulism need not occur in the future. Elaborate plans have been made to have serum on hand so that we will be ready for any further outbreaks.

But what really bothers me is that such a catastrophe is needed to stimulate corrective measures. We spend billions to stockpile for defense against a possible military conflict. Is it not equally

necessary and sensible to spend a fraction of this amount to stockpile against possible death from disease?

At the time of this outbreak, it was reported that we had substantially no type E botulism antitoxins in this country. The Washington Post for March 21, 1963, reported that the antitoxin needed to treat the two women in Detroit, who were the first victims, had to be imported from Canada. It arrived too late, and both women died.

Even after that warning, we were not adequately prepared. At the second outbreak, the New York Times for October 9 carried an AP dispatch from Knoxville. It said:

Doctors at University Hospital here said all the type E serum known to exist in the United States was flown here early today for the treatment of seven victims of the food poisoning. Some of the antitoxin was flown on to Nashville for use on \* \* \* a patient there.

Only enough serum was on hand to treat seven or eight people. Some of that came from Canada and some was flown in from Denmark. We can be most grateful and appreciative that Denmark—population 5 million—and Canada—population 18 million—were able to supply a highly critical antitoxin that the United States—population 190 million—urgently needed but did not have.

Why did we not have our own supply? There are several parts to the answer. First, botulism is a rare disease, fortunately. Second, the antitoxin we do have is for types A and B, but apparently that is not effective against type E. Third, biological products of this nature differ from chemical drugs in that they are much more expensive to produce and have much shorter storage life.

It is clear that no one had undertaken the responsibility of being ready for this kind of emergency situation wherein the emergency is rare and the cost is high.

A brief technical background may be helpful in understanding this problem. Two basic classes of inoculations are used to fight disease: vaccines which are designed to confer immunity, and antitoxins which are used to treat an existing disease.

In the main these products share these limitations:

First, the production process is long; Second, both basic materials and finished products are perishable, and cannot be stored in ordinary warehouses against a distant emergency;

Third, the supply cannot easily be greatly expanded in a short time;

Fourth, most of these are administered by injection, and hence must meet the highest standards of purity;

Fifth, many of them are needed only on rare occasions, but when needed are required in considerable quantity and on extremely short notice; and

Sixth, there are no substitute drugs for the diseases against which these biologicals are used.

The pharmaceutical companies have, of course, made some provision for the problem. Lederle lists Bivalent Botulism Antitoxin, globulin-modified, types A and B. The recommended dose is 10,000 units, "repeated at 4-hour intervals until the toxic condition is alleviated." The

manufacturer's price of a single dose to the retail drugstore is \$41.37. With a day's treatment running around \$300 per person, it is clear that mass treatment of an exposed population can be highly expensive—as long as the available supply of the antitoxin holds out.

"Immunity" is the ability to withstand attacks of the bacteria or viruses which cause diseases. This capability takes the form of active attack, and killing or neutralizing the disease carriers; it is not in the nature of armor which prevents entry into the body of the disease-causing germs.

The attacking forces are called antibodies. These are spontaneously produced within the body upon invasion by a disease. If the individual survives the disease, the antibodies usually remain—or are reproduced—for subsequent protection against the same disease. In some cases, antibodies developed from one kind of infection may be effective against some other disease.

It is well known that most "children's diseases" are relatively mild in effect, and confer immunity thereafter.

The natural sources of immunity, then, are prenatal inheritance from the mother, and individual generation of antibodies from natural exposure to diseases. Artificial immunity derives from the body's reaction to vaccination or inoculation with killed or weakened strains of disease-bearing germs. But natural immunity is on the decline.

As public health measures continue to advance, more and more diseases are almost stamped out. Fewer and fewer people are exposed to even mild infection. As incidence declines, fear of the disease diminishes, and vaccination and inoculation are given less frequently. Artificially-induced immunity thus also declines.

Diseases are rarely eliminated completely, however. Somewhere in the world there is likely to be some person, or some animal, harboring seeds of a virulent disease.

When intercontinental travel was by boat, the traveltime was normally longer than the incubation time of most diseases. Quarantine at the port of entry of an infected individual, or even of an entire ship, could prevent the spread of the disease in the United States. In these days of jet transportation, a traveler exposed to a now-rare disease in a jungle on Tuesday may be in Washington, Detroit, or San Francisco on Friday afternoon—with no symptoms yet observable.

Just such a case occurred recently. A boy came down with smallpox a few days after he had arrived here by plane from South America. He even had a medical certificate that he had been successfully vaccinated. Fortunately, the case was diagnosed and the boy was isolated in time, apparently, to prevent infecting other people.

Science News Letter for November 16 carried an immunology item. Headlined "Immunity to Smallpox Down in the United States," it said:

Smallpox is on the increase overseas at the same time the level of immunity in the United States appears to be going down.

An American Medical Association official warned in Washington that the United States has not had a confirmed case since 1949, but smallpox has appeared again in Sweden and other countries long free of the disease.

In most parts of the world the smallpox average is up 13 percent. Children should be vaccinated before they enter school or sooner, and adults likely to be exposed to travelers from overseas should renew their vaccination at least every 5 years.

Dr. Raymond L. White, director of Environmental Medicine and Medical Services for the AMA, cautioned that one infected person could touch off 100 cases before it is even known that smallpox is in the country.

An example of the danger in lack of immunity is provided by the case of Greenland, a civilized but relatively isolated island which did not have a great deal of contact with the rest of the world. There had been no case of measles in Greenland for many years. Natural immunities lapsed and were not replaced.

In 1951, a measles epidemic developed from a single case brought by a sailor from Europe during the incubation period. Out of some 4,300 inhabitants in the district affected, over 99 percent suffered measles. The only people who escaped were a handful who had previously had the disease in Europe, or who received complete passive immunity. In spite of the best medical care furnished by doctors and nurses from Denmark, the death rate was very high, amounting to 18 per thousand of the exposed population. By contrast, the death rate in the United States from measles for the same year was about 4 per million population. The Greenland rate was 4,500 times the U.S. rate—a high price to pay for the lack of immunity.

The botulism outbreaks and the smallpox case point up the necessity of having large and more dependable supplies of lifesaving biologicals on hand in the United States. We must have both treatment-type serums and immunizing types.

Fortunately, the U.S. Public Health Service is already authorized to make biologicals. Section 352, "Preparation of Biological Products," of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 263) reads:

Sec. 352. (a) The Service may prepare for its own use any product described in section 351 and any product necessary to carrying out any of the purposes of section 301.

(b) The Service may prepare any product described in section 351 for the use of other Federal departments or agencies, and public or private agencies and individuals engaged in work in the field of medicine when such product is not available from establishments licensed under such section.

Mr. President, section 351 is broad in its scope, covering "any virus, therapeutic serum, toxin, antitoxin, or analogous product, or arsphenamine or its derivatives, or any other trivalent organic arsenic compound, applicable to the prevention, treatment or cure of diseases or injuries of man."

This is the section which gives the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare licensing and inspection authority over the manufacture of all these biologicals. The Secretary exercises this authority through the Public Health Service. The Service, therefore, has a



long history of intimate connection with the preparation of these biologicals.

Section 301 directs the Surgeon General to conduct a wide range of research and investigation and to provide funds and information to others to enable them to engage in research on matters affecting the public health.

I am, therefore, calling on the Surgeon General to prepare a program of production and stockpiling for critical biologicals.

The Surgeon General should call a conference of all manufacturers of biological products. He should explore with industry the potential peak requirements for each antitoxin, vaccine, toxoid, antivenin, and so forth, and the commercial supply which can be counted on.

Naturally, he should urge the manufacturers to shoulder the responsibility for the slow-moving items. The industry's spokesmen have stressed, in testimony before the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, the necessity for great profit margins on the popular drugs to make up for losses on drugs of only occasional use. Here is an opportunity for the pharmaceutical industry to justify some of those statements.

In the event, however, that the industry does not elect to furnish the required biologicals, the Surgeon General must act upon his own statutory responsibilities. With the powers and funds at the disposal of the Public Health Service, it is essential that life-saving but unprofitable drugs be provided by the Government, if the industry fails to do so.

Mr. President, the expenditure of public funds to protect against a potential threat to the public health is analogous to paying insurance premiums. So, also, is the expenditure of \$40 to \$50 billion a year for defense. We make the expenditure which we can afford, to protect against a cataclysm which we cannot afford to face unarmed.

I submit that out of all the hundreds of millions of dollars annually appropriated to the Public Health Service—including the National Institutes of Health—we can well afford to spend a fraction of that amount to have all the biologicals we need ready in case of a major natural—or even enemy—attack.

I ask unanimous consent to have my letter to the Surgeon General printed in the RECORD.

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

MARCH 4, 1964.

HON. LUTHER TERRY,  
Surgeon General of the United States, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. TERRY: The outbreaks of botulism last year and the inability of the pharmaceutical industry to provide the antitoxin required for treatment have been most disturbing to me.

Certainly the Public Health Service and yourself are to be commended for the prompt action taken to insure that deaths from botulism need not occur in the future. But what really bothers me is that such a catastrophe is needed to stimulate corrective measures.

May I suggest that a conference of manufacturers of biologicals be called to devise

ways and means of assuring that supplies of antitoxins will be adequate to meet any likely emergency for other rare diseases. Toward this end, the U.S. Public Health Service could conduct a survey of the potential requirements for biologicals that may be needed on a once-in-a-year basis. Commitment should be obtained from biologicals manufacturers to produce and maintain adequate supplies of usable vaccines. Some means of providing "fair compensation" to cover the actual cost of producing and storing little used biologicals could also be devised.

In the event firm commitments by the industry are below your estimate of essential minimums, the Public Health Service could produce, or have manufactured for it, the needed supplies. As you know, of course, you are specifically authorized by section 352 of the Public Health Service Act to prepare biological products for use of the Service; and for use of other medical agencies and individuals when such products are not available from commercial producers.

Also, under your research and investigation authorization, section 301, you can cause to have carried on research in improved methods of preserving such biologicals (as for example freeze-drying and storing in vacuum or inert gases at very low temperatures) so as to reduce the costs of storing and to increase the possibility of stockpiling significant quantities.

We spend billions stockpiling for defense. Should we not spend a fraction of this amount stockpiling for health? It seems to me that the American people have a right to expect that antitoxins be available for even the rarest of diseases. I know that Government and industry working together under your leadership can provide this assurance.

Sincerely,

PHILIP A. HART,  
Chairman.

#### OFFICE OF DEPUTY PRESIDENT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish the Office of Deputy President, to provide for the continuous discharge of the powers and duties of the Office of President, and for other purposes.

The Office of Vice President has been vacant on 16 occasions in our history—8 times because the Vice President succeeded to the Presidency, 7 times through the death of the Vice President, and once following resignation of the Vice President. No President has attained office under any of the succession laws, but even if the possibility of succession is remote, we should carefully consider adjustments in procedures which might better protect the national interest in case of succession.

The bill which I have introduced would create a new Office of Deputy President. The Office would be filled only in the event the Office of Vice President is vacant. Nomination to the position would be made by the President within 30 days following the vacancy in the Office of the Vice President, and confirmation by the Senate would be required according to the regular procedure. I would prefer that the approval of both the House of Representatives and the Senate be required for confirmation of the Deputy President, if this can be provided without a constitutional obstacle. If further study shows this can

be done, I will move to amend my bill to provide it.

The bill designates the Deputy President as first in line of succession to the Presidency in event of the death or disability of the President. It removes the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate from the line of succession, but in other respects it follows the succession law of 1947 in providing for succession through the members of the Cabinet, in case the Office of Deputy President is vacant.

The proposal incorporated in my bill does not require a constitutional amendment. I am not absolutely opposed to adoption of a constitutional amendment to provide a more detailed system, but I believe there is advantage in retaining the flexibility which now exists.

The Constitution provides sufficient authority to enable Congress to act by statute. Article II, section 1, paragraph 5, of the Constitution states:

In case of the Removal of the President from Office, or of his Death, Resignation, or Inability to discharge the Powers and Duties of the said Office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by Law provide for the Case of Removal, Death, Resignation, or Inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what Officer shall then act as President, and such Officer shall act accordingly, until the Disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

In addition to this direct grant of authority, the responsibility of Congress was set forth in the original section 1, paragraph 3, of article II, of the Constitution. This placed the right to elect the President with the House of Representatives, in the event the electoral college failed to elect.

This procedure was reaffirmed by the 12th amendment which was ratified in 1804. The 20th amendment in 1933 further extended the right of Congress by providing for congressional action when neither the President-elect nor the Vice President-elect shall have qualified. All these powers taken together clearly indicate the importance of Congress in extraordinary occasions involving the Presidency.

Congress has exercised its responsibility for succession by law in 1792, 1886, and 1947. The law of 1792 designated the President pro tempore of the Senate as first in line for succession, followed by the Speaker of the House. The act of 1886 placed succession in the President's Cabinet, starting with the Secretary of State. The law of 1947 returned to Congress but this time the Speaker of the House was designated first in line, followed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the members of the Cabinet.

These laws have protected the basic national interest, but conditions change, and I believe we should again examine the succession law to see if it can be improved.

The responsibilities of the President have increased greatly in recent years, and so has the need for the official next in line of succession to be experienced and well informed about the duties he may be called upon to assume.

The President cannot share his responsibilities or information fully, but it is possible for the officer next in line to have daily familiarity with the operations and policies of the administration which he may be called upon to head, and with the executive personnel with whom he must work.

The creation of the Office of Deputy President would provide an officer who could give full-time assistance to the President and who would gain practical experience with the responsibilities of the Presidency. Neither the Speaker of the House, as under the present law, nor the Secretary of State, as once provided, can adequately fulfill this twofold responsibility. These are very important positions in their own right. They require the full attention of those holding them. On the other hand, their responsibilities are specialized.

The President has need of a Vice President, or equivalent officer, to assist him in the performance of his duties; and the Nation should have the assurance that the Vice President, or other officer, is prepared to assume the office if it becomes necessary.

In effect, my proposal returns the succession policy to the procedure provided from 1886 to 1947. During this time the Secretary of State, a Presidential appointee confirmed by the Senate, was next in line.

A major advantage of creating the new Office of Deputy President, which would be filled only in case the Office of Vice President was vacant, is that the choice of the Deputy President would be made under politically realistic conditions. A weakness of our succession laws has been that the designated successor often attained his position for reasons and considerations quite apart from the possibility of succession.

Under the terms of the bill I have introduced, the choice of the Deputy President will be made with the full understanding that he would have the right of succession.

The bill provides that the President shall nominate from among those experienced in Government: the members of the Cabinet, the Members of Congress, the Justices of the Supreme Court, and the Governors of the States. The Deputy President would be required to resign this office on assuming his duties.

Finally, the proposal would guarantee continuation of leadership by the political party which won the previous election. In 8 of the past 18 years, the Speaker of the House has been a member of a different party from the President.

In the event of a double vacancy, a complete change of administration would have followed. The succession law should respect the mandate of the people, who vote not only for a man but also, in a broad way, for his party and its program. The elevation of a leader of another party in midterm is undesirable in principle and could have most unfortunate practical effects.

There might be difficulty in getting a Member of Congress to resign his office to fill an abbreviated term as Deputy President, but the choice is somewhat similar to that which one must make

when he, in anticipation of election, accepts the nomination for Vice President. The procedure would present no difficulty at all if the President nominated a member of the Cabinet as Deputy President. In any case, we can be confident that when the President asked a man to help him and the Nation meet this serious problem, well-qualified men would be available.

The law which I propose would not become effective until January 20, 1965, inasmuch as President Johnson and Speaker McCORMACK have already made arrangements for keeping the Speaker informed and for action in the event of Presidential disability.

I hope that the succession law will be unused in the future as during the past 170 years, but the responsibilities of the President have become too great not to develop the most effective procedure possible in the event it is needed. I believe the creation of the Office of Deputy President will accomplish this.

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

The bill (S. 2597) to establish the Office of Deputy President, to provide for the continuous discharge of the powers and duties of the Office of President, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I should like to commend the Senator from Minnesota for the interest he has taken in this subject and the study he has given it. The concern of the Senator from Minnesota in this field is one which is widely felt, particularly because of the tragic events of last fall. Nevertheless, even the interest which is expressed now has from time to time been expressed by many people. This has been expressly emphasized during the course of the first installment of hearings of the Judiciary Committee on a Presidential succession and disability act.

It will be with a great deal of interest that I personally shall want to study the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota. In the meantime I again commend him for the study he has given it and the interest he has expressed in it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his interest in the proposal.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I join in commending the Senator from Minnesota on his interest expressed in the central question involved; namely, Presidential succession. The record of the Senator as a scholar and professor, and as a theoretician of government, is implemented by his many years of leadership in government itself. I wonder if I correctly understood the Senator to say that the real reason focused on the succession act now in lieu of the existing bill is one of protecting the will of the people, so to speak, in the most recent presidential

election, whenever that might be, in the event of a vacancy.

Mr. McCARTHY. This consideration must be of primary concern.

Mr. McGEE. Under the present organization, then, it would be possible for the party which lost the presidential election to end in the White House in the wake of a tragedy.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is quite possible. In the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, there were only 2 years during which the Speaker of the House was of the same party as the President.

Mr. McGEE. Is it also the judgment of the Senator from Minnesota that a person closely identified with the administration in the White House would be more responsive to the feelings and the policies of the President than the President pro tempore of the Senate or the Speaker of the House, even though they were of the same party?

Mr. McCARTHY. I should think so, since the office of Speaker of the House is a very demanding office in itself, and the responsibility in a general way runs through a different area in terms of substance. It is a more limited area, and certainly the effects are very different in terms of procedure and the methods by which the House of Representatives operates, in contrast to the executive branch of the Government.

The office of Speaker of the House is of such importance in the whole structure of American democracy and American constitutional government that I think we ought to leave the House as free as possible to choose a person to fill that particular office, because of his qualities and not force it to take into account that it must select a person who could fill the office of President. It might find a person with the qualities combined in both offices, but the chances of that would be slight because the demands made upon a person by each office are so great. We ought not to place upon the House the burden of conditioning its judgment and consideration to their fear and anticipation that this person might have to succeed to the office of President.

Mr. McGEE. If I correctly understand the Senator, there is a factor of considerable importance; namely, the separation of powers or division of powers in our constitutional framework, that suggests that there is an executive responsibility that ought not to be blended too completely with the legislative arm of the Government, as the existing situation would, in fact, require.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is quite correct. There is one other point regarding the Speaker. If the President were to determine that the Speaker was the man whose nomination he would want to submit to the Senate for confirmation, the man whom he would want to succeed him, there would be no obstacle to the President's nominating the Speaker of the House and submitting his name for confirmation by the Senate.

In that case, the Speaker of the House would resign his office as Speaker and assume, not really the Vice-Presidency, but the Deputy Presidency, because it is not intended to pass on to a man holding that office the full constitutional powers

of the Vice President, which includes the right to vote in case of a tie. That would be the only power that would be denied the Deputy President, except the power to preside over the Senate, which the Senate, by separate action, could extend to him or could extend to anyone else whom it saw fit to have preside.

Mr. McGEE. Do I correctly understand the reason for returning to the 1947 arrangement for succession to be that in the event of a larger catastrophe, there would be an order of succession?

Mr. McCARTHY. If time intervened until the point at which the Deputy President succeeded to the Presidency, he in turn could submit the nomination of a successor for confirmation by the Senate. If there were no time for that—if there were a serious catastrophe, or if the time were too short—I would propose a reversion to the right of succession that was in effect for approximately 150 years, in which the Secretary of State would then take over the office of President. It would be for a short period of time.

Mr. McGEE. And the following order of succession would be the order in which the Cabinet positions were created?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, the old order.

Mr. McGEE. That would supply stability. But would the succession prescribe that the Deputy President, proposed by the Senator in his bill, would take precedence over the Secretary of State?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would.

Mr. McGEE. Under all circumstances?

Mr. McCARTHY. Under all circumstances.

Mr. McGEE. If he were physically able to do so. That was the point that was not clear to me.

I thank the Senator for his recommendations.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his support and comments.

#### THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF CHARTER OF BROWN UNIVERSITY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on Monday, March 2, Brown University, at Providence, observed one of a series of ceremonies marking the 200th anniversary of its charter. A plaque commemorating the occasion was accepted in behalf of Brown by John Nicholas Brown of the board of fellows of the university.

It was in 1764 that the General Assembly of the Governor and Company of the English Colony of Rhode Island and the Providence Plantations granted the college charter for the purpose of "preserving in the community a succession of men duly qualified for discharging the offices of life with usefulness and reputation."

An editorial in the Newport Daily News of Friday, February 28, 1964, is evidence of the statewide—and, indeed, nationwide—appreciation in which the university is held. The editorial suggests something of the intracolony competition to provide a permanent side for the college. As a historical contribution, I ask

unanimous consent that the editorial be included at this point in my remarks.

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

Brown, 200 years old in March of 1964, marks the 200th anniversary of the granting by the colonial legislature of the charter of Brown University which originally was known as Rhode Island College.

The founding of this college was not without acrimony. The charter, finally granted at a sitting of the legislature in what is now Kent County Courthouse in East Greenwich, was the subject of much dispute. John Nicholas Brown will have meaty material to include in his discourse on Monday, at the opening of the bicentennial celebration when he speaks on the origin and evolution of the university charter.

Brown University, the Nation's seventh oldest college, taught its first students in Warren but the site of its permanent home was not finally decided until after Newport, Providence, Warren, and East Greenwich had each sought the honor. It was a matter of subscriptions that finally upset the balance in favor of Providence. Newport though came close to being chosen.

Just as Rhode Island and Providence Plantations were founded on the premise of full liberty in religious concerns so was Brown University, whose charter was one of the most liberal of its kind written in the 18th century. It declared that: "All the members hereof shall forever enjoy full, free, absolute, and uninterrupted liberty of conscience."

Brown University, while it was founded under Baptist control, through subsequent amendments to the charter lost all denominational restrictions on membership on the corporation and faculty.

From a small colonial English college it has developed, in 200 years, into a distinctive "university college." Next Monday's ceremonies will be only the first of successive observances of this important anniversary in the history of this university, to which Newport has sent so many sons and daughters who have graduated with distinction.

It was in the atmosphere indicated by the editorial that the seventh oldest college in America and the third oldest in New England was established. Starting with a student body of one and a faculty of one at Warren, R.I., by the time of its first graduation in 1769, Providence had won out over Newport as the permanent site of the school; and in 1770 the college located on the very hill it at present adorns.

In 1804 the school adopted the name of Brown University in recognition of the generosity of Nicholas Brown of the class of 1786, a son of one of the founders of the college.

During the American Revolution the college was closed, as its faculty and students fought in the colonial forces. Its great building became a barracks and hospital for the French soldiers of Rochambeau.

In August of 1790 President George Washington, and his Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson, came to Providence. Upon being awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws, President Washington gave his promise, "You may rely on whatever protection I am able to afford in so important an object as the education of our youth."

Another President, Abraham Lincoln, had a Brown man, John Hay, as his secretary. He was later Secretary of State, as was Richard Olney, of Brown. Just a few other names in the university's two centuries of "usefulness and reputation" are Charles Evans Hughes, Theodore Francis Green, and John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

The 20th century for Brown has been a time of change and growth and challenge. They are the eras of President Faunce, President Wriston, and President Keeney.

The growing pains of the college are evidenced by a current \$15 million matching fund campaign to meet a challenge grant of \$7,500,000 from the Ford Foundation. This follows upon a successful \$15,100,000 capital funds drive. All these are dedicated dollars—dedicated to the most far-reaching development program in Brown's history.

All that I have said is the heritage, too, of Pembroke College in Brown University, the separate woman's college which has been receiving its degrees from Brown University for just 70 years.

All—of both colleges, of both faculties, student bodies—all share in this time of challenge that reaches from College Hill to the home of every alumnus and alumna.

I am sure my colleagues of the Senate join me in this salute—salute to the two centuries of Brown University—success to the centuries of service that lie ahead, service to America in providing men and women with lives of usefulness and reputation.

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2455) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments:

H.R. 7381. An act to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 935).

#### REPORT ENTITLED "THE MIGRATORY FARM LABOR PROBLEM IN THE UNITED STATES"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 934)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit a report entitled "The Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the United States," pursuant to Senate Resolution 22, 88th Congress, 1st session, as amended.

I ask that the report be printed together with the additional views of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 2593. A bill to improve the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program by

providing minimum benefits for certain individuals who have attained age 70; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. HART, Mr. METCALF, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 2594. A bill to assist States in providing work-study programs for youths who need the earnings from part time employment to begin or complete their formal secondary education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 2595. A bill relating to the determination of sale price of a rebuilt television picture tube; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2596. A bill to amend section 1245 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in order to limit application of that section in the case of the sale of an entire business or farm; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2597. A bill to establish the office of Deputy President, to provide for the continuous discharge of the powers and duties of the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2598. A bill for the relief of Lubomira Chodakiewicz (Luba Hodakievic); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 2599. A bill for the relief of Denise Hojebane Barrood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### IMPROVEMENT OF OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY PROGRAM IN RESPECT TO CERTAIN PERSONS

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which, in the language of its title, seeks to improve the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program by providing minimum benefits for certain individuals who have attained age 70.

Mr. President, social security benefits have been in effect for almost 30 years. These benefits have given working women and working men and their wives an opportunity to provide an annuity for themselves during their retirement years. The annuity is, of course, a supplement to whatever savings and investments they have been able to make during their years of active employment.

Unfortunately, however, the original social security law did not cover many people who should have been covered, and although its scope has been expanded over the years, a significant number of persons do not fall under the umbrella of its protection.

I speak now of those individuals who worked throughout their lives and who are now too old to return to work to earn coverage under the provisions of an ex-

panded law—those persons who are 70 years of age or older.

Mr. President, these older folks are not to blame because the opportunity for an annuity has been denied to them. On the contrary, I am fairly certain that many, perhaps most, of them would have participated in the old-age and survivors insurance program had they been permitted to do so. But, not only were they excluded from mandatory coverage, they were not even permitted voluntarily to come within the effect of the law.

Mr. President, the bill which I have introduced provides that the Treasury transfer from general funds to the social security fund an amount equal to the employer-employee contributions which would otherwise have been contributed during the working career of persons 70 years of age or older for the period January 1951 to December 1962 or earlier if the intended recipient reached age 69 prior to that date.

The bill is designed to provide an annuity only for those who have none from any public source, local, State, or Federal. However, the fact that a man or woman has some income from savings would not bar him or her from receiving social security benefits under my bill.

Mr. President, we talk grandly about wars on poverty, Domestic Peace Corps, and the like. I submit that this bill will very dramatically attack "pockets of poverty" which have resulted not from neglect on the part of our older people, but rather from the simple fact that the law ignored them when it and amendments to it were adopted.

There are in this country some 10,773,000 persons 70 years of age or older.

In my own State of Vermont, there are about 27,000 persons in this age category, and according to information from the Vermont Department of Social Welfare, there are within this group 2,536 persons over 70 years of age who are on public assistance but who are not recipients of social security. It is these people that my bill would seek to include within the social security system of retirement benefits.

Mr. President, this bill does not establish an immense program which will continue to grow. Indeed, the number of persons whom it will benefit will constantly diminish. This is true because of the constant increase in the number of persons covered by the various retirement systems. As more people reach 70 years of age, they will already be entitled to receive pensions because they have participated during their working years.

My bill, then, simply corrects a "gap" in the law through which justice can be done through legislative action.

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

The bill (S. 2593) to improve the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program by providing minimum benefits for certain individuals who have attained age 70, introduced by Mr. PROUTY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### A BILL TO MEET THE HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUT PROBLEM

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, for myself, Senators HART, METCALF, INOUYE, NEUBERGER, BURDICK, PASTORE, MCGOVERN, and NELSON, I introduce a bill intended to meet the severe and increasing problem of high school dropouts. The relationship between low incomes and poor education is perfectly clear, and this measure can be a major weapon in the war on poverty. If we do not take direct and positive action now to reduce the number of school dropouts, it is almost certain that the children of today will become the semiliterate proletariat of tomorrow.

Poverty is a vicious circle, linking the deprivation of one generation to the next. The low income of the parents forces the child to leave school and seek employment. So the child of the poor grows to maturity without skills or training and in his turn raises another generation of impoverished citizens. This bill is designed to break this vicious circle.

It will assist States to provide financial help to qualified high school students so that they can finish high school. This is not a giveaway program; the students must earn their money through hard, honest work. They will be employed in public service agencies such as hospitals, mental institutions and day care centers which are desperately understaffed. The sums involved are modest; a maximum of \$40 a month, with an annual limit of \$400. Yet, this small amount may make all the difference between an unemployed citizen living on the dole and a self-reliant, educated citizen.

Basically, this bill is a logical extension to the secondary school level of an idea already accepted by the Congress when it passed the Vocational Education Act of 1963, which included similar work-study provisions. We owe a debt of gratitude to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his leadership on this bold and imaginative new approach to the education of Americans.

We must act now on this dropout problem. In one southern State, for example, only 49 percent of the white students and 23 percent of the Negroes finish high school. Our industrial society is changing rapidly. In an age of nuclear technology, the number of jobs requiring high school education is increasing rapidly, while the number of unskilled jobs is declining with equal rapidity. This trend will continue in the years ahead. Our failure to meet this problem now will leave us in the future, not only with a vastly increased rate of unemployment, but also an economy which is faltering for the lack of trained manpower to run it.

At the present time, 57 percent of our adults have not completed high school. In addition, one-third of today's fifth grade pupils will not complete high school. The connection between poverty and poor education is shown dramatically by the fact that 64 percent of the unemployed are high school dropouts. Our proudest boast as Americans has

been that this is the land of equal opportunity for all. Yet, in fact, cruel economic circumstance bars the way to a decent education for too many of our young people. They are trapped in a cycle of poverty which pious slogans about equal opportunity cannot break. We cannot turn our backs with the callous remark that their predicament is due to stupidity and lack of ambition. They did not choose the circumstances into which they were born.

It has been said the duty of the Government is to help the people to do those things which they cannot do for themselves. Surely we can extend a helping hand to today's dropout to get him off the streets and the unemployment rolls, and back into the classroom. We must do this not only for idealistic reasons, but from practical motives as well. The families living on unemployment compensation, or outright relief, contribute nothing to the growth of our economy or the strength of our Nation. They are an unproductive burden on the taxpayer and the economy. In addition to being a practical approach to a long-term solution to unemployment, this bill will be one means of making the phrase "land of equal opportunity" a proud reality.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this measure lie on the desk until close of business March 9, 1964, in order that those who would desire to cosponsor this measure would have the opportunity to do so. Further, I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a brief explanation thereof be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey, and the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2594) to assist States in providing work-study programs for youths who need the earnings from part-time employment to begin or complete their formal secondary education, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), 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:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "High School Dropout Act of 1964".

#### DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the security and the economic growth of America depend to a great extent on the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women, who, in future generations will be the leaders of the Nation.

Today, however, serious financial needs prevent countless numbers of this Nation's young men and women from completing high school which is essential for further education, the attainment of technical skills, and gainful employment.

The Congress reaffirms the principle that the States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education. The Congress recognizes that, although many States and local communities are making outstanding efforts to alleviate the dropout problem, additional effort is needed to insure that a lack of resources does not prevent a student of ability from completing his high school education.

Therefore, it is the purpose of this Act to provide financial assistance to States to help initiate, maintain, and extend programs in urban and rural areas which provide part-time employment for youths who need earnings from such employment to continue or complete high school.

