rooms for rent), eating establishments, gasoline stations, and places of entertainment are to serve all customers who are well-behaved and who are able to pay.

This requirement is weaker than the public accommodation laws of 32 States. And, where these States properly enforce their laws, there is no reason for the Federal Government to interfere.

RIGHT TO JURY TRIAL

The civil rights bill contains no primary criminal penalties. Only civil actions are authorized, to prevent an individual from continuing to violate provisions of the bill. Historically and according to the Constitution, jury trials are not authorized in these types of cases. The laws of the 50 States are the same in this regard.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AND FREEDOM OF SPEECH

The bill does not permit the Federal Government in any way to interfere with freedom of the press and freedom of speech.

GRANT OF DICTATORIAL POWERS TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

A majority of the States have enacted legislation which is as strong or stronger than the major provisions of the civil rights bill. Nothing in the bill interferes with the effective enforcement of these State laws. And, where these laws are being effectively enforced, there is no reason for the Federal Government to interfere in States' rights.

In each title of the bill, effective administrative and judicial safeguards are provided. Federal officials are granted no final authority to withhold Federal financial assistance or impose penalties upon citizens. Every citizen is guaranteed his day in court with all the judicial safeguards that the Bill of Rights guarantees.

STATE CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS

A majority of States have strong civil rights legislation which is effectively enforced. The Federal civil rights bill specifically provides that the Federal law will in no way interfere with the right of those States to continue enforcing their laws. And, where the States do so, the Federal Government will have no cause to enforce the Federal civil rights law in those States. Thus, for the Americans who do not discriminate against their fellow citizens because of race, color, or religion, the Federal civil rights bill will have no effect on their daily lives.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend G. Earl Daniels, rector of Christ Episcopal Church, Hyde Park, Mass., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, O Lord, for the priceless gift of a new day. This fragment of eternity is our whole life in miniature; and no matter what were the failures of yesterday, or what may be the hopes of tomorrow—we have only today.

May we do honor to the name of this place—the House of Representatives. May we truly represent the folks back home, but not at the expense of the Nation's welfare, and not in unconcern for the world's needs.

But most of all, we would not forget that "among those present" this day is "One greater than this temple," One "unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known," and One, whom we believe will one day be our judge—even Thyself, O Lord God of our Fathers, and so:

"Not for the eyes of men
May this day's work be done,
But unto Thee, O Lord,
That with the setting sun,
Our hearts may know the glad surprise
Of sure approval in Thine eyes."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SETTLEMENT OF THE RAILROAD DISPUTE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, all Americans acclaim the leadership of President Johnson in connection with the settlement yesterday of the 5-year-old railroad dispute. His role in the negotiations of the last 13 days was indispensable to their success.

All those involved in this matter, including the Secretary of Labor, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, and various others deserve the commendation of the country. Railroad management and the five operating brotherhoods displayed industrial statesmanship of the highest order. They have proved once again the viability of collective bargaining.

Industrial peace has been preserved. I congratulate all who gave their efforts to this success for the American people.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader if he can advise us as to the legislative program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District day. There is no District business.

On Tuesday, H.R. 1997, limitation of diversity jurisdiction of Federal courts under direct action statutes will be called up for consideration.

On Wednesday, H. R. 10669, to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 will be called up for consideration.

On Thursday and the balance of the week, the following bills and concurrent resolution will be called up. These bills went over from last week.

These bills and concurrent resolution are as follows:

H.R. 287. Including Nevada among States permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for OASDI coverage purposes;

H.R. 1608. Providing that aircraft engines and propellers may be exported as working parts of aircraft;

H.R. 2330. Providing that antiques may be imported free of duty if they exceed 100 years of age;

H.R. 2652. Duty-free importation of certain wools for use in manufacturing of polishing felts;

H.R. 3348. Extending time for teachers in Maine to be treated as covered by separate retirement systems for OASDI purposes, and permitting Texas to obtain coverage for State and local policemen;

H.R. 4198. Free importation of soluble and instant coffee;

H.R. 4364. Free entry of mass spectrometer for Oregon State Univeristy and spectrometer for Wayne State University;

H.R. 6455. Amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to unrelated business taxable income;

H.R. 7480. Temporarily suspending the import duty on manganese ore (including ferruginous ore) and related products;

H.R. 8268. To prevent double taxation of certain tobacco products exported and returned unchanged to United States and subsequently reprocessed;

H.R. 8975. Providing for the tariff classification of certain particleboard;

H.R. 9311. Suspension of duty on alumina and bauxite;

H.R. 9393. Extending time for ministers to elect coverage under OASDI, providing full retroactivity for disability determinations, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 19. Designating "bourbon whiskey" as a distinctive product of the United States.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

SETTLEMENT OF THE RAILROAD DISPUTE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in expressing great delight, and I think the delight of all Members of Congress and I am sure the people of the United States, in the settlement of the issues between railroad management and the brotherhood employees.

For almost 5 years the country has been plagued with one of the sharpest controversies that has developed in this country in the field of management and labor relations. President Eisenhower wrestled with this problem extensively and tried to help resolve it. President Kennedy had the matter come to a head, and he was really put to the test, as were we in the Congress, in trying to resolve the issues, and you are familiar with what we did. We had a right to rely on the assurances that these additional issues could be settled.

President Johnson has done, in my judgment, one of the most magnificent jobs. I have the highest commendation for the President, Mr. Wirtz, the Secretary of Labor, and for all those who have worked with them in their untiring efforts to resolve these highly controversial and important issues in this field. It is one of the finest jobs that I have seen accomplished in my experience in the Congress.

I want to pay tribute to the management in the railroad industry and my compliments to the brotherhood for their efforts in really joining together for the first time in some 5 years with hard bargaining, as it was intended under the law, in joining the issues and arriving at a settlement.

I think we all owe them, and certainly President Johnson, and his associates, our thanks for their untiring efforts and the accomplishment brought about in the settlement of this most controversial problem, and therefore relieving us of the responsibility, which would have been a very nasty thing. I commend all of those involved with this very worthy accomplishment.

The American people have been relieved of a very real threat that would have had dire consequences and caused suffering and hardship throughout the country.

I am sure we can look forward to cooperation and harmony within the railroad industry in the years to come.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight Saturday night to file a report on H.R. 10041, the hospital construction bill, which was reported on yesterday by the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SETTLEMENT OF THE RAILROAD DISPUTE

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, representing as I do an area into which over 20 of the Nation's railroads operate, I want to join the majority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the remarks they have made complimenting the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, the representatives of management, and the representatives of the railroad brotherhoods, who, as the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has said, accomplished such a magnificent success in the settlement of the dispute that has plagued the Nation and the railroad industry of the Nation for the past 5 years. Three Presidents have wrestled with this problem. It remained for the incumbent to find a way to bring the negotiators together and develop a settlement that, for the time being, at least, and we hope for a long time in the future, has brought a settlement to the problem.

It is a great accomplishment and the President, Government, management, and the brotherhoods are certainly deserving of the compliments of this House and of the people of the Nation in accomplishing this great victory through collective bargaining.

POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is one of the most disturbing phenomena of our national life that the postal service—the bulwark and foundation of our social and economic existence—should be constantly on the decline.

Everything else in the United States moves forward. Our science, our industry, our business, our gross national product, our standard of living—all these things advance steadily and swiftly with each passing generation. But the postal service deteriorates. Postmaster General after Postmaster General has announced, with nauseating regularity, that his administration is going to balance the postal budget by getting rid of services which he terms "unnecessary."

Almost every time this is done the Postmaster General who happens to be in office at the time announces that costs will be cut without impairing the service. But, somehow, the service is impaired with each cut—and the damage that each Postmaster General does is never repaired by his successors.

As a result—today's postal service, if we disregard certain improvements in the Nation's transportation patterns—for which the Post Office Department can take no credit—is less efficient than it was in the 1890's.

But, evidently the present disgraceful state of the postal service is a challenge to the incumbent in the office of Postmaster General. Mr. Gronouski has come up with a plan—which he intends to put into effect on May 4—which will reduce the postal service of the United States of America to a level which one would expect to find only in the most backward and socially deprived nations of the world.

The plan which Mr. Gronouski, and his deputy, Mr. Frederick C. Belen, are contemplating is not only a massive exercise in postal retrogression, it is—as I shall point out later in these remarks—a direct slap at the authority of the Congress of the United States and a defiance of our wishes.

The major victim of the May 4 holocaust will be the parcel post system.

Parcel post has, for some years now, been the sick man of the postal service. It has been sick—not because of any inherent weakness in itself—but because it has been systematically poisoned by the bumbling doctors in the Post Office Department.