#### STATE CONTROL

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision or control over the curriculum or of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

#### AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each of the next five fiscal years such sums as may be necessary, for the purpose of making grants to States as provided in this Act.

#### ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 5. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 4 for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such sums as the population aged fifteen to twenty, inclusive, of the State, in the preceding fiscal year bears to the population aged fifteen to twenty, inclusive, of all the States in such preceding year.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under section 5 shall be available for reallocation from time to time on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallocated to a State under this subsection during such year shall be deemed part of its allotment for such year.

#### STATE PLANS

SEC. 6. (a) A State which desires to participate under the provisions of this Act shall submit through its State educational agency to the Commissioner a State plan, in such detail as the Commissioner determines necessary, which—

(1) designates the State educational agency as the sole agency for administration of the plan, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local educational agencies;

(2) sets forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in approving work-study programs, under which policies and procedures funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 5 will be expended solely for the payment of compensation of students employed pursuant to work-study programs which meet the requirements of this Act, except that not to exceed 1 per centum of any such allotment, or \$10,000, whichever is the greater, may be used to pay

the cost of developing the State's plan and the cost of administering such plan after its approval under this section;

(3) sets forth principles for determining the priority to be accorded applications from local educational agencies for work-study programs, which principles shall give priority to applications submitted by local educational agencies serving communities having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school before completing grade 12, and provides for undertaking such programs, insofar as financial resources available therefor make possible, in the order determined by the application of such principles;

(4) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this Act;

(5) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this Act, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verifications of such reports.

(b) For the purposes of this Act, a work-study program shall—

(1) be administered by a local educational agency and made reasonably available (to the extent of available funds) to all youths in the area served by such agency who are able to meet the requirements of paragraph (2);

(2) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be furnished only to a student who (a) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student in a secondary school, or in the case of a student already enrolled in any such school, is in good standing and in full-time attendance, (b) is in need of the earnings from such employment to commence or continue his education in any such school, and (c) is at least fifteen years of age and less than twenty-one years of age at the commencement of his employment, and is capable, in the opinion of the appropriate school authorities, of maintaining good standing in any such school while employed under the work-study program;

(3) provide that no student shall be employed under such work-study program for more than twenty hours in any week in which classes in which he is enrolled are in session, and that no student shall receive compensation which exceeds \$40 in any month or \$400 in any academic year or its equivalent.

(4) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be for the local educational agency or for some other public agency or institution;

(5) provide that, in each fiscal year during which such program remains in effect, such agency shall expend (from sources other than payments from Federal funds under this Act) for the employment of its students (whether or not in employment eligible for assistance under this Act) an amount that is not less than its average annual expenditure for work-study programs of a similar character during the three fiscal years preceding the fiscal year in which its work-study program under this Act is approved.

(c) The Commissioner shall approve a State plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), and shall not finally disapprove a State plan except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State agency designated pursuant to clause (1) of such subsection.

(d) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering a

State plan approved under subsection (c), finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this Act (or, in his discretion, further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State under this Act (or shall limit payments to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(d) Any such State agency which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (e) or (d) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record the Commissioner may modify or set aside his action. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting it aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action.

#### PAYMENTS

SEC. 7 (a). From a State's allotment under this Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the Commissioner shall pay to such State an amount equal to the amount to be expended for compensation of students employed pursuant to work-study programs under the State's plan approved under this Act, plus an amount, not to exceed 1 per centum of such allotment, or \$10,000, whichever is the greater, expended for the development of the State's plan and for the administration of such plan after its approval by the Commissioner. From a State's allotment under this Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the next four succeeding fiscal years, such payment shall equal 75 per centum of the amount so expended. No State shall receive payments under this Act for any fiscal year in excess of its allotment under section 5 for such fiscal year.

(b) Such payments (adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner in advance on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such

times, as may be reasonably required for expenditures by the States of the funds allotted under section 5.

#### WORK-STUDY NOT FEDERAL SERVICE

SEC. 8. Students employed in work-study programs under this Act shall not by reason of such employment be deemed employees of the United States, or their service Federal service, for any purpose.

#### DEFINITIONS

SEC. 9. For the purpose of this Act—

(1) the term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam and American Samoa;

(2) the term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education;

(3) the term "State educational agency" means the State Board of Education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law;

(4) the term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district or political subdivision in a State;

(5) the term "secondary school" means a school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law, except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12; and

(6) the term "public" as applied to any school does not include a school or any agency of the United States.

The explanation presented by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey is as follows:

#### BRIEF EXPLANATION OF HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUT MEASURE

This measure is designed to alleviate the high school dropout problem by assisting States and local communities to initiate, maintain, and extend work-experience programs which provide part-time employment in public agencies or institutions for young men and women who need earnings from such employment to continue or complete high school.

The State which desires to participate under this act shall submit through its State educational agency a State plan to the U.S. Commissioner of Education. The State plan must contain principles for determining the priority to be accorded particular work-study programs. Priority shall be given to applications submitted by local educational agencies serving communities having substantial numbers of youths who dropped out of high school before completing grade 12.

Employment under a work-study program is furnished only to a student who (a) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student in a high school or is already enrolled and in good standing in such school, (b) is in need of earnings from employment to continue or complete his high school education, and (c) is at least 15 and under 21 years of age, and is capable, in the opinion of appropriate school officials, of maintaining good standing while employed under the work-study program.

No student shall be employed under the work-study program for more than 20 hours in any week in which classes are held, and no student shall receive compensation which exceeds \$40 per month or \$400 in any academic year or its equivalent. Payments may be made directly to the student through the appropriate State educational agency; the employing institution or agency may, in some cases, act as the paying agent and be reimbursed by such State agency.

This bill authorizes an expenditure of \$50 million for fiscal year 1965, and for each of

the next 5 fiscal years, such sums as Congress deems necessary.

Federal funds, which are allotted to States according to the State population of youths between the ages of 15 and 21, will be used to compensate the State for expenditures to students employed under the work-study program approved by this act. An amount not to exceed 1 percent of the State allotment or \$10,000, whichever is greater, is authorized to cover State expenses relative to developing and administering the State plan. The Federal share for the first 2 years is 100 percent of the amount expended by the State; for the next 4 succeeding fiscal years, the Federal share is reduced to 75 percent.

#### AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1964— AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 462)

Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### COURT OF VETERANS' APPEALS— ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 2509) to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] be added as a cosponsor.

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

#### RESTRICTION OF IMPORTS OF BEEF, VEAL, AND MUTTON— ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2525) to restrict imports of beef, veal, and mutton into the United States.

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

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. SCOTT:

Excerpt from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 22, 1963, containing a statement by him on Ukrainian independence.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Reply by him to a letter from a Protestant minister, on the subject of civil rights.

#### THE SEARCH FOR THE SOLUTION TO THE ARAB REFUGEE PROBLEM

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, for 15 years now, the free world has searched for a solution to the Arab refugee problem but little has

been achieved. Complicating the situation has been the intransigence of the Arab nations. Their repeated threats to destroy the State of Israel have created an atmosphere in which meaningful dialog is almost impossible.

Meanwhile, more than 1 million human beings have become virtually permanent wards of the United Relief and Works Agency of the United Nations. The United States has borne 70 percent of the cost of this relief program and spent \$350 million to date.

The situation cries out for objective analysis if we are ever to resolve the refugee problem, and although prospects of progress appear bleak at the moment, there are constructive suggestions available which could lead to a new beginning in our Government's approach.

Some of the most profound thinking on the problem has just appeared in a series of articles written under the distinguished byline of Philip Hochstein, editorial director of the Newhouse Newspapers, and president of Advance News Service.

Mr. Hochstein's commentary is relevant and constructive because, like all good journalists, he has gone to the sources of the problem and examined them first hand. He has talked with Arab leaders in their offices in Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan and Syria; he also talked with Israel's leaders on their own soil; and finally, he has spoken with the refugees themselves in their no man's land.

While the picture which emerges from Mr. Hochstein's tour of the Middle East is not a bright one, neither is it hopeless, for he makes several concrete proposals for action on the Arab refugee problem which merit the consideration of our policymakers.

Inasmuch as I believe his thinking is valuable, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Hochstein's report printed in the RECORD.

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

#### I. ARAB REFUGEES: A FROZEN MESS (By Philip Hochstein)

A computer suffers a nervous breakdown and performs like an insane genius. This has been the theme of many a science fiction story and movie comedy.

What happens when a high-strung, very capable world social service organization, functioning under United Nations auspices and with a multi-million-dollar budget, is fed the wrong basic assumptions and applies them to a million or more human beings?

That is not entertaining fiction, but brutal fact.

For 15 years, the subjects of this true story have been living in refugee camps—57 camps now in existence and more in the planning, and many thousands of squatter shacks.

They are the most senselessly segregated people in the world today. The basis of their segregation is neither color nor race nor religion, nor even class; it is an oriental prejudice, part superstition, part unkindness, part political, against people singled out by misfortune. They live in double-boilered bitterness, the seething hatred around them intensifying the heat of their inner resentments.

The United Nations Relief and Works Agency, known as UNRWA, provides these people—a few hundred thousand infants and

babies incredibly excluded, as explained in a subsequent article—with calories, literacy, and health supervision, the United States paying 70 percent of the bill.

The State of Israel, whose territory these refugees left in loyalty to the Arab states in the war of 1948, urges final settlement of the problem.

The Arab nations, with the single exception of Jordan, deny them the right of resettlement, the right to work, and other civil rights.

UNRWA underwrites this segregation in the name of all humanity and proceeds with its relief mission on the apparent assumption that the segregation will go on forever.

The people of the world, preoccupied with tenuous problems, do not wish to be annoyed with something that has been referred to an appropriate agency of the U.N. So Uncle Sam has paid out about \$350 million over 15 years to finance the rotting away of human beings who want to work and whose work is urgently needed by the underdeveloped countries in which they reside. And there is no end in sight ever, unless present policies can be reversed. No agency is attempting to solve this problem.

The wrong basic assumptions on which the U.N. operates are, mainly, these:

1. That Israel, a struggling new nation of little more than 2 million people, should take back over a million hostile people who left to assist the enemy war effort, although the enemy after 15 years still refuses to hold a peace conference, or even a refugee conference.

2. That the Arab nations who instigated and mobilized these refugees are all have-not nations who must therefore be excused from obligation to the fellow Arabs they seduced. (Jordan alone is a have-not nation; Lebanon is spectacularly affluent, Syria rich in oil transit revenue, Saudi Arabia, much richer; Iraq, underpopulated and the possessor of the largest area of undeveloped but rich farmland in the world; Egypt has spent far more on an aggressive military venture in Yemen than the cost of the whole refugee program; and Kuwait is richer on a per capita basis than the United States, thanks to oil.)

3. That it is acceptable to operate with false statistics because the Arab governments do not want a census and because the refugees themselves do not wish to be checked on, although it is admitted that families generally do not report deaths because they wish to hold on to the rations and do not report income from work for the same reason. UNRWA reports thus continue to publish comprehensive statistics, although the footnotes do acknowledge lack of census, lack of adequate investigation and other circumstances pointing to their worthlessness.

The largely overlooked, essential facts in the refugee situation are that:

1. Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and other oil-rich Arab States are employing about 80,000 refugees at relatively high wages to man their technical, civil service, and teaching jobs, the refugees having a higher standard of education than the native populations.

2. Remittances from refugees so employed are one of the main sources of income in Jordan, next to farming and tourism, while many recipients of remittances continue to draw rations.

3. Iraq admits in official publications that its fabulously fertile, well-watered lands need more manpower for development, yet refuses to invite experienced and idle farmers among the refugees to resettle or work on these lands.

4. Lebanon is so starved for labor power, its own people in Beirut and the other cities preferring business and the professions, that it permits the importation of 120,000 Syrian laborers, yet refuses to facilitate the employment of refugees.

5. Although Egypt has granted few civilian rights to its several hundred thousand refugees in the Gaza Strip, governing them by strict military rule, President Nasser has made himself the hero of the refugees in all the Arab countries by inciting them with subversive propaganda against all existing governments but his own.

6. Despite the aggressive objection of most of the Arab governments to resettlement and absorption of the refugees, that process is making rapid headway on an illegal, under-the-table basis, with most of the younger refugees in Lebanon and Syria finding work by accepting lower than the prevailing wage.

7. Despite the remittances and the fact that most refugees earn money, the refugee relief rolls do not decline but threaten to grow. This, because the dead and the employed are unreported, while the parents of new children press for their inclusion in the rolls.

8. Jordan, the poorest of the Arab States, is alone in having granted them equality with all its citizens and is making a vigorous effort to solve the problem by building the entire economy, and with an encouraging measure of success.

#### II. WITHOUT A SPONSOR

(By Philip Hochstein)

In an age dominated by the specter of total human extermination and burdened by memories of Hitler's and Stalin's mass murders, are we not in danger of laying away and forgetting our consciences and sympathies in a few United Nations pigeonholes?

As an American, a newspaperman with many years of discipline in objectivity and as an adherent of a source religion of both conscience and sympathy, namely Judaism, I had long wished to make some firsthand examination of the quality of our collective humanity in dealing with one of the most controversial and embittered problems of the times—the problem of the Arab refugee.

Having stolen 10 weeks' time from my routine duties and won my wife's enthusiastic collaboration, the next step was to obtain visas to visit the Arab countries.

This threatened to present a few difficulties, not only because I had visited and written about Israel, but also because my wife had been born there. I hoped that the latter fact would be overlooked, the event having taken place some time before the creation of the State of Israel 15 years ago, but our religious and racial identification and earlier visits to Israel seemed to be a problem in view of the widespread impression that the Arab States were rigidly barring visas to Jews, except to those rabidly anti-Zionist. I am not anti-Zionist, rabidly or even mildly, although I am not a Zionist.

I made my first visa request in a visit to the Kuwait consulate in New York, by way of reconnoitering the problem. The young lady looked at my completed forms and asked if I could get a letter from my clergyman.

I replied that I no doubt could, but that his name would be Goldberg, Capt. Joshua Goldberg (U.S. Navy, retired).

She then asked if I could get another letter from the American Council for Judaism. I said that I would not want to compromise myself by being sponsored by this anti-Zionist or any political sponsor.

She said she would have to take up this problem with a superior, and I went on to the Jordanian consulate.

The gentleman there was genuinely polite after reading my forms but sensibly suggested that since I have an office in Washington it would be more appropriate for me to go to the Jordan Embassy there, since the Ambassador would no doubt have to pass on my case.

The score was now one negative indication and one slightly positive. It seemed to me that an attempt at a decisive breakthrough was indicated. I put in a call for

Dr. Mohammed Mehdi, the representative of the Arab League, the militant pan-Arab nationalist organization operating throughout the world. Dr. Mehdi was not in his office and I left my name and professional identification. He called back later that evening, explaining he had been tied up on business at the U.N.

I laid my problem on the line to him. I wished to do a critical, searching story about the Arab refugee problem. I was a Jew and had a strong affection for Israel, but I considered that I liked people generally and felt strongly that people should not be made refugees; above all, I was a reporter with a lifelong commitment to the truth.

Would our unwillingness to accept sponsorship from an anti-Zionist Jewish splinter group stand in the way of our visiting Arab countries, visiting refugee camps, and interviewing Arab officials and citizens?

Dr. Mehdi explained that he could promise no visas, but did promise that he would do his best to facilitate my visas. He approved of my candor and thought it would be helpful if I accompanied my visa applications with a letter to the embassies concerned setting forth the personal facts I had given him, and I followed his advice.

At the Syrian Embassy in Washington, I found the Ambassador had been recalled home because of one of the recurrent political upheavals in that country. The chargé d'affaires was both polite and frank. He could not pass on this delicate matter, but would cable his Foreign Office back home.

At the Iraq Embassy, there was an Ambassador on the job and he hesitated not a moment. "We are happy to see an important American newspaper organization show an interest in our country," he said.

I asked if we could take cameras and tape recorder along and he replied that the Government favored free reporting, but that we might encounter people on the street who had a sensitive feeling of privacy. "By all means, feel free to do anything you wish to do in Iraq, but just remember that some of our people are shy of cameras, and just use your discretion. Iraq is an open society and we hide nothing."

"Do you think we may encounter a little suspicion because we are Jewish?"

"I can't say, but we will give you some letters of introduction to people who will introduce you to anyone you care to meet." (Despite all this cooperation, we never did get to Iraq. By the time we were ready to enter, the then current Baathist regime had been progressively overthrown by a series of coups and the people to whom we had letters of introduction were now exiles.)

I then mentioned our difficulties about Syria. "Don't give that a thought," he encouraged. "They're just afraid to make a decision. We'll get you your Syrian visa and we'll get word to you while you're abroad." He did just that.

A few days later, there was a note from Mr. Mohammed Habib, of the United Arab Republic Embassy, expressing deep hurt that anyone would even think that race or religion would enter into the granting of a visa to his country. He expressed delight, however, at our willingness to visit Egypt and to interest ourselves in his country, and promised us utmost cooperation.

Possibly indicating the approach of a thaw in Arab-Israeli bitterness was the identical advice given me in three different Arab Embassies. "Please don't tell anyone if you're planning also to go to Israel." Since I had given no hint of such intention, I felt encouraged to believe that bitterness was beginning to wear down a bit.

So, on October 11, we arrived at Cairo Airport to begin the on-the-ground portion of our inquiry into the Arab refugee problem.

### III. A SO-SO HERO (By Philip Hochstein)

There is no doubt that President Nasser is genuinely popular in Cairo. It obviously goes much deeper than mere lip service reflecting fear of the dictator.

This man, to all Egyptians, is the hero who survived a tussle with France and England. And even the most cynical of the generally cynical Egyptians is gratified by his continued residence in a modest home after years of power and wishes him well, if skeptically, in his blueprints for social progress.

The visiting foreigner who wants to enjoy a spirited argument about Nasser will soon feel frustrated. Most people will not go beyond upholding Nasser's goodness of intentions and politely retreat from any defense of specific policies. Egyptians are far from being perfectionists, so they are polite and agreeable and don't mind at all if President Nasser is made out to be headstrong or misguided or mediocre. They agree that he is a dictator and perhaps not an effective one, but they are very proud of his survival and fame.

The most outspoken critics of President Nasser are not to be found among the expropriated foreign and native capitalists, whose comments are either self-intimidated or quite mild. But his underlings in the controlled and kept press of Egypt are obviously resentful of their loss of independence and privilege and sharply critical of him and his policies in private conversation, in contrast to their extravagant adulation of him in their columns.

I asked a popular writer whether he thought Nasser could afford to accept the 280,000 refugee population said to reside in the Gaza strip for integration into the Egyptian economy.

"Could he afford it economically or politically?" the newspaperman asked. I chose the economic view and he continued:

"Perhaps the best thing he could do to put Egypt on its feet would be to place the refugees on Egypt's badly managed farms, to demand another 280,000 refugees for its factories and to demand that Israel return the Jews he forced out of Egypt, if necessary returning twice what he confiscated to win them back.

"What Egypt needs more than anything else is the competence of the refugee farmers and workers and the competence of the Jewish businessmen. Politically, of course, he manages his refugee population with military rule in Gaza, while manipulating the refugees in the other countries as his troublemakers and U.N.-dominated mercenaries. Economically, Egypt continues to take one step forward and two backward, but politics comes first."

At the information ministry where I applied for the military permit to visit the Gaza strip, my efforts to discuss the refugee problem were rejected with the explanation that the question belonged to another department of the Government. On the way back to the hotel, we stopped to make a purchase and the merchant happened to be a former Palestinian and was quite willing to discuss the refugee problem.

"I had some money," he explained, "and I was able to buy this shop and get my nephew out of Gaza and he now works for me. We employ three salespeople and give work to a lot of people whose wares we sell."

Another merchant with a shop in the hotel lobby thought that the refugee problem was standing in the way of the country's development.

"We could do a lot for our people with all the money we're spending on the refugees in Gaza," he complained.

"But you're not spending any money on them," I corrected him. "The money is sup-

plied by the U.N. and the United States gives 70 percent of it."

"That can't be," he argued. "They're Arabs and Nasser is the only man who cares about them. They're our guests and we wouldn't think of letting outsiders support them."

A student at the American College thought it would be cruel to let the refugees be dispersed all over Egypt. "People are better off with their own kind," he contended. "Egyptians feel very strongly about that. You never hear of Egyptians emigrating to the United States or anywhere. We like to be in our own country, and if the Gaza refugees are anything like us, they would not want to leave where they are."

Two Egyptian Government people were entertaining us at a downtown eating place fitted out as a huge Bedouin tent. Over a bottle of Lebanese Arak, a milky-looking but potent enough liquid, we were being initiated into the social subtleties reflecting religious differences as between different sects of Islam and Christians.

"I understand," I suggested, "that your Government has been thinning out another population element that has been an ancient tradition in your country." My hosts appeared not to understand, and I added: "The impression is that Jews aren't welcome here any longer."

"It has nothing to do with their religion," I was assured. "It's just that they're not Arabs and they're not suited for socialism because they're either business men or professional people. But we haven't really been harder on them than on many of our own people who owned factories and large businesses. The trouble is that the Jews went to Israel and talked about it as if we were discriminating. We're not like Hitler or Stalin."

"Now that thousands of Jews have left Egypt for Israel," I asked, "why not take in some of the Arabs who have left Israel and are stranded in the Gaza Strip?"

"The one has nothing to do with the other," one of my friends suggested. "The Jews left for Israel because it is their country. The refugees really don't want to be in Egypt, and why should we induce them to come here?"

We were satisfied that they're not at all like Hitler or Stalin in Egypt. They don't have either the murderous mania of the first or the cold calculation of the second. They are mostly people who go, not quite along with, but not very far behind the leader who drags them.

### IV. THE NUMBERS CAME (By Philip Hochstein)

The census as an essential tool in governing a society is about as old as civilization itself. The Bible refers, at many stages in history, to the taking of a census in the Holy Land.

UNRWA, the United Nations agency which has the responsibility of reconciling a relief budget with human needs has, however, abandoned all thought of a census to determine how many Arab refugees there are, how many have made new lives for themselves, how many are still unsettled but self-supporting, and how many are the hard-core cases who need relief.

UNRWA, in abandoning the census, has accepted the veto of the Arab States, which contend that any attempt to take a census would incite resentment and riot. But, UNRWA dismisses the inaccuracies resulting from lack of authentic information as being "to a considerable degree offset by the names of eligible refugees (mostly children) who are at present being denied rations because ceilings have had to be imposed on the number of ration recipients in each host



country in order to maintain the solvency of the agency."

A footnote in the report refers to 154,000 babies in Jordan alone for which no rations are furnished because of ration ceilings that had to be imposed to offset undetected false registrations and failure to report death and employment. How 154,000 unrationed babies in a total population of only 654,092 could survive and remain in good health without rations, the report does not undertake to explain. The only possible explanation, obviously, is that the parents who are thus apparently shortchanged on rations for their babies actually have some income and are able to get along without.

UNRWA recognizes that failure to report the deaths of ration holders is wholesale and therefore protects its budget by refusing to add new-born babies to the ration lists until room has been made on the lists by elimination of dead or employed persons. Despite this policy, which would bar a total of 300,000 infants and babies from the ration lists, there has been no consequent health problem, and the health of the 300,000 unrationed babies seems at least as good as the health of the general nonrefugee population in the Arab countries.

If the statistics pertaining to relief are largely worthless, there is nothing more controversial than the UNRWA's official figures on the number of people who come under the U.N. definition of Arab refugees. According to UNRWA, there were 1,210,170 registered as refugees in 1963 and an unspecified number who are not registered.

This is based on the assumption by UNRWA that there were 960,021 refugees in 1950, 2 years after they left Israel, and that the number has grown through an excess of births over deaths.

In 1948, however, there were only 1,200,000 Arabs in all of Palestine, according to the British mandate authorities. Of these nearly 200,000 remained in Israel. Of the remaining 1 million a substantial portion could not have become refugees because they resided in the non-Israel areas of Palestine. These numbered about 550,000. It is extremely unlikely, then, that more than 450,000 Arabs left Israel as refugees in 1948. Allowing for a 50-percent gain in 15 years as a result of a high birth rate, the present refugee population would be about 675,000. Furthermore, a portion of those who fled had liquid assets and became immediately self-supporting.

If 80,000 are employed in Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and other oil-booming areas and if many of the others find some employment, even at depressed rates, the extent of waste and buckshot application of relief by UNRWA can be readily sensed.

UNRWA's philosophical acceptance of the limitations imposed upon it in the vetoing of a census and curtailment of investigation is highlighted by the remark in its annual report that, "During the past year, the relationship between UNRWA and the host governments has continued to be generally good."

The fact is that UNRWA, which distorts the historic background of the refugee problem, has sought toleration of the Arab governments by methods of appeasement and partisanship.

When I pointed out a gratuitously partisan observation in a statement by UNRWA Director John H. Davis to one of his assistants, the explanation was, "Remember, Dr. Davis has the responsibility of making himself and UNRWA acceptable to the host governments. What would happen if we were thrown out of here?"

It is an ironic fact that UNRWA has no dealings with Israel, and therefore no need to consider the wishes and feelings of Israelis. Although the war of 1948 produced

40,930 indigent refugees in Israel, the Israel Government had fully provided for these people by 1953, taking them off UNRWA's hands.

Thus, the UNRWA has only Arab clients today, and wholeheartedly pursues the policy that the customer is always right. The customers in this situation are the Arab host governments, whose refugee policy, with the single exception of Jordan, is to deny the refugee the opportunity to reestablish himself, while exploiting him politically.

To the Arab host governments, the numbers game is vital. It is a weapon against Israel. The larger the advertised number, the stronger is the prospect that world opinion can be manipulated to pressure Israel into agreeing that a substantial percentage of them may be returned to Israel.

Returning refugees under these circumstances, it is fully recognized by Arab leaders, if not by UNRWA, would be pawns in the Arab determination to destroy Israel from within, since this apparently cannot be done from without. Arab leaders look upon the quarter-million Arab citizens of Israel as owing allegiance to them. Their refugee policy is to pressure for the conversion of a large part of the refugee population as a reestablished fifth column for the destruction of Israel.

This is clearly understood in Israel, and will be firmly resisted.

#### V. EXPULSION OR EVALUATION?

(By Philip Hochstein)

Palestine under the later years of the British mandate, before the creation of Israel as an independent state in 1948, was a land of bitter threefold strife.

Zionist underground forces and Arabs fought each other, and the British troops acted on the assumption that the quickest path to pacification was to suppress the Zionists, who were less numerous than the Arabs and therefore appeared to them to be weaker.

In this atmosphere, terrorist groups sprung up on both sides, with resultant violence that often appeared indiscriminate. On the Zionist side, three military organizations became famous: The Haganah, the main Zionist militia which held itself subject to Zionist civilian authority and later became the Israel Army; the Irgun, which held itself subject to the authority of minority Zionist elements; and the Stern gang, which was the smallest, most extreme, most irresponsible, and most indiscriminately violent.

On the Arab side, there was a long and monotonous history of violence and murder against Zionist settlements, so that such incidents came to be accepted as routine and failed to receive headlines in the press unless the killings were wholesale or concerted on a countrywide scale.

Early in the Israel struggle for outright independence, on April 9 and 10, 1948, the Zionist extremist group perpetrated, at the Arab village Der Yasin, an utterly senseless massacre of more than 200 men, women, and children. Israel opinion was as outraged as neutral opinion, perhaps more so. The top leaders of Israel expressed their horror and determination to destroy the military terrorists and to assure the population and the world that no such incident would ever occur again.

Ever since, Arab spokesmen have blamed the subsequent evacuation of hundreds of thousands of Arabs from their villages and towns in Israel on the terror created by the Der Yasin massacre. Arab pronouncements at the time of the war of 1948, however, wholly belie this contention.

The document, "Arab Higher Committee on the Problem of the Palestinian Arab Refu-

gees" published in Cairo in 1952, had this to say:

"It was natural for those Palestinian Arabs who felt impelled to leave their country to take refuge in Arab lands near their own and to prefer to stay in such adjacent places \* \* \* so that to return \* \* \* would be easy when, according to the promises of many of those responsible in the Arab countries (promises which were given wastefully) the time was ripe. \* \* \* Some of the Arab leaders and their ministers in Arab capitals made declarations to mollify the Palestinian Arabs and to threaten the Jews, and declared that they welcomed the immigration of Palestinian Arabs into the Arab countries until they saved Palestine. Many of the Palestinian Arabs were misled by these declarations and hence intended to leave the country."

A publication of the Arab Higher Committee in Cairo, "A Résumé of the Development of the Palestinian Question and the Refugee Problem," makes the following observation:

"Arab leaders and Ministers in the Arab capitals published declarations and statements by which they tried to calm the Palestinian Arabs, to frighten the Jews, and to welcome the immigration of Palestinian Arabs to the Arab States until the battle is over. Many of the Palestinians were misled by these declarations."

According to Muhammad Nimr al Khatab on page 196 of "Results of the Catastrophe," published in Damascus in 1951: "In January it was decided to evacuate all women and children and old people from towns and villages near Jewish settlements. The decision was taken at a meeting in Haifa." (This was months before the Der Yasin affair.)

Jamal al Hussein, brother of the Grand Mufti, commenting before the Security Council of the U.N. on April 23, 1948, 1 day after the Arab evacuation of Haifa, had this to say: "The Arabs did not want to submit to a truce \* \* \* they rather preferred to abandon their homes, their belongings, and everything they possessed in the world \* \* \* we have never concealed the fact that we began the fighting."

Al Hoda, Lebanese paper published in Detroit, on June 8, 1951, offered this interpretation:

"As the time for the British withdrawal drew nearer, the zeal of the Arab League was redoubled. Meetings and conferences took place almost daily and burning calls and appeals were issued. Brotherly advice was given to the Arabs of Palestine, urging them to leave their land, homes, and property and to stay temporarily in neighboring brotherly states, lest the guns of the invading Arab armies mow them down.

"The Palestinian Arabs had no choice but to obey the advice of the (Arab) League and to believe what Azzim Pasha, Secretary General of the Arab League, and other responsible men in the Arab League told them: That their withdrawal from their lands would end in a few days with the successful termination of the Arab punitive action against Israel."

A British Broadcasting Co. broadcast on May 15, 1948, quoted the same Azzim Pasha on behalf of the Arab League: "This will be a war of extermination and a momentous massacre which will be spoken of like the Mongolian massacres and the Crusades."

According to Akhbar Al Yam, a Cairo weekly in an issue during the early fighting in 1948: "There are three characteristics of the Palestinian war: The belief in glorious death; the opportunities of lust; and the Bedouin love of slaughter for its own sake."

The record leaves no doubt that the refugees left their homes in Israel to cooperate

with the Arab invading armies in their planned but unsuccessful invasion to destroy Israel. The refugees were not driven, for nearly 200,000 of the Arabs remained in Israel, unmolested to this day. The refugees did not need to flee for their safety, but were induced by their leaders to move behind the lines of the invading troops. The Arab States thus assumed moral responsibility for the future welfare of the refugees, but they speedily disowned this responsibility.

#### VI. HATRED FOR THE STRICKEN

(By Philip Hochstein)

The Arab refugee problem arose 15 years ago and has cost the world, including donations to extra-budgetary items as well as the annual budget, about a half billion dollars. The United States, voluntarily paying 70 percent, has thus contributed nearly \$350 million. The end of this burden is nowhere in sight.