These "doctors" now say that, beginning on May 4, parcel post will be delivered in metropolitan areas on a 5-day week basis, only, instead of the traditional 6-day week. This represents a 16-percent reduction in service.

With typical Post Office Department logic it follows closely on the heels of an average 13-percent increase in parcel post rates, which become effective on April 1.

In the lunatic logic of the Post Office Department, an increase in rates almost always results in a reduction in service.

Parcel post has been losing ground to private enterprise for years, and it has been losing ground in the area in which the losses hurt most. Private enterprise has taken away from the Post Office Department an increasingly large percentage of the profitable short-haul or local package business and left the Department the money-losing dregs, the transportation of parcels to distant, out-of-the-way places where private enterprise does not care to operate.

Now, by cutting another day's service off parcel post, the Department bids fair to lose all its perishable goods business. Who will take the risk of sending perishable goods by fourth-class mail when there is a good chance that such goods will be left to stand in a post office over an entire weekend, in addition to the usual period consumed in transportation?

The elimination of another day of parcel post service may not seem important

in the minds of some people. However, I would like to point out that it is within the discretion of the individual postmaster to determine which day of the week he wants to eliminate. Supposing he chooses a day in the middle of the week? What happens to all the educational materials and teaching booklets which our schools have learned to expect, on a regular basis, to arrive in time for distribution and use in the classroom?

And how about the records for the blind? Blind people expect these records, which come to them through parcel post. They count on them to help fill their darkened days, and to help them learn trades which they can practice despite their infirmities? Are we to tell these blind people to possess their souls in patience and wait an extra 24 hours, or another weekend, just because the pennywise pound-foolish postal accountants want to balance their budget?

Last year—on June 24, to be exact—this House debated and approved legislation (H.R. 5795) which granted the Postmaster General a moratorium of 3 years, during which time he could operate the parcel post system without being forced to seek, from the Interstate Commerce Commission, an increase in rates whenever the cost of fourth-class mail exceeded the revenues by more than 4 percent. As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] said at that time:

> The purpose of H.R. 5795 is to provide for the continuance of essential postal services by granting the Postmaster General temporary relief from existing statutory requirement which can operate to prevent the withdrawal from the Treasury of funds for any postal operation unless such relief is granted.

I call attention to the words:

> Provide for the continuance of essential postal services.

I strongly suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it was the undeniable thinking and desire of this body that this moratorium should be granted only on the understanding that there would be no further reductions in service. But now—just 10 months later—the Post Office Department arrogantly and officiously has chosen to flout our expressed desires.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Postmaster General and his deputy have not been content to cripple parcel post alone. They have gone much further than that. On May 4 the order will become effective which will make Saturday a black day in every post office and rural route in the Nation.

After May 4, window service in post offices will be reduced on Saturdays to just 4 hours. In most post offices, on Saturdays, only one window will be kept open, to handle packages, stamp sales, and every other allowable function and service which the patrons desire.

I say "allowable" function and service, because the Post Office Department's order has arbitrarily forbidden many of the usual functions of the post office to be performed on Saturdays—such as the sale of money orders, the issuance of c.o.d. money orders payable to mailers, all postal savings transactions, all boxrent collections, and many other services which the patron has a right to expect.

There will be no information window open on Saturdays. If you have a simple question to ask—about size and weight allowances, let us say, or the mailing of packages to our boys in uniform in South Vietnam—you must be prepared to stand in the long, weary line and wait your turn. You might have to wait 2 hours to ask a question that can be answered in 2 seconds.

The Post Office Department, Mr. Speaker, forgets that America is filled with working people who can only get to the post office on Saturday. They cannot leave their job to perform their personal postal business on any other day of the week. Are we going to condemn such people to waste their precious holidays by standing in line in their local post office or station?

Even the rural routes will suffer on our black Saturdays. For some reason not quite clear to me, the order which will become effective on May 4 forbids rural letter carriers to sell any money orders, domestic or international, on a Saturday. I cannot for the life of me see how this can save the Department any appreciable amount of money or time. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the Department thinks that, in fairness, it should do its best to make misery universal throughout the entire postal system.

The tragedy of this entire bureaucratic mess is that these so-called economies come when they are least necessary. The Postmaster General himself says that the postal deficit is now lower than it has been in years. The President of the United States tells us that our gross national product is the highest in our history. The Federal economists tell us that we are living in an age of unparalleled prosperity.

The postal service—for all its management-imposed faults and inefficiencies—has been largely responsible for the growth of our economy and the sustenance of our prosperity. But it is the postal service which now is made to cry "poor mouth" and which will be reduced to a national and international laughing stock.

Mr. Speaker, I am sick and tired of postal administrations seeking to put a dollar value on the postal service. This is the communications system which is the basis of our social well-being, the cornerstone of our economic and financial strength. We cannot put a dollar value on such a creation, any more than we can put a dollar value on Michelangelo's "Pieta" or Leonardo da Vinci's "Mona Lisa." When a postal executive tries to do such a crass thing, he proves to all the world that he knows the price of everything, and the value of nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Postmaster General to rescind this order which is planned to go into effect on May 4.

If he does not accede to this request, I intend to ask the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct hearings on this matter, and I intend to introduce and support legislation which will prohibit and prevent this projected rape of the postal service.

SUMMARY OF NET BUDGET RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES (THE TRADITIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET)—9 MONTHS OF FISCAL 1964 VERSUS 9 MONTHS OF FISCAL 1963, WITH COMPARISONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include my usual monthly statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting herewith the usual monthly tabulation of budget receipts and expenditures for the first 9 months of fiscal year 1964—to March 31—with comparisons with last year and the latest official budget estimates for fiscal 1964.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

In contrast with budget expenditures which tend to recur more evenly throughout the fiscal year, the more usual pattern of budget receipts shows September, December, March, and June as peak months; receipts in the first half—July–December—of the fiscal year are not usually as high as in the second half—January–June.

Budget revenues for fiscal 1964 were officially estimated by the President in the new budget in January at $88,400,000,000 which, if realized, would exceed actual fiscal 1963 revenues by $2,024,000,000. In the first 9 months of fiscal 1964 actual net budget revenues amounted to $64,313,000,000—some $2,687,000,000 higher than the corresponding 9 months of last year. A reading of the April 15 tax returns will permit more precise judgment as to probable final results, but at first glance, seems to indicate likelihood of collections exceeding the official forecast.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Budget expenditures for fiscal 1964 were officially estimated by the President in the new budget in January at $98,405,000,000 which, if realized, would represent an increase of $5,763,000,000 over the fiscal 1963 actual budget expenditure. The $98,405,000,000 includes a tentative estimate of $1,788,000,000 expenditure in 1964 from fiscal 1964 supplementals submitted to this current session.

On a straight monthly basis, it would mean an average of $8,200,000,000 per month, in contrast to which the expenditures in the first 9 months, July–March, averaged $8,079,000,000 which in turn compares with $7,763,000,000 in the corresponding 9 months last year; the national defense monthly average was virtually the same as a year ago but the

monthly average for all other items—nondefense—was $302,000,000 higher. In the first 9 months, defense spending ran below the straight budget average while nondefense ran slightly above the budgeted average. In total, as noted, the monthly average is below what the budget would permit.

As in all past budgets, the revised budget expenditure—disbursements—estimate of $98,405,000,000 for fiscal 1964 represents a composite of estimated disbursements in fiscal 1964; first, from unexpended balances of prior year appropriations; second, from permanent appropriations recurring automatically under prior law; and third, from annual appropriations made currently, including amounts associated with supplemental authority requests submitted in the current session for fiscal 1964.

EXPENDITURES FOR DEFENSE, SPACE, AND INTEREST—AND ALL OTHER PROGRAMS

Messages and statements associated with the original 1964 budget repeatedly emphasized that expenditure estimates and programs for fiscal 1964 were so planned that total proposed administrative budget expenditures for all programs other than national defense, space, and interest were slightly below the fiscal 1963 level—as then forecast—for such programs. But in the new budget received from the President this past January, updated estimates for fiscal 1964 show expenditures for such other purposes as being above, rather than below, corresponding fiscal 1963 actual spending—$28,007,000,000 now estimated for 1964 compared to $27,355,000,000 actual for 1963, up $652,000,000 from 1963.

And in comparison, for the first 9 months, such other spending was up from the corresponding period of fiscal 1963 by $972,000,000.