Since the end of the World War there have been at least three vastly larger problems of displaced persons that have been resolved with little or no help through the U.N.

West Germany has absorbed millions of Germans displaced from areas of Czechoslovakia and East Germany; Israel, on a base population of only 600,000 in 1948, has absorbed more than a million destitute and often handicapped immigrants; and the Nationalist Chinese in Formosa have absorbed at least a few million of mainland Chinese.

These absorptions took place, not in a period like the present prosperity, but at low points in the economies of the receiving countries. Germany had not yet recovered from the economic paralysis brought on by the war; Formosa suffered from a primitive economy; and Israel was definitely a have-not state bedeviled by war and an encirclement of hostility. All of the three receiving nations not only welcomed the refugees but derived stimulus from their energies.

Yet, with respect to the Arab refugees, only the very poorest of the Arab nations, Jordan, has made a substantial effort.

Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf principalities, among the world's richest states, thanks to oil, have freely exploited refugee talents while contributing only pittance, yet have rigidly withheld civil rights and economic opportunities. Iraq, with the world's largest reserve of rich soil needing cultivation, has preferred underdevelopment to admission of any sizable number of refugees.

Syria, deriving enormous revenue from oil transit, continues to deny its 126,000 refugees civil rights and discourages their employment by refusing work permits.

Lebanon, the most advanced of all the Arab states educationally and economically, suffers from a severe labor shortage and imports scores of thousands of workmen, but refuses work permits to the breadwinners among its reported 150,000 refugees.

Some observers who have studied these horrible paradoxes have suggested the oversimplified conclusion that the Arab countries are balking the integration and resettlement of the refugees in order to exploit them against Israel.

That can be only a partial explanation, and not a major part of the explanation. Certainly, Jordan's free grant of equality to its huge refugee population is not consistent with that theory. Lebanon is far less preoccupied with hostility to Israel than any of the other nations and actually sorely deprives itself of scarce labor, yet its anti-refugee discrimination runs to extreme rigidity.

In reality, the refugees are far less of a threat to the security of Israel than to the security of Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria. In Jordan, they constitute a Nasserite under-

ground at no cost to him, and the same may be said, in lesser degree, of the refugees of Lebanon and Syria. While Jordan lacks the resources with which to prosper and thereby win over the refugees speedily, Lebanon and Syria have no such problem. Lebanon could give a job to every physically fit refugee in its country simply by cutting down by less than a third in the number of work permits issued to laborers coming in from Syria.

Lebanon's self-spiting rejection of its refugee population is sometimes laid to the delicate balancing of Christian and Arab in this tensely divided country, it being reasoned that since most of the refugees are known to be Moslems, their absorption would give the Moslems of the country a clear majority over the Christians.

This seems to the writer to be only a partial explanation in view of the fact that the country is committed against taking a census and in view of the further fact that the Moslems of Lebanon seem just as adamant against enfranchising the refugees as the Christians. Not until 1963 did Lebanon even promise employment rights to the refugees, but the promise has remained a dead letter.

More to the point is the very evident prejudice against the refugees in all quarters of the population. It is to be found among Moslems, as well as among Christians, and it is to be found most emphatically of all among ex-Palestinians who have managed to make their way financially and express an actual loathing for their fellows.

While official and public attitudes in the press of Lebanon are conventionally pan-Arabic and anti-Israel, conversational comments run to disparagement of the refugees.

I was hiring a taxi driver to take me on a visit to a refugee camp outside of Beirut. Even after I had pressed an extra \$10 bill on him, he was still most unhappy about the assignment. "They are dirty, lazy no-good people," he objected. I suggested that they were the victims of circumstances, and he countered: "I don't forgive the Israelis for not killing them and getting rid of the whole problem."

Another time I mistook a camp of Syrian squatters in Beirut for a refugee camp and I entered a shack to ask if the people were from Palestine. "We're good people," I heard. "They're no good. We have homes in Syria. Some of us fought in Palestine. They ran."

Which is very far from the precise truth. The Syrian squatter camp was actually far dirtier and less orderly than any of the refugee camps I had seen and the shacks even flimsier. Nor were the Syrians as well spoken as most of the refugees I talked with. As for the fighting in Palestine, the Syrian soldiers had done their full share of running.

If Syrians are unsympathetic and callous toward the refugees, I could find no trace of friendliness toward the refugees among the very affluent, well-mannered and quite charming people of Beirut.

There, where UNRWA headquarters is located and large American, as well as British and French colonies, there is a great deal of voluntary fund collecting to finance extra-budgetary activities on behalf of the refugees. But, I could find no trace whatever of Moslem support for this activity, nor any substantial support from even the Christian Arab population. Virtually all of this activity depends on non-Lebanese residents and visitors.

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Arab refugees suffer from a quite prevalent prejudice among their fellow Arabs against people afflicted by misfortune. More than \$2 million were donated for the Arab refugees in the past 3 years by individuals and nongovernmental organizations throughout the world, but not one penny appears to have come from an Arab source.

To the Arab world, the refugee question seems to be merely a subject for bitter and violent political oratory, and its vast resources for charity and helpfulness remain wholly untapped for this cause.

#### VII. A NEUTRAL EXCEEDS HIS ROLE

(By Philip Hochstein)

UNRWA is a tragedy within a tragedy. One of the instinctive reactions to great human suffering is to look for the villain who causes it. The double tragedy here is that UNRWA bears much of the blame for the prolongation of the Arab refugee problem but there is no trace of villainy in the personnel of UNRWA.

It has been charged by some critics that UNRWA is motivated primarily by bureaucratic self-perpetuation and aggrandizement. This is a plausible explanation but not, in my opinion, one with substantial validity.

It is difficult to believe that the top personnel of UNRWA, with whom I became acquainted, are not wholeheartedly concerned, above all else, with the welfare of their charges.

It has also been widely suspected that UNRWA personnel may be infected with anti-Semitism as well as pro-Arabism. This suspicion is not easily susceptible of verification, but it is clear fact that some UNRWA personnel worked in displaced persons camp in Europe and were deeply devoted to their Jewish charges.

Generally speaking, UNRWA personnel seems far above the level of people motivated by narrow racial or religious prejudice.

The villainy lies, not in people, but in circumstances. The most distorting circumstance is the action of the U.N. General Assembly over the past 3 years in taking the much-quoted paragraph 11 out of the context of the whole resolution and seeking to apply it, while ignoring the earlier paragraphs that are prerequisites.

The paragraph provides that "refugees wishing to return to their homes and live in peace with their neighbors should be permitted to do so." Preceding paragraphs of the resolution, first adopted by the U.N. General Assembly in December 1948, called upon the Arab States and Israel to meet in peace conference and to negotiate a settlement of the refugee problem.

The Arab States have not only refused to meet in peace conference, but have even refused to discuss the refugee problem with Israel and have vowed again and again to bring about "a second round" of war. Nevertheless, the United States has taken the leadership in the U.N. General Assembly in condoning Arab intransigence while urging that paragraph 11, twisted out of its context, be implemented.

How people who responded to the war call of the pan-Arab leaders, who still vow eternal war against Israel, can return to Israel and there "live in peace with their neighbors" is not explained.

As a result of this appeasement policy, the Arab "host" states (with the solitary exception of Jordan, which alone has acknowledged a human obligation to the refugees) have looked upon UNRWA as a miscreant who must be tolerated because of the gifts he brings. Thus, although UNRWA has provided a budget of nearly \$38 million, with comparable sums for earlier years, for the support of Arab refugees, it has not been permitted by the "host" government to conduct a single census, thereby being rendered incapable of stopping wholesale fraud in refugee claims.

While UNRWA has felt obliged to appease the militantly anti-Israel sentiment of the Arab leaders, it has had no need to consider the position of Israel on this question, since it has had no dealings whatever with Israel since 1953. After 1948, Israel had about

40,000 refugees with claims on UNRWA, but by 1953, Israel had resettled all of these, thus relieving UNRWA of a burden and leaving that agency with an exclusively Arab clientele. And the agency appears to have operated on the theory that "the customer is always right."

Since it is plain that the Arab "host" states will not permit resettlement of the refugees in Arab countries and will not negotiate with Israel for a solution, it is understandable that UNRWA should look upon the refugee problem as a permanent one and a growing one, given the prolific Arab birth rate.

Thus it is that while UNRWA initially hired a number of construction experts because of ambitious plans to build industries and new communities for resettling the refugees, the plans are now abandoned for a purely relief operation. By now, the administrators appear to have responded so fully to the atmosphere of Arabism in which they work that they are sometimes more Arab in their pronouncements than their "hosts."

Thus, in his final report for 1963, Dr. John H. Davis before leaving his position as director of UNRWA, as in earlier reports, represents the refugees in these words:

"The refugees are still embittered by the conviction that a grave injustice has been done to them through the loss of their homes and homeland, to which they continue to demand the right to return."

Dr. Davis, who has since become a member of the faculty of the American University in Beirut, thus enlarged upon his role as relief administrator to act as the spokesman of the aggrieved Arabs, as if they had made their feelings known either by a democratic process or by some other acceptable method of communication.

When I was in Beirut, visiting UNRWA headquarters there, Dr. Davis was in New York for his U.N. appearance, but I questioned the acting director, Louis Gendron, who is the director of relief programs on this point. My question was:

"Bearing in mind that public opinion researchers have improved a variety of techniques for distinguishing between the real sentiments of people and the clichés they express offhand and in crowds, has any effort ever been made by UNRWA or by another agency, public or private, to learn the sentiments of individuals among the refugees?"

Mr. Gendron replied that no such effort had been made. I then suggested that I had been talking at length to a number of refugees as individuals, not in the presence of fellow refugees or officials, and asked whether my quite limited research might not be the most extensive that had been conducted. He readily agreed.

I found strong anti-Israel sentiment among the refugees, but I also found that some of them felt they had been tricked by their leaders; and I found a general impression that the United States was unwilling to help them, despite the fact that we contribute 70 percent of the UNRWA budget, which some refugees stubbornly refuse to believe. I found most of the refugees to be quite ambivalent in their resentments and readily responsive to a variety of mutually inconsistent suggestions. Refugee opinion would be far less of a problem were the refugees not emoting to the suggestiveness of paragraph 11, the guilt complex of UNRWA, and the general atmosphere of political hysteria in the Arab world.

#### VIII. THEY WANT TO BE ARABS

(By Philip Hochstein)

Dr. John H. Davis, the recently resigned commissioner general of UNRWA, the U.N. agency assigned to the care of Arab refugees, has written in his official reports as the spokesman of the refugees, as if he assumed

that they were unanimous in rejecting resettlement in Arab lands. He has taken this position in face of the fact that his agency has never made a systematic effort to learn the true feelings of the refugees and has had neither the means nor the authority for doing so.

I talked with individual Arab refugees in the privacy of an automobile and in conversations some distance from camps and from the ears of fellow refugees.

I also talked with quite a number of refugees in camps in the presence of UNRWA representatives and fellow Arab refugees. Even these latter talks produce some variety of reaction, certainly not the unanimity of determination to return to Israel taken for granted by Dr. Davis.

An attractive young schoolteacher in a refugee school on the outskirts of Beirut had been demonstrating the alertness of her pupils. I asked her whether she lived in the camp, and she explained that she had just married an engineer and had an apartment in Beirut.

"I suppose you feel quite at home now in Lebanon," I suggested. "Oh, yes," was her enthusiastic reply. "Beirut is a marvelous city and we have a nice apartment and many friends."

I thanked her, shook hands with her and started to leave, but she called me back. "Sir," she said with great tension: "I hope that if we meet again, it will be in my native land in Palestine." I could feel the eyes of the camp officials glowering angrily at her for having failed to express a yearning to return to Palestine.

I had walked into the camp at Saida, Lebanon and got into conversation with a young man who appeared to be in his early twenties. I asked him if he would go in my car with me to help me find someone in a nearby village. He got into the car and, when we were rolling, I asked:

"How badly do you feel about not being able to get back into Israel?"

"I am getting along well here," he said. "I have work, but I could earn more if they gave me a work permit. My father was a Lebanese who came to Palestine to work for the British and I was born in Lebanon. I have offered proof, but they tell me I have to have a certain lawyer. This lawyer wants 900 pounds (\$300) to handle my case and a retainer of one-third. Where am I to get that money, working without a permit?"

"But would you go back to Israel if you had the chance?"

"Not if they offered me three times what we had there. I'd be in the middle of trouble all my life there. I would rather live in an Arab country."

I offered to drive him back to camp, but he asked me to let him walk back. He started to leave, then turned back.

"I did you a favor by answering your questions. Now I want you to do me a favor."

"What can I do?"

"Just don't go into the camp again and try to get my name. I know you can do it. The others would tell you. But it would make trouble for me. We are watched and we are supposed to be in favor of nothing but going back to Israel. I don't want any trouble."

I talked with a middleaged man whom I stopped on the street, ostensibly to ask a direction. It was near a refugee camp and I asked him if he lived there. He did. Then I asked, after some preliminary conversation, if he looked forward to returning to Israel.

"Not me," he replied. "It may be all right for farmers who want to go back to their farm villages. But I came from Jaffa, and it was bad enough before, living in a poor area close to a large Jewish city. I'd rather live with my own people. But we don't talk

about this in camp. They would call me a traitor."

An acquaintance at the hotel with whom I discussed the refugee question mentioned that a teen-ager who ran errands for him was a refugee. I talked with this boy at length and then put the question: "Do you intend to go back? He was quite emphatic about it. His family claimed a tract of land in the Galilee area and a house.

"I suppose," I suggested, "that all the people who owned land can think of nothing but going back." He smiled. "My father says there wasn't as much land as the people claim they owned. Everybody talks about being a great landowner and going back, but they're just dreaming. My father must be telling the truth because he doesn't talk about hundreds of farmers working for him. He just had enough land for himself and his three brothers."

I did find one man in camp who gave specific information about having been a large landowner. He identified himself as Ali Kamil Hussein. Later, when in Israel, I was able to verify much of what he had told me.

He had been the mukhtahr or mayor of a village and its largest landowner. He had engaged in important commercial deals, and some people important in the Arab world, including President Chehab of Lebanon and the Grand Mufti, now also in Beirut, had been his close friends.

Now, he complained, he was working as a janitor in a refugee school and was limited to two small rooms for his two wives (as a Moslem, multiple marriage is lawful for him) and 17 children.

But he was angry, even while inviting me to his shack to partake of the inevitable Turkish coffee. He was angry at Israel for not welcoming him back, he was angry at Lebanon for not granting him citizenship, he was angry at the U.N. for not giving him a third room for his brood, he was angry at the United States for refusing to give even a tiny portion of its great wealth to help the homeless refugees (again the refusal to admit a recorded fact, that 70 percent of all aid came from the U.S. Treasury) and he was angry at the Arab world for having used him and abandoned him.

I suspected at the time that he was indulging in ego-satisfying name-dropping when he mentioned President Chehab, the Grand Mufti and other notables. Weeks later, in Israel, I learned that he had indeed been the mukhtahr of his village and a large landowner, as well as a wheeler and dealer on a large scale who had important partners.

Even more interesting, he was the son of an important Arab leader believed to have slain Joseph Trumpeldor. Since Trumpeldor was the most fabulous hero in all Israel's prestate history, this made the family of his slayer famous to the Arab world, if infamous to the Israelis.

Trumpeldor, one of the few Jews who had ever attained high rank in the czarist army, had lost an arm fighting for the czar. Then, deeply disillusioned by Russian anti-Semitism, he found his way by foot to Palestine and there made many friendships with Arabs while pioneering in the agricultural development of the area. Acting as if unaware of danger, he achieved a fabulous reputation for having a charmed life.

One day, a group of Arabs approached his kibbutz in a mountainous area bordering Galilee under a white flag of peace, slew Trumpeldor and brought on a shooting match in which a few of them were left dead.

Now, the aging son of the man who slew the great Trumpeldor was a refugee in the land of his rich friends and cut dead by them, and he is bitter.

Dr. Davis' dictum notwithstanding, I am convinced that the refugees want any settlement of their problem that will put them on an equal footing with their fellow-Arabs.

## IX. FEW LIVE ON RATIONS ALONE

(By Philip Hochstein)

It is difficult to describe the misery of life in a refugee camp for those who have neither work nor the prospect of work and must live on the meager minimum rations, costing only pennies a day, provided them by UNRWA, the U.N. relief agency. No doubt, there are many aging refugees whose morale has been rotting away during the past 15 years.

It should be understood, however, that the great majority of Arab refugees supplement their UNRWA rations with some earnings from work. At least 35,000 of them are known to be earning high wages in Kuwait alone, sending remittances to their families in the camps and the villages of the so-called "host countries."

At least as many again have found employment in Saudi Arabia, in other Gulf oil states, and in other countries, including small numbers in West Germany, Switzerland, Scandinavia, and the United States. More than 11,000 refugees receive salaries from the UNRWA administration.

Remittances from refugees who support their families in Jordan are admittedly a major factor in Jordan's economy. While, theoretically, the refugees receiving remittances or, for that matter, earning money regularly from work are ineligible for rations, UNRWA has had to admit in its annual reports that it has no means of checking on the incomes of its charges. It is dependent almost entirely on volunteered information.

A well-financed refugee family may feel a twinge of conscience about receiving the UNRWA rations, especially since those rations are of slight monetary value, but if that is so there are other considerations to deter them from reporting their good fortune.

A Damascus merchant visiting Beirut and staying with his family at the attractive and hardly austere Phoenicia hotel put it this way: "It is a nuisance to report for the rations. It is out of my way, and it is a bother to dispose of the food. I have done well in business and employ six people. If I and others like me take our names off the ration rolls, we will only be taking pressure off Israel. My rations are my patriotic commitment."

If only a few of the refugees have become rich businessmen while remaining on the ration lists, there are many thousands, probably scores of thousands, who work more or less regularly without reporting their earnings, thus remaining on the ration lists.

I picked up a refugee in a camp north of Beirut and induced him to ride with me in the car so we could talk. I offered to drive him back, but he said he would rather not be seen coming back with me. I asked him if he could change a 10-pound Lebanese note. He said he could and I told him to give me five. He proudly refused to take pay for conversation or to accept fare. I then asked him whether he was too proud to accept his rations.

He said that was another matter. He worked quite regularly as an iron worker and didn't need the food. But he did not want to incur the hostility of his fellow-refugees by taking himself off the list, and he also felt that he might jeopardize his claim for eventual compensation from Israel for his abandoned property if he were to desert the refugee cause by removing his name from the ration lists.

Rations provide about 1,500 calories per day in the summer and 1,600 calories in the winter and consist mainly of flour, pulses, sugar, rice, oils, and fats. How few of the refugees actually live solely on these rations is indicated by the busy marketplaces to be found in every camp, where entrepreneurs among the refugees buy up large quantities

of the rations and bake them into breads, cakes and confections. UNRWA provides these small merchants special quarters for their trade in some of the camps, collecting nominal rents to finance sports activities and other amenities for the youth centers. But the tradesmen are so numerous that they overflow the areas assigned them.

While less than 40 percent of those listed as refugees live in camps, it would be an incorrect generalization to say that all those living outside of camp are more fortunate. While a majority of the 60 percent who live in normal Arab villages may have better quarters, a small percentage of them live as squatters because there is no room for them in camps.

Nor are camps uniform in their appointments. Some of the camps are easily up to the standards of nearby nonrefugee villages and even better, but I have seen camps that would probably be the most miserable mud-holes in the rainy season.

One reason why the demand for camp facilities keeps growing is that refugees who live in normal villages must pay rent, while camp residents do not. The weight of this consideration may be measured by a tour of Beirut, where there are a number of squatter camps maintained by well-employed Syrian laborers who dislike paying rent. In Beirut, too, most of the many new construction projects are used by building workers for free sleeping quarters.

It is not possible to know how many or how few of the refugees are entirely without some earnings or income to supplement their meager UNRWA rations because UNRWA has no means of conducting spot checks of its relief clients, nor is it allowed by the "host" governments to conduct a census to determine how many of the names of its list are of dead persons whose deaths have never been reported.

UNRWA is dependent almost entirely for its verification of relief statistics on the sentiment of the refugees, and the prevailing sentiment among them is that it is treason to the Arab cause to admit that one is able to make a go of it without returning to the place from which he had fled in the 1948 war.

## X. THE FASTEST CHANGING COUNTRY

(By Philip Hochstein)

United Nations policy with respect to the Arab refugees rests on the false assumption that all the refugees ardently wish to return to the areas they abandoned in the war of 1948 and that it is feasible for all of them to do so.

In 1948, there were about 1,200,000 Arabs in all of Palestine and about 600,000 Jews, but the present area of Israel is considerably less than the area of Palestine in 1948. Into this smaller area have come, since 1948, Jewish immigrants greatly in excess of 1 million. More than half a million of them came from the Arab countries that persecuted them in the wake of the war of 1948. The present population of Israel is, roughly, 2 million Jews and a quarter million Arabs.

I have toured the areas of former Arab population time and again. Most of the departed Arabs had lived in farm areas in the northern valleys. None of this land is now idle, and most of it is still occupied by Arabs, although some has been taken over by Jewish settlers and Jewish cooperative farm communities.

A major factor in considering the possibility of turning the clock back is the former role of tenant farming among the Arab population. While it seems to be taken for granted by UNRWA officials and by the refugees themselves that most refugees have land claims against Israel, the fact is that much of the abandoned lands was owned in large tracts which were parceled out to tenant farmers on a crop-sharing basis. It is difficult to see how the many thousands of for-

mer tenant farmers will be able to substantiate any land claims when a settlement with Israel is finally made.

These large tracts, in any event, are now parceled out, mostly to Arab farmers, on a far more equitable basis. The Government of Israel actively encourages cooperative farming among its Arabs, as well as among Jewish farmers. Tenant farming and crop sharing are now a negligible factor in Israel.

There remain large unproductive areas in Israel that the Government would like to bring under the plow. Most of these lands are in the Negev, the desert area that has no rainfall and depends entirely on the creation of new sources of water. There also are some extremely stony lands in the north, and some singularly enterprising kibbutzim have succeeded in creating new farms by incredible feats of terracing.

For every available dunam of unexploited farmland in Israel, there must be at least 10,000 in underdeveloped Iraq.

While Israel is pursuing the agricultural development of the vast Negev, its economic outlook rests primarily on industry. Already, although Israel has attained virtual self-sufficiency agriculturally, its growing citrus exports more than balancing meat import requirements, the agricultural population is only about 17 percent of the total.

Forecasts point to a steadily declining proportion of agricultural residents as the total population rises, with the probability of a 10 to 12 percent agricultural population when the total will have reached 4 million. Israel is pressing for intensive land use and discouraging the old pattern of Arab agriculture. This does not promise much for Israel's ability to absorb large numbers of Arab farmers.

Many of the refugees, of course, had lived in cities. The homes they occupied are in no instances now available. There is, for instance, a whole hillside of Arab homes in Safed that remains undemolished but beyond repair as a result of the 1948 war. In Jaffa and other urban Arab centers, there are no vacant homes or apartments to be found, and most of the former Arab homes have either been demolished in slum clearance or are marked for demolition.

The fact is that a returning Arab refugee would not recognize either the country or his own town or village. No country in the world has undergone as much transformation in 15 years as Israel.

If Israel could not reabsorb a large population of returning Arab farmers, economically, the problem of political and civic absorption is almost beyond contemplation.

Could Israel possibly coexist with a returning Arab population of, say, a half million?

I sought an answer to this question by speaking with many Arabs now living in Israel. The Arab minority has complete religious and civil rights in Israel, with but one exception: the Arab is not subject to the military draft. While I found some Arabs who pointed to this as a grievance, I found none willing to say that he would, if inducted, fight loyally on the Israeli side if Israel were attacked by Arab armies.

"But I would fight for Israel against Turkey or England or Canada or any non-Arab country," one Nazareth schoolteacher told me. "I could not fight against my own people."

The fact is, of course, that all of Israel's neighbors and potential enemies are Arab States.

Arab unwillingness to identify with Israel is much less nationalistic than cultural, going back to Genesis in the Bible and deepening through the ages. The Arab thinks of himself as the son of Abraham, whereas the Jew thinks of himself as the child of Abraham and Sarah, and this difference makes assimilation impossible and even social friendship a great strain.

The Jewish family may find an Arab well-mannered and hospitable, but family friendship cannot develop for the Jew if the Arab wife remains permanently unknown. While most of the Arab women in Israel have long ago discarded the veil, they still stay out of social life and never go calling with their husbands. While the male Arab is far too polite to express himself, he has his private opinion of girls and women who go out with men into restaurants, cafes and theaters.

Israelis differ among themselves on Arab policy as on all other questions, but none doubts that it would be speedy suicide for Israel to admit even half the people who are classified by UNRWA as refugees. Since Israeli Arabs are said to have the highest rate of population gain in the world, thanks to Israel's high health standards, and since disaffected political elements might make common cause with the enemy nations, the doom of Israeli nationalism would seem a certainty.

As an illustration of the danger, Israelis point to the fact that the Communist Party ran first in the last election in Nazareth, the largest Arab community.

#### XI. UNITED STATES FOOTS THE BILL

(By Philip Hochstein)

The size of a problem may be greatly enlarged by its neglect or mishandling.

The Arab refugee problem has persisted for 15 years and will continue forever and grow worse unless the present aggravating treatment is abandoned for something really healing.

If the problem is not relieved, we in the United States will be footing most of the bill, and ultimately, we may have to pay the cost of reconstruction following a war caused by this problem.

That distasteful prospect is easily avertible. All that is necessary is to apply to this problem some of the simple lessons we have learned since World War II in relocating masses of displaced people.

The Arab refugee problem is a simple one, made to seem insoluble by indefatigable misrepresentation. To grasp how limited are the dimensions of this problem, a little background information is necessary.

The problem, of course, stems from the land long known as Palestine. This is the Biblical country and consisted of all the land west of the Jordan River plus a great swatch of land east of the river. Modern Israel, by comparison, has no land east of the river and lacks considerable areas west of the river, which are held by the Arab kingdom of Jordan.

There is controversy as to the history of the land held by Israel. The Israelis point to the fact that there has never been a single day in all the thousands of years of the land's identity that Jews have not lived there and regarded it as their sacred home. The Arab nationalists claim, on the other hand, that Arabs have occupied this land ever since the Romans broke the Jewish power early in the Christian era, and that they have been driven out by sheer terror and force.

What is the truth as between these contentions?

It is undeniably true that both Jews and Arabs have lived in the Holy Land through the centuries. There were about 85,000 Jews in Palestine before the Balfour Declaration favoring a Jewish homeland was issued by Britain in 1917. There were no doubt many more Arabs residing then in Palestine, but the Jewish population was concentrated almost entirely in what is now Israel, whereas the numerically superior Arabs were dispersed over all of Palestine, an area three or four times as large. If the comparison were restricted to what is now Israel, it would be much closer.

While Arabs have lived in Palestine through the centuries, it is not necessarily

true that most or even a large proportion of the present refugees are the descendants of those Palestinians. Through the centuries, Palestine was mostly a devastated, forbiddingly barren wasteland. Palestine began to return to life only as a result of the First World War and the Balfour Declaration. The British established their military base in Palestine, making Haifa a munitions port and requiring large numbers of laborers; the Balfour Declaration brought large numbers of enterprising Jewish colonists, who stimulated enterprise and created additional opportunities for the inflowing Arabs.

The Arab laborers were drawn by the prospect of high wages, and they came from the east. After the war, the stream of Jewish colonists kept growing, creating additional enterprise, with more jobs to attract new Arab settlers.

Then came the Second World War, and Britain again established great arsenals and military camps in Palestine, attracting still more Arabs. As they earned money, the Arab settlers sent money back to their old villages with which to buy wives, and thus began the Arab repopulation of the ancient land, alongside of the Jewish repopulation through Zionist colonization.

Before the First World War and before the Balfour Declaration, Palestine was one of the lesser of the many Turkish territories and largely a no man's land. For most of the Arab refugees as for most of the Israelis, the land did not exist until well into this present century, although the Jews had treasured their historical ties at all times.

The refugees fled from the Israeli areas of Palestine in 1948 during the fighting when the British abandoned their mandate and the Jews proclaimed the state of Israel. Arab armies from Jordan, Syria, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt invaded Israel in concert. The Arab high command issued repeated appeals and orders to the Arab population to cross beyond the lines of the advancing Arab armies, so that they would not be in the way and so that the Arab armies could kill and destroy more freely.

Arab spokesmen now contend that the refugees left because of acts of terror committed by Israelis against them. They cite the massacre at Der Yasin, where a terrorist Jewish organization is blamed for the death of more than 200 men, women, and children. That this massacre occurred has been clearly established, for in consequence the responsible Israeli leaders not only condemned their terrorists before the world, but energetically broke up all secret and armed groups not taking orders from Haganah, the official Israeli army.

The Der Yasin massacre may have been a contributory cause to the flight of refugees, but certainly not a major cause when the many appeals and orders of the Arab high command are considered. The flight of the Arab population, as a strategic maneuver, was Arab military policy. Moreover, there is record of appeals by Israeli authorities to Arabs to remain, and record of deliberations and negotiations between Israeli authorities and Arab communities. The fact is that nearly 200,000 Arabs remained and remain unmolested to this day, while more than twice that number chose to obey the Arab high command.

Since 1948, more than a half million Jews have had to flee Arab countries and abandon all their property. The Israelis contend that this should be accepted as an exchange of population, with property settlements to be negotiated. However that may be, some of the Arab countries, notably Iraq, Lebanon, and Syria greatly need the labor power of the refugees, who are fellow Arabs.

The U.N., far from encouraging resettlement, has acted on the assumption that this could not be and has in consequence erected what may turn out to be the first permanent refugees relief setup in history.

#### XII. A DELIBERATELY PERPETUATED PROBLEM

(By Philip Hochstein)

Is the Arab refugee problem too massive or too complex to permit of solution? The answer has two parts:

1. The problem has already half evolved itself through employment and infiltration of refugees into the economies of Arab States.

2. What remains of the problem would almost vanish if the Arab States and Israel would sit down at a conference, if not to discuss peace, then at least to settle the refugee problem. Even in the absence of a conference, what still remains of the problem would be still further diminished if UNRWA, the U.N. relief agency, would begin to liquidate itself and turn over some of its responsibility to the "host" Arab governments.

The refugee problem has been liquidating itself and will continue to do so as long as the truce between the Arabs and Israel can be continued. More than 35,000 refugees are working in Kuwait alone, earning high wages and sending regular remittances to their families who are refugees. Many thousands man the civil services and school faculties in Saudi Arabia and other Arab countries, and some have even found employment in Germany, Scandinavia, South America, and the United States.

Slightly more than half the number of all the refugees live in Jordan, and there they have full civil rights, including the right to compete for work with the native population. The solution here obviously is to keep assisting Jordan's vigorous efforts to build its economy. It would be folly for the United States to reduce Jordan's foreign aid allotment, in view of this problem.

King Hussein represents the only Arab state that has made a sincere effort to integrate the refugee population into the nation, but Nasser propaganda has often succeeded in turning the refugees against Hussein's government. This problem would be relieved, if not cured, if UNRWA would dismantle itself in Jordan and turn the responsibility and authority over to the Jordanian Government, along with a proportionate share of its funds.

Iraq has enough neglected but fertile land to offer opportunity to the whole of the refugee population, and Iraq has ample oil income to finance the whole operation unaided. Syria has only 10 percent of the refugee population and few of its refugees are without some earned income. Syria, too, has ample means out of its great oil transit revenues, to finance the integration of its refugee guests.