SURPLUS OR DEFICIT

Actual results to date in fiscal 1964, in comparison with last year and the budget estimates, seem clearly to suggest the probability that the deficit for fiscal 1964 will be something less than the January forecast. But whether the deficit turns out to be the $10,005,000,000 foreseen by the President's budget, or some other amount, fiscal 1964 represents the 28th year of budget deficits in the last 34 years—with at least one more, perhaps two more, to follow. In summary, here are the official administrative budget deficit figures for the last 3 years:

	Administrative budget deficits	
	From July 1, 1961, to date	For 3 full fiscal years, 1962–64
Fiscal 1962 (from July 1, 1961)	$6,378,000,000	$6,378,000,000
Fiscal 1963	6,266,000,000	6,266,000,000
Fiscal 1964 (9 months to Mar. 31, 1964)	8,079,000,000	----------
Fiscal 1964 (current estimate in President's 1965 budget)	----------	[1] 10,005,000,000
Totals, as above	20,723,000,000	22,649,000,000

[1] Probability is that it may not go this high.

Total budget expenditures projected by the President in January in the revised budget for the current fiscal year 1964 compare with certain earlier years as follows:

	Administrative budget spending, 1964 estimate		
	Over fiscal 1963	Over fiscal 1961	Over fiscal 1964
1964 current official estimate for national defense over	+$2,542,000,000	+$7,803,000,000	+$8,311,000,000
1964 current official estimate for other than national defense over	+3,221,000,000	+9,087,000,000	+22,557,000,000
Total, 1964 current estimate over	+5,763,000,000	+16,890,000,000	+30,868,000,000

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. Speaker, after 9 months of budget operations in the current fiscal year 1964 the total public debt, both direct and guaranteed, stood at $310,407,793,839.96 and compares with certain earlier dates as shown in the following table:

	Federal public debt—Direct and guaranteed				
	Fiscal 1954	Fiscal 1961	Fiscal 1962	Fiscal 1963	Fiscal 1964 (at Mar. 31, 1964)
1. The debt at end of period (in billions)	$271.3	$289.2	$298.6	$306.5	$310.4
2. Amount per capita (in dollars)	1,670	1,575	1,600	1,619	1,622
3. Average for a family of 4 (in dollars)	6,680	6,300	6,400	6,476	6,488

The following table elaborates the receipt and expenditure situation more fully:

Budget receipts and expenditures (the traditional administrative budget) 9 months of fiscal 1964 versus 9 months of fiscal 1963 and comparisons with full-year estimates

[In millions of dollars]

	Actual for 9 months (to Mar. 31, 1964)			President's budget estimates (revised) for all of fiscal 1964 compared to actual results for all of fiscal 1963		
	Fiscal 1964 (9 months)	Fiscal 1963 (9 months)	1964 compared to 1963 (9 months)	Revised budget estimate, 1964 (January 1964)	Actual, 1963	1964 revised budget estimate compared to actual 1963
1. Budget receipts (net)	64,313	61,626	+2,687	88,400	86,376	+2,024
2. Budget expenditures (net):						
(a) National defense (per official budget classification)	39,255	39,126	+129	55,297	52,755	+2,542
(b) Other than national defense	33,461	30,742	+2,719	43,108	39,887	+3,221
Total budget expenditures, net	72,716	69,868	+2,848	98,405	92,642	+5,763
3. Net deficit or change	−8,403	−8,242	+161	−10,005	−6,266	+3,739
4. Average monthly expenditure:						
(a) National defense	4,361	4,347	+14	4,608	4,396	+212
(b) Other than national defense	3,718	3,416	+302	3,592	3,324	+268
Total monthly average	8,079	7,763	+316	8,200	7,720	+480
5. Dividing net budget expenditures on the basis emphasized in original budget for 1964:						
(a) National defense	39,255	39,126	+129	55,297	52,755	+2,542
(b) Space	2,888	1,701	+1,187	4,400	2,552	+1,848
(c) Interest on debt	8,011	7,451	+560	10,701	9,980	+721
(d) All other expenditures	22,562	21,590	+972	28,007	27,355	+652
Total budget expenditures, net	72,716	69,868	+2,848	98,405	92,642	+5,763

Sources: Budget for 1965 and monthly Treasury statement for Mar. 31, 1964.

WALTER REUTHER SPEAKS OF A BETTER TOMORROW

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, there are few men in this country who are able to articulate the goals of a

better tomorrow in eloquent language and concrete detail. It is always a refreshing experience to listen to one of those whose vision of a new America goes beyond the carefully cultivated cliches and pious platitudes that make up too much of our political discourse.

On April 7, 1964, many of my colleagues and I were privileged to hear an address by such a man. At a dinner held by the industrial union department of the AFL–CIO, IUD President Walter Reuther spoke about the "core values of our free society." With great clarity, Mr. Reuther displayed that scope of vision that has made him one of the freshest breezes blowing through our tangled political forest.

Walter Reuther spoke of the goals of the American labor movement. He noted that there are "serious deficits in the quality of American society" and outlined the program of labor to help meet those deficits, a program of which all Americans who value social progress rather than social stagnation and reaction should take note.

Mr. Reuther spoke of the tragic waste of resources in the neglect of our young people and the denial of economic security and human dignity to our older citizens. He spoke of the "great national coalition of conscience" that is working to make civil rights a reality and of the need for "a measure of democratic, rational, responsible public planning for people" to wage an effective war on poverty and unemployment.

I commend Walter Reuther for the following speech which I hope all Americans will take to heart.

SPEECH BY WALTER REUTHER TO INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT, APRIL 7, 1964

Jack Conway, reverend clergy, our many distinguished guests from the executive and the legislative branches of the Government, my colleagues in the IUD and friends: First, I should like to extend to each of our guests here tonight our very heartiest welcome. We appreciate the opportunity of breaking bread with them and having an opportunity to visit with them. Now the purpose of my speech is twofold. First of all, it's a fringe benefit for my colleagues who insist upon hearing me all the time, and, secondly, our lawyer told us that in order to make this dinner within the framework of the Labor-Management Act of 1949, I, as the leader of the IUD, had to make a speech. So those Congressmen who voted for that act must pay the penalty.

It has been said that the genius of a free society is its capability of achieving unity in diversity, and I think that this, the composition of this dinner tonight is living proof of that fact. I should like, if I might, to share with you, those of you from both branches of the Congress and those of you from the executive branch of the Government, some of the thoughts that we in the American labor movement have in this very difficult period in which we live. We have said many times on other occasions that we believe the labor movement is important because it's about people. It's about their problems and their needs and their hopes and their aspirations, and it is about the practical job of men and women joining together to try to bring to practical fulfillment their dreams of a better tomorrow. And while we do what we can at the bargaining table to improve the lot of our membership, we have worked in the knowledge that the labor movement cannot solve the problems of American wage earners and their families if we try to find answers to those problems in a vacuum, that we can really solve our problems only as we work together with men and women of good will in the total community trying to find answers to the problems of all the people. We can truly make progress only as we share in the general progress that the whole of our society makes together. And it is in that spirit that we have tried to formulate our collective-bargaining programs, and it is in that spirit that we act together as citizens to urge upon the Government, both the executive and the legislative branches, to enact those programs and policies that we think reflect the needs of all the people of our great country. Now, we share the view that this is a time of testing, that what is being tested is really the commitment that we have as a people and as a nation to the core values of our free society. And those core values as we understand it is our common belief in the worth and the dignity of each human person. But we share the view that you cannot test our commitment to these values by carefully cultivated cliches or by pious platitudes about the virtues of democracy, that the only real test of our commitments is what we do in a practical way to square our performance with our promise. In the practical job of giving meaning and substance and purpose to these values in terms of the lives of people.

Now, as we all know Mr. Khrushchev has boasted that in due time his system will bury us. We believe he's counting more upon our failures than upon his successes. And I believe, having spent some time with him in the give and take of a rough and tumble debate, that as a Marxist he believes that our kind of free society, being composed in his mind of competing and conflicting and irreconcilable economic pressure groups, is incapable of achieving a sense of national common purpose in the absence of the threat of total war. He understands, as we all know, that when we were faced with the challenge of war, when we were driven by common fears and common hatreds, we were equal to a total effort as a free society. Mr. Khrushchev does not believe that we can achieve the same sense of common motivation because we share common hopes and a common faith and, therefore, he does not believe that we can achieve a comparable effort to deal with the challenge of peace.

Now, we live in a troubled world in which the realities necessitate that we be strong on the military front. But the real contest in the world between our system of freedom and all other forms, all other social systems that would destroy human freedom is a contest that cannot be won no matter how big we make the H-bomb, no matter how strong we may be militarily, that in the long pull this contest can be won only as we demonstrate that our social system can best harness man's creative genius in the field of science and technology and can devise the economic and social instruments necessary to relate the abundance of automation to the basic needs of the human community. That's the contest. And while we need to spend billions of dollars to be strong on the military front, that is but the negative aspect of the total effort that we must make if freedom is to prevail over the forces of tyranny. And in this contest we will be judged in America not by the fact that we have the most productive economy, but by the fact that we perhaps have greater material resources than any other people in the world. The real measurement of the worth and quality of any society is not what it has but what it does with what it has. The real measurement is its capability of taking material wealth and equating that material wealth with human values. Of taking technical progress and reflecting that in human progress. And when you measure what we have to work with in terms of our productive power, in terms of our technological development, in terms of all the economic and material resources that we have at our command, when you measure that based upon what we are doing with what we have, every American who has dared to think about the problem must in all good conscience come to the conclusion that there are serious deficits in the quality of American society. I should like to talk briefly about some of those deficits that disturb us very deeply in the American labor movement.

We are the richest country in the world and yet in the year of 1964 there are between 30 and 50 million Americans, depending upon what yardstick you measure your poverty with, who live in the subbasements of the social structure of our great country. These are the unemployed and the underemployed and the underprivileged. They are the have-not peoples of America and they are denied and disadvantaged and discriminated against. And this must be made a matter of the highest priority. And we salute President Johnson for the courage and the vision that he has put into his program in which he has declared all-out war against human poverty. We hope the Congress will act upon that program but we are under no illusion. That is but the first historic step in the long road that we must travel together before we will have abolished poverty in all of its ugly forms in our country.

I was in Africa last December where I had the privilege of representing our Government at the independent celebration in Kenya. I went to Uganda and Tanganyika. In Tanganyika I met in the villages with many people whose total income for a whole year was $50 a year. There you see ugly naked poverty. But the poverty you find in Africa is not nearly as destructive of human values as the poverty you find in Washington, New York, Detroit, and Chicago. Because in Africa people who live in a community where the overall average is around $50 to $55 per capita income per year, they are poor economically but they are not poor spiritually because they belong to their community. They have a sense of participating and a sense of worth in value in the social context in which they live. But poverty in America not only robs you materially, it robs you of a sense of worth, a sense of dignity because you are shut out, you are isolated from the mainstream of society and you are denied a sense of belonging and a sense of purpose. That's why poverty in America is much more destructive of the values that we believe in than poverty in any place in the world. That is why we need to do something about it. We in the labor movement believe that what we need to do in this country is to make up our minds that there is much work to be done and then work out a list of national priorities in which we put first things first.

And I should like on behalf of my colleagues to suggest to our congressional friends and our friends from the executive branch of the Government some of these priorities. What I am going to say is not new but I am going to try to reemphasize our deep feelings and commitments in respect to these matters. The top priority is what we do about our youth. Because no nation has a future if it continues to neglect its most precious resource and that's the human potential, the potential for maximum growth on the part of our young people. Yet we live in the richest country in the world in which we know that millions of our children are being denied the kind of education that is essential to facilitate their maximum growth and development. When you read that tragic report that Secretary Wirtz had something to do with in his shop, the manpower report, and we learned that 50 percent of our young people are being rejected by the draft board, some for physi-

cal reasons, but mostly because of the lack of adequate education, and when the discrepancy in one State in the North where 3 percent are rejected to 67 percent in the South, the young people are not different. The only thing that is different is the kind of education and the kind of opportunities that they are getting. We in the labor movement believe that every American child, regardless of race or creed or color, should have the kind of education that will facilitate the maximum growth and development. Every child. And the right to limit that should be only as God gave each child the capacity to grow. And that right should not be limited by an overcrowded schoolroom and an underpaid schoolteacher. And this is where we are. Now, no one who sits down objectively and tries to understand or to evaluate the dimensions of our educational needs can really believe that those needs can be met within the limited resources of either the State or the local community and, therefore, we believe Federal aid to education on every level is essential if we are to overcome this tragic deficit in education.

The second item that I would like to emphasize—it's been said that the two measurements of whether a society is good, whether it is worthy and whether it is moral is what it does for its children, and what it does for its older people in the autumn of their lives. We are neglecting our old people. We are denying them that measure of economic security and human dignity that every human being ought to have as a matter of right when he is too old to work and too young to die, during the autumn of his life. And yet we are still debating about whether or not we ought to factor in medical care in our social security system. The Wall Street Journal had a story yesterday in which the insurance companies are now recomputing how many older citizens are covered by their insurance program. We know that there are millions of Americans who are denied the kind of medical care they need because when their medical needs are the greatest, their income is the lowest. And good high quality medical care comes high. And so we believe that this ought to be high in our agenda. And look around the world. You will find that we and Canada are the only two highly industrialized nations in the world on either side of the Iron Curtain that have not provided for a more rational and responsible way of meeting the medical care needs of our aged citizens.

And we've got this third item, the question of equal opportunity and first class citizenship. Negro Americans have waited a hundred years and they are growing impatient. We in the labor movement have not achieved perfection and we have to work hard inside the labor movement to end discrimination wherever it may still exist, but while we are doing that we are going to work as citizens in this great democracy of ours to see that America does its homework. We believe civil rights transcends partisan politics. We believe that civil rights relates to a great moral issue which bears upon the relationship of man to man within the framework of a free society. Now, one of the things that we're going to be privileged to do tonight is to honor two of our friends who worked with great dedication and devotion, and with great human compassion to make possible the civil rights bill out of the House. I refer to those great stalwarts, Congressman CELLER and Congressman MCCULLOCH. They gave us a fine and noble demonstration of bipartisanship leadership that puts principle above party, that puts the country ahead of any political advantage. And I am confident that later in the evening after we have heard our two good friends from the Senate, Senator KUCHEL and Senator HUMPHREY, that working together over in the Senate they will repeat what Congressmen CELLER and MCCULLOCH did in the House of Representatives. We are confident that the Senate will enact that bill essentially as the House passed it. But let us be under no illusions that the civil rights bill will solve the civil rights problem. It's not the end of the road that we must travel. It's but the beginning of a new phase. It will give us new tools. But we must use those tools in every State, in every community. And the real challenge before us is to find a way to take that great national coalition of conscience which is now working together, labor and the churches and the civil rights groups and fraternal organizations and civic groups and mobilize the number of people in that great army of conscience. For when we get these new tools, men of good will will need to join together to use these tools in communities all over the country and only as men of good will of every race and creed and color and political persuasion can join together and search for answers in the light of reason in the spirit of brotherhood, can we meet the problem. For if men of good will fail, then the vacuum created by our failure will be filled by the apostles of hatred and they will search for answers in the dark of night. And reason will yield to riots in the streets and brotherhood will yield to bitterness and bloodshed, and we will tear asunder the fabric of our free society. And, therefore, let us work to get the bill through the Senate but let us work that much harder to use the tools that the bill will give us all through this country. But let us also not delude ourselves into believing that you can solve the civil rights problem in a vacuum or that you can solve the question of education in a vacuum, or any of these other serious economic or social problems. We will find the answers to these problems, we in the labor movement believe, only as we achieve full employment, only as we learn better how to harness the great unused economic potential of this country and relate the abundance of automation to the needs of all people.

In the last 10 years we have wasted 25½ million man-years of potential economic production because of chronic and continuing unemployment. And because we had idle workers, idle productive capacity. We have got what we're told is a boom in the automobile industry. We're chewing up millions of tons of steel and yet the steel industry is operating at 75 percent of its capacity. In 1960, it got below 50 percent, and we had more idle steel capacity in America than the Soviet Union had in total steel capacity. So what we've got to do is to get America's economic potential mobilized and relate that abundance to our unmet basic needs and because we had idle workers and idle capacity and because we failed to achieve adequate economic growth we lost in the last 10 years more than $700 billion in our gross national product. And that $700 billion is both the margin of economic progress in terms of civil rights and housing and education and social security and all the other things we need to do. It is also a margin of survival, I believe, in the contest between freedom and tyranny. Now, we in the labor movement believe that the basic problem is that we have not fully comprehended the dimensions of the technological revolution which is changing the world in which we live. We need 41 million new jobs, we are told by the people who know the most about what's happening. We need 8,000 new jobs every week. But we are not creating those new jobs. There are less full-time jobs in the private profit-making sector of our economy today than there were 10 years ago. This is why we are in trouble. And when you look at what's happening in manufacturing where if you compare 1953 with 1962, production went up 28 percent with 12 percent fewer workers. If you look at the automotive industry and you compare 1947 with 1962, in 1962, 54,000 fewer workers made 4,300,000 more complicated cars and trucks than they did in 1947. And this is happening right across our total economy.