Lebanon has a slightly larger refugee population, but Lebanon has an enormous labor shortage and could profitably accept three times as many refugees for their labor power. Lebanon is spectacularly affluent.

Egypt rules a little more than a fifth of all the refugees in the Gaza strip. Egypt has not been succeeding with its program for social progress because it has not been able to increase productivity of goods as rapidly as its population has been growing. Still, Egypt has found it profitable to tap the refugee reservoir of labor power for skilled labor at Aswan, and it has squandered many times the cost of refugee rehabilitation on futile military adventures in Yemen and north Africa. There is no doubt, however, that the refugee problem in the Gaza strip could not be speedily liquidated, unless manpower-hungry Iraq were to cooperate in a joint plan.

It would be nothing less than scandalous if we did not move to liquidate the problem in Lebanon and Syria by turning the responsibility over to those two countries.

Jordan is well on the way to solving its part of the problem, which is the biggest part, but Jordan should continue to receive both basic aid for its improving economy and

relief aid until the economy can fully absorb its refugees.

Only in the Gaza strip will a large hard-core problem remain, but here, too, a direct contribution for the refugees to the Egyptian Government may be preferable to perpetuation of the UNRWA bureaucracy.

The United States, supplying 70 percent of the cost of the refugee program, has both the need and the duty to insist upon easing and liquidating the problem. The leverage of our contribution should be exerted to bring a solution nearer.

The most obvious step toward an easing of the problem would be a conference between the Arab States and Israel. It has been 15 years now since the Arab States failed to crush Israel by invasion, yet the Arabs persist in refusing to recognize the reality of Israel, which has more than doubled its population by immigration and has achieved the highest standard of living for all the people in that part of the world.

If a conference could be brought about, even if the conference were limited to the refugee problem, Israel would make compensation to the owners of property abandoned by them in 1948. This would give capital to many thousands of refugees with which to build homes in their new countries or launch self-employing businesses. If this were done, the dimensions of the problem would be still further enormously reduced.

Israel braved much criticism at home by releasing refugee bank accounts in the amount of more than \$8 million since this was in contrast to the harsh policy of Arab States toward migrating Jews, whose property was confiscated and who were allowed to take nothing with them but restricted baggage. Israel has maintained a department to manage refugee property and records as a basis for negotiating compensation.

Would Israel assume responsibility for a substantial percentage of the refugee population? At present, most assuredly not. Israelis feel that their enemies wish to foist the refugee population on them to constitute a huge fifth column. There are now nearly a quarter million Arabs in Israel who readily agree that they are fortunate economically and enjoy full civil rights, but most withhold full loyalty from Israel, and the Israelis are set firmly against multiplying that problem.

In the midst of negotiations, that attitude would probably change radically. With the proportions of the problem minimized by earlier steps, there would be so much less to argue about as to assure final solution.

Since the basic evil in the U.N. refugee solution is to ignore the reality of a 15-year state of war by the Arabs against Israel while pretending that Arab nationalists could live in peace in Israel, the convening of a conference would be the key to complete solution of the problem.

In the absence of all and any of the steps indicated, the refugee problem will nevertheless continue to liquidate itself in reality, but will be magnified and distorted in bureaucratic reports and partisan propaganda.

### BEEF IMPORTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a few communications that I have received from Oregon on the beef problem.

These being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAKER, OREG.,  
March 4, 1964.

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

Am opposed to the cotton and wheat bill but strongly in favor of a beef quota bill

based upon a 5- to 10-year average with an annual increase based on agricultural economics factor and population increase as shown by the preceding year.

FRED A. PHILLIPS.

BAKER COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,

Baker, Oreg., November 20, 1963.

The legislative committee of the Baker County Chamber of Commerce in its meeting of November 20, 1963, passed the following resolution:

"Whereas there are being imported into the United States of America large quantities of fresh meats from foreign countries; and

"Whereas over 85 percent of all farm income in Baker County comes from the sale of livestock; and

"Whereas income from cattle represents a significant segment of all farm income; and

"Whereas said imports of foreign meats have caused livestock prices to decline to a level where livestock producers not only in Baker County but throughout the Nation are progressively getting into more financial difficulties; and

"Whereas the import of meat is not sufficiently controlled: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That Congress be urged to pass legislation placing adequate duties and allocating quotas on imports of fresh meats as needed to bring sales prices of such imported meats to the level of the domestic products."

Respectfully submitted.

HANS LEUENBERGER,

CHAS. GORDON,

Cochairmen, Legislative Committee.

PALM SPRINGS, CALIF.,

March 1, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are spending a short vacation in Southern California and in today's Los Angeles Times I saw a headline, "U.S. To Spend Millions To Up Price of Beef." The article said that Secretary Freeman had issued the order to help administration forces win a fight in the Senate this coming week over the farm legislation bill. Also he was quoted as saying that meat prices were lower in February than they had been in 7 years. He apparently has not bought any meat at retail lately, since steak here is selling at \$1.53 a pound. Better he had looked at the price spread between producers and purchasers at retail.

His decision to use my tax money to raise the price of meat I buy, for political purposes, is in the pattern of the waste of taxpayers money on cotton subsidies, about which I wrote you recently.

Further price rise of meat will only serve to drive more retail buyers, including myself, out of the market. This will then necessitate further subsidy, and so on ad nauseam.

The whole farm subsidy program stinks to high heaven. Even when the wheat farmers serve notice that they want no more to do with it this Democratic administration seems determined to shove taxpayers money down their throats.

I hope you will do what you can to stop the repeal of the law of supply and demand.

Yours truly,

VIRGIL A. PARKER, JR.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.,  
February 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I read recently that Congressmen from cattle producing states were asking for legislation designed at reducing foreign competition for their products. This was very upsetting for two reasons. First, this has become the typical reaction of groups who find they have overinvested in an area of the economy. The free market was designed to regulate investment be-

tween industries by changing the return to the investor as the amount invested grew. Protective legislation of this type is far more damaging to our free market economy than any welfare legislation, as it distorts the social value received from investment by artificially raising returns above the competitive level. Second, legislation of this kind makes the problems of foreign aid and foreign development greater by preventing less developed countries from expanding their exports. Our fear of competition cannot win us friends. It indicates a desire for the status quo, and a lack of foresight in developing the growth potential of our own country.

As my Senator, I would hope that you would do as much as possible to see that such legislation was defeated.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

MARK G. COPELAND,

Yale, 1964.

HAINES, OREG.,

February 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in regard to the meat imports to this country from New Zealand and Australia.

The cattlemen and sheepmen of this country are facing a disastrous situation.

I am in business here in Haines, Oreg. I run a small grocery store and locker plant and am very well acquainted with the ranchers of this valley. If something isn't done about the imports of meat, the cattlemen and sheepmen will be in very bad shape in another 2 or 3 years.

The biggest share of them right now are having a hard time because of the depressed cattle prices.

A moratorium on the imports of foreign meat at this time would help a great deal.

The economy of this western country, as you know, depends on a healthy price structure. You, being in the cattle business, must be able to see what happens if you had to compete with the cheap labor and vast herds of Australia and New Zealand. I urge you to use your good office and great influence to right this wrong so the ranchers of this country can get back on their feet.

Very best regards,

D. E. HALL.

RICHLAND, OREG.,

February 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Can you do anything to help us in the matter of beef imports? We make our living here in eastern Oregon, as our family has been doing since the Indians were here, in the livestock business. People here in the cattle business have survived depressions, recessions, wars, and the many other hazards of the business, but we can't compete with imported beef.

If something isn't done to give us some protection soon, many of us will be broke and looking for jobs, as some already are. Please do what you can.

Sincerely,

W. DALE ELLIS.

POWELL BUTTE, OREG.,

February 25, 1964.

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

DEAR WAYNE: Thank you for putting your shoulder behind the wheel in stopping these beef imports. Now that we have it slowly moving, there is a lot more to be done or a lot of our beef breeders are going broke.

There was a cattlemen's meeting at Madras last night. Some 200 men were there. Beef imports was their main problem. They can't survive with the imports based on the 1962-63 imports as stated on the enclosed market report. If the imports were averaged over the last 10 years instead of the last 2,

which were the very highest beef import years, I think the cattlemen might go for it.

I keep hearing that the imported meat goes mostly for hamburger. I can't believe this is true. Our hamburger cows and bulls remain at about the same price, or only slightly below what they were before the imports swamped our markets. It is the high-grade steers and heifers which have dropped \$7 per hundredweight in price.

They tell us it costs only 11 cents per head a year for the land use in Australia compared to \$25 per head a year in the United States, plus all the other costs. I heard over the radio that the big ranchers, including the big King Ranch in Texas, are moving to Australia and shipping their cattle back here.

Who pays the taxes to keep this country going? Is it the taxpayers of other countries, or is it the citizens of this country? I think you will agree that the farmers of this country have for some time been carrying a much larger part of the cost of the upkeep of our Government than the income they have received would warrant. We are doing a fine job of burying ourselves, it seems.

I understand that when some of these boxes of frozen imported meat have been thawed, a large quantity of flies have been found in them. If the consumer was informed of the condition of the meat, and if the butcher handling the imported meat had to post a sign in his shop in letters at least 2 inches high stating that his meat was fly-strewn products, perhaps these two factors alone would help curb the imports just by the consumer's resistance.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

LLOYD ELLIS.

#### MEAT ANIMALS AND WOOL MARKET REVIEW, FEBRUARY 20, 1964

(Review from Cooperative Extension Work in Agriculture and Home Economics, Oregon State University and U.S. Department of Agriculture cooperating, Corvallis, Ore., by Stephen C. Marks)

**OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY.**—The newest items in the livestock markets this week are the agreement to limit meat imports, and the annual livestock inventory which shows cattle numbers did not increase as much in 1963 as expected earlier.

#### COMPACT LIMITS MEAT IMPORTS

The Governments of Australia and New Zealand have agreed to limit meat exports to the United States, according to a joint announcement from the Departments of State and Agriculture. This is what the agreement means. Imports of beef, veal, and mutton in 1964 will be limited to the average of the 1962 and 1963 imports, which figures out to 770 million pounds. At this level, imports from the two countries this year will drop 6 percent below last year's record, estimated at 821 million pounds, product weight basis.

Perhaps the most significant feature of the agreement is the provision to limit future expansion of beef imports far below the increases of recent years. Starting in 1965, imports will be allowed to increase, but at a rate less than 4 percent each of the next 2 years, from 773 million pounds, product weight, in 1964 to 802 million in 1965 and 831 million in 1966.

The rate of increase in imports after 1966 may be renegotiated. Meantime, the agreement provides assurance of efforts by both Governments to improve access to world beef markets in the Kennedy round of trade negotiations in Geneva next May. Also, the agreement can be terminated by either Government if at least 180 days' notice is given.

#### U.S. CATTLE HERD EXPANDED SLOWER IN 1963

The potential source of beef in this country increased to an all-time high in 1963,

but it didn't reach quite the level earlier indicated by some sources. The preliminary estimate, as of January 1, shows 106.5 million head of cattle on the Nation's farms and ranches. This is an increase of 2.7 percent, or 2.8 million head over a year earlier, and compared with an increase of 3.9 million head in 1962.

The 5-percent increase in beef cattle more than offset another 3 percent decline in the number of dairy cattle. All classes of beef cattle show gains. However, only beef cows increased at a faster rate than they did in 1962. They increased 1.8 million head to a total of 31.8 million and represent 64 percent of all U.S. cows. A slower rate of increase in numbers than the year before was made by heifers, calves, and steers 1 year and older. The steer population increased only 384,000 head, or one-third as much as the year before. This suggests the availability of steers for feedlot placement is only moderately larger than a year ago.

#### OREGON CATTLE AT NEW HIGH

Here in Oregon, cattle numbers followed the national trend, with the dairy stock dropping to a new low, while beef cattle increased to an all-time high of 1,278,000 head. The biggest percentage increase in beef cattle was in steers—up nearly 16 percent. Heifers show a 12-percent increase. Cows and calves each are up 5 percent from the year before. Beef cows now number 632,000.

#### FED CATTLE, LAMB PRICES DROP

In the cattle markets this week, prices dropped to a new low since 1957 at major terminals, as beef production continued near record levels. At North Portland, all of the January advance in steer and heifer prices was erased this week when prices dropped 50 cents to \$1, as cheaper intermountain beef crowded into Northwest markets. Good and Choice slaughter steers were quoted in a range of \$18.50 to \$22.50, with the top of this range \$2.50 lower than a year ago.

Slaughter lambs closed mostly 50 to 75 cents lower, with discounts up to \$1.50 on weights over 115 pounds. Prime woolled lambs topped at \$19, and the same grade shorn sold down to \$16.

Meantime, the hog market edged up 25 cents and closed in a range of \$16.75 to \$17 on Nos. 1 and 2, 190- to 230-pound butchers.

#### OREGON CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION,

Prineville, Ore., February 21, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Oregon cattlemen felt they had been sold down the river when we received word Monday that the USDA had agreed to a voluntary agreement with Australia and New Zealand on the average imports of 1962 and 1963. Their agreement will also include a growth factor of 3.7 percent.

At the American National Cattlemen's Association meeting in Memphis when Dr. Renne proposed the above average and put pressure on us to accept it, all the States present voted to turn it down, on the basis that the industry just cannot live with such a high import quota. At this convention they voted to accept not more than the last 5 years average on beef imports.

We sincerely feel that Congress must regain some control on our trade negotiations and will press for some legislation in this regard. The Oregon Cattlemen's Association will have a brief to file at the April 28 Tariff Commission hearings. In this regard we have requested a study be made, showing the impact beef imports are having on the economy of Oregon. This report will be headed up by Dr. Burton Wood, Oregon State University and should be available by April 1. The OCA is paying \$1,350 to help finance this study and we will see that you get a copy when it is available.

Any suggestions that you might have to support our case will be appreciated. Maybe there is some other avenue that we should take but it looks to us like we have been outtraded into a corner and just have to fight our way out for survival.

I plan to testify for the OCA on April 28 and am looking forward to a visit with you at that time.

Sincerely,

WALT SCHROCK,  
President.

VALE GRANGE No. 696,  
Vale, Ore., February 15, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We submit the following resolution for your consideration:

"Whereas the administration's policy of free meat imports as governed by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is a direct cause of the current depressed cattle prices; and

"Whereas the livestock industry has made every effort to remain free of subsidy: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Vale Grange No. 696 go on record as favoring the enactment of measures that would impose additional duties on foreign meats shipped into this country."

Respectfully yours,

CLARENCE M. HILL,

Master.

PRISCILLA M. WESTCOTT,

Secretary.

#### RESOLUTION BY OREGON SLOPE GRANGE

Whereas cattle and beef imports are increasing each year, even in the face of increased local supply and depressed prices; and

Whereas these depressed prices represent a tremendous loss to individuals, as well as local, State, and Federal economy, and jeopardizes the future success of the beef cattle industry in the Nation: Be it

*Resolved*, That the Oregon Slope Grange urgently request Congress and the executive branch of the Federal Government to adequately protect our own beef cattle industry by imposing realistic quotas, higher tariffs, or other realistic means.

EARL HEEB,

Master.

MRS. DONALD HOPKINS,

Secretary.

#### ARTICLE BY HARRISON SASSCER

Mr. MORSE, Mr. President, Mr. Harrison Sasscer, a very competent staff associate of the American Council on Education, in the February 1964 issue of the Phi Delta Kappan, has discussed extensively the public debate over the use of public funds by private institutions of higher education.

In it, he has posed the question of the extent to which private institutions should be held publicly accountable in Federal legislation providing funds to such institutions.

In his article, Mr. Sasscer has stressed one of the issues which we tend sometimes in this debate to overlook. As he points out:

The excessive attention given to the church-state issue has obscured a much more important issue in the debate over the granting of public funds to private colleges and universities, whether church connected or not. This issue is whether, as a matter of public policy, public funds should be made available to nonpublic educational institutions. The purpose of this article is to suggest that the issue might be debated

more fruitfully in terms of the accountability of public and private institutions than in terms of "separation of church and state."

In view of the interest which continues and will continue for some time to come in these issues, in my judgment the article will be helpful to Senators. I therefore request, Mr. President, unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

**NEW TERMS FOR AN OLD DEBATE—USE OF PUBLIC FUNDS BY PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

(By Harrison Sasser)

The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is a landmark in the history of Federal educational legislation because, for the first time, it makes Federal assistance for construction of academic facilities available to all institutions of higher education, public as well as private.

The bill signed by President Johnson on December 16, 1963, as Public Law 88-204 represents 4 years of legislative endeavor. In 1962, a measure very similar to Public Law 88-204 failed to gain House approval primarily because it included student assistance. A secondary though major cause of this defeat was the opposition of organizations in elementary and secondary education. They regarded grants of funds to church-connected colleges and universities as a possible opening wedge for grants to church-operated elementary and secondary schools.

This same issue was raised during the 1963 debates on H.R. 6143, the college aid bill, particularly in the Senate, where strenuous efforts were made to eliminate church-connected institutions from its provisions and to provide a special court test for grants to such institutions through the so-called judicial review amendment. In the end, the church-state issue did not prove to be the roadblock that many observers thought it would be, and H.R. 6143 became Public Law 88-204.

The church-state issue will probably continue unresolved until a test case can be instituted to bring the question before the Supreme Court. Such a case may be brought to stop payment of a grant made under terms of the Higher Education Facilities Act, or it may come as the result of a suit to enjoin the payment of public funds from the State of Maryland to four church-connected colleges. Having been instituted by the Horace Mann League, the latter case is now making its way through the Maryland courts.

The excessive attention given to the church-state issue has obscured a much more important issue in the debate over the granting of public funds to private colleges and universities, whether church connected or not. This issue is whether, as a matter of public policy, public funds should be made available to nonpublic educational institutions. The purpose of this article is to suggest that the issue might be debated more fruitfully in terms of the accountability of public and private institutions than in terms of separation of church and state.

To make the author's position clear at the outset, he believes that the Federal Government can and should, as a matter of public policy, make funds available to both public and private institutions of higher education. However, the conditions attached to assistance to privately controlled higher education should be such as to assure public accountability, in both the legal and fiscal senses, on the part of the institution. The author also believes that if proper conditions are attached to Federal assistance to privately controlled institutions of higher

education such assistance will be so clearly limited to the educational functions of those institutions with a church connection as to be well within the bounds of what is intended by the first amendment to the Constitution when it prohibits Congress from making any law respecting an establishment of religion.

**THE CONCEPT OF ACCOUNTABILITY**

Before suggesting an important, and probably essential, point of difference between public and private higher education, it will be well to speak of some equally important points of similarity and common interest. These points are admirably summarized in the February 1959, statement of the Problems and Policies Committee of the American Council on Education entitled "The Need To Close Ranks in Higher Education":

"Private institutions no less than public institutions are by their charters dedicated to the public service. Private institutions receive direct or indirect benefits from tax-supported programs of student aid; many receive State and Federal grants for research and other purposes. Most public institutions have income from student fees and individual donations; many receive substantial contributions from industry and philanthropic foundations. Institutions of both types enjoy tax-exemption because of their public purpose. Hence, in terms of financial support, no institution is strictly private or strictly public" (p. 2).

The above quotation suggests that the distinction between public and private institutions of higher education is fast becoming blurred as far as financial support is concerned. Certainly this is the case with the large "multiversities" (to use President Clark Kerr's term). We need a new mode of distinguishing between public and private in higher education, one that will have both legal and fiscal connotations. The words "accountable" and "accountability" have these connotations and offer the possibility of drawing an operable distinction between public and private institutions.

Thus in discussing the difference between the two kinds of institutions we should ask: To whom and to what extent must this institution be accountable for its operation? The term "accountable" is suggested as offering a more precise means of describing the difference between public and private institutions that such words as "responsible" or "obligated." Indeed, to compare institutions in terms of accountability is less invidious than to try to compare them in terms of responsibility or obligation to serve.

We are especially concerned here to distinguish between public and private institutions in terms of public accountability, that is, to distinguish between public and private institutions in terms of the extent to which they are accountable, not to themselves or to their students, faculty, and trustees, but to the public. Thus, for the rest of this discussion, the term "accountability" will be limited to public accountability and will be used with reference to both public and private institutions.

**ACCOUNTABILITY OF PUBLICLY CONTROLLED INSTITUTIONS**

A publicly controlled institution of higher education is regarded as accountable because:

1. Its board of control is either elected by the public or appointed by a public official.
2. The institution has a statutory obligation or an explicitly stated policy to give special consideration to admitting the children of citizens of the governmental jurisdiction by which the institution is supported.
3. Funds for support of the institution consist principally of appropriations from taxes which must be publicly justified in a budget and accounted for by public audit; alternatively, funds may be derived from the

sale of bonds or other obligations backed by public credit, again subject to such forms of public review as legislative action or, in some jurisdictions, by referendum.

**ACCOUNTABILITY OF PRIVATELY CONTROLLED INSTITUTIONS**

Quite clearly, institutions under private control are not publicly accountable in the same manner as those under public control. The accountability of private institutions, such as it is, is much more diffused; in some instances it is almost negligible. Within very broad limits, subject principally to the judgments of its peers (e.g., the action of accrediting associations), a privately controlled institution of higher education does not have to be publicly accountable. Nevertheless, private institutions render themselves accountable as follows:

1. In most jurisdictions, privately controlled institutions must be chartered or given some form of governmental recognition which, presumably, could be withheld or withdrawn in compelling circumstances.
2. Privately controlled institutions are accorded tax exemptions on their property and their purchases of goods and services, but this exemption is subject to review by public authority and can be withdrawn or restricted in its applicability, e.g., use of private institutional property for commercial operations.
3. By accepting contracts (or grant agreements) from a public agency in which definite terms and conditions for specific performance are agreed to.
4. By carrying out in their admissions policies the implied obligation to serve the residents of a given area where, by public authority, they are given special status and prerogatives.
5. By the legal responsibility attached to their boards of control.

Accountability of private institutions for public funds: At this point the question to be asked is: If privately controlled institutions are to receive grants of public funds (either local, State, or Federal), by what means should they be held publicly accountable for the use of these funds?

At one extreme, the answer to this question would be that the limited public accountability of private institutions described above is all that should be required and that no further conditions should be attached to a grant of public funds to a private institution. At the other extreme would be a requirement that a private institution receiving more than a certain percentage of income from public funds should make itself publicly accountable by admitting to its board of control a representative of the public in the person of an elected governmental official serving ex officio or of someone appointed by the public agency supplying the funds. To be sure, this method of requiring public accountability would be generally contrary to the American tradition of relationships between Government and higher education, particularly privately controlled higher education. On the other hand, privately controlled higher education must ask itself with what justification public funds should be granted to institutions that decline to make themselves publicly accountable for the use of these funds.

Fortunately, there are alternatives that lie between the extremes of no accountability, on the one hand, and surrender of an institution's autonomy, on the other. Thus, private institutions receiving grants of public funds (local, State, or Federal) could be held accountable as follows:

1. By requiring private institutions receiving public funds, particularly for construction purposes, to expand enrollment and to show evidence of efficient use of facilities. Such requirements are among the criteria for determining priorities for Federal grants in section 106 of Public Law 88-204, the new Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.



2. By requiring institutions that receive public funds to adopt a policy of no discrimination because of race, creed, or color in student admissions and faculty recruitment. Many church-connected institutions admit students and hire faculty who do not belong to the denomination with which the institution is associated. There are legitimate reasons for limiting faculty and students to a single denomination (in theological seminaries and rabbinical colleges, for example), but these reasons do not justify the use of public funds by an institution exercising the privilege of discriminatory admissions and hiring.

3. By limiting the access of private institutions to public funds through a matching requirement, thus making it necessary for institutions to commit their own resources and adjust their priorities accordingly. Such a matching requirement would not necessarily preclude borrowing from public funds for part of the matching; but the institution would be required to commit some of its otherwise uncommitted resources, and this commitment would constitute a form of accountability.

4. By restricting the use of public funds granted to a private institution to specific categorical purposes and by requiring strict fiscal accounting to insure that public funds are used only for these purposes. In effect, this is but one step removed from the kind of accountability that is expected when public funds are made available to private institutions through contracts or research grants. Grants for graduate fellowships under title IV of the National Defense Education Act are somewhat more flexible in this regard, but accountability is built into these grants by requirements that the graduate program be in a field approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

It cannot be emphasized too frequently that the means employed to make private institutions publicly accountable for public funds should not destroy the private character of these institutions. Thus the extreme approach of required public representation on the board of control should be rejected, together with any other approach that would destroy the autonomy of the private institution.

#### IMPLICATIONS FOR FEDERAL LEGISLATION

We must keep in mind that the Federal Government is continuing to spend sizable sums of money through privately controlled institutions of education, money for which these institutions are now accountable to the public in the legal and fiscal senses as well as in the broader sense of rendering a national service. But the warning signals have already been raised that the kind of accountability that is built into Federal contract and research grant programs can distort an institution's function.<sup>1</sup> The fact that this distortion can occur when the Government makes funds available for specific performance in specific fields is used as an argument for unrestricted grant programs; for example, to construct academic facilities without specifying the purpose for which the facility should be used. Thus, if we begin to move from specific and restricted Federal grant programs to relatively general and unrestricted programs, the question of accountability becomes even more crucial and can be stated in this form: To what extent should private institutions be held publicly accountable in Federal legislation providing funds to these institutions?

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, "Twenty-six Campuses and the Federal Government," a summary of the Carnegie study of higher education and the Federal Government published in the "Educational Record," XLIV (April 1963), pp. 95-135; and "The Effects of Federal Programs on Higher Education," by Harold Orlans, published by the Brookings Institution in 1962.

By way of specific illustration, let us try to answer this question with reference to Federal financial assistance for construction of academic facilities. And let us consider the question, first, in the light of what the legislative possibilities were or might be at some future date, and, second, in the light of what has actually happened in the passage of Public Law 88-204.

Theoretically, proposals for Federal assistance for college academic facilities could have approached the question of public accountability of private institutions as follows:

1. By legislation that would require the same degree of accountability from both public and private institutions without endeavoring to distinguish between them. This could be done (a) by limiting all assistance to loans, on the theory that public and private institutions cannot be held equally accountable for grants (in essence, the method proposed by the Kennedy administration in 1961-62 as a way out of the aid-to-religion problem); or (b) by providing grants to public and private institutions without any distinction in terms of matching requirements or categories of instructional facilities to be constructed. This latter approach would imply that, as far as the Federal Government is concerned, it does not recognize any difference either in degree or kind between the accountability expected of a public institution and the accountability expected of a private institution. It would further imply that, even if there were such a difference, the Federal Government would not expect more accountability in the use of its funds from a public institution than it would from a private institution.

2. By legislation that would draw a very sharp distinction between the accountability of public institutions and that of private institutions by providing different kinds of Federal assistance to each, namely, grants to public institutions but only loans to private institutions. While this is the approach recommended by some who wished to avoid the possibility of Federal grants to church connected institutions, it also implies that the difference between the accountability of public and private institutions is a difference in kind and not in degree.

3. By legislation that would require accountability of both public and private institutions but in different degrees and that would, therefore, provide different degrees of Federal assistance. Thus, grants would be available to publicly controlled institutions without any restriction as to the type of academic facilities to be constructed, whereas grants for construction of academic facilities for privately controlled institutions would be limited to facilities in specific categories of instruction—science, mathematics, foreign language, for example. Construction loans could be unrestricted in purpose because they have accountability built into them.

In one form or another the proposals above were under consideration in the 87th and 88th Congresses. In hearings on academic facilities legislation, organized higher education supported grants and loans to institutions of higher education without any distinction between public and private control. Opposition to a program limited to loans as proposed by the Kennedy administration in 1961 and again in 1963 was based on the ineffectiveness of such assistance as far as public institutions would be concerned. The position taken by organized higher education was probably sound in terms of minimizing the church-state issue and in terms of presenting a united front in support of legislation, yet it did not recognize some of the obvious differences between public and private institutions. On the other hand, the organizations opposed to grants to private institutions concentrated so exclusively on possible violation of the first amendment if

grants went to church connected institutions that they likewise overlooked more important distinctions.

As it turns out, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 received much of its present shape in the Senate, where, following the lead given by Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, the House-passed bill (H.R. 6143) was amended to limit construction grants, whether to public or private institutions, to facilities for science, mathematics, engineering, and libraries. Foreign language was added as a category for construction grants in conference with the House.

As passed by the House, H.R. 6143 made no distinction in the accountability of public and private institutions; grants and loans were to be available to build any academic facility, and the exclusion of athletic stadiums and buildings for religious use or instruction was applied to public as well as to private institutions.

The Senate drew no distinction between the accountability of public and private institutions as far as grants to 4-year institutions and graduate schools were concerned. It held public 4-year institutions to the same categories of construction as private institutions and, at the other extreme, imposed no restrictions on either public or private institutions in the construction of graduate facilities. Yet in the version of H.R. 6143 that emerged from Senate-House conference and became Public Law 88-204, the beginnings of a distinction between public and private accountability can be found. Section 103 of the Higher Education Facilities Act sets aside funds for construction of public 2-year institutions (junior or community colleges and technical institutes), while section 106 exempts such facilities from the categories of construction applicable of 4-year institutions. Thus, though it probably did not intend to do so, in the Higher Educational Facilities Act of 1963 Congress has taken the first step toward drawing a line between public and private institutions that recognizes the different degree of accountability expected from each. Two-year public institutions are to be granted construction funds without specification as to the category of facility to be built; 2-year private institutions will receive grants, but they are limited to specific categories.

To be sure, there is no evidence that Congress intended to distinguish between public and private 2-year institutions on the basis of accountability. Indeed, the Senate debate on H.R. 6143 (see especially the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for October 10, 11, and 15, 1963), indicates that the restrictions on construction grants were intended to sidestep the religious issue by assuring that funds would be used to build facilities for specific educational purposes.

Nevertheless, the distinction in degree of accountability has been made and the beginning, though small, is a hopeful one. The time may come in the future when private 4-year institutions will accede to the proposition that Federal construction funds be granted without restriction to public institutions, while restrictions would remain in effect for grants to private institutions. The rationale for this would be that public institutions are accountable to a greater degree, and through clearly established mechanisms, for the use of public funds; while private institutions, by the very fact that they are private, are not so accountable. Hence, for the public institution accountability will be maintained through the control exercised by public bodies (regents and legislatures); while for the private institutions accountability will be maintained through restrictions in Federal authorizing legislation.

By exercise of much forbearance and even some statesmanship, public higher education has taken a united stand with private higher

education. It has brought about the enactment of a landmark in Federal legislation comparable to the Morrill Act of 1862. Perhaps it is now time for private institutions to recognize that they are not (and indeed do not want to be) accountable in the same degree as public institutions, and that it is not discrimination against them if, in the future, Federal legislation recognizes this difference.

#### THE ADMINISTRATION ON EDUCATION

When he signed the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, President Johnson said that it "is the most significant education bill passed by Congress in the history of the Republic. In fact, this session of Congress will go down in history as the Education Congress of 1963." But he added that the education task before Congress is unfinished, and renewed his plea for Federal aid to elementary and secondary education in his first state of the Union message.

Writing in the NEA Journal, Johnson strongly urged "positive action on the unfinished portion of the National Education Improvement Act, particularly those programs which will assist elementary and secondary schools." He is emphasizing education as a means of attacking "pockets of poverty" in urban slums and rural areas.