Now, we place the major reliance in our free society upon our free economic system. And we in the labor movement, this is the only free labor movement in the whole world that is committed to a free enterprise economic system. There is no other labor movement in the whole free world, in the Scandinavian countries, in France or England, or Germany or Italy that is committed to the free enterprise system. And while we are committed to it, this does not mean we don't recognize some of its practical limitations. And, therefore, we say that we are for giving the private sector of the economy every possible assistance, every possible encouragement, to create as many new jobs as possible. But after that effort has been made and there remains a serious deficit in employment, it is then the responsibility of the Government to take steps and to pursue programs and policies essential to meet the deficit which the private sector has failed to fill. And this is really the crux of where we are. I believe that only an economic moron believes that the blind forces of the marketplace are adequate to cope with the revolutionary kind of technology and, therefore, we need to think in terms of how does a free society supplement, not eliminate, not curtail but supplement the job creating process which the private sector of our economy is unable to meet.

Now in 1946, our friends in Congress enacted what we know to be called the Employment Act of 1946. It commits this country to policies and programs to achieve and maintain production, employment, and purchasing power. I told friends last year that that bill, and it is still true, is as good as new because it's never been used. And our urging cries for the Congress to get this bill out of the mothballs and put some money and muscle behind it so that we can effectively implement its purposes because we are in deep trouble. The tax bill was an important step in the right direction. The enactment of President Johnson's antipoverty program is another step in the right direction. We would like to urge an accelerated and expanded public works program of at least $2 billion. There is a large shelf of local projects waiting for that money on a matching basis. It will put 400,000 people to work directly and between 300,000 and 400,000 to work indirectly in industries where the materials and the supplies will be manufactured. We ought to expand the housing program. You realize how far we've slipped in the wrong direction? In 1949, Senator Taft, Mister Republican himself, proposed a housing bill for public housing of 135,000 public units a year. Our population is much greater. The need is much more pressing and yet, this last year, we built less than 30,000 public housing units. That's how far we've come in lowering our sights. We are told, that the last 74 months, unemployment has exceeded 5 percent for 74 consecutive months but that's an understatement because that doesn't count the partially employed and those people who got lost in the work force because they became so discouraged after wearing out their shoe leather and their thin tires, and we ask a simple question. Why is it that for 74 consecutive months we have in excess of 5 percent unemployment where, in Great Britain, they have 2½ percent, in Sweden, they have 1½ percent, in France, they have 1.9 percent, in West Germany, they have 1 percent? They don't have any economic magic that we don't have. Why is it that they consistently have done better than we do? It is because they are superior men. The answer is "No." It is because they have understood some things that we have not understood.

First, I think that they have understood the purpose and the role of fiscal policy. They have, I think, shed some ancient myths and embraced the new realities in terms of fiscal policy. They have understood that a balanced economy is more important than a balanced budget and they have recognized that a deficit in jobs is more serious than a deficit in budget. And they have understood the sequence of fiscal priority. They have understood that you first balance job budgets, then family budgets and out of a balanced job budget and balanced family budget, you ultimately can get a balanced Federal budget, but when you reverse it, then you are on an impossible economic treadmill and this is why we had recessions and mass unemployment. I think that one of the great tragedies of this country is that we have been hypnotized and paralyzed by fear words of fiscal irresponsibility. When, as a matter of fact, everybody knows that the size of the budget is a relative, not an absolute, thing. It is how big is the budget measured by the size of our gross national product. And when you measure the budget in 1948 by our gross national product you find it was 74 percent in 1948, while in 1962, it was only 38 percent and what we have been doing is progressively starving the public sector. We spend a smaller percentage of our gross national product for the things that relate to the people's general needs than does any other modern democracy in the world. And this is why we are in trouble in education, in housing, and in these other areas. There is one other thing they have done in these countries and they have done it under conservative governments, Mr. Adenauer in Germany, Mr. de Gaulle in France, Mr. Macmillan and when he led the Tory government in Great Britain, he did it. And our labor friends who are in the governments of Sweden and Norway and Denmark, they do it. They have all understood and recognized one simple fact and that is you can't drive an octane jet-propelled automated economy down the highway of the future by using the rear-view mirror as the windshield. You've got to know where you're going. You've got to know what is going to happen tomorrow and 5 years from now. You have got to project some priorities and you've got to begin to develop a rational and responsible system by which you allocate natural resources to meet those priorities. And if you rely upon the blind forces of the marketplace, you are expecting the marketplace forces to perform functions beyond their capabilities.

Now, the conservative governments of Europe have understood that. They are no less committed to freedom than we are. But freedom also requires a measure of economic realism and social responsibility. The other thing that they have done, and this includes MacMillan and Adenauer and De Gaulle, as well as the Prime Minister of Sweden and Prime Ministers of the other Scandinavian countries that have labor governments. Conservative governments and labor governments alike in all of the democratic nations of Europe have recognized that public planning for people can be made compatible with private planning for profits. And yet we haven't understood that very simple truth. And planning is still a scare word. General Motors does their planning and they do it well. That is why they made $3½ billion last year. You can't make that much unless you plan it. And if you can plan privately to make profit, why can't you have a measure of democratic, rational, responsible public planning for people and make them one compatible with the other? You can. And this country had better catch up. You see, we pride ourselves in America on being pragmatic. We pride ourselves in being nondoctrinaire. And yet we are the most rigid doctrinaire people in the world in the areas of these ancient myths. That's why we get in trouble. I say these things because we feel deeply about these problems. We go to the bargaining table and 90 percent of the problems of the bargaining table are the results of the fact that union after union goes there, it represents two workers but there is only one job and you can't find the kind of magic to solve that problem. And, therefore, this is the problem. This whole question of full employment is one that we feel is the crux of all these other related problems.

So I conclude by saying these are the priorities that we hope Congress will give attention to and that the executive branch of Government will give increased attention to. I say these things with the deep personal conviction that in the great capabilities of our free societies and free institutions of freemen I believe that we in our free system are equal to the challenge that we face in the world. But we are equal only if we mobilize our full human and material potential, not if we go on wasting 25½ million man-hours of valued economic production. I quote, to conclude, the words of Woodrow Wilson because he said these at a time of great stress in the world. Back in 1910, he said these words and I quote, "We live in an age disturbed, confused, afraid of its own force. It is our duty to find ourselves." I share the view with one American that each of us has a high responsibility. It doesn't matter what political party you may belong to or support. This transcends that. But each of us has a high responsibility to help America find itself. Help America achieve what I consider to be a matter of great urgency. First, a greater sense of national urgency so that we can get on with the job, and, secondly, a stronger sense of national unity and finally, and perhaps most important of all, a deeper sense of national purpose. What is the purpose of a free society? It is not economic activity, it is not the creation of greater and greater material wealth. It is not breaking through new frontiers of technological progress. These are but tools related to the central purpose of human society, to the enrichment of human life, to build the world community in which every human being can live his life and achieve in his own way and in his own capabilities the maximum sense of self-fulfillment.

RAILROAD SETTLEMENT

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join the distinguished majority leader and the chairman of my Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in commending the President for his work in the settlement of the labor dispute with the railroad industry.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's announcement of the settlement of the railroad work rules dispute is a milestone in his career of accomplishments. The President's success offers further proof of his skill as a mediator and statesman, a reputation he earned long ago with his distinguished service as majority leader in the Senate.

Evidence of the President's success is seen in the statements made by both union and management representatives praising his handling of the dispute, and signaling a new era of cooperation not only in the rail industry but throughout the free enterprise system.

It is significant to note that the dispute has spanned two previous administrations, and attempts to settle it had not met with the same success as we now have. Thus President Johnson's achievement assumes additional note.

The reaction across the Nation has begun, and I would hope all Members on both sides of the aisle would match statesmanship with statesmanship by joining both sides of the railroad industry in extending congratulations to the President for his fine efforts.

OUTLAWING PRAYER IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the arguments most often heard in support of the Supreme Court decision outlawing prayer in the public schools is that the uplift of religion is best experienced in church and at home. There is merit in the argument. But, unfortunately, in this materialistic age there are too many children whose parents, largely through indifference or laziness, or both, neither instruct them in religion at home nor see to it that they attend church. To these children, the inspiration, the enlightenment, and the comfort of prayer and Bible reading is totally lost now that even a brief exposure to the lessons of religion is denied them by law.