Labor Secretary Wirtz told reporters after leaving the Texas White House in late December that the country badly needs, for strengthening its economy, one rapidly expanding industry. "I nominate education," he added. He noted that unemployment is most severe among young people. As a solution, he proposed large-scale expansion of education efforts so that young people will stay in school longer and equip themselves better in the skills required by modern industry.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT FROM THE NATIONWIDE POINT OF VIEW

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very encouraging address by Mr. Norman Beckman, an Assistant Director of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, on the accomplishments of our 50 State legislatures during the 1963 sessions. In this speech, entitled "Local Government From the Nationwide Point of View," the author traces the many progressive steps that various States have taken to enlarge the permissive powers of local authorities and to ease or abolish outdated State restrictions on county and local governments.

Through these and other acts, several States have strengthened their traditional role of providing assistance and leadership in meeting pressing social problems of the times. Today, one of the greatest—if not the greatest—challenges confronting these levels of government is that of urbanization and the maze of problems which are its inevitable byproducts. For those who are pessimistic about the ability of the States and their local governments to assume their proper share of the burdens that this complex development imposes, I commend this excellent address. For those who are unaware of the role of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in this major trouble spot of Federal-State-local relations, it should be "must" reading.

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

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT FROM THE NATIONWIDE POINT OF VIEW

(A presentation by Norman Beckman, Assistant Director, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, at the annual conference of the League of Wisconsin Municipalities, Milwaukee, Wis., October 25, 1963)

The thesis that I would like to defend is one not often heard today because of the focus of attention on Washington. The thesis is that the States are on the move in helping their local governments meet their problems of growth and expansion and of assisting their residents in achieving what Aristotle long ago termed the reason for cities, namely, that it offers a better way to live. Further, this State assistance is, by and large, strengthening our general purpose units of government—the cities and counties—permitting local governments, especially those in urban areas, to take advantage of the economies of scale and a broadened and equitable tax base while remaining accessible to its citizens and subject to their desires.

State legislatures in 1963 went a sizable distance toward strengthening local government to permit it to cope with emerging problems. Many of the legislative actions taken by the States this year are consistent with the legislative recommendations to the States made by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations based on our assessment of useful steps that might be taken to make local government more effective.

It is right and fitting that the States take such actions. No single level or unit of government today can, by itself, solve the complex problems of urban living. However, the States necessarily must play an important role. Providing a workable structure and pattern of local government is clearly a State responsibility, since the present complex pattern of restrictions and intergovernmental relationships is the State's own handiwork. After briefly describing the work of the Advisory Commission, I would like to describe some of the more significant State legislation enacted this year to assist local governments.

The role of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and its objectives with respect to the well-being of our municipal governments, is spelled out in the congressional legislation establishing the Commission as a permanent bipartisan body of 26 members representing all levels of government. The Commission is directed to seek improvement in the American Federal system through increased cooperation among the National, State, and local levels of government.

The Commission has devoted its major efforts to a step-by-step look at areas in which consensus among its diverse membership would suggest solutions to difficult intergovernmental problems. It has concerned itself less with producing a comprehensive philosophy and more with practical steps toward improvement. We have concentrated our attention upon significant "gut" issues that affect John Doe as a citizen and a taxpayer. These issues—be they a fair basis of representation in our State legislatures, or the determination of the ability and effort of State and local governments to provide needed revenues—will not go away of their own accord. They must be solved by conscious effort if our cities are to grow and prosper, and if local government in this country is to be truly effective and responsible.

The Commission has no authority other than the persuasiveness of the merit of its proposals. The Commission's value as a continuing agency will be determined by the extent to which it makes constructive contributions which are put into practice.

As a vital part of its effort, the Commission has prepared and distributed to the States a package of model State legislation on such subjects of concern to the cities as control of municipal incorporations, a State office of local affairs, interlocal contracting, voluntary transfer of functions between municipalities and counties, improved collection of nonproperty taxes, and investment of idle funds. We, of course, recognize that these proposals must be evaluated against and tailored to the needs of individual States. However, with remarkably few exceptions, these State legislative proposals, some 21 in number, have been endorsed by the American Municipal Association, the National Association of Counties, and the Committee on Suggested State Legislation of the Council of State Governments. But such endorsement is just the beginning, not the end, of the implementation process. Recommendations must be translated into reality.

It is, therefore, encouraging to us to turn to a national review of outstanding State actions taken in 1963 to strengthen local government and to assume a more positive role of oversight and assistance. These 1963 State legislative actions, consistent with the recommendations of the Advisory Commission, fall into three groups: First, removing undesirable restrictions—that is unshackling local governments; second, making available an arsenal of permissive powers to local governments in meeting public service needs and in cooperating with their neighboring jurisdictions; and third, exercising State leadership, assistance and control.

#### ARSENAL OF PERMISSIVE POWERS

At no point in our Federal system are problems of intergovernmental relations so marked, varied and difficult as in our urban and metropolitan areas. Here the activities of all levels of government are in close proximity and friction points and conflict are common. On this subject of coordinating the policies and programs of many units of government, it is interesting to note that Wisconsin's six metropolitan areas enjoyed almost a 25-percent reduction in number of governmental units from 1950 to 1960, as against a nationwide increase of 20 percent. At the same time your six metropolitan areas expanded in population at a rate of 24 percent, only slightly less than the national average.

In its legislative proposals the Commission proposes no single "pat" solution for easing the problems of political and structural complexity in urban areas. In most metropolitan areas consolidation into an areawide government is neither politically feasible nor necessary to meet areawide problems. Rather, the Commission has proposed enactment by State legislatures of a wide variety of permissive powers to be utilized by local governments in urban areas as they see fit.

#### ANNEXATION

Among the foremost of these legislative authorizations, and most commonly used for adjusting the boundaries of local government in urban areas, has been reasonable authority for annexation. The Commission has recommended that, at least in urban areas, provision should be made for orderly and equitable extension of municipal boundaries to include unincorporated territory in which urban development is underway or in prospect. The Commission has found merit in the proposition that inhabitants of a minor outlying unincorporated territory should not possess an absolute power to veto

a proposed annexation which meets reasonable standards of equity. Where a city is already closely ringed with satellite municipalities the damage is already done. Annexation is one of the oldest techniques for extending urban services and is still one of the most useful. Nearly two-thirds of all municipalities over 2,500 population annexed some territory during the past decade. The areas annexed represented nearly one-seventh of all the total population of all the cities and towns involved.

A number of State legislatures, in 1963, took action to liberalize annexation laws. In Nebraska, first-class cities may now annex contiguous urban or suburban areas by single passage of an ordinance. In Wyoming and Oregon, new laws likewise authorize annexation of adjacent territory upon passage of a city council ordinance. South Carolina this year has eased its annexation provisions to permit initiation of annexation referendums upon petition of 15 percent of the property owners in the unincorporated area. Nevada legislation now requires any area, within 7 miles of the city, desiring to become a special district to give the city an opportunity to annex the area. Iowa now permits a city to annex land in an adjoining county. Strengthened annexation powers were also granted to municipalities in New Mexico, New York, Arkansas, Missouri, and California.

#### METROPOLITAN PLANNING

Urban areas today are increasingly characterized by a number of uncoordinated sources of development activity and numerous local jurisdictions and special districts. Given this situation, an effective areawide comprehensive planning agency can play a unique and vital role in properly coordinating urban programs. The Advisory Commission has emphasized that such planning must be integrated into the local political decisionmaking process to be of real use to governmental policymakers.

The Maryland Legislature this year established a regional planning council for the Baltimore metropolitan area that might serve as a model elsewhere. Council membership includes representatives from the cities and counties, the director of the State department of planning, and the State highway administrator. Upon completion of a development plan for the area, no local physical development project which affects more than a single unit of government may be authorized until the council has had an opportunity to review and comment on its consistency with general development plans for the area. The council is financed by local, State, and Federal contributions.

Alabama, North Dakota, Oklahoma, and Iowa have just provided general authority for counties and cities to create joint metropolitan planning commissions. In Mississippi, authority to enter into interstate planning agreements has been extended to both State and local governments. Hawaii has authorized its counties to establish planning commissions and to formulate a master plan and subdivision and zoning regulations.

#### INTERLOCAL AGREEMENTS AND OTHER PERMISSIVE POWERS

Nebraska, North Dakota, New Hampshire, Idaho, Vermont, and Maine have authorized interlocal contracting and joint enterprises whereby two or more units of local government can exercise jointly or cooperatively any power possessed by one or more of the units concerned. Oregon, West Virginia, Washington, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, New York, and New Mexico have expanded their previously limited authorizations for interlocal agreements and joint enterprises by local governments. Texas, North Carolina, and Montana have, this year, extended local extraterritorial planning, zoning, and sub-

division regulation authority. Oregon has established a legislative metropolitan study commission for the Portland area to prepare a comprehensive plan for metropolitan government or for furnishing metropolitan services. Other large Oregon cities can also initiate such metropolitan charter studies.

#### UNSHACKLING LOCAL GOVERNMENT

One of the classic roles of a State in our Federal system is to serve as a political laboratory for governmental experiments, which, if successful, can be safely adopted by other States and the Federal Government. Wisconsin has played this vital role on a number of occasions.

Among the most important contributions of Wisconsin are constitutional home rule, flexible optional charter systems, and liberal legislative grants of municipal powers. The experience of home rule in Wisconsin, as in New York and Texas, early demonstrated that as long as States retained the right to act, where necessary, there is much to gain and nothing to lose in leaving a wide range of discretion and initiative to local governments. Such action benefits not only local government, but permits the State government to direct its time and energy to statewide concerns.

Blanket State constitutional guarantees of home rule, however, have created problems for local governments in attempting to meet emerging urban problems. To cite a recent case, the Colorado Legislature authorized a metropolitan capital improvement district to levy an areawide local sales tax for financing capital improvements needed by the governments of the Denver metropolitan area. Last year the Colorado Supreme Court held the areawide tax unconstitutional on the ground that the constitution gave home rule citizens exclusive right to govern themselves in matters of local and municipal concern. The advisory commission has, therefore, recommended retention of sufficient authority by the States to take action where necessary to meet new problems of local government.

#### STRENGTHENED HOME RULE

Several legislatures took action in 1963 to submit constitutional amendments to the voters which propose broadening of home rule powers. The New York proposal, to be voted on by the people later this year, replaces the city and village home rule laws with greater home rule powers for all classes of municipalities, including towns. The Massachusetts General Court adopted a legislative amendment to the constitution which, if approved by the next session of the legislature and voters at the following election, will confer on cities and towns authority to "exercise any power or function which the general court has power to confer upon it, which is not inconsistent with the constitution or laws enacted by the general court."

Hawaii, Washington, Massachusetts, New York, Idaho, New Mexico, Vermont, and New Hampshire all extended additional home rule authority to their local units of government. Iowa granted cities broad powers of self-determination over strictly local and internal affairs.

#### REVENUE RESOURCES

The 1963 State legislation significantly increases the revenue potential at the State level, and should fortify financial aids to local government. Although Governors' legislative programs placed little explicit emphasis on augmenting the taxing powers of local governments, some legislative activity can be recorded. The Hawaii Legislature, this year, abolished the existing millage limitation on the property taxing power of the counties. Indiana authorized local motor vehicle license taxes and Oklahoma, for the first time, authorized the use of local income taxes. California and Tennessee granted se-

lected new taxing authorities to their local governments. Connecticut enacted legislation designed to raise local government debt limits by linking such debt to local tax collections.

#### STATE LEADERSHIP, ASSISTANCE, AND CONTROL

Local government officials understandably welcome State financial aid and home rule powers. Too many such officials, however, bridle at the thought of direct State activity in providing and regulating local services and in furnishing technical assistance. As urbanization increases, many States today are in a real sense the only established regional forms of government. Wisconsin's splendid record of State planning is testimony to the potentialities of leadership to achieve more orderly development and allocation of resources in the State. California has developed a statewide water plan to meet the needs of competing areas within the State. New Jersey has acquired extensive recreation areas on the outskirts of major metropolitan areas.

Increasingly, no authority exists short of the State for resolving disputes between local governments. Where action or inaction by one jurisdiction may do injury to the people of other jurisdictions, State action is necessary lest a vacuum in government be created.

#### STATE OFFICE OF URBAN AFFAIRS

The commission has recommended that the States establish a State office of urban affairs for continuing attention, review, and assistance on problems of local government, finance, structure, organization, and planning. New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania have already established such agencies. In 1963 Tennessee established an office of local government with a local government advisory commission to assist the Governor in coordinating State agency policies affecting local governments and to assist local governments in finding cooperative solutions to common problems. Incidentally, three members of the Tennessee Local Government Advisory Commission are appointed by the Governor on recommendation of the Tennessee Municipal League. Likewise, the State of Washington Legislature has, this year, established an office of local affairs in the department of commerce and local development to study needed legislative changes and render technical services to local governments.

A number of new State technical assistance activities for specific urban operating programs were authorized in 1963. These include comprehensive transportation planning assistance in Ohio, Tennessee, and Minnesota, general local planning assistance in Idaho, North Dakota, Florida, and South Dakota, and new State-local assistance for water supply in New York, Texas, and New Hampshire. The Arkansas Highway Department is now authorized to provide engineering services to counties for Federal aid—secondary highways; Florida, North Carolina, New Hampshire, and Connecticut legislation initiated programs for developing local outdoor recreation facilities, and Arkansas, Tennessee, North Dakota, Oklahoma, and Massachusetts have established new law enforcement training programs for use by local governments.

#### CONTROL OF NEW INCORPORATIONS

Too often municipal incorporations have been designed solely to obtain a liquor license, preempt a tax base provided by a new industry, avoid zoning or gambling laws, or to resist annexation by an adjacent municipality. The commission's draft legislation for control of new incorporations is modeled generally along the lines of Wisconsin's precedent-making legislation in this field under which all municipal incorporation proposals are reviewed against discretionary and non-discretionary standards.

No less than nine States enacted incorporation control legislation in 1963. The Kansas Legislature gave new powers to county boards to control incorporations. In addition to holding hearings and applying standards, petitions are to be denied if annexation of the area to the adjacent city would better serve the interests of the area.

A new California statute creates a local agency formation and annexation commission in every county. The statute specifies a number of factors to be considered in passing on proposed incorporations. Likewise, new statutes in Georgia, Nevada, Oklahoma, Texas, Washington, New Mexico, and Ohio establish minimum standards for new municipalities. The new California agencies, incidentally, have control over creation of special districts as well as new municipalities. Unlike other States, Wisconsin has not gone down the path of creating special districts which tend to make coordinated and responsible local government administration more difficult to achieve. The latest census count shows that Wisconsin has only 68 special districts, mostly drainage units, which ranked her 32d among the States in this regard. Your southern neighbor, Illinois, by contrast, is at the top of the list with 2,126 special districts.

You do have more than the average number of small school districts, ranking seventh in the Nation. But this problem seems to be pretty well in hand through the progressive use of incentive grants, with a 20-percent reduction of the smallest school districts in the last 5 years.

#### WATER SUPPLY AND SEPTIC TANK CONTROL

Public investment in water and sewer facilities almost everywhere in the Nation is inadequate. The indiscriminate use of wells and septic tanks, especially in suburban areas, encourages urban sprawl, often endangers public health and rarely provides a permanent solution for obtaining and disposing of water. Area-wide approaches for water supply and sewerage facilities offer economies of scale, protection against unwise investment, equalization of rates, and an adequate base for long-term development programs with capacity for growth. Finally, more vigorous enforcement of water pollution control powers is needed.

The Empire State, along with at least nine other States, took decisive action in 1963. New York, which already contributed to sewage treatment plant construction and operating costs this year authorized financial assistance for comprehensive engineering and economic feasibility studies for development of projects to meet water supply needs. A new Kansas law provides State assistance for water conservation storage projects including financial aids for projects which "create benefits beyond the local boundaries." An amendment to the Oregon public health law provides that the sanitary authority may, without need of prior administrative procedure, take legal action to abate or restrain threatened or existing pollution of State waters. New Hampshire, for the first time, guarantees unconditionally up to \$25 million in bonds on projects for construction of sewerage systems and other facilities needed for pollution control. Nebraska now requires that construction or modification of any sewage disposal system be submitted to the State water pollution control council for review and approval. Other State actions to provide financial assistance or more effectively regulate pollution control were taken this year by Maryland, Minnesota, and Texas. California authorizes water and sewer districts to require elimination of cesspools and septic tanks upon extension of sewer system to a given area.

#### CONCLUSION

To some extent I have accentuated the positive. Progress in this field has never been rapid—issues are complex, stakes are

high, and feeling runs strong. And the record of State legislative action on local government problems this year is impressive. Increasing urbanization, and legislative apportionment actions now underway in some 40 States, cannot help but result in accelerating State authority and concern with major urban development problems. In domestic activities, State and local governments together are carrying more than five times the financial burden of the Federal Government. The time has come to acknowledge that State and local government is not a weak and faltering relic of our Federal system.

The States this year also created a number of interim study committees to deal with local government problems. Colorado created a Governor's local affairs study commission to study the problems of local government in urban areas. Georgia, New Mexico, and North Dakota have, this year, set up constitutional study commissions. Florida, Missouri, and New Jersey created little "Hoover" commissions. Minnesota and South Dakota are studying State and local tax resources and tax laws. The Indiana Legislative Advisory Commission will study annexation laws. A dozen other examples could be cited.

Thus the States are called upon to fulfill, in more modern garb, their traditional functions in the Federal system of (a) serving as political laboratories, (b) preventing undue concentration of political power, (c) adapting national programs to local needs, and (d) assisting local governments—with their ample legal powers, financial resources, and geographic coverage.

In stressing these positive actions one must be careful not to become a Pollyanna or assume that progress is inevitable. Blood, sweat, and tears are needed on the part of local officials, citizens, and State representatives in order to achieve the inevitable reforms of removing outmoded State financial and organizational restrictions; providing adequate provisions for annexation, for metropolitan area planning, for extraterritorial zoning, and for interlocal contracting; and securing State financial assistance in such expanding problem areas as water supply and sewage disposal, air pollution, mass transportation, open space, and hospital care.

Much remains to be done. A survey last year of some 30 States indicated that no State had as many as one-half the commission's proposed bills enacted in their entirety. Only four of these fundamental bills—authorizing interlocal contracting, extraterritorial zoning, metropolitan planning, and idle cash investments—had been adopted entirely or in part by at least one-half the States. Only a handful of States render financial assistance to local governments for parks and recreation, water and sewage and housing. Overdetached State constitutions, Governors with responsibility but little authority, underpaid and understaffed State legislatures are the rule rather than the exception in too many States.

For those of us who have carried on a long-term love affair with our Federal system, the States have had a special place in our heart. Like Shakespeare's Cleopatra, "Age cannot wither her, nor custom stale her infinite variety." We can but hope that she will become a tidier housekeeper, be less restrictive and be more permissive with her legal offspring—the local governments.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in the February 8, 1964, edition of the Saturday Review, a distinguished American, Norman Cousins, penned an eloquent and moving tribute to the memory of the late

President John F. Kennedy. I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of that editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THE WHITE HOUSE REVISITED

It is a house still possessed by the spirit and color of a man no longer there. The main desk is now occupied by a man substantial and able in his own right, yet there is a sense in the house of a persisting presence—inescapable, palpable, pervasive. Beyond the many physical evidences is an unmistakable suffusion, a sort of lingering electrical energy generated by the young President. He didn't just reside in or preside over the big house, he filled it—quite literally, with a special quality of aliveness. And the charge is still in the air.

The memories are much too new and strong to be assigned to history. There is first of all the memory of a man in motion. He would seldom sit at his desk for long stretches at a time. Very often you would see him striding through the corridors or the colonnade, his shoulders held high and seemingly bunched together in characteristic posture. Something was always happening at one place or another in the White House, and the President was always in the center of it. Some people thought it was restlessness. Those closest to him knew he liked to be on the move and to pursue things instead of waiting for things to pursue him.

You had the feeling at times that he felt cooped up and longed to sprint in an open field. Once, he found himself with 7 free minutes before his next engagement, a 2 p.m. talk on the White House lawn to several hundred music students invited by Mrs. Kennedy. He hadn't yet had lunch, but he sped down to the White House pool, tore off his clothes, and plunged in. He did the backstroke with only one hand. In the other he held a card high above the water, it contained his notes for the talk and he studied them while swimming. After three or four circuits the President jumped out, the hunger of his body for exercise at least temporarily appeased.

The echoes of the last 3 years still race through the air in the big house. Sounds of great debates—not just on questions of political strategy but on philosophical values and the messages of history—are audible to those who listen and those who remember. There are also the sounds of laughter of a man who knew that the greatest responsibility in the world was made not merely tolerable but comprehensible through full response to life and the enjoyment of living.

There was also a quality of silence and loneliness. The making of big decisions is the loneliest business in the world. The experts can swarm all over the place—for a time—but in the end it is one man staking the life of a nation and perhaps a civilization on the way his own mind turns. Few men listened harder or did their homework more conscientiously than he, but he recognized, too, that there are elements in important problems that go far beyond facts and into the unmeasurables and intangibles where the specialists stand on even ground with every man.

People speak of his "style." That quality eludes definition, but whatever it was, a good place to look for it was at a White House dinner. There was something Jeffersonian about the range and depth of both guests and conversation. The young President was frequently in the questioner's role. He liked to hunt paradoxes and haul in contradictions. But he was careful not to pursue an argument after he knew he had scored the vital point.

Countless photographs, portraits, and candid snapshots are omnipresent in the offices of the men who worked closely with him.

One of these pictures showed him stretched out on the deck of a racing sloop; he was reading a book. The title was not visible, judging from the unevenness of the lines, it may have been poetry. Another photograph showed him in slacks and sport shirt, grinning back at the cameraman. Still another showed him signing the nuclear test ban treaty that may well be the most signal accomplishment of his Presidency. There was also a photograph of him with his wife and children at Hyannisport.

The depth of the tragedy is writ large in the faces of the men who worked alongside him in the White House and who continue to serve today. They are young, too, most of them in their thirties or forties; but they have been caught up in one of the greatest ordeals in modern history and they show it. What brought them to their jobs in the first place was not just an attractive proximity to power but a profound admiration and affection for their chief. And what has kept them in those jobs since his death is a desire to serve in whatever way they can. But the period of transition is fast nearing completion. Already there are signs that the new men are ready and perhaps impatient to take over the whole of the job themselves, as is natural. And so, most members of the team put together by the young President will soon be leaving one by one.

Their sadness will not down, any more than that of the Nation itself. But they will never lose the sense of privilege of having been close to a man fully alive. That privilege, in a larger sense, is the common property of the American people.

#### FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION— AFL-CIO RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is increasing recognition that the Federal Government will have to provide a great deal more assistance than it already has in this session if educational institutions are to have the facilities and personnel they need to meet the demands of our growing population and national responsibility. These educational needs are accelerating, and the gap is growing wider. The measures passed by this Congress so far and signed into law can only be regarded as a beginning toward the fulfillment of Federal Government responsibility for the Nation's education. There are wider areas of need that have not been met and these are described in a resolution that has come to my attention.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement on education adopted by the AFL-CIO Executive Council at its meeting in Florida, February 20.

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

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON EDUCATION, BAL HARBOUR, FLA., FEBRUARY 20, 1964

Early in 1963, President Kennedy, in a special message to Congress, proposed an omnibus Federal-aid-to-education bill. The bill would have drawn together in a single piece of legislation solutions for a wide range of educational problems. The AFL-CIO said at the time that by bringing the problems of elementary and secondary education, higher education, and adult education within the scope of a single piece of legislation, the President had usefully focused attention upon the interrelationship between separate educational problems. Whether the problems were to be approached

through a single bill or through a series of bills was less important than that they be approached and solved.

In its 1963 session the 88th Congress passed substantial parts of the Kennedy education program and it was deservedly described by President Johnson as "the educational Congress of 1963." Apart from the specific importance of the separate bills passed by Congress the legislation taken together constitutes a new national commitment to education. Once and for all it has been established that the Federal Government is permanently concerned with the solution of the problems of education.

There are many education problems which still remain to be taken care of. These problems are every bit as urgent as those dealt with in the educational bills already passed.

Nothing substantial has yet been done to meet the problems of elementary and secondary education. Overcrowded classrooms, poorly paid professional and operating staffs, and obsolete facilities continue to plague our schools. A comprehensive program of Federal assistance to elementary and secondary education, including aid for both classroom construction and for improving teachers' salaries, remains one of our greatest educational needs. In a Nation of rich and poor States, only the Federal Government can insure that every child will have equal opportunity to an adequate education. The problem of aid to nonpublic schools continues to stalemate Federal aid legislation, and we again urge, as we did at our 1963 convention, that we seek a solution to this problem through the expansion of National Defense Education Act assistance to nonpublic schools. Such an expanded program might well include more subjects than those presently covered and grants for classroom construction could be added to the equipping of teaching facilities presently covered by the act.

The AFL-CIO has long urged the development of special Federal programs to deal with education in the large city slums and in the many rural areas where poverty goes hand in hand with poor educational opportunity. We are heartened by the growing national concern with poverty and with its relationship to inadequate education. Poor communities are unable to provide good schools for their children and new generations of badly educated young people face a future of poverty and unemployment. The Federal Government must break this cycle by providing special aid to education in low income areas. We can no longer deal with these problems halfheartedly, and on a piecemeal basis. The Federal Government must finance massive support for educational programs aimed at both the causes and effects of poverty. If we do this we can eliminate adult illiteracy, and we can provide the kinds of special assistance which will overcome cultural disadvantage and motivate children and adults alike to an enthusiasm for education. This is the most important long range program for the elimination of school dropouts, and the resulting problems of young people who are out of school, yet unqualified to work even when jobs are available.

The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 will do much to ease the problems of higher education, but it will do little to help students and their families meet mounting college tuition and living costs. There is need for comprehensive student aid to assist low and moderate income young people obtain higher education.

The expansion of the National Defense Education Act student loans is a start in this direction. This should be supplemented by Federal insurance for private low-interest student loans. Even more important is the establishment of a large-scale student work program similar to the NYA

of depression days. The AFL-CIO has long supported a system of Federal scholarships which would provide payments to the colleges and universities as well as the students. We urge that these be set up on a State and congressional district basis to provide the widest possible opportunities. There is also special merit to the cold war GI education bill introduced by Senator YARBOROUGH. The AFL-CIO has long supported this legislation which would provide veterans of the cold war educational opportunities similar to those given veterans of World War II and the Korean war.

At its 1963 convention the AFL-CIO urged the extension of the principle of universal free public education through at least the 14th year and the raising of the compulsory school age to 18. The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, with its special provisions for aid to public junior colleges, gives every State an opportunity to act in the direction of making this goal a reality. We reiterate our support of the principle of free public education through the junior college level and of comprehensive aid for students in all areas of higher education.

#### LA CROSSE TRIBUNE OPPOSES PROXMIRE BUT LIKES HIS VOTE AGAINST TAX CUT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most refreshing and honest editorials I have read in a long time came recently from the La Crosse Tribune, of La Crosse, Wis.

This newspaper makes no bones of its opposition to my reelection in the event I decide to run. It says so loud and clear, but it also has the good grace and active integrity to say that it approves of my opposition to a tax cut which I think is irresponsible in a year of unparalleled prosperity and a heavily unbalanced budget.

It is so refreshing and unusual that a newspaper in this age of one-sided partisanship can find good and favorable things to say about public officials whom they basically oppose that I ask unanimous consent that the Tribune thoughtful editorial "Two Sides to the Tax-Cut Coin" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

#### TWO SIDES TO THE TAX-CUT COIN

Senator PROXMIRE is getting his lumps from Wilbur Renk, his Republican challenger, for voting against the big tax cut bill this month.

We like Renk, and think he'd make a more effective spokesman for all of Wisconsin than the present senior Senator.

But we also think PROXMIRE was right in voting against a tax cut while the Federal budget stays in the red—as it admittedly will stay for several more years. White House experts themselves talk hopefully of a balanced budget no earlier than 1967.

Mr. Renk is telling audiences around the State that Wisconsin citizens will have another \$250 million to spend "because a majority of Senators voted for the tax cut" and asks whether PROXMIRE believes that this quarter-billion "will do them more good in Washington."

"Did anyone ever send a dollar to Washington and get a whole dollar back?" Renk asked.

It's a good question, and the answer is no. But it doesn't stop there. Another side of the tax-cut coin is what the average American loses out of his wages or savings if the new spending sparks more inflation.

Some economists estimate that lost purchasing power between the eve of World War II and 1960 cost Americans some \$200 billion.

That's a hundred times the money lost in all the bank failures of the 1920's and early thirties.

Senator PROXMIER wants his party to keep its 1960 campaign promises of frugal spending and a balanced budget. His vote against the tax cut may not be popular, but we think it was consistent.

#### PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S GEORGIA ANCESTORS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, we Georgians take a great deal of pride in the part the early citizens of our State played in making ours a great State, a prosperous State, and one which is steeped in tradition. Many, many Georgia citizens and their descendants have risen to greatness and made for themselves a prominent and respected place in history.

One such person is Lyndon Baines Johnson, the President of the United States, whose ancestral heritage can be traced back to Georgia.

The history of President Johnson's Georgia ancestors is told in an interesting article on March 1 in the Sunday magazine of the Atlanta Journal-Constitution, written by Mr. Andrew Sparks.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

##### PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S GEORGIA ANCESTORS

At the State Archives on Peachtree Street, President Lyndon Johnson's folks are known as G.T.s.

"We call them G.T.s for 'Gone to Texas'—those Georgians who left the State back in the 1830's and 1840's and headed West," said Mrs. Mary Givens Bryan, director of the archives. "They went in droves."

President Johnson's family were Georgians until sometime around 1838. The President's great-grandfather, Jesse Johnson, served as sheriff of Henry County and later as justice of the inferior court in McDonough. Numerous records with his name on them can be found in the ordinary's office.

Jesse married a Greene County girl. At the Greensboro courthouse you can read that justice of the peace John Willson married Jesse and Lucy Webb Barnett on November 14, 1817. She was 18 and he, 22.

And at the Oglethorpe Courthouse in Lexington is a copy of the will of Jesse's father, John Johnson, deeds for various land transactions he made, and an amazing marriage contract John and a Green County widow signed before their wedding. He and his second wife set down in black and white before witnesses exactly what the financial arrangement would be after they married.

It is surprising how much can be learned about the President's ancestors more than 125 years after they died or left the State. The Johnsons are still around, ghosts caught in old deeds, wills, tax digests, census lists—the papers are scattered, crumbling, hard to find and difficult to read once you find them, recorded in some forgotten clerk's spidery handwriting. Putting the pieces together is a puzzle when you try to dig up the roots of a family tree and recreate it limb by limb. You need a bird-dog nose, a maiden aunt's perseverance for gathering family details and a novel writer's imagination. And even if you find the names, it is hard to pry a real person out of the dry

old records, a flesh-and-blood man who fought Tories and Indians, loved women, fathered a family, and inspired his children to move west in the American pioneer tradition. Pioneers the Johnsons were. They fit perfectly into that pattern of south and western migration that settled "upper Georgia" after the Revolutionary War, moved on into Indian territory as west Georgia opened up to white settlers and then headed for new wide-open spaces in Alabama and Texas.