Yet the plight of these children, though tragic, is but one of many arguments in favor of putting God back in the public schools. What principles are threatened by brief exercises that enrich young people spiritually and strengthen their moral values? How can prayer and Bible reading violate the clause concerning the establishment of religion when they are neither sectarian nor compulsory?

It is apparent, too, from our history that the Founding Fathers had no thought of excluding all religious content from public life. If we ban the recitation of the Lord's Prayer and the reading of the Bible, we deny our children their right to share in the spiritual heritage of their country.

To begin each morning on a note of uplift gives our children a brighter, more hopeful outlook on the challenges of the day, and also imparts to them moral lessons which only the Bible holds. A reading each day is a continuous spiritual inspiration.

Further, since the Bible is read without comment, and pupils are given a choice of the King James or Douay version, the simple reading of a passage is not a sectarian exercise and, since students also may be excused for reasons of conscience, religious freedom is preserved. I feel, too, that the vast majority of Americans are firmly in favor of prayer and Bible reading in the public schools, and that

in persuading the Supreme Court to ban these traditional exercises, a minority has infringed on the freedom of the majority.

But there is even a more urgent argument. Today, the forces of atheistic communism are on the rise the world over; Christianity is battling for its life in the war of ideas. The word of God is our principal weapon in this mortal struggle; should we not keep it before our children—who will fight this battle—every day?

It is for these reasons that I have introduced House Joint Resolution 534, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the voluntary offering of prayers and reading of the Bible in public schools of the United States.

SETTLEMENT OF RAILROAD DISPUTE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, congratulations are in order today to President Johnson, Secretary Wertz, and to railroad management and to the union leadership for their efforts in getting together and solving the threatened railroad strike by collective bargaining. I think everybody in the United States is thankful that this matter was worked out without being referred to the Congress where we would have been asked to legislate rather than arbitrate.

I believe this showed that the American free enterprise system can work and collective bargaining can work when there is good faith on both sides and when they get down to real, hard, tough negotiating.

The President deserves a great deal of credit for his faith in this system and for his part in bringing these two sides together and in helping to achieve a solution after more than 4 years of stalemate.

SCHOOL PRAYER PROPOSALS

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has, through the years, ably interpreted the revered words of the Constitution in such fashion as to reflect the crystallization of public opinion at a given point in time. Perhaps this is a tribute to the foresight of our Founding Fathers; perhaps it is a virtue to which the jurists have aspired through attuning their ears to prevailing sentiment. Be that as it may, it would appear that we have arrived at a juncture, a sort of crossroads in history, a point that seems to prevent the Court from interpreting the Constitution in a fashion which reflects public sentiment.

It would be presumptuous of me at this late date to remind the committee of the public furor occasioned by the Court's decision in the Engel case—1962—concerning the New York State Board of Regents' introduction of a voluntary nonsectarian opening for the schoolday; however, it is well to bear in mind that the decision was limited to the prayer quoted in full as follows:

> Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessing upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country.

The opinions of a divided Court turned upon the establishment clause and the free exercise clause of the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States, as adopted in 1789:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

While the Engel prayer decision did not relate to Bible reading, great public concern has arisen that the Court may well have eliminated all reference to religion in our schools and mention of a Supreme Being within the sound of youthful ears.

The observations of participating Justices in the Engel case and subsequent decisions eloquently describe the historical issues involved:

> Justice Brennan: "The use of prayers and Bible readings at the opening of school long antedates the founding of our Republic."
>
> Justice Stewart: "To deny the wish of these schoolchildren to join in reciting this prayer is to deny them the opportunity of sharing in the spiritual heritage of our Nation."
>
> Justice Goldberg: "Government must inevitably take cognizance of the existence of religion, and indeed, under certain circumstances the first amendment may require that it do so."
>
> Justice Clark: "Less than 3 percent profess no religion whatever."
>
> Justice Brennan: "Not every involvement of religion in public life violates the establishment clause."
>
> Justice Stewart: "Accommodation of religious differences on the part of the State, however, is not only permitted but required by that same Constitution. The choice involved, however, is one for each local community."

Are we then to enforce a ban on such vestiges of democracy as the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance, the Declaration of Independence, the singing of "America," the offering of a benediction at public functions, the opening of court or in Congress itself, merely because dissidents may choose to attack them at some future date?

The Communists' avowal by Soviet Premier Khrushchev that: "If you give me your youth of today, I will conquer you in a single decade," makes it especially difficult for me to follow the suggestion of Justice Brennan: "Legislators, Federal and State, are mature individuals, who may presumably absent themselves from such public and ceremonial exercises without incurring any penalty."

Since its beginning, our Nation's citizenry has been made up of a variety of races and religions. The several crises which history has presented, however, have minimized the differences of systems of worship and proven that the moral strength of our democracy is based on an overall devout faith in a Supreme Being. For these reasons, I believe it imperative that Congress take appropriate action on the several resolutions providing for a constitutional amendment to rectify the present paradox.

SETTLEMENT OF THE RAILROAD DISPUTE

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I join with some of my colleagues in commenting on the successful negotiation and the final settlement of the railroad dispute which has plagued this Nation for nearly 5 years. The President of course should be complimented for whatever part he has played in this—in lending the good offices of the White House, which belong to the American people, to the settlement of this dispute.

I believe that equal commendation should go to the American Association of Railroads and to the five operating brotherhoods which were involved in settlement of this dispute.

I feel certain that all Americans are happy that this dispute has finally been resolved subject to approval by members of the unions, and I believe that proper credit should go to all parties involved.

There is one disturbing factor in regard to this, however, which I believe should be brought to the attention of the American people. I refer to whether we have seen a precedent set whereby all or almost all of the labor disputes which go on for any period of time ultimately will be expected to be taken to the White House for a final disposition. There are too many disputes of this nature to load down the executive branch and the White House, if that is what is to be expected.

Although we are all in favor of a solution to these problems by free collective bargaining, I hope that no precedent has been set so that management, or the brotherhoods, or labor unions will expect the White House to solve all their differences.

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS ON URBAN RENEWAL BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I strongly commend for consideration by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle

the March 3, 1964, compilation of General Accounting Office findings and recommendations for improving Government operations in slum clearance and urban renewal for fiscal year 1963. These should prove very useful in evaluating any housing legislation coming to the floor this year.

It is the feeling of the minority members of the House Special Housing Subcommittee that our bills, H.R. 9771, H.R. 9772, H.R. 9785, and H.R. 10277, will alleviate the problems described by the Comptroller General of the United States. A section-by-section analysis of these measures appears on page 7363 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 20, 1964.

I include the findings and recommendations of the Comptroller General of the United States at this point in my remarks:

REVIEW OF SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL ACTIVITIES

During fiscal year 1963, we continued to review selected activities under the slum clearance and urban renewal programs administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency (HHFA) and by the Urban Renewal Administration (URA), a constitutent unit of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Local public agencies (LPA's) administer the programs in each locality.

The cost of the slum clearance and urban renewal programs is shared by the Federal and State or local governments. The Federal Government's share is generally two-thirds but, under certain circumstances, is three-fourths. The State or local government may contribute its share of net project cost in the form of cash or noncash local grants-in-aid, such as donations of land, installation of streets and utilities, and construction of schools, recreation areas, and parking facilities. A proper evaluation of local grants-in-aid is important because excessive credits and credits for ineligible grants-in-aid result in additional costs to the Federal Government. Also, excessive costs incurred in acquiring land for a project, in acquiring buildings or residences to be demolished, or in demolishing buildings unnecessarily, adds to the Federal Government's share of the cost.

131. HHFA repeatedly recertified cities' programs for eliminating and preventing slums and blight although no appreciable progress had been made in correcting program deficiencies: A regional office of the Housing and Home Finance Agency repeatedly recommended that the Administrator, HHFA, recertify workable programs for eliminating and preventing slums and blight and such programs were recertified even though they were seriously deficient and the cities had shown no appreciable progress toward correcting the deficiencies. The Housing Act of 1949, as amended, requires that, as a prerequisite to the receipt of Federal financial assistance for certain housing programs, a community must present a workable program to the Administrator, HHFA. These programs must be certified and then be recertified periodically by the Administrator. The programs recommended for recertification contained evidence of uncorrected weaknesses in substance and enforcement of codes and ordinances and in relocating families displaced by governmental action. We also found that regional office officials had neither budgeted funds for nor made visits to the communities whose programs they had reviewed.

In a report issued in December 1962, we expressed the view that recertification of programs under such circumstances was not consistent with the objectives of urban renewal legislation because the cities were not required to provide the means of preventing the spread or recurrence of slums and blight. We suggested that the Administrator, HHFA, require more meaningful evaluations of all elements of the cities' programs and that recertification be withheld if the cities do not make progress in meeting program goals. We suggested also that the Administrator require that field visits be made by the regional office program staff. The Administrator informed us that the Agency endorsed these suggestions and was employing and would continue to employ every means for carrying them out.

132. Need for uniform standards in evaluating communities' housing codes and ordinances: A regional administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency accepted a city's housing code as being satisfactory in meeting a condition to a loan and grant contract although the code was ineffective because its provisions were not made applicable to properties existing at the date the code was adopted. Inasmuch as all existing properties were exempt from the provisions of the code, the code did not provide a means of eliminating or preventing slums and blight in neighborhoods in existence when the code was enacted.

In our report issued in December 1962 on our review of selected phases of community programs for eliminating and preventing slums and blight, we expressed the belief that the Congress intended that the problem of slums and blight be approached on a communitywide basis—rather than on a project basis—and that HHFA's approval of housing codes containing recognized significant deficiencies indicated that there was a need for uniform HHFA standards in evaluating communities' codes and ordinances. We expressed the belief also that the intent of the urban renewal legislation necessitates that an HHFA evaluation be made, as a requisite for executing loan and grant contracts, of the extent to which local communities have adopted codes. Accordingly, we recommended that the Administrator establish minimum standards for use by regional officials in evaluating the adequacy of housing codes and that these standards be applied uniformly by all HHFA operating groups.

133. Federal financial assistance should not be extended to cities not making reasonable progress in correcting significant deficiencies in their programs for eliminating and preventing slums and blight: An HHFA regional office executed a planning and survey contract with a city without reevaluating the city's seriously deficient program for eliminating and preventing slums and blight. We expressed the view that the execution of this contract negated HHFA and congressional requirements that Federal financial assistance be extended to only those communities that utilize their own resources to combat, on a communitywide basis, the problem of slums and blight. We proposed that a city's progress in correcting recognized significant deficiencies in its program be considered by HHFA before executing a contract with a city.

The Administrator stated that our suggestion would require an unnecessarily burdensome administrative operation. However, we believe that the adoption of our proposal is essential to an effective administration of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, and, if applied to only those cities that have recognized any significant program deficiencies, should not unduly burden the HHFA regional office staff. Accordingly, we recommended that, prior to entering into a contract with a city whose program contains recognized significant deficiencies, the Administrator, HHFA, require that an evaluation be made of the city's progress in correcting the deficiencies. We expressed the view that, in the absence of reasonable progress, additional Federal financial assistance should not be extended to the city.

134. Need for improved administration of the relocation phase of programs for eliminating and preventing slums and blight: The Housing and Home Finance Agency's procedures and practices were not adequate to provide reasonable assurance that cities could provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for displaced families, as intended by section 105(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. The procedures did not require cities to present specific plans for relocating displaced families. In certain cities whose programs had been certified and recertified as acceptable by the Administrator, HHFA, families displaced by slum clearance projects were relocated permanently into substandard housing.

We found that there was a need for effective coordination between the regional office staff dealing with the relocation of displaced families under the slum clearance and urban renewal program and the staff dealing with the relocation of displaced families under the programs for eliminating and preventing slums and blight. We expressed the belief that a major factor contributing to the lack of coordination was a tendency of HHFA operating officials to consider the requirements of the Housing Act relating to programs for eliminating and preventing slums and blight as being separate and distinct from the urban renewal requirements of the act. As a result, separate objectives and criteria were established for implementing the act, and coordination between operating staffs was deficient.

The Administrator, HHFA, agreed that there was a need for effective coordination, and outlined several actions taken in this regard. He emphasized, however, that he considered the provisions of the act relating to a community's continuing plan to be separate and distinct from the urban renewal provisions of the act. Nevertheless, we believe that these provisions must be applied in a coordinated and consistent manner in order to effectively fulfill the requirements of the entire act.

We recommended that the Administrator require that HHFA procedures be revised to provide that, as a prerequisite to certification and recertification of a city's program, the city must demonstrate that it has determined its need for and the supply of decent, safe, and sanitary relocation housing for displaced families. We recommended also that the Administrator require that certification or recertification of the programs be withheld from cities that have demonstrated an inability to make available such relocation housing.

135. Revisions made to eliminate ineligible and excessive costs from noncash grant-in-aid credits: The Urban Renewal Administration had tentatively allowed noncash grant-in-aid credits amounting to about $4.7 million for five schools to be provided in connection with certain urban renewal projects. We pointed out that four of these schools did not appear to be eligible as noncash grants-in-aid because the urban renewal areas involved were not expected to receive the required minimum of 10 percent benefit from the schools and that the amount of credit for the fifth school was excessive. We recommended that URA reduce the grant-in-aid credits allowed for these five schools by $4.2 million. By December 1962 URA had reduced these credits by about $3.4 million.

136. Regulations for use in evaluating the adequacy of relocation programs submitted by LPA's revised: In June 1961 we pointed out that the Urban Rewal Administration had not received adequate evidence that sufficient standard housing would become available for displaced nonwhite families in an urban renewal project which was estimated to cost the Federal Government $10.6 million. We

pointed out also that, at the time of our review, about 40 percent of the nonwhite families relocated had moved into substandard housing which had been classified by the local public agency as permanent relocation housing, indicating that the LPA considered that it had discharged its responsibilities with respect to the relocation of these families. We expressed the view that inadequate relocations of project families decreased the effectiveness of the projects and was not in conformity with the objectives of the slum clearance and urban renewal program and we proposed that no further projects be authorized by the Commissioner, URA, unless URA receives adequate evidence from the local public agencies that sufficient standard housing will become available for relocating all project families.

In February 1963 the Administrator, HHFA, revised the regulations to provide specific guidelines for use in evaluating the adequacy of relocation programs submitted by LPA's and to provide that no recommendation for approval of a relocation program shall be submitted to the Administrator unless there is reasonable assurance that the relocation requirements will be met.

137. Need for effective review of claims for noncash grant-in-aid credits: We reported in October 1962 that a regional office of the Housing and Home Finance Agency had not effectively reviewed the data submitted by local public agencies in support of claims for noncash grant-in-aid credits. We expressed the opinion that certain cited ineligible and excessive grant-in-aid credits were attributable in considerable part to the lack of effective reviews.

The Commissioner, URA, informed us that he did not consider it necessary to verify data submitted by LPA's in support of claims for tentative grant-in-aid credits and that the development of written procedures for the various types of verifications of noncash grant-in-aid claims is impracticable. Nevertheless, we reaffirmed our belief that the large amounts of excessive noncash grant-in-aid credits cited in our report pointed up the need for effective examinations based on written procedures, and we recommended that the Commissioner, URA, establish such procedures.

138. Need for procedures to preclude the improvement of properties in areas designated for slum clearance: The costs of acquiring certain residential properties in an urban renewal project area were increased because extensive alterations had been made to the properties after the area had been designated as a slum clearance and urban renewal project area. Since the cost of acquiring project land is included in project costs of which the Federal Government generally bears two-thirds, any increases in land prices attributable to such alterations would be largely borne by the Federal Government.

In a report issued in October 1962 we recommended that, in the future, the Commissioner, URA, not approve an LPA's planning application for a project unless the governing body of the locality has made provision to (1) prohibit the issuance of permits, subsequent to the designation of the project area, for the improvement of properties which are to be acquired and demolished and (2) revoke any existing permits authorizing improvements which have not been started and which involve properties intended for acquisition and demolition. Such provision would not preclude normal repair work or minor improvements which are determined to be necessary to avoid undue hardships to owners or occupants of the property, nor would it affect improvements related to the rehabilitation program. We also recommend that, after the preceding recommended procedures become effective, URA disallow any increased land acquisition costs resulting from the issuance of permits or the failure to effect timely revocation of permits for the improvement of properties intended for clearance.

139. Need to establish clearly defined policies, responsibilities, and criteria governing the eligibility of areas for large-scale demolition: The Urban Renewal Administration approved Federal grants of over $10 million and Federal loans of over $33 million for large-scale demolition in an urban renewal project without making an adequate examination of the structural condition of the buildings in the project area to verify that the extent of clearance proposed by the municipality was warranted. We pointed out that URA's approval of the project had been based on building inspection reports, submitted by the city to an HHFA regional office, which classified 71 percent of the existing buildings in the project area as "substandard" because of what the city considered to be serious building deficiencies. The Agencys' records indicated that HHFA regional office personnel had not inspected the interiors of any of the buildings in the project area prior to the time URA authorized Federal assistance for the project. A detailed reinspection made at our request by an HHFA specialist then showed that only about 20 percent of the buildings in the project area were substandard because of building deficiencies which could not be corrected by normal maintenance.