This story so intrigued the President's mother, Mrs. Sam Ealy Johnson, Jr., of Austin, Tex., that she made an exhaustive search to find out everything she could about the Johnson family. Several of her letters are on file at the State archives. Across middle Georgia from Henry to Oglethorpe Counties, a string of ordinaries and clerks of court remember correspondence from her and from the President, then a Senator, seeking information about the Johnsons.

When she finished her history, Mrs. Johnson gave a typewritten copy of it, bound as a book, to Lyndon, her oldest child, for his 48th birthday present. That was in 1956, 2 years before she died. The book has 145 pages, including genealogical tables, and on the front cover, of lightweight, flexible cardboard, "The Johnsons" is printed in gold-colored ink. Probably no other American President ever took office with such a well-authenticated past.

"My purpose in this undertaking," she wrote in her foreword, "is primarily to acquaint my children, and their children after them, with their father's family. Secondly, I desire to introduce the various branches of the Johnsons to each other. Knowing the Johnsons and their love of family as I do, I feel that this book may lead to many pleasant relationships between kinspeople previously unknown or only slightly known to each other. \* \* \*

"I begin with the Revolutionary soldier, John Johnson, whose antecedents I have been unable to trace despite a protracted search. I located John by the process of deduction, concluding that Jesse Johnson's father must have been a John, because Jesse named his first son John. I was correct, but in discovering the right John, I encountered practically a regiment of Georgia Revolutionary soldiers named John Johnson. Perhaps some who read this book may find information leading to John's ancestors—I sincerely hope this may be true."

John Johnson, that earliest ancestor she could track down, was living in Oglethorpe County 169 years ago when his son Jesse was born there in 1795. Mrs. Johnson never learned where he came from. This section of Georgia had been opened up just a few years before and filled up with immigrants, mostly from the Carolinas, Virginia, and Pennsylvania. As new counties were laid out, west of the Ogeechee and the Oconee, veterans often were the first settlers.

"Georgia was the most generous of the States to Revolutionary veterans," said Mrs. Pat Bryant, who has charge of land records at the archives. "It was the most sparsely populated of the original 13 colonies, wanted settlers, and enticed droves of them by giving free land. Some of the best land in the State was being offered and that's why we had those heavy migrations at the end of the 18th century. A man didn't have to be a veteran. He could petition for land under the Head-Right system, which entitled him to 200 acres on his own head and 50 acres for his wife and each child and slave, not exceeding a total of 1,000 acres. Pioneers wanted lots of land. It was this same urge that made them later go to Texas. One group would go out and write back home and a whole colony would troop west to join them. Some kept going on and on to California and greener pastures."

Often the pastures were literally greener because the early farmers wore out the land, and then moved on to do it somewhere else.

Lotteries also helped settle Georgia. As new areas opened up after the Indians moved out, citizens drew lots for the available land—veterans were entitled to two extra draws under an act of the legislature in 1825. John Johnson, in 1827, not long before his death, drew 202½ acres in the 18th district of original Lee County, a spot near the headwaters of Talfalga Creek, now in Webster County about 4 miles southeast of Preston. John never lived there. The land wasn't granted until 1833, after his death, but he mentions it in his will along with other land he owned outside Oglethorpe County, in Dooly, and in Greene.

John Johnson died January 14, 1828. According to Mrs. Johnson's research he was first married around 1787 to Ann Ealy, who was the mother of his eight children and died January 5, 1815. Eight years later he married Joicy Bowdite Fears, the widow of William Fears' of Greene County.

You can read the rare and wonderful marriage contract John and Joicy (or Joyce) signed on May 27, 1823, if you go to the office of the clerk of the superior court, Thomas Noell, in the courthouse at Lexington, Ga. With no June wedding nonsense, it settled who would own what after the marriage. Joicy agreed to "put into the possession of the said John Johnson all my estate both real and personal." But she made one exception. When her little daughter Edney Ann Fears reached the age of 17, or if she married sooner, she was to have Joicy's Negro boy named Lewis, and the following articles: "One pine cupboard, one large trunk, one walnut dressing table, one loom, four bed quilts, four counterpins, four white cotton sheets, six blue earthen plates, six cups and saucers." If Edney Ann should die, her mother reserved the right to dispose of this property "in any manner I may choose among my own relatives."

John agreed and consented to all this and added that little Edney Ann "shall live with her mother in my house. I will expend to the amount of \$60 to a teacher or teachers for her tuition, exclusive of any other expenses but the tuition, provided there be a school so near that her mother will send her from home." He also said that when Edney Ann became 17, or if she married sooner, he would give her \$100.

The contract was witnessed by Booz Maxey and Henry Willis and signed by John and Joicy—she with her mark.

In his will, probated 4½ years later, John left Joicy among other things "\$200 in discharge of an equivalent for the money promised in a marriage contract entered into by said Joicy and myself." He gave her back 100 acres in Greene County inherited from her first husband, a mare named Rosebud and her colt, her saddle and bridle, 10 barrels of corn, and 400 pounds of pork.

He also left Joicy "the bed, bedstead, mattress and bed furniture owned by said Joicy previous to our marriage, also one pine table, five chairs, one black pine chest, and square top trunk, one wash and one dinner pot; one large oven, one small washtub \* \* \* the supply of sugar and coffee that may be on hand at my death, six shoats of the spring gang including a sow shoat, her choice of the spinning wheels and cotton cards, one clock reel, one pair of flat irons, one case knives and forks, half a dozen pewter plates, half dozen earthen ditto, one large and one small earthen dish, one small churn, one plank meal gum and flour gum and salt gum, one large plank box, one sifter and two bread trays, two pewter dishes, one set cups and saucers, sugar dish and tea spoons, one pine table used for salting meat on, one foot noggin, one brass kettle and one pot rack, to her and her heirs forever."

He remembered each of his living children, three sons, Jesse, Sam, and Thomas, and two daughters, Polly Barnett and Ann—giving a Negro girl to each of his daughters; \$100 and a horse, saddle and bridle to Ann; the Lee County farm, \$100, and a bed, bedstead and furniture to Thomas. Polly and the other boys, who apparently had already married, received "\$5 in money in addition to what I have heretofore given. \* \* \* The three children of his late son John, who had died around 1822, received \$60 each. John appointed his son Jesse executor and directed him to sell all his property not mentioned in the will and divide the money equally among the Johnson children, giving John Jr.'s children their father's share.

At his death John Johnson owned four slaves—Treasy, a woman and her child, Bidly, \$400; old Bidly, \$150; and Denwood, a man, \$150." His personal property excluding land, was valued at around \$1,500 including horses, cattle, hogs, geese, oxen, farm implements, household furnishings, and notes owed him. One was for \$1.14%, had been drawn up 4 years before his death and had a credit of 50 cents. His house furnishings were simple but typical of what a well-to-do 18th century or early 19th century Georgian would have had. The prices make an antique collector drool: one sideboard, \$12; one desk with drawers, \$20; one "cub-board pine," \$8; one shotgun, \$8; two feather beds and furniture and three bedsteads, \$40.

The best clues for discovering where the President's great-great-grandfather lived and may be buried are in the executor's deeds for the sale of his land. His home was probably in the southwest corner of Oglethorpe County, west of Maxeys, Ga. Jesse sold two tracts of land to the highest bidder "at public outcry" early in 1830, according to executor's deeds dated February 2, 1830, on file at the courthouse. Abner Ward, one of the witnesses of John's will, paid \$576 for 145 acres on the waters of Falling Creek and Sandy Creek. Emanuel Zuber paid \$500 for 360 acres on Sandy Creek, all of it in Oglethorpe except for the extreme southwest corner in Greene. It was bounded on one side by the land of Abner Ward. The deed locates this land on the road between Scull Shoals and Bowling Green.

In spite of warnings that we'd never get back if we went, the photographer and I took off west of Maxeys on those rivers of mud called roads. Our guide was a State highway map of Oglethorpe County, one which shows every creek, farmhouse, church and cemetery. We found cemeteries full of Smiths and Brightwells and graves with no names at all, but no Johnsons. We crossed Sandy Creek and Falling Creek, both mentioned in the Johnson deeds. And we even saw an 18th century farmhouse, probably similar to that John Johnson built and lived in. It is Mr. Pearl Aycock's house, not far from the Oconee, where four generations of Aycocks have lived. Mr. Aycock says the house was built around 1780 and that when it was new his great-grandmother once looked out the window and saw two Indians grinning at her. She didn't stop weaving. The Indians stole the Aycock's horses and then went on to burn Greensboro.

But you don't have to get in the mud to see the kind of house John Johnson might have lived in. The Thornton House at the Atlanta Art Association, which was moved to Atlanta and restored in 1960, was built about 15 miles from the Johnson farm by one of those Virginians who came to Georgia after the Revolution. It was 9 years old when Jesse Johnson was born.

Claude Stevens of Carlton, Ga., is President Johnson's fifth cousin. He is a retired physics teacher with an interest in genealogy and learned from a correspondent in Texas that he is related through Lucy Barnett

Johnson. Mr. Stevens so far has been unable to pinpoint the Johnson farm.

"When the mud dries and the roads get better in the spring," he said, "I'm going down in the country below Maxeys and see if I can locate it. John Johnson's probably buried right there."

The tantalizing thought that the old Johnson house is still standing made us go back after the mud had dried some—but not enough to keep us from getting stuck. Mr. Stevens met us at the courthouse, bringing along the descriptions of the old deeds. Frank Maxey, the ordinary, whose ancestors were relatives of Booz Maxey and Hall Maxey mentioned in many of the Johnson papers, volunteered to go with us. He remembers well the old Zuber place, which could be the tract Emanuel Zuber bought from the Johnson estate. When we got there, we discovered that the oldest part of the Zuber house, a hewn log section, had been torn down some years before. In the family cemetery, the only two marked graves were Zubers.

Richard Maxey, who lives in the area, took us to the old "Adkissin' Church"—Atkinson's—where nothing remains but a cemetery and not a single grave is marked except by seashells or by a depression in the forest floor. We cut across a pasture and walked at least a half mile to the old Andy Gillen house, which could easily date from John Johnson's time and may even be his house. W. M. Gillen of Lexington, whose father was born in this house, always told him that his father, Andy, had bought a farm known as the Johnson place. Andy came to this country from Ireland as a stowaway and could have bought the Johnson land from the Zubers. The two main rooms of the house have the gayest old color schemes, probably original—bright orange, yellow and white in one room, deep green, yellow, and white in another.

Back on the Wire Bridge Road, the ordinary showed us where the old Scull Shoals Road he remembered as a boy turned off to the left. Now, long deserted by stagecoaches, wagons—and even automobiles—it is nothing more than a ditch in the forest. Tractor ruts follow it for a little way to a field near the edge of the Oconee National Forest.

"I can show you where the old Tarpley place is," Frank Maxey said, "but it won't do you any good because you can't see any more than you can here which is nothing."

But we couldn't resist going down the old disappearing Fontenoy Road, as it is called on a 70-year-old county map Mr. Stevens had. We parked the car and walked for more than a mile in the mud. The only thing we saw was an abandoned farmhouse and on a slight rise beyond it stood an old log barn. We climbed through tangled underbrush to get to the barn and as we turned to go, we spied on in the distance the shingled roof of a house hidden by overgrown bushes and trees. Fighting on through briars, we came to two ancient twisted cedars and beyond them something you'd never expect to find in Georgia, the tumbledown remains of an 18th century house. It is still covered with beaded weatherboards. One of the two end chimneys is mostly intact. This pioneer house affected 18th century styles; its batten doors had applied moldings to give them a paneled-door look and a chair rail sets off the wainscot. The steepest of staircases twists up between the rooms in two attic bedrooms, now open to the sky. In one of them, a snake has shed its skin. Ceiling boards have fallen and the mantels lie on their faces. The timbers slowly are returning to humus of the forest floor.

This ancient house, little changed from the time it was built by the first settlers to look like the stylish Virginia and Carolina houses at home, is, certainly, the kind John

Johnson would have built on his farm there on the Scull Shoals Road, the house where Jesse was born and where the widow Fears came with little Edney Ann, her sheets, counterpanes, and dishes. The rotting house between Sandy Creek and Falling Creek is more remote now than it was in their day when the road beside it ran down to Scull Shoals, a busy factory town where the mid-winter rains of 1812 destroyed the South's first papermill. John and his wife, Ann Ealy, may be buried nearby, but finding them may be an impossible task.

In Greensboro, Miss Catherine Cornwell proudly showed us that the marriage record of Jesse Johnson and Lucy Webb Barnett appears in the new Greene County history which she helped get published. (Only 90 more copies of it are available.) She says Jesse's name is on the 1820 census as a Greene County resident and on the tax digests.

He had already moved on to Henry County, 70 or 80 miles from the old Johnson farm, by the time of his father's death.

"There's little authentic information about Jesse around here," says Mrs. R. A. Rainer, of McDonough, who probably knows as much about Henry County history as anyone else. "He was a first settler, served as sheriff from 1822 until around 1835 and was a justice of the inferior court. He lived between Luella and Hampton near the John Adams place. I am familiar with this locality, know old homesteads, graveyards, and houses and remember many which are gone. I am certain no house remains where the Johnsons lived."

Jesse and Lucy had 10 children, the youngest of whom was born in Alabama in 1838. He was Sam Ealy Johnson, the President's grandfather. Two of the older children apparently lived out their lives in Henry County. The marriage records show that Ava Johnson married James Adams, October 4, 1842, and Nathan Johnson married Malissa Williams, January 31, 1843. One daughter married and settled down in Alabama. Most of the others went on to Texas with their parents.

An Alabama genealogist, Mrs. Elizabeth Wood Thomas of Tuscaloosa, is now diligently trying to track down everything she can find about the Johnsons in Alabama. She has a copy of Mrs. Johnson's history and plans to publish the President's genealogy in the March or April issue of her Alabama Genealogical Register. Her research puts Jesse and his family in Randolph County, Ala., just over the Georgia line.

"Jesse entered land there for taxes in 1837 and 1838," she said. "He must have been living there by then although he still had business in Georgia. His father's estate was not finally settled until 1842. In the 1840 census of Randolph County I found a Jesse Johnson and the children of his family fit perfectly with those that the President's ancestor had. Three people in the family were engaged in agriculture and two in 'commerce.' Only two people in the entire county were listed that way. What was it? My guess is that they operated a stagecoach line or were in the banking business. They were prosperous. The Johnsons owned 17 slaves in 1840. I've been over the county with a fine-tooth comb and know there's no house standing where they lived."

According to Mrs. Johnson's history, Jesse and his family reached Texas in 1846 and settled at Lockhart, where Jesse died May 15, 1856, and Lucy died less than a year later. Young Sam, the President's grandfather, was only 8 years old when he reached the West. He became a farmer and livestock man who bought cattle and drove them to the Kansas market. He died in 1915. The President's father, Sam Ealy Johnson, Jr., was the fifth child of Sam and Eliza Bunton Johnson. He was born October 11, 1877 at Buda, Tex., and died in Austin, October 22, 1937.

For several years he was a State representative. The President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, was the first of five surviving children of Rebekah Baines and Sam Johnson, Jr. He was born in 1908 in a farm cabin that his pioneer Georgia ancestors would have considered not a bit fancy.

No one would have dreamed the trail would lead from Stonewall, Tex., back east to the White House.

### LOCAL CONTROL OF SCHOOLS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, Mrs. Fred A. Radke of Port Angeles, Wash., is the president of the National School Boards Association. In this role she has made some noteworthy contributions to our educational system. In the February edition of Nation's Business magazine, Mrs. Radke was interviewed on the subject of "Local Control: Secret of Schools Success." I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD so that my colleagues might share in the thoughts of Mrs. Radke on this subject.

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

#### LOCAL CONTROL: SECRET OF SCHOOLS' SUCCESS

The basis for progress in American education is local control.

This is the view of Mrs. Fred A. Radke, president of the National School Boards Association.

Mrs. Radke believes local control of education is being challenged today as never before. Such threats stem from a variety of sources. One which particularly concerns her is the demand by teachers' organizations to share in the responsibility for formulating educational policy. Teachers' unions are asking for collective bargaining rights and teachers' organizations affiliated with the National Education Association are asking for professional negotiations to see that their demands are heard. Both organizations threaten reprisals if their demands are not met.

School boards, Mrs. Radke points out, have the responsibility of policy determination as prescribed by law and it is an obligation which cannot be delegated to others.

You can expect to hear considerably more of this controversy in the months ahead.

Mother of three, a daughter and two sons, Mrs. Radke lives in Port Angeles, Wash., where she is president of the local school board. She has been a member since 1948 and is a past president of the Washington State School Directors Association. She has been a member of the Washington State Board of Education and the State Board for Vocational Education since 1955.

A delegate to the White House Conference on Education, she later served as delegate to the White House Conference on Children and Youth.

More recently she was a member of the President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education and is a member of the Governor's Committee on the Employment of Youth in her State.

During the past 2 years Mrs. Radke has visited hundreds of schools throughout the United States. Recently she toured schools in Europe.

Mrs. Radke, how do you assess the job being done by American schools today?

"I think we can be very proud of our progress in education. Our citizens have provided—and are providing—more education for more children than any nation in history.

"Many of the Nation's schools provide an excellent program.

"Despite this fact we cannot be complacent. About one-third of our youth do not graduate from high school. Some do not even graduate from the eighth grade. At a time when every phase of our lives has grown more complex these young people will have great difficulty in obtaining employment and in leading useful lives."

What are some of the problems you foresee?

"One of great importance is providing the necessary funds to operate educational programs of high quality.

"Another involves pressures by teachers' organizations which threaten local control of education."

Will you explain?

"One pressure that local boards of education face stems from proposals of teachers' organizations, as represented by the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers.

"The NEA advocates professional negotiations and the use of sanctions when an impasse is reached. The teachers' unions advocate collective bargaining and the use of strikes in certain impasse situations. We are opposed to these approaches."

What do you feel is their objective?

"They want to have a voice in the determination of salaries, working conditions and other educational policies.

"Here is a part of the NEA policy statement: 'The National Education Association insists on the right of professional associations, through democratically selected representatives, using professional channels, to participate with boards of education in the determination of policies of common concern, including salaries and other conditions of professional service.'

"This is where we part company. Although the National School Boards Association believes that local school boards should exert great effort to take into consideration the needs and requests of their employees, we believe that the final determination of policy is the legal responsibility of the board of education and this is something we cannot share with other groups."

You see this as a threat to local or citizen control of education?

"Yes. As soon as school boards start sharing this responsibility for the determination of policies and goal, then it seems to me that the people of the community have in a very real sense lost their right to determine what goes on in a local school district."

What solution do you suggest?

"We believe that school boards can do a great deal to eliminate difficulties that arise between boards and superintendents and teachers by developing better communication between these groups and by adopting written policies that cover the subjects which are of great interest and concern to teachers."

What other problems do you foresee?

"Money is always a problem. Unless you have sufficient funds to support your schools properly you can't attract the good teachers you must have if your program is to meet today's needs.

"I would say that it is equally important to have a good school board. It must be one which is aware of responsibilities and their importance, willing to give time and to make the effort to understand school needs and to establish two-way communication between the school and the community."

How do you suggest communities get the money they need for education?

"This is a difficult question. Both the wealth and the tax structure vary greatly among the 50 States.

"In my State a good share of the money to support schools comes from the State sources.

"In this case local school board members, the State school boards association and other educational groups need to establish good

communication with the State legislature so that legislators thoroughly understand school needs.

"Probably even more fundamental is having the local community understand these needs—to know how school money is used and its relationship to the amount and quality of the services the school is able to offer.

"So good communication is certainly an underlying means of getting good financing."

Does the proposal that the Federal Government provide funds for teacher salaries and construction offer any particular possibilities for solving money problems?

"Many people seem to believe so. In many cases I think this belief is based on the opinion that this is one means of equalizing educational opportunities among the various States.

"But the National School Boards Association opposes general Federal aid."

Why is that?

"The main reason is the belief that Federal aid leads to Federal control. Local control of education is something the American people have believed in very strongly for more than 300 years. We believe in it because we want the opportunity, through our local boards of education, to determine what and how our children shall be taught and who shall teach them."

Why do you feel that local control is better than Federal control?

"For several reasons. First of all, local control of schools—just as local control of government—is one of the fundamental concepts on which our whole form of government is based. If people at the local level are unwilling to assume their responsibility, then it seems to me that this leads to the breakdown of our whole concept of democratic government.

"Those of us who do believe strongly in local control of schools and government certainly have an obligation to see that we meet the needs of this day and age, which are different from those at any former time.

"As our whole way of life grows more complex I think local control is being challenged as never before and we must be very sure that local boards of education are serving effectively, that they are meeting the full measure of their responsibility to the children they serve. Beyond that, I think citizens have an obligation to understand the broad needs of our Nation."

How can a citizen best judge whether his local school system is a good one?

"Attracting and holding good teachers is one of the most important measures of a good educational program. If your district is doing this, boards of education can certainly tell. So can parents. If you are scraping the bottom of the barrel and hunting very hard for applications, this is a good sign that your district is not doing a really good job."

Is expenditure per pupil a good measure of effectiveness?

"It is one measure, although the cost of living varies enough throughout the United States so that I don't think that this alone is a measure of the excellence of your program. Such statistics can be misleading. The great range which exists is important. Many districts spend more than \$1,000 per pupil. Some spend less than \$300. Within this wide range you know there are many differences in the programs.

"In general, though, it is a measure that can be used if you keep in mind its limitations."

Does the dropout problem have any relation to how much money is spent for education?

"Yes, I am sure that it does.

"While almost all areas face the dropout problem, it is most acute in large cities. Here per pupil expenditures actually might be higher than in some other areas; yet, because schools are dealing with large groups



of young people whom we describe as culturally deprived, the program must meet their special needs if it is to be successful. Such education is expensive.

"This class of student is growing rapidly. The superintendents from the 14 largest cities say that a few years ago 1 of every 10 could be classified as 'culturally deprived.' Today it is one of three."

What other measures of good schools would you recommend?

"Many things mark good schools. In my own school district we pay a great deal of attention to how many of our young people go on to higher education. We have a community college, so we watch to see how many go there, how many go on to a university. After they have gone, we watch their performance record, how well they do.

"In addition, while we know that national achievement tests don't provide us with a complete answer, we do test carefully at regular intervals to determine the effectiveness of our program."

What other innovations have you made in your school district that you feel might be useful for other school systems?

"We work very hard at good school-community relations. I think that is the secret of success for any school program. If you can succeed in interesting the parents and citizens of your community in getting into your schools and following the programs quite carefully, in being informed as to what sort of a program their children have, what sort of progress these children are making, you will have citizen support."

Do you feel there is need for further broadening of educational opportunities?

"Indeed. Many people feel that providing equal educational opportunity means providing the same program for each child.

"We feel that you are providing a child with equal educational opportunities when you provide him with a program which challenges his abilities.

"In other words, equality is not a question of providing standards; it is a question of helping each child develop to the fullest of his capabilities—whatever they are.

"This is something that cannot be standardized from a central Government office or bureau; it has to be determined on a local basis.

"If you really gear your program to the needs of each child, then you are going to do a good job of providing for those who are handicapped, the slow learners, those of average ability and your gifted.

"For many years the gifted were neglected. Now in many better schools we are providing them with opportunities to move at a very rapid pace. We are discovering that young people, even in grade school, can do many things that we thought they couldn't do until later years.

"In the better schools, really, you have now a whole new concept of learning. For example, we are teaching algebra and geometry in the very beginning grades, putting these subjects in terms that the children can understand. This is your new mathematics."

You have recently returned from Europe. What are your impressions?

"What struck me in all six countries I visited was that all are wrestling with some of the same problems we have. For example, automation is a factor of life that requires more education. We have our dropout problems—people for whom employment is not easily available—and this is becoming increasingly true in Europe."

What are Europeans doing about this?

"First of all they are seeking ways to keep youngsters in school longer. It has long been a tradition in Europe to screen their students at a very early age—in some cases as early as the fourth year—to sort out those who will go into higher education. An academic program was provided for the talented, some went to vocational schools—many just dropped out.

"To solve this they are trying to delay the final decision on career training and to reduce the dropout rate they're stressing vocational education.

"We can learn from this. We need a great deal more vocational training here. We need particularly to update our programs and to enlarge the offerings and to abolish some. We need especially to key our training to job opportunities that are available.

"The whole job picture here, as in other countries, is changing rapidly. Young people in school now can expect, within their lifetimes, to train and retrain anywhere from three, four, up to seven or eight times."

You think Uncle Sam should spend more for this training?

"I think it is imperative that more money be provided for vocational education.

"The decisions as to how funds should be spent for vocational programs should be left largely to the States and communities. There should be a great deal of local freedom to determine how to use the money to best advantage for the national and local good."

**THE IMPORTANCE OF GREAT LAKES SHIPPING**

Mr. HART. Mr. President, those of us who represent the Great Lakes region are concerned, quite naturally, with the economic well-being of the area. Central to this issue is the optimum use of our unique asset, the Great Lakes themselves.

This morning, before a subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, Mr. A. C. Sullivan, Jr., representing the Great Lakes Ship Owners Association, gave a most thoughtful and constructive analysis of this problem. I ask unanimous

consent that Mr. Sullivan's outstanding statement be printed in the RECORD, for I believe the Congress and the country will find it of value.

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

STATEMENT OF A. C. SULLIVAN, JR., PRESIDENT, GARTLAND STEAMSHIP CO., REPRESENTING GREAT LAKES SHIP OWNERS ASSOCIATION, IN SUPPORT OF S. 1774, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, MARCH 4, 1964

My name is A. C. Sullivan, Jr., of Chicago. I am president of the Gartland Steamship Co. I appear before you today as president of the Great Lakes Ship Owners Association, a nonprofit trade association representing substantially all of the U.S.-regulated common carriers on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River. The independents account directly or through associated companies for almost half of the capacity of the U.S.-flag Great Lakes fleet. The operators of the group have been engaged in water transportation for over 50 years and all hold themselves out to the public as for-hire carriers. These are the so-called independent companies as contrasted with the so-called captive or integrated companies who are essentially private carriers.

In previous testimony, it has already been clearly established that the U.S. Great Lakes fleet has suffered a dramatic decline in the past 5 years. In that short time, we have lost one-fifth of the total fleet. There is no dispute over the fact that unless decisive action is taken quickly, this essential industry will disappear. No new ships are being built for the Great Lakes fleet and none is planned.

We have a prepared table showing a breakdown of the U.S.-flag Great Lakes fleet between independent and integrated or private carriers, together with an analysis of the number of ships laid up and their capacity.

Total U.S.-flag Great Lakes fleet excluding special-purpose vessels, Nov. 1, 1963

	Bulk ore		Self-unloaders		Crane vessels	
	Units	Capacity	Units	Capacity	Units	Capacity
<b>Independent companies:</b>		<i>Tons</i>		<i>Tons</i>		<i>Tons</i>
American Steamship Co. ....	2	21,350	14	179,200		
Brown & Co. ....	2	14,800				
Browning Lines, Inc. ....	1	10,600				
Gartland Steamship Co. ....	4	36,650	2	16,000		
Buckeye Steamship Co. ....	3	35,000				
Kinsman Transit Co. ....	5	48,700				
T. J. McCarthy Steamship Co. ....	3	20,800				
Oglebay Norton Co. ....	10	161,500	8	63,900	6	38,400
The Reiss Steamship Co. ....	6	67,700	5	49,500		
Roen Steamship Co. ....					5	22,350
Tomlinson Fleet Corp. ....	3	38,700	2	20,400		
Wilson Marine Transit Co. ....	13	160,300				
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>52</b>	<b>616,100</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>329,000</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>60,750</b>
<b>Integrated companies:</b>						
Bethlehem Steel Co. ....	12	177,300			3	27,000
Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co. ....	12	171,800				
Ford Motor Co. ....	5	70,100				
Hanna Mining Co. ....	9	165,700				
Inland Steel Co. ....	7	110,200				
Interlake Steamship Co. ....	26	363,700				
International Harvester Co. ....	2	24,000				
United States Steel Corp. ....	51	728,650	7	90,400	1	6,500
Republic Steel Corp. ....	9	107,700				
Shenango Furnace Co. ....	3	54,400				
Wyandotte Transportation Co. ....			4	24,800		
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>136</b>	<b>1,973,550</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>115,200</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>33,500</b>
	Fleets		Out of service		Net in service	
	Units	Capacity	Units	Capacity	Units	Capacity
Independent.....	94	<i>Tons</i> 1,005,850	21	<i>Tons</i> 219,600	73	<i>Tons</i> 786,250
Integrated.....	151	2,122,250	37	453,650	114	1,668,600

The responsibility for the decline of Great Lakes shipping may clearly be traced to about seven Government policies which, taken together, have had a devastating effect on the industry. The Government has demonstrated insufficient knowledge of and concern for the industry in recent years. While our industry is reluctant to ask for Government aid, nevertheless we are convinced that the Government must step in if the damage is to be repaired and the industry rebuilt. We strongly believe that any aid would be temporary, provided the Government policies listed below are revised and modernized.

It is our view that the common carriers—the independents—represent an essential workable nucleus for a sound program leading toward the revival and modernization of Great Lakes shipping. We appear in support of the provisions of S. 1774, which call for a construction subsidy for common carriers.

There is no dispute that the high productivity of the Great Lakes region is largely due to its great natural resource, the low-cost water highway. On heavy-loading bulk materials—the ore, limestone, coal, and grain—Great Lakes ships can carry cargo for a fifth of a cent a ton-mile. Our most efficient land competitor—the railroad—averages a cent and a half per ton-mile. Not all rail service, of course, is priced at a cent and a half, but there are few rail rates lower than 1 cent a ton-mile, five times the Great Lakes water carrier price.

The Great Lakes bulk carrier is among the most efficient transport vehicles in the world. A self-unloader which can, and often does, tie up to a tree on the bank, delivers bulk materials anywhere on the shores of the Great Lakes without expensive shore-based unloading facilities. No type of transport of dry bulk is cheaper. Recent technological advances in shipping, particularly the development of faster and larger vessels, operation of unmanned barges, and ship automation, continue to make water transportation on the Great Lakes more and more essential to industry and agriculture. Efficient as the Great Lakes shipping is in terms of its land contemporaries, the basic fleet is now 20 to 50 years old. I stress this because I want to emphasize that there is a great potential for even more substantial transportation economies than have so far been developed if and when the U.S. fleet is rebuilt and modernized.

Low-cost transportation is the key to the manufacturing cost advantage of the Great Lakes region. The products of its factories are more competitive in the domestic and foreign markets because water transportation is available. Cheap raw materials and cheap electric power resulting from low-cost waterborne coal and cheap water-compelled rail rates add up to a decisive advantage for the States in the Great Lakes region.

The question I want to raise today is not the narrow one of how to help a few shipping companies, but the much broader one of how best to use, for the public advantage, the region's greatest natural asset, the Great Lakes system. The upper lakes region of northern Minnesota, northern Wisconsin, and upper Michigan is reporting economic depression. Unemployment is twice the national average, according to news reports. Similar reports come from the other end of the lakes in upper New York State. There is no doubt that the decline in vigor of Great Lakes shipping in recent years is an important contributory reason for the decline of industry and employment in these regions. Vigorous revival of low-cost shipping would be of enormous value in helping to restore economic growth and prosperity. No new basic industry can be expected to locate, no old industry can be expected to expand where low-cost water transport is showing such obvious signs of decline, decay and difficulty.

A small investment in reviving the shipping industry could well be the most economical means by which to stimulate a general revival of industry throughout the broad region of the Great Lakes. Today, those in charge of plant location surveys can only report that the future of low-cost shipping on the Great Lakes is not encouraging. Anyone planning to invest new money in any industry which is dependent for its competitive advantage on low-cost water transportation will think twice about locating along the Great Lakes unless there is a drastic change of climate for the shipping industry.

The Great Lakes shipping industry has not had much to say about itself for many years. Its service is taken for granted and there is little contemporary appreciation of its function.

For example, many people think of Great Lakes shipping as almost exclusively concerned with shuttling iron ore between the mines and the steel mills. Discoveries of ore deposits abroad, many of them richer in iron content than deposits in the upper lakes, have been accompanied by the belief that domestic Great Lakes ore is exhausted and, hence, the survival of the domestic shipping fleet is not really significant.

It is true that upper lakes ore now has stiff competition from foreign ores. The opening of the seaway and ore discoveries abroad have changed the ore market from one of shortage to one of abundance. Both in quality of ores and in quantity, domestic supplies of ore are under much heavier competitive pressures than ever before.

But a careful study of new technological developments, particularly the practice of beneficiating U.S. low grade ores so that they are competitive with the highest grade ores in the world, shows a continued opportunity for upper lakes ore at least until the end of the century and probably far beyond. Annual production of about 45 million gross tons is predicted.

Needless to say, if the domestic fleets cannot be maintained, the U.S. ore will not get to market and foreign ores will be substituted.

It should be stressed that transportation accounts for from 20 to 45 percent of the cost to the consumer of the delivered ore. For example, total transportation cost of Mesabionbessemer ore delivered in the Youngstown region is \$5.95 out of a price to the plant of \$12.85. Of the transportation cost, it is interesting to note the following breakdown:

Rail charge for 2 rail hauls totaling 124 miles.....	\$3.36
Dock charges.....	.69
Vessel charges from Duluth to Ashtabula, Ohio, 882 miles.....	1.90
Total.....	5.95

This illustrates the economy of Great Lakes transportation very vividly. Rail and dock charges—the docks are owned by the railroads—are 31.5 percent of the total price of ore at the plant and vessel charges are only 14.8 percent. In today's highly competitive ore market, the lowest delivered price wins. Transportation costs are critical.

But although iron ore is the most important single commodity on the Great Lakes, other commodities and other services are of vital significance to the economy of the region.

My own company, Gartland Steamship, carries little or no ore. Last year we served 105 shipper-consignees in 42 separate ports in 7 States. A check with another member of the Great Lakes Ship Owners, Columbia Transportation division of Oglebay Norton Co., shows that they had 258 shipper-consignees in 74 different ports in the 7 Great Lakes States, and the Province of On-

tario. The independent fleet serves a great variety of ports in the Great Lakes regions, some of them very small and heavily dependent on water service.

The captive fleets do not undertake to serve, do not have the specialized equipment to serve, and cannot be relied upon to serve the demands of the general public on all these different communities. Only a common-carrier service can fit the needs of this commerce and the volume requirements of the steel industry as well.

It is no secret that independent Great Lakes shipping has had a struggle to live in the shadow of the private fleets of ore carriers owned by the steel mills. While the private fleets have no responsibility for providing regular, reliable service at nondiscriminatory rates, they have been a major factor in the "for hire" segment of the Great Lakes shipping industry.

When the mills are producing at or near capacity, the captive fleets are fully occupied carrying their own ore. This, however, on the average, is about once in 4 years. In that year, the hundreds of ports on the Great Lakes which are not primarily concerned with the ore trade look to the independents for service.

But when the steel mills are not fully occupied, the captive fleets have surplus capacity which is thrown on the shipping market often at below cost or at marginal rates. For 3 out of 4 years, shipping rates are greatly depressed and the independents either just break even or lose heavily.

It is a difficult business in which to make money under the best of circumstances. My point here is that only the independent fleet is available every year, good years and bad, to provide regular service at nondiscriminatory rates on coal, limestone, and construction aggregates, grain, steel, pig iron, paper, automobiles, scrap, salt, grain, and many others.

The traffic is substantial and will grow strongly if our services are allowed to survive.

I now list the Government policies and lack of policies which, taken together, have devastated U.S. domestic shipping on the Great Lakes. The disastrous impact of these policies has been felt most heavily by the relatively small independent shipping companies.

1. Depreciation allowances: Modernization and replacement of plant in most industries is accomplished by provisions for depreciation on equipment. A Government policy has undermined every modernization and replacement program in our industry. Until last year, Great Lakes operators have been required by the Treasury Department to depreciate a ship over 50 years. Now we are permitted, much too late to do us any good, to reduce our depreciation to 18 years. By contrast, the Canadians can depreciate a ship in as little as 3 years.

2. Maintenance: A series of Government regulations administered by the Coast Guard require of us costly maintenance program. We do not argue that the Coast Guard regulations are unnecessary or unhelpful, but it is a fact that U.S. regulations are far in excess of those required by the Canadian and other governments and have a substantial cost impact. There are U.S.-built ships operating under the Canadian flag in competition with U.S.-flag ships which could not pass Coast Guard inspections.

3. Seaway competition: The opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, as we predicted at the time, brought to the Great Lakes a variety of shipping in one degree or another owing its existence to the promotional maritime policies of foreign nations. These policies vary from outright subsidy of operations and construction to labor laws which would be described as repressive in this country. This governmental action has had a serious adverse effect on the Great Lakes

fleet. It now seems only too likely that the joint United States-Canadian investment in a great waterway will, in the end, benefit the maritime interests of every nation but our own. The seaway merely highlights the need for a reexamination of U.S. domestic maritime policies.

4. Policy requiring use of U.S.-built ships: American industry has few restrictions on where it may buy its equipment. Even Government-owned and operated powerplants in the United States are permitted to buy foreign-built generating equipment. Airlines, railroads, trucklines and pipelines are also permitted to follow the dictates of economics in obtaining their equipment. The domestic merchant marine, however, is restricted to purchasing U.S.-built ships, despite the fact that foreign-built ships would cost just half as much. We appreciate the national defense and national interest arguments in favor of maintaining adequate shipbuilding facilities, but it is a fact that a weak and dwindling domestic shipping industry is, in effect, called upon to subsidize this policy. It is a policy so burdensome, in the light of lower cost foreign competition specifically introduced into the Great Lakes by a separate Government action, as to be completely self-defeating. The hard fact is that the domestic Great Lakes fleet is not building ships and has no plans to do so.

5. Rate regulation: The failure of the ICC to enforce Government policy protecting the inherent advantage of low-cost operators and the further failure of the ICC to require, as congressional policy clearly sets forth, coordination of service between rail and water carriers has had a serious adverse effect on shipping. It is a major reason for the lack of interest of investors in financing the modernization and reequipment of the Great Lakes fleet. Using a theory which permits railroads to count only a part of their total costs in justifying rate reductions, the ICC has found against the Great Lakes carriers in case after case involving millions of dollars in revenues. Ship after ship has been laid up as a result of these decisions. The irony is that selective rate manipulation by a higher cost mode of transportation has destroyed shipping services that can do the work at a fifth of the real economic cost of rail service. The policy determination not to protect the low-cost carrier has had decisive results.

6. Government policies on labor: It is part of the basic transportation policy of Congress, written into the Transportation Act of 1940, to "encourage fair wages and equitable working conditions." Shipping companies subject to the Interstate Commerce Act are expected to pay wages comparable to those paid in other industries. All this has an economic impact. Labor costs on a 10,000-ton Canadian ship are about \$1,000 a day; the U.S. labor cost for a similar ship is \$1,800 a day. The U.S.-flag fleet has lost nearly all the carriage of trade between the United States and Canada.

7. Canadian ship subsidy program: Recognizing the opportunities presented by the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway, Canada began in 1960 a vigorous program to modernize and expand her Great Lakes fleet. A 40 percent construction subsidy was granted and had immediate results. Seventeen new ships have been built and more are being planned. In the same period no new U.S. ships have been built and none is planned. This, of course, is a direct challenge to U.S.-flag service. The U.S.-flag fleet can hardly be expected to win a contest with the Canadian Government Treasury. Already, as noted above, we have lost to the Canadians most of our share of the trade between the United States and Canada. Government promotional programs on one side of the border, if not met by similar policies on the other side, mean that our Gov-

ernment has, indeed, adopted a policy; it has decided to abandon the field.

These seven governmental policies and programs among others, taken together, have devastated the domestic Great Lakes fleet. They overwhelmingly handicap the ability of the private enterprise Great Lakes fleet to exist. The issue is a simple one: is low-cost water transportation provided by a U.S. Great Lakes fleet important enough to the economy of the region to require its preservation?

There are several alternatives:

One alternative is to do nothing. No one questions that this will lead to the eventual demise of the U.S. Great Lakes fleet. Indifference and neglect have overtaken U.S. shipping before in the Nation's history and the U.S.-flag fleet has been allowed virtually to disappear. It can happen again.

In this connection, the Department of Commerce's suggestion in these hearings that Great Lakes shipping companies be given access to the reserve fleets for possible replacements is disappointing. Studies have been made of the available ships. They undoubtedly have their uses in offshore services, but their drafts are too deep for economical use on the Great Lakes. Several C-4's have been operated on the Great Lakes and the results have been unsatisfactory when compared with modern equipment. The much-vaunted Victory ships have also been tried with similarly disappointing results.

As the Great Lakes fleet is further weakened, overwhelming pressures will mount to repeal the cabotage laws and allow foreign-flag fleets to carry commodities between U.S. ports. Already pressure is starting.

Passage of S. 1773 to provide subsidy for all Great Lakes shipping is another possible alternative. Our group would have no objection to this measure, but we have doubts that it is practical. Our situation is urgent and we must be frank. The precise issue of subsidizing bulk carriers for a large steel company was before the Commerce Department only recently. We would like to believe that the negative reaction to that proposal could be overcome, but this does not seem likely.

The seriousness of the situation suggests a new approach. The proposal, as expressed in S. 1774, is, in effect, a determination to concentrate public assistance to Great Lakes shipping on the substantial segment of the industry with a responsibility for public service; namely, those who hold a certificate of public convenience and necessity. A construction and reconstruction differential subsidy should be granted equal to the difference between the cost of building or rebuilding a ship abroad and in the United States. Practical additional measures would include credit for obsolete vessels to be applied toward the cost of construction or reconstruction and the creation of construction reserve funds taken out of earnings before taxes.

There is an alternative in S. 1774 that permits a U.S. domestic operator to buy ships abroad in the event no action is taken on subsidy applications. This takes into account the very real problem that congressional policy and administrative policy are not always the same. No more clear example of this problem is to be found than in the congressional requirement that water and rail carriers should coordinate their service in the public interest.

Those charged with administration of this policy have interpreted it out of existence. In an official report on the Decline of Coastwise and Intercoastal Shipping, the Senate Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee called attention to joint rail-water rate problems as recently as August 29, 1960. Nothing has been done.

We therefore thought it appropriate to include a provision that would face the Government with a clear-cut issue: either provide the subsidy for the Government policy requiring domestic operators to buy ships at home, or allow domestic shipping companies to buy ships abroad. In other words, don't give the authorities an opportunity to do nothing.

The domestic operators do not favor buying ships abroad. We have every confidence that domestic shipyards can provide our fleets with efficient ships second to none in the world. We have noted how often U.S. shipyards have led the way in design only to see those same designs, once they were in the public domain, adopted by foreign shipyards and used against us. The shipbuilding know-how of the United States is not at fault. If anything, we are the victims of our own standard of living. And it is a plain matter of Government policy whether the shipbuilding facilities are important enough in the national interest to be maintained by public subsidy. One absolutely clear-cut fact is that the domestic operators and their shippers cannot provide this subsidy any longer.

We see S. 1774 as an opportunity to revitalize the common carrier service on the Great Lakes. It would seem logical, to meet the complaint that all the independents may not qualify under this proposal, to accompany the passage of S. 1774 with the passage of measures now before the Congress to repeal the bulk commodity exemptions, sections 303 (b) and (c). This would bring all the independent groups under regulation. Grandfather certificates would be given to those carriers now performing "for hire" service in the bulk trades on an exempt basis so that they could continue doing, under economic regulation, what they are now doing.

These are sweeping changes. There will be objections to them. Some have already been voiced by competing modes. But the choices available are not very large. A common carrier Great Lakes service, regulated in the public interest, with subsidies limited to the construction differences of foreign-flag shipping is one alternative. The other unquestionably will be the admission of foreign-flag shipping to domestic service. Time is running out for the inexpensive solution proposed in S. 1774: to modernize and expand an existing U.S.-flag fleet. Failure to act will soon bring on the other alternative, an irresistible pressure for domestic service by foreigners.

Our own hope is that a solution will be found to our problem that will be in the best interests of industry and agriculture in the Great Lakes region. Six U.S. Great Lakes shipping companies have recently been liquidated and there is no relief in sight justifying optimism on the part of investors. Our climate is set for us by Government policies which can only be described as uninformed. We are hopeful that a thorough reexamination and revision of these policies will not be long in coming.

The U.S.-flag position is already seriously weakened. A new ship ordered today could not be delivered for 2 years. The Canadian program is well along. The U.S.-flag share of the international traffic on the Lakes has deteriorated seriously. What is now needed is an emergency program.

Shipping is a tool, and a relatively inexpensive tool, which must be efficiently used if the potential mineral and agricultural wealth of the Great Lakes region is to be translated into employment and income for the benefit of the Nation. History demonstrates that a nation neglects its shipping at its peril.

We appreciate this opportunity to present our point of view and hope it has been helpful to you.

### TAX REDUCTION AS A STIMULATION TO THE ECONOMY

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, according to the oft-told story James Abbott McNeill Whistler and Oscar Wilde were discussing art. Whistler was talking about one of his favorite theses which was that nature imitates art. He said: Nature's creeping up.

Oscar Wilde exclaimed:

Heavens; I wish I had said that.

And Whistler replied:

You will, Oscar, you will.

In the March 7 issue of the New Republic is an article on the recently enacted tax bill that is so penetrating that I can parody Wilde by saying that I wish that I had written it. However, it is such an excellent article that I call it to the attention of my colleagues and perhaps many of us can find some quotable paragraphs to use in the months ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert this New Republic article written by James Tobin in the body of the RECORD.

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

#### TAX CUT HARVEST: WHAT WE CAN EXPECT FROM THE NEW BILL (By James Tobin)

(NOTE—James Tobin was a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, 1961-62. He is now Sterling Professor of Economics at Yale University and director of the Cowles Foundation for Research in Economics.)

The tax cut represents our first deliberate major use of the Federal budget for stimulation of the economy. It is thus an historic event. At a time when the budget is already in substantial deficit, the President and the Congress are cutting taxes \$11.5 billion a year.

Liberals should give credit where it is due. Ever since Keynes, they have argued that the budget should be manipulated to balance the economy at full employment—against the orthodox view that the economy should be sacrificed to balance the budget every year. The Employment Act of 1946 seemed to declare a national consensus that Federal fiscal and monetary powers should be employed to stabilize the economy and prevent unemployment. But this consensus, always fragile, eroded during the 1950's when orthodox financial sermons were repeatedly preached from the Presidential pulpit. Budget deficits we had nonetheless, but they were for the most part the unplanned consequence of economic weakness. Now at long last a planned deficit is accepted to gain economic strength.

Satisfaction with this victory should not, I think, be appreciably dimmed by the evident fact that tax reduction has been supported for a mixture of motives and justified by a variety of arguments. There is not a Keynesian majority in Congress, and conscious deficit finance is still not respectable. But actions speak louder than words. The country and the Congress accepted the views of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson that the economic pump needed priming, and that a tax cut was the way to prime it.

The tax cut has been purchased, it is true, by some reduction in the Federal budget. By holding administrative budget expenditures for fiscal year 1965 within the 1964 figure, President Johnson secured early passage of a bill which might otherwise have

been passed, if at all, only after economically dangerous delay. We can only applaud his political acumen while regretting the misguided but powerful ideology which made his bargain necessary. How large and how permanent a reduction of Federal expenditure has been made because of the tax cut is a different historical conjecture. So far budgetary frugality appears to be wiping out less than a third of the fiscal stimulus of the full tax reduction.

The main savings are in defense, which had been built up substantially under President Kennedy to remedy strategic weaknesses and to deal with crises in Berlin, Vietnam, and Cuba. We cannot really complain if now Secretary McNamara's efficiency experts and a cold war détente combine to stabilize or reduce defense expenditures. President Johnson is right to scorn both a nuclear WPA and obsolete bases.

The President's declared war on poverty begins modestly, with only \$500 million in the new budget. But a serious, well-organized campaign will need much more, and will in time learn how to spend it fruitfully. In recent sessions of Congress, spending to meet America's social needs has not been popular; the war on poverty may turn out, however, to be the banner under which is mobilized political support for causes that have been shortchanged. If so, the longer-run prospects for Federal expenditures, both in size and in direction, are not disheartening. Moreover, one effect of Federal tax reduction is to increase the politically feasible tax base of States and localities, which can be counted on to spend new tax receipts for education and other urgent social needs.

The main purpose of the tax cut is to reduce unemployment. The difference between an unemployment rate of 5.5 percent of the labor force and a rate of 4 percent corresponds to a deficiency of about \$30 billion a year or 5 percent in total national spending, public and private, for goods and services. To produce \$30 billion extra in goods and services, American business would have to give jobs to about 30 percent of the manpower now unemployed, and put to work a corresponding amount of idle industrial plant capacity.

The gap in demand and production has remained about the same over the past 2 years. Yet total national spending has been increasing 5 percent per year. The economy has to run forward at that pace just to stay in the same place. A 5-percent annual increase in the gross national product suffices only to absorb the normal increases in the labor force, in labor productivity and in prices. It leaves the unemployment rate undiminished. To eliminate the \$30 billion gap, spending needs to increase by 7 or 8 percent for a couple of years.

How can a tax reduction of \$11.5 billion a year add \$30 billion to total demand? The key point is that we need to find only half of the required \$30 billion; if we can do that, the other half will take care of itself. In the normal course of events, an increase of \$30 billion in production and income would by itself generate about \$15 billion in additional consumer spending—the other \$15 billion going into personal and corporate taxpayments and savings. Observe, for example, that the \$100 billion increase in GNP from the first quarter of 1961 to the last quarter of 1964 led to a \$50 billion increase in consumer spending—a result just of the growth of personal incomes, without any help from tax cuts or other measures to stimulate consumption.

The \$11.5 billion tax deduction, when it is fully in effect, can be expected to increase consumer spending by \$9 billion; this estimate takes account of the allocation of the benefits between corporations and individuals and among individual taxpayers in various brackets. To make up the full \$30 billion, then, requires \$6 billion more in non-

consumer spending. To provide this, government and business spending together must not only keep pace with the normal growth of the economy but increase further by about 1 percent of GNP.

#### INCREASE IN BUSINESS SPENDING

The major reliance must be on business expenditures for new plant and equipment. To restore full employment they must grow from 8.5 percent of full employment GNP, as they have been running recently, to 9.5 percent. Indeed, they must rise a bit more than that, perhaps to 10 percent, in order to make up for the prospective slowdown in the growth of Federal expenditures. There is a reasonable chance that this will happen, though not all in one year. Business fixed investment has been weak in recent years that have been characterized by excess capacity and economic slack, but it typically exceeded 10 percent of GNP in earlier periods of prosperity, both postwar and prewar. Business investment plans for 1964 are cautious, but there is evidence that they are already being revised upward. The year 1964 may well set the stage for a spurt in investment in 1965. The profit and liquidity positions of business are already favorable, and they are reinforced by the tax incentives for investment introduced by the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. With consumer spending boosted by the tax cut, demand may rise enough in 1964 to cut down excess capacity. This will add the strategic investment incentive that has so far been missing throughout much of American industry, the need to build new capacity to meet expanding demand.

For this prospect we have to thank the wisdom of the administration and Congress in deciding to cut the withholding rate 4 points right away, instead of 3 points now and 1 in 1965, as originally planned. For 1964, this revision in plans more than compensates for President Johnson's frugality. The timing has been criticized by some who fear it overstimulates the economy in 1964 and by others who fear the absence of sufficient new stimulus in 1965. But the timing appears to be excellent economic strategy. This year, while business investment is still cautious, the economy needs all the stimulus to consumer spending which the tax cut can provide. Next year, with the pump well primed, business investment should keep the economy moving ahead.

One cloud on this horizon is monetary policy. Some monetary officials are inclined to view the tax cut not as a measure to expand demand faster but as a reason to tighten credit further. Worried more about inflation than unemployment, they are constitutionally disposed to jitters about economic booms. Moreover, their European fraternity brothers keep telling them that a country with a balance-of-payments deficit, like the United States, should have higher interest rates. As the President and Congress release the fiscal brakes on the economy, they may feel freer to step on the monetary brakes. The administration will have to be alert to prevent the tax cut from being wasted in higher interest rates.

#### TAXES AND THE IMPOVERISHED

Like most major legislative proposals, the tax cut has probably been overadvertised. To repeat, its essential purpose is to reduce unemployment, to eliminate the waste of manpower and productive capacity that has plagued our economy for the past 6 years. That is enough to justify it, and enough to expect of it. Tax reduction will not by itself solve all our other economic problems. Let us consider its relationship to three of these problems: the balance-of-payments deficit, the longrun rate of economic growth, and poverty.

On the balance of payments, the tax cut has no direct impact, and it is hard to predict its indirect effects. On the one hand,

a more prosperous domestic economy will import more. On the other hand, profitable operation at full capacity may keep wayward investment funds at home. Another possibility is the one mentioned above, that the Federal Reserve will respond to the tax cut by raising interest rates in order to attract internationally mobile liquid funds. If so, the tax cut can be said to be good for the balance of payments only at the expense of some of its benefits for the domestic economy and domestic investment.

The tax cut has been billed as a measure to promote economic growth. And, true enough, as its stimulus helps the economy recover lost ground, GNP and other statistics will show higher year-to-year "growth" rates for a time. For the central purpose of the measure is precisely to restore full capacity operation of the economy. But a more meaningful measure of "growth" is the rate at which the economy's capacity itself grows. This, over the long pull, is the trend that determines how fast standards of living rise.

The tax cut is good for longrun growth only in the general sense that prosperity is good for investment. And, as observed above, the main kind of spending that the tax cut stimulates is consumption. Growth would have been better served if the same increase in spending could have taken the form of public or private investments. But a large increase in public investment was not possible politically, and a large enough increase in private investment may not have been feasible economically. It surely would have required an aggressive and persistent easy money policy—probably unthinkable to our monetary leaders in the best of circumstances and certainly out of the question when their primary aim was to defend the gold stock.

As for poverty, a dose of demand stimulant is necessary but by no means sufficient medicine. So long as there is a general shortage of jobs, the war on poverty will be an uphill battle. Those who suffer most from high national unemployment—Negroes, teenagers, workers lacking skills, experience, literacy, or education, workers in depressed areas—have the most to gain from full employment. Sustained general prosperity will not by itself solve their difficult problems, but it will make them much less intractable. Specific programs of education, training and retraining, area redevelopment, equal opportunity, and urban rehabilitation are certainly essential. But they are doomed to considerable frustration so long as national spending is inadequate and jobs are scarce; there is little point in shifting poverty and unemployment from group to group or region to region. If the campaign is to be a national success, it needs desperately a favorable national economic climate.

It should be said that the cut comes too late, in the sense that the economy would be in better shape today if taxes had been reduced 2 or 3 or even 6 years ago. In January 1961, the Samuelson committee, one of President-elect Kennedy's preinauguration task forces, suggested that serious consideration be given to a temporary tax cut to help bring the economy out of recession. This suggestion was not implemented, partly because the recovery that began promptly after the inauguration proceeded vigorously throughout 1961, partly because the balanced budget fetish was still very powerful.

(In January 1962, President Kennedy proposed, as antirecession insurance, new procedures for making quick, temporary, pre-fabricated cuts in tax rates. The proposal caused scarcely a ripple in Congress, but it deserves to be revived. If Congress needs 15 months to enact a tax bill, tax adjustments are not very useful weapons against cyclical recessions or inflations.)

By the summer of 1962, it was clear that the recovery was faltering. The idea of a

tax cut, perhaps temporary, perhaps permanent, was revived. President Kennedy announced in mid-August that he had decided against it, but at the same time he committed the administration to offer a major proposal for permanent tax reduction and reform in January 1963. The idea of a 1962 tax cut had not evoked much enthusiasm in public or congressional opinion. Indeed, the business and financial community rather mysteriously backed away from the favorable stand taken earlier in the summer by the chamber of commerce. Moreover, the Treasury had its heart set on tax reform and believed that the interested parties would swallow the bitter pills of reform only with a thick sugar coating of tax reduction. In retrospect, it is clear that this strategy failed. The Congress removed the bitter pills of reform from the candy anyway. The tax cut should have taken the form of a quick, simple, neutral, uniform, across-the-board reduction in rates, leaving revision of the tax structure for later and longer deliberation. The attempt to obtain reform served only to delay the administration's proposal and its enactment by Congress.

Broadly considered, two kinds of reform were at stake. One was to enlarge the base of the personal income tax, eliminating or limiting special deductions from taxable income and substituting lower rates. The other was to plug some of the many loopholes through which high-income taxpayers escape the high rates to which they are nominally subject, in return moderating the progressiveness of the rate structure. For the most part Congress provided lower and less progressive rates without broadening the tax base or eliminating loopholes. Thus the whole episode cost the cause of tax reform a good deal of its bargaining power.

The bill has just been passed, though it is good economics and is a victory for rational fiscal policy, it is not the last word on Federal taxes. Real reform still lies ahead. And economic circumstances in the future may require either higher or still lower rates than those now enacted. The history of this legislation indicates that we in the United States still have much to learn in making taxation a flexible and responsive instrument of economic stabilization.

#### THE IOU'S: RICH DESSERTS—AND THEY CLAMOR FOR MORE—NO. 12

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the investor-owned utilities—IU's—are inviting stomach aches by clamoring for more and more rich desserts.

This conclusion was reached by David A. Kosh, a public utility consultant. He wrote in the September 26, 1963, issue of Public Utilities Fortnightly. That was before Congress handed the IOU's the cookie jar by inserting, in the tax law, section 203(e), which prohibits Federal regulatory agencies from requiring flow through of the benefits of the 3 percent investment credit.

Mr. Kosh reported that the cost of capital "has been declining during the past few years," and that "utilities are earning substantially in excess of the cost of capital required by the market."

When 75 percent of all electric utilities are selling at two times book value or higher—

He said—

the market is signaling that earnings are high and possibly too high \* \* \*. When the market price to book value ratio gets so far out of line, as it is right now, it is time for a good, hard look at the level of utility earnings.

He continued:

Excessive earnings, which lead to stock prices out of all reasonable relationship to rate base values, pose a real threat to the continuation of private ownership of our public utilities.

Ours is one of the few countries in the world where public utility enterprises are not all owned by the Government. The reason for this is that under our system of private ownership plus Government regulation, consumers have generally been provided with good service at reasonable rates.

This private ownership of utility enterprises will continue only as long as the public has faith in the effectiveness of regulation. If utility earnings become so high that the public loses this faith, then it will turn to the only possible alternative—Government ownership.

There seems to be a tendency on the part of some to identify overly generous regulation with good regulation. This is an egregious error. An overly generous Commission is doing both utilities and consumers about as much good as is an overly generous mother who allows her offspring to eat nothing but rich desserts. The desserts taste good and there is clamor for more, but the stomach ache that inevitably follows is devastating.

There has been much talk recently concerning creative regulation. It is suggested that creative regulation is that which creates confidence in regulation as an effective guardian of the public interest. Regulation is neither good nor creative if it countenances the continuation of excessive earnings.

#### THE GENOCIDE PACT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I issued on January 23, 1964, which includes a letter to the President signed by 10 Senators.

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

#### SENATORS URGE PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S HELP IN RATIFYING GENOCIDE PACT

WASHINGTON.—U.S. Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, said today that he and a bipartisan group of 10 Senators have appealed to President Johnson for help in ratification of the Genocide Convention.

Others signing the letter included Senators J. GLENN BEALL, Republican, of Maryland; ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska; WILLIAM PROXMIER, Democrat, of Wisconsin; EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota; EDWARD V. LONG, Democrat, of Missouri; JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York; MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon; KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York; DANIEL B. BREWSTER, Democrat, of Maryland; DANIEL K. INOUE, Democrat, of Hawaii.

They wrote:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We respectfully request your support of our effort to have the United States ratify the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

"As you know, the United States signed this United Nations Convention in December 1948 and since that time 66 other nations have completed the ratification procedure. But the United States has not.

"In 1950 a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported the Convention favorably to the full committee, but no further action has been taken by the Senate.

"We are writing to you because it is generally recognized that only a strong appeal from the President will bring this measure

to debate and a vote in the Senate. We believe that if public opinion is adequately informed of the need for this Convention the Senate will ratify it.

"In the words of Louis E. Shecter of the American Jewish Congress, 'After years of work for this cause, I am unable to name a single Senator who is opposed to the Genocide Convention.'

"We urgently request word from you that will help us complete the ratification procedure on the Genocide Convention."

Senator SCOTT said in a statement accompanying the release of the letter to the President:

"The Genocide Convention is endorsed by all decent people who remember with horror the Nazi extermination of 6 million Jews and 2 million Poles. It says, simply, that genocide is a crime punishable under international law.

"Although the United States signed the Convention at the time of its adoption by the United Nations, the U.S. Senate never ratified it. Meanwhile 66 other nations completed the ratification procedure and the Convention is in force, as between ratifying states.

"How can we who played a major role in defeating the Nazi armies in World War II fail to be a party to the agreement which condemns the mass murder of a whole people?"

"Genocide is not a new crime. History records many examples of the wholesale slaughter of human beings. We must recognize that our society still has its share of beasts who may some time in the future attempt another 'final solution' of a whole people.

"It is important that free mankind go on record not only condemning genocide, but also warning those who would commit this crime that they are accountable to all humanity for their acts.

"I hope that, with the help of the President, the Senate may finally take an action that it should have taken 15 years ago."

#### DEVALUATION OF DOLLAR WITHOUT QUICK REMEDIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by the prominent and able columnist, Hon. Henry J. Taylor, entitled, "New Gold Low May Bring Devaluation of Dollar Without Quick Remedies."

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

#### NEW GOLD LOW MAY BRING DEVALUATION OF DOLLAR WITHOUT QUICK REMEDIES

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Down goes our gold again—down and out. Artificial underpinnings, delayed payments, and complex currency swaps have allowed the Treasury's gold stock figures to read "unchanged" for many months. But basically our Government has been borrowing from Peter to pay Paul.

Sooner or later foreign creditors blow the whistle. For the cover-up in Government is sometimes skillful but it is rarely permanent.

So—bingo—our depleted supply has fallen \$50 million more. This knocks it down to another new 25-year low.

The latest deal with oversea creditors involved U.S. permission to borrow up to \$500 million in foreign currencies from the International Monetary Fund. Except for a fast call on this loan in German marks, French francs, and Italian lire, our gold stock would have dropped an additional \$100 million.

Meanwhile, last fall our Treasury passed the hat abroad and asked France, West Ger-

many, Canada, Switzerland and other countries (even Spain) to pay in advance some amounts owed us. But this was window dressing, pure and simple, although President Kennedy made it the basis for his Telstar statement on July 23 that "our gold situation is improving." The claim attempted to support a campaign promise made in October 1960: "Our balance of payments will be strong and we can cease to worry about the gold outflow."

Instead, the mounting New Frontier budgets, red ink overspending and repeated lifting of the debt limit turned the gold problem President Kennedy inherited into a gold crisis.

Our solvency and our security are indivisible. Yet Fort Knox has gone with the wind. We do not own a nickel of the famous stock there any more. All of it, including our currency reserve, has gone into hock.

At its new 25-year low this stock has fallen to only \$15.5 billion. To judge the small size of this, just remember that Washington's spending exceeds \$2 billion a week—every week. In fact, we're paying a large slice of the \$15.5 billion this year to pay only the interest on the money Washington has already borrowed.

Never at any time, in war or peace, has our Government (the taxpayers) owed so much to so many. No wonder the enemy's sixth column—inflation—is on the march here. For the main inflationary pressure in America's economy is the Government's mis-handling of the people's own funds at home and abroad.

Our Fort Knox strongbox dates from January 13, 1937. Deliveries to it were officially designated parcel post, the heaviest mail delivery in the history of the United States. Of the \$15.5 billion now on hand, \$11.5 billion represents our currency reserve required by law. But the United States now owes foreigners more than \$18 billion in net foreign short-term demands, payable in gold. Thus all our legitimate gold plus our entire currency reserve is mortgaged to creditors abroad plus some \$2.5 billion in gold we do not even have.

Foreign central banks have cooperated handsomely in the technical props. All free world currencies are anchored to the U.S. dollar. But these creditors know coverups on the full crisis cannot last, and devaluation of our dollar must follow, if Washington remains on the deficit road.

All this is obscured from the American public. But leery foreigners are exercising their option to call for gold, as some depositors draw money out of what they suspect is a badly managed bank. Thus they protect themselves against Washington's overspending in the way U.S. citizens are unable to do.

A goldless Uncle Sam now finds Britain with about 82 percent of her dollar reserves in gold, France 83 percent, Belgium the same, the Netherlands 88 percent, Italy 69 percent and even Spain 50 percent.

We are trapped in the backwash of an unfavorable trade balance, deficit financing, juggled books, and pork-barrel spending.

The result may make political hay but it is playing hell with everybody's cost of living, everybody's savings and the fundamental security of the United States.

President Johnson's moves toward economy point in the absolutely required direction. But they must be real, they must be immense, and they must be immediate.

#### TAX RELIEF FOR COLLEGE EXPENSES

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, shortly after the administration used pressures of every sort to defeat the Ribicoff and Prouty amendments which were offered to the tax bill, Secretary of Labor Willard

Wirtz expressed the view that all high school graduates should be entitled to 2 additional years of free education.

Members of the Senate will recall that the Ribicoff and Prouty proposals were designed to aid lower and middle income families who are staggering under the heavy burden of college expenses and they would have provided some modest measure of tax relief to those carrying the heavy financial load.

Holmes Alexander, writing for the McNaught Syndicate, Inc., has exposed the inconsistency in this "now you see it now you don't" approach to the question of student aid in an article entitled "A Sterile Stockpile."

I have never met Mr. Alexander but my hat is off to him for doing this very frank and honest piece.

He seems to feel that the boy who is working his way through college should be given the right to deduct from his taxable income money spent for the cost of his higher education. Every Republican Senator took the same position as did 15 Democratic Senators when the issue was before the Senate. Perhaps the Alexander article will bring us some new converts, and for this reason I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

#### A STERILE STOCKPILE

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz has floated an administration trial balloon which could easily get in trouble with the truth-in-packaging laws. It is labeled "education" when it ought to be labeled "stockpiling."

Wirtz wants to give all high school graduates 2 more years of free education in college. This could roughly double the college population, adding 2 million more students to the campuses, which are already overcrowded. The only predictable result would be to lower the number of Americans listed as unemployed—a bookkeeping triumph, nothing more.

If the administration had really wanted to make college education more available to worthy students, the opportunity knocked loudly, and knocked twice, as recently as last February 4. Senator RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut, proposed an amendment to the tax bill that would have allowed tax credits for lower and middle income groups with children to send through college. The proposal, with a top benefit of only \$325 a year, would not be giveaway, or wholesale education. But it would have helped families to whom paying tuition for their children is a burden. Did the administration, with its two-thirds Senate majority, back the bill? No; and it was narrowly defeated, 48 to 45, for that reason.

Senator PROUTY gave the administration another chance with a more direct-action amendment. It would allow an income-earning student to deduct from \$1,200 to \$1,500 from his taxable income on money spent for the tools of his education—tuition, books, equipment. Did the administration back it? No; and it failed to pass on a tie vote, 47 to 47, from lack of that backing.

Opposition to both the Ribicoff and Prouty amendments was Treasury-minded. Loss of Federal revenue was the main argument against giving parents of students, or students themselves, a tax break. Yet the administration, under Secretary Wirtz' plan, would go back into the Treasury for wholesale education.

The example shows, in roundabout but valid fashion, how firmly and unfortunately the Kennedy-Johnson administration is anchored to Democratic mistakes of the past. There is the Rooseveltian obsession with social planning, the Rooseveltian reluctance to trust the people and the economy with a freedom of choice.

Worse, there is a fixed faith in phony panaceas which have never worked. At the trough of the depression under Herbert Hoover, in 1931, there were 8,020,000 persons unemployed in the United States. In 1940, after all of F.D.R.'s peacetime splurges in public works and human stockpiling, the unemployed numbered 8,120,000. In the last year of the Eisenhower era, 1960, the unemployment figure was 3,931,000. In 1963, the last year of Mr. Kennedy's life, after experiments in area redevelopment and retraining, the figure was 4,136,000.

President Johnson, an activist in every other way, has not unfettered his mind from the Democratic past. The war on poverty is, thus far, a numbers game in which a \$3,000 income is made the mark of the pauper. If the Wirtz education plan goes forward, it will further depress college standards, and do nothing whatever to fit the junior college teenagers for the very special requirements for modern jobs.

There is evidence—a tremendous amount of it—that much of the unemployment in America is voluntary. A good many people do not choose to fit themselves for work, do not take advantage of job-training courses in their home communities. A government which accommodates large segments of such persons in poverty programs and idleness stockpiles is no friend to America.

#### DEATH OF SAMUEL G. LASKY

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I was shocked and saddened to learn of the death last Thursday of Mr. Samuel G. Lasky, while on a mission for his country in Luxembourg. I had the honor of serving as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the 87th Congress when Mr. Lasky was engaged to chair the group of experts we assembled to conduct our fuels and energy study.

Samuel Grossman Lasky began his career in the mines of Colorado during summer vacations from the Colorado School of Mines in 1918-22. After graduation from that school he was employed by private industry in this country and in Latin America as a refinery foreman, mill and mine shift boss, mining engineer, and geologist. He began his public service in 1929 as a geologist in the New Mexico Bureau of Mines following his earning of the master's degree in geology from Yale University.

In 1931, Mr. Lasky's career in the Federal service began as an assistant geologist in the Geological Survey. He advanced through increasingly responsible and difficult positions to principal geologist in 1951. In the period 1951-53 he was a member of the staff of the Assistant Secretary—Mineral Resources. Upon the creation of the technical review staff in the Office of the Secretary in 1953, he became a member of that staff; his special talents and long experience were utilized in guiding departmental planning in the area of mineral resources. On January 1, 1960, he again became a member of the staff of the Assistant Secretary—Mineral Resources and for a considerable length of time he was the sole

person on that staff charged with developing and carrying forward the organizational plans of the new Office of Coal Research. In December 1960, the Secretary designated Mr. Lasky as Acting Director of Coal Research, pending appointment of a Director. He served in that capacity until the appointment of the Director, and on May 22, 1961, Mr. Lasky was formally appointed Assistant Director of the Office of Coal Research. From August 1, 1961, to September 7, 1962, he was on part-time detail to the U.S. Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs as chairman of the national fuels and energy study.

The national fuels and energy study, under Mr. Lasky's direction, won high praise from both industry and Government sources as an outstandingly complete assessment of available information on energy and fuels in the United States and a survey of economic and social costs of various fuels and energy policy directions. At that time I commented:

I am convinced that the study group has made a real contribution to this Nation's store of knowledge on a complex and all-important subject, and that its report will prove of great value to the Government, to our fuels industries, and to the public.

Mr. Lasky's service in the national fuels and energy study was only one of many such important extra assignments in which he brought high credit upon the Department through the imagination, personal integrity, and professional excellence with which he fulfills such duties. Such special assignments were of importance to the mineral agencies and programs of the Federal Government and his work in them was based upon his skill as a mining geologist and his searching analytical ability which had been evident since the earliest years of his Federal service.

Mr. Lasky was a member of the Geological Survey-Bureau of Mines committee that supervised preparation of the comprehensive 1947 report on "The Mineral Position of the United States," and he edited that report as well as authoring several chapters. He was special consultant to the President's Materials Policy Commission—the Paley Commission—and was specifically asked to assist in preparation of the Commission's report; the Chairman singled him out for his contributions to the Commission and for his exceptional editorship of the volumes on "The Outlook for Key Commodities" and "The Outlook for Energy Sources." In 1952 he was a member of the Munitions Board Interdepartmental Stockpiling Committee, authorized to speak for the Secretary of the Interior, and he was instrumental in formulating the minerals stockpile criteria and goals. He was credited with playing a major role in the success of the 1953 Mid-Century Conference on Resources for the Future. In the latter year, too, he was the only departmental member of the Secretary's Committee on the Geological Survey which was created to review and recommend on the organization and operations of the Geological Survey; he served as secretary of the Committee. He directed the 1954 departmental re-

port on the "Impact of the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy on the Coal, Oil, and Natural Gas Industries" prepared for the Panel on the Impact of the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. In recent months he edited the special report of the Secretary of the Interior concerning the Secretary's 1962 official visit to the Soviet Union.

Mr. Lasky was selected by the Department to attend the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, from which he received his diploma in the spring of 1951, and after graduation he was called upon annually to serve as guest lecturer at the college. He also lectured at the George Washington University Graduate School, Beloit College, the Colorado School of Mines, Columbia University, Washington State College, and the University of Chicago, and appeared before the National Industrial Conference Board and the I Symposium sobre Recursos Naturales de Cuba held in Havana, February 1958.

Mr. Lasky was the author of more than 60 articles and books on engineering, ore deposits and related branches of geology, exploration for ore deposits, mineral resources and mineral resource appraisal, and mineral economics. A number of his papers have been translated into foreign languages, and his published studies are accepted as authoritative in industry and Government circles alike.

The Department of the Interior and his friends in Congress will miss this fine civil servant.

#### DEATH OF ALEXANDER SMITH, JR.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we were shocked to learn today of the untimely death of the only son of our former colleague, H. Alexander Smith.

His son, H. Alexander Smith, Jr., of Georgetown, died suddenly this morning and will be mourned by many for he was a distinguished member of this community who devoted much of his energy to civic work.

Mr. Smith's abilities showed themselves early in his career when he became general counsel of the Davidson Chemical Co., of Baltimore. During World War II, he served in the War Department and was cited for exceptional service.

At the time of his death, he was giving leadership to the Murray Corp. in Towson, Md., as its president and chairman of the board.

His commitment to service and to community work were exemplified by the leadership he gave to the City Tavern group which he founded in Georgetown to undertake the reconstruction of historic sites. He was also active as a member of the Opera Society of Washington and he was a charter trustee of the National Trust for Historic Preservation in America.

I am sure that we all extend our most profound condolences to his widow, to his parents, Senator and Mrs. Smith, to his son, Alexander, at the University of Colorado, and his daughter, Mrs. Michael Shallcross, of Monmouth, Oreg.

### CAPTAIN DONER, A FINE AMERICAN ABROAD

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the behavior of Americans abroad has often been the target of severe criticism. It is particularly refreshing and heartening in view of this to hear a glowing report on the magnificent job an outstanding Wisconsin citizen is doing for his country in Italy.

The man is Capt. Landis E. Doner, of Plymouth, Wis., who is commander of the U.S. Naval Air Force facility in Sigonella, Sicily. I learned of the activities of this fine officer through a letter written to me by a civilian employee who served under Captain Doner. The writer asked that he remain anonymous.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this tribute to an unusual man be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

JANUARY 30, 1964.

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: There is an old saying: "Give credit where credit is due," and it is with this theme in mind that I wish to inform you of the outstanding work being done here in Sicily by a native of Wisconsin.

Capt. Landis E. Doner, U.S. Navy, assumed command of the U.S. Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily, approximately 7 months ago. This facility is the U.S. component of a NATO military base located approximately 11 miles from Catania, Sicily. The inherent conditions of Italy's "depressed south" still prevail although some economic progress has been made. Politically, the Sicilians are somewhat divided but greatly tend toward socialism combined with a deep sense of nationalism; hence, the behavior of all Americans, particularly the naval officers, are constantly under close public scrutiny.

Captain Doner, upon assuming command of the facility, foresaw the task of not only maintaining good community relations between his command and the local populace as a whole, but also that of establishing a personal rapport with the civic leaders and businessmen of the city of Catania and the many other smaller cities in the proximity of the facility. He immediately set out to inform himself about the island and its people by studying the language, the history, the customs and the current economic trends and a wealth of other details. His social activities began very soon after his arrival and have continued at a pace seldom encountered by the Department of State's Foreign Service personnel.

To cite a typical example, during the period of October and November 1963, Captain and Mrs. Doner entertained approximately 110 local civic leaders and businessmen from the city of Catania and other nearby cities mostly through small informal dinner parties in their home, all held at personal expense.

Never has the cooperation and good will of Captain Doner's Italian military counterparts been so apparent, forceful, and personal. The mutual respect held by both commands has enabled the base to function in a classic manner perhaps only envisioned by the originators of the NATO program.

The U.S. officers and military personnel have followed the personal example set by their commanding officer with Italian language classes, educational island tours on weekends and a near perfect record of community relations. Weekly lectures with full

attendance of personnel are held on all aspects of the military service. One is no longer surprised to see technical, trades, and administrative specialists performing group calisthenics or close order drill together on scheduled mornings prior to work call.

It is small wonder, then, that this facility received a "high excellent" in overall rating during the last comprehensive station inspection.

The death of President Kennedy brought poignant and deeply moving expressions of sympathy from the local populace. Captain Doner literally spent that entire weekend behind his desk receiving personal callers and telephone calls until wee hours in the morning only to return to his desk after several hours of rest.

Captain Doner, a devout Protestant, received and accepted numerous invitations to attend Catholic religious services for the late President in towns and villages which have seldom or not seen an American since the invasion of Sicily during the last war.

The captain's biggest surprise occurred when he was personally invited by the mayor of a small mountain town to see the ancient buildings in the surrounding area; he was subsequently brought into the city hall and told that he and his guests were to attend an extraordinary meeting of the city council. At this council meeting an Italian senator, on visit from Rome, read the proclamation that the city council had given approval for changing the name of one of the city's main squares. Today, in Paterno, Sicily, there is a new but famous square—Piazza John F. Kennedy.

Captain and Mrs. Doner both hail from Plymouth, Wis., and have an attractive family of three daughters. The poise, manners, and general behavior of the girls are indicative of a happy and perfect family.

Under Captain Doner's leadership, this facility has become the pride of the Mediterranean area. The captain's modest, quiet yet forceful and unassuming manner has made him not only a respected and an outstanding leader but a popular officer and gentleman to his men and to his NATO military and civilian friends. Captain Doner's personal integrity, tact, sincerity, personal diplomacy, military bearing, and leadership is certainly in keeping with the highest traditions of the U.S. Navy and is indeed most exemplary of our American way of life.

### TEXAS HAS A TWO-VOTER SYSTEM, SOME WITH POLL TAXES, SOME UNDER THE 24TH AMENDMENT, WITH 2 DAYS TO GO ON REGISTRATIONS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the 24th amendment to the Constitution, which became a part of our fundamental law on February 6, 1964, on ratification by 38 States, will undergo a dramatic test in the series of elections in Texas this year.

The 24th amendment bars the poll tax as a requirement for voting in Federal elections for offices of the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress.

Since Texas is one of only five States still requiring a poll tax as a requirement for voter qualification in State elections, a situation has developed with two different sets of qualified voters in Texas, one set qualified to vote only in Federal elections, the other set qualified to vote in all elections.

It is possible to obtain a poll tax and with it vote in both Federal and State

elections. It is possible for a person not holding a poll tax to register by March 6, 1964, and still vote for candidates in Federal races. In Texas this year the Federal races include the Presidency, Vice Presidency, a U.S. Senator, and 23 Members of the House of Representatives.

Many of us who have fought for years to abolish the poll tax in all elections are still hopeful this may be achieved. But the important thing now is to urge every citizen in our State to qualify by March 6 to vote at least in Federal elections. Many responsible organizations in Texas are making every effort to see that our voter qualification percentage is raised.

Lower income groups in Texas have always found payment of poll tax a difficult barrier to overcome. It is hoped that the 24th amendment will be effective to extend the voting franchise to many thousands more people in Texas. But whether it is or not depends on the people themselves. I appeal to my fellow Texans, all the adult Texans who have not obtained poll taxes or a certificate, to obtain their certificate these last 2 days, and be prepared to vote in the presidential election next November.

### COURAGEOUS WOMEN IN HISTORY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most remarkable expositions of the role of courageous women in our history was given by the senior Senator from Texas, Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH, before the Reserve Officers Association Ladies' Annual Luncheon here in Washington on February 27.

I was particularly struck by Senator YARBOROUGH's description of Mrs. Lyndon Johnson during the tragic and terrible moments of the assassination of President Kennedy.

The world has witnessed and admired the splendid courage of Mrs. Kennedy, but I have seen no public account of the fortitude and calm with which Mrs. Johnson also faced and met the terrible events of November 22. Both of our First Ladies are great ladies, indeed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address by Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH entitled "The ROA Wife Knows Courage, Too," delivered in Washington, D.C., on February 27, 1964.

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

#### THE ROA WIFE KNOWS COURAGE, TOO

(Excerpts from an address by Senator YARBOROUGH before the Reserve Officers Association Ladies' Annual Luncheon at the annual Mid-Winter National Council Meeting of ROA at Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., February 27, 1964)

As a married man who has been a member of the Reserve Officers Association for nearly a score of years, and a Reserve officer since World War II, I learn from the distaff side that holding the home together while the man is overseas in war, or warming the fire alone while he is training in peacetime, is a weary, lonesome business, hard on the heart and mind and body.

You who wait and work and encourage, you keepers of the home fires, you morale



builders, you heads of the family during the lonely vigils, you also serve the Nation, above and beyond the calls of family duty alone.

The human race has honored its Joans of Arc but has often overlooked the quiet sacrifices of its many Penelopes, who, like the wife of Ulysses, hold a nation together while the husbands are away on some great quest.

This Nation was built and its frontiers extended by heroines who held many a frontier blockhouse or a settler's cabin alone, while the men were away on expeditions.

For more than 300 years, the women of America have been an auxiliary force in support of the military, centuries before the Woman Contract Surgeon, the Army Nurse Corps, and WACS and WAVES and Lady Marines came into legal existence.

In times of our early wars, women often accompanied their officer husbands to the scene of action, often living with them in the Revolutionary and Civil Wars, near the battlefields, even as Martha Washington came and lived with George Washington that bitter winter at Valley Forge.

Practically every State in the Union has its heroines. It is remarkable how many of them were wives like you of citizen soldiers.

My own native State of Texas is typical. Dr. James Long led a filibustering expedition into Texas while it was a Spanish province; his military forces were dispersed by Spanish troops. He went to Mexico City, leaving his young wife, Jane Long, well-educated daughter of General Wilkerson, of the U.S. Army, in a fort with a detachment of 40 men as a guard at Point Bolivar on Galveston Island in Spanish Texas. The 40 men deserted when the food gave out. Jane Long was left alone in the deserted fort on a wild and turbulent frontier with her small child and a small Negro maid on abandoned Galveston Island.

The tall cannibalistic Karankawa Indians came to attack. Jane Long manned a cannon at the fort and fired it, frightening the Karankawas away. She continued to fire the morning and evening artillery salute and kindled fires in the fort so that the Mexican soldiers and the Indians in the vicinity would not know that all the Anglo-American volunteers had deserted her and left.

She fished and waded in the cold waters of the bay in a bitter winter to gather oysters to save her little band of three from starvation. That bitterly cold winter of 1821 Jane Long's third child was born at the fort, the first Anglo-American child born in Texas. Because of this, Jane Long is known as "The Mother of Texas."

Her doctor-officer-citizen-soldier husband was murdered in Mexico City, but it was the year of Mexican independence, and the eve of the Anglo-American settlement of Texas, and Jane Long stayed in Texas to become a colonist in Austin's first colony of Anglo-Americans in Texas.

When the Alamo fell to Santa Anna's thousands March 6, 1836, after a 12-day siege with all of its 186 defenders, men and boys, slain, 16 women and very small children and 2 Negro man-slaves were spared as non-combatants. Among the fallen were Capt. Almeron Dickinson, able commander of the Alamo's artillery, a former ordnance expert in the U.S. Army, but a Texas farmer for 5 years before the Alamo fell.

But Mrs. Dickinson and her small babe, Angelina, were spared. They were the only Anglo-Americans among the women and children. Mrs. Dickinson and her baby daughter, Angelina, were placed on a Mexican burro and sent through Indian country to Sam Houston's gathering army, 80 miles away to carry a message of threat to Texans who continued to resist. Unarmed, terrorized, shocked and stunned by the death of her husband and all of their friends in the Alamo, she rode the 80 miles with her babe

alone except for Travis' Negro man-slave. Ever after, the baby, Angelina, has been known as the child of the Alamo.

Another young woman became a heroine of Texas by marriage when beautiful, gentle 20-year-old, college-educated Margaret Lea, of Alabama, fell in love with and married the hero of San Jacinto and president of the Republic of Texas, rough, uncouth, hard-fighting, hard-drinking 47-year-old Sam Houston. She succeeded where two former wives failed.

Sam Houston became a teetotaler and a temperance lecturer and became such a devoted husband and churchman that there is now a stained glass window to his memory in the First Baptist Church on 16th Street NW, here in Washington, D.C., where he served as a Senator from Texas for 13 years. Margaret Lea Houston bore Sam Houston eight children; the youngest, Temple Lea Houston, was born in the Governor's mansion at Austin in 1860 while Houston was 67, and was the only child born to a Governor of Texas in office until Dan Moody became Governor in the late 1920's.

Margaret Lea Houston built a family to match her husband's frontier leadership, military achievement, and his high statecraft, still first among all Texans. Sam Houston had served 5 years in the U.S. Army under Andrew Jackson, as enlisted man, ensign, third lieutenant, and first lieutenant. He was a major general and commanding general of the armies of the Republic of Texas.

Margaret Lea Houston, like Jane Long and Mrs. Dickinson before her, was the wife of a citizen-soldier, a man who was basically a civilian but always ready to go to the front in time of danger. The wives I have mentioned, like many in this room, were scarcely less in active service than their menfolk.

Do not think that all the heroines were in the past. I saw three of our own times, under fire in Dallas that sad Friday, last November 22, as I rode in a car with President and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson. The incomparable courage and nobility in disaster of Jacqueline Kennedy touched all the world. She gave this Nation and all the world a new pride in woman's courage in the face of disaster, in the hour of the cruel and malevolent taking away of her beloved husband, the late beloved John F. Kennedy. Her anguish and travail have been described too many times for me to dwell upon that sad chapter of our history here. And so has the conduct of Mrs. John Connally, whose husband lay wounded and helpless in her lap.

But what of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson in the second car back of the President's car during those fateful minutes? With becoming modesty and sense of fitness, she has had no news interviews to describe what was happening to her. The cameras at that time and place were trained on the President's car. The Vice President, Mrs. Johnson, and I rode in the rear seat of Vice President Johnson's automobile.

What happened to Mrs. Johnson in these seconds of crises? Loud crashing sounds of rifle fire were echoing over her head and her husband's head as the bullets followed their evil trajectory from the assassin's lair in a corner room above her head and the Vice President's head and into the President's car and body. The smell of burnt gunpowder from the rifle's muzzle, blasted down the downward sloping bullets' path, was strong in the Vice President's car.

With the first rifle shot, the cavalcade ground to a halt or virtual halt; after the third shot, it roared away.

In that 6 seconds of the pause, with people to the right of the cavalcade falling to the ground upon the embankment, Mrs. Lyndon Johnson sat her place like a queen, looking

neither to the right nor left, neither seeking cover nor uttering a sound. There was no panic there, but a tremendous self-control, worthy of one who was having the heavy burdens of First Lady of the land cast upon her.

In the wild 5 minutes' ride past the Trade Mart where the President was to have spoken, on to the hospital emergency entrance, Mrs. Lyndon Johnson retained complete composure and self-expression, her upright posture changing only when the Secret Service agent ordered, "Get down," at which she leaned down beneath the top of the doors of the open-top car.

As the President's car, the Secret Service car, and the Vice President's car roared up to the emergency entrance to the hospital and came to a quick stop, most of the Secret Service agents rushed to the Vice President's automobile. They quickly opened the door, and as President Lyndon Johnson stood up, they formed a living circle of either five or six men around him, all facing him and staring intently at him.

One agent said two words, which I understood to be "Mr. President"; there was a brief pause as they all stood mute and silent, just the tight circle with President Johnson inside, then they quickly guarded, walked with, and steered President Johnson directly into the safety of the hospital, carrying him away from and past President Kennedy's car, none of whose occupants had been moved since it stopped.

In these seconds of great historical transition, what happened to Mrs. Lyndon Johnson? In their haste to protect the new President, the Secret Service seem to have forgotten her. But with a woman's instinct and a wife's love, she followed close behind the tight cordon of Secret Service officers who were guarding and guiding President Johnson into the protecting walls of Parkland Hospital.

In minutes and seconds that seemed ages, that haunt us still, Mrs. Lyndon Johnson had a self-control that is worthy of the White House.

Never once did she question, or show any sign of panic. Out of her spiritual and bodily resources, she steeled herself during these minutes. With quiet and becoming grace, she has refrained from describing them since.

I have described six heroines, all of whose husbands were or had been citizen-soldiers. Three lived in the frontier age; three live now in our own age. All these events transpired in Texas, though the women were there as wives of Presidents.

As you ladies of the Reserve Officers Association of America contemplate your work and the sacrifices that I know that you make in order for your husbands to be Reserve citizen-soldiers, be comforted in your status by the great and final sacrifices that other wives of valiant servants of the Republic have made and by stern ordeals nobly borne by all generations of American women.

God bless you.

RECESS TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HRUSKA obtained the floor.

I yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN].

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska has completed his remarks for today, and there is no further business, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, in accordance with the previous order.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Nebraska has completed his remarks for

today. However, I have not completed my remarks on the explanation of my amendment, and I expect to pursue that subject tomorrow morning.

Mr. McGOVERN. I understand that will be the pending question on tomorrow.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

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

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) under the previous order, the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 5, 1964, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 4 (legislative day of February 26), 1964:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
Rutherford M. Poats, of Virginia, to be Assistant Administrator for the Far East, Agency for International Development.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 4 (legislative day of February 26), 1964:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
William P. Bundy, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Elbert G. Mathews, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

UNITED NATIONS

Walter M. Kotschnig, of Maryland, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 19th plenary session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Kenneth T. Young, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 20th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

First District of Michigan Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, a strong interest in public issues was indicated by the heavy response to my questionnaire, sent out to voters in the new First District of Michigan.

The recipients of my questionnaire were selected without regard to neighborhood or party affiliation.

It is significant that voters favor the overall record of the Kennedy-Johnson administration by over 4 to 1. This is heavier than the Democratic-Republican breakdown in this predominantly Democratic district. Of course, as the election nears, partisan feeling will increase and the margin can be expected to narrow.

On foreign policy issues, the voters favor our assisting South Vietnam's fight against the Communists, and U.S. support of the U.N. But, evident from comments added to responses, there is much confusion and dissatisfaction over our Cuba policy. Much of this appears to be an emotional response, an irritation arising from Castro harangues, Communist terrorist activity in Latin America, allied trade with Cuba, and the mere fact of Castro's presence in Cuba.

On domestic issues, medicare under social security draws strong bipartisan support. It is not only a popular issue but reflects a need Congress should not ignore any longer. The vote on a Domestic Peace Corps reflects concern with urban poverty, school dropouts, and teenage unemployment. The civil rights bill is supported by better than 2 to 1, but considerable uneasiness in the race relations field is shown in the attitudes on question 8.

I think the Congress must face the problem of Presidential succession. A better law of succession is obviously favored by the public, judging by the

vote and the many supplemental comments. At the very least, we should provide some method of filling the vacancy in the office of Vice President:

Results of questionnaire—Congressman Lucien N. Nedzi, 1st District of Michigan

	Percentages		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you favor the overall record of the Kennedy-Johnson administration.....	72.5	17.6	9.9
2. Do you favor our fight to keep South Vietnam out of Communist control?.....	70.2	16.4	13.4
3. Do you favor our present policy regarding Cuba?.....	31.8	60.3	7.9
If not, would you favor—			
A tougher policy?.....	Percent 79.7		
Resumption of diplomatic relations?.....	20.3		
4. Do you favor continued U.S. financial support of the United Nations?.....	79.1	13.3	7.6
5. Do you favor medicare for aged under social security?.....	79.1	14.9	6.0
6. Do you favor a Domestic Peace Corps to work on local community projects?.....	64.8	21.8	13.4
7. Do you favor the administration's civil rights bill?.....	56.2	27.2	16.6
8. Do you think integration is being pushed—			
Too fast?.....	Percent 55.5		
Not fast enough?.....	14.1		
About right?.....	30.4		
9. Do you favor changing the order of Presidential succession so that the Secretary of State, rather than the Speaker of the House, is next in line?.....	61.2	24.4	14.4
10. Do you favor having your Congressman poll you for your views?.....	91.3	2.8	5.9

11. If you are a Republican, please indicate your first and second choices among the following men mentioned for the Republican nomination for President:

1st choice:	
Nixon.....	34.3
Goldwater.....	18.2
Romney.....	17.4
Scranton.....	11.1
Rockefeller.....	9.0
Other.....	8.9
2d choice:	
Romney.....	24.9
Nixon.....	24.3
Scranton.....	21.1
Goldwater.....	11.4
Rockefeller.....	11.4
Other.....	8.8

12. If you are a Democrat, please indicate your first and second choice among the following men mentioned for the Democratic nomination for Vice President:

1st choice:	
Kennedy.....	35.3
Stevenson.....	29.0
Humphrey.....	19.8
Shriver.....	11.0
Wagner.....	2.4
Other.....	2.4
2d choice:	
Humphrey.....	24.5
Stevenson.....	24.2
Shriver.....	23.0
Kennedy.....	21.1
Wagner.....	5.3
Other.....	2.0

The Church and the Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my reply to a letter from a sincere but, in my opinion, misguided minister of a fine Protestant denomination.

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

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,  
March 4, 1964.

DEAR Mr. —: I have read with interest your letter of March 2, in which you urge me to vote for and use my influence to pass without amendment the pending civil rights bill, H.R. 7152.

In the last paragraph you say you will be interested in knowing the way I vote and hope that I will not be a party to filibustering at the expense of the American people.

I regret that I cannot share your belief that the pending civil rights bill would, as you say, promote the welfare of our own Nation and benefit our world image. I think that the bill was born of political