We expressed the belief that since demolition is generally the most expensive form of urban renewal treatment, and the intent of the urban renewal legislation is to encourage less costly forms of urban renewal treatment such as rehabilitation and spot clearance, URA should have fully investigated whether the extent of demolition proposed by the city was warranted. We expressed the view that the basic cause for the premature approval of the project for large-scale demolition was URA's vague criteria for determining whether buildings are substandard to a degree requiring clearance. Under URA's criteria, as applied to the project, a city might, with URA approval, designate any of its buildings as "substandard" and schedule such buildings for demolition, even though far less costly methods of renewal might accomplish the objectives of the urban renewal legislation. In a report issued in June 1963, we recommended that the Administrator, HHFA, and the Commissioner, URA, take the necessary steps to revise the criteria governing the eligibility of areas for large-scale demolition to more clearly define the condition "substandard requiring clearance" and to relate this condition solely to the structural condition of the specific buildings being considered.

We recommend also that steps be taken to clarify the criteria for Federal participation in proposed large-scale demolition to provide that, if an area does not have a significant number of structurally substandard buildings, expenditure of Federal funds shall be limited to other feasible but less costly forms of urban renewal such as rehabilitation and spot clearance. In addition, we recommended that HHFA and URA (1) obtain more effective administration, at all levels, of URA's established policy that the Government will not share in the cost of acquiring and demolishing properties which can be improved and successfully integrated into a project, and (2) require thorough examinations by qualified HHFA personnel of the condition of structures in proposed project areas before such areas are approved for large-scale demolition. With respect to the cited urban renewal project, we recommended that a review be made of the proposed demolition of buildings in the project with the view toward retaining those buildings that could be successfully integrated into the project.

In addition, we proposed that URA advise the city of the desirability for establishing reasonable classifications for the buildings in another project in the same area inasmuch as a large percentage of the buildings in this project also had been classified as substandard and hence are subject to demolition. The Commissioner, URA, agreed that there may be a need for modification of the classification system used by that city and stated that the city would be required to make the necessary modifications with respect to this second project and all future projects.

REVIEW OF LOW-RENT HOUSING PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

The Public Housing Administration (PHA), a constituent agency of the Housing and Home Finance Agency (HHFA), is responsible under the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1401) for administering the low-rent housing program. PHA provides financial and technical assistance to local housing authorities (LHA's) in the planning, construction, and operation of the projects for families of low income. Federal contributions to the LHA's are increased to the extent that the LHA's make unnecessary expenditures or do not realize all possible revenue.

140. Action taken to preclude installation of unnecessary equipment for measuring consumption of electricity and gas: In June 1963 we reported on our review of the installation of unnecessary check-metering equipment for measuring consumption of electricity and gas by tenants in low-rent public housing projects. This review disclosed that, because of a PHA requirement that check-metering equipment be installed at all low-rent public housing projects, such equipment had been installed for thousands of dwelling units in projects where metering and surcharging for excess use of utilities either was prohibited by utility regulations or was opposed by LHA management. After we reported this situation, the PHA Commissioner issued instructions providing that check-metering equipment not be installed in new low-rent housing projects unless there is a reasonable probability the equipment will be used. In addition, check-metering equipment, which was to have been installed, was omitted from about 9,000 dwelling units under development or authorized for future construction in one PHA region. This reduced the development costs of these projects by about $225,000. No estimate is available of the effect of PHA's action on the development costs in areas administered by other PHA regional offices.

141. Limitations established on LHA expenditures for participation in housing organization activities: In December 1962 we reported that the Public Housing Administration had no regulations, guidelines, or limitations on the amounts or types of expenses for participating in the activities of private nonprofit housing organizations that the LHA's could charge to their federally subsidized low-rent housing projects. After reviewing the expenditures of 31 LHA's, we estimated that the total amount charged to the low-rent housing projects for participation in housing organization activities generally exceeds $560,000 a year.

We suggested that consideration be given to establishing policies for the LHA's guidance regarding the types and limitations on the amounts of such expenditures that may be charged to the projects. We were informed that in March 1963 PHA established limitations on travel expenses and now requires attendance at conferences to be limited to the number of officials necessary to adequately cover the meetings. HHFA also established consistency between the policies of the Public Housing Administration and the Urban Renewal Administration which also administers federally subsidized programs through local agencies that participate in housing organization activities.

142. Need for regulation to require insurance to be purchased at lowest available cost: Our reviews disclosed that some local

housing authorities had purchased fire and extended coverage insurance at costs in excess of the lowest net costs available with the result that the Federal subsidies may have been increased. These purchases were permitted by Public Housing Administration policies, which allowed the LHA's to negotiate for their insurance coverage provided that the costs obtained through negotiation were reasonably within range (not more than 25 percent in excess) of the lowest net cost known to be available from any other financially sound and responsible insurer licensed to do business in the State.

We believe that insurance in the low-rent housing program should be purchased at the lowest possible net cost and we had recommended that PHA revise its regulations to provide that (1) contracts for insurance be awarded to qualified low bidders and (2) after an LHA receives competitive bids, the negotiation procedure be invoked only when it will result in a lower premium cost. PHA did not revise its regulations, and some LHA's had awarded new contracts for insurance to other than qualified low bidders. Accordingly, in a report issued in August 1962, we restated our opinion that insurance in the low-rent housing program should be purchased at the lowest possible cost in order to reduce the amount of Federal subsidy to the program.

143. Need for guidelines for determining which families are in the lowest income group: In a report issued in April 1963, we pointed out that families with relatively high incomes were occupying units in low-rent housing. This condition was permitted to exist because a number of LHA's, with PHA approval, had established eligibility policies which permitted occupancy by families with total incomes greater than the median family incomes in their communities.

Some of these policies provided for such liberal deductions and exemptions from income that families with total incomes greater than the median family incomes were considered eligible to reside in the projects; others provided for maximum income limits greater than the median family incomes. Since the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 requires that occupancy of low-rent housing be limited to families in the lowest income group, it would seem that, except in unusual circumstances, a family with total income greater than the median family income in the community should not be considered as a family in the lowest income group so as to be eligible to occupy low-rent housing.

The act does not specifically state which families are in the lowest income group, and PHA has not established adequate criteria for the LHA's to use in making a determination. We believe that PHA has a continuing responsibility for providing the LHA's with guidelines for maintaining the low-income character of the projects. Accordingly, we recommended that the PHA Commissioner establish guidelines for use by the LHA's in determining which families are in the lowest income group in order to maintain the low-income character of the projects.

144. Need to eliminate incentive for families with relatively high incomes to remain in low-rent housing: In our April 1963 report, we pointed out that some LHA's had established low-rent ceilings which provided incentives for families with relatively high incomes to continue living in the projects instead of seeking private housing. At several LHA's the rent ceilings were so low that families with relatively high total incomes paid a much smaller proportion of their incomes for rent than other tenants in the project. In one instance, a tenant with total annual income of about $11,000 was charged the ceiling rent of $61.50 a month for his four-bedroom unit.

We pointed out also that some LHA's were charging ceiling rents to families whose income had increased beyond the maximum income limit for continued occupancy. We believe this practice is contrary to the provision of the 1961 amendment to the Housing Act which provides that a family whose income has increased beyond the approved maximum income limit for continued occupancy may be permitted to remain in a project if it pays an increased rent consistent with the family's increased income.

In order to carry out the objectives of the act, one of which is the housing of families in the lowest income group, we recommended that the PHA Commissioner instruct the PHA regional directors to make periodic reviews of LHA rent schedules to assure that the rent ceilings do not provide an incentive for families with relatively high incomes to remain in the low-rent housing projects instead of seeking private housing.

145. Need to consider assets in determining eligibility for occupancy of low-rent housing: In our April 1963 report we also pointed out that some families were permitted to live in low-rent housing projects although they appeared to have sufficient assets to afford private housing. The United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, does not specifically require that a family's assets be considered in determining eligibility. PHA encourages but does not require the LHA's to place limitations on the assets that applicants and tenants may have and still be considered eligible for occupancy.

In commenting on our report, the PHA Commissioner stated that PHA has not required the LHA's to establish asset limitations because it believes such action would be pointless unless PHA has the right to approve them. Accordingly, we recommended that the Congress consider amending the United States Housing Act of 1937 to provide that PHA require the LHA's to establish limitations, subject to PHA approval, on the amount of assets that may be owned by a family that is to be considered eligible for admission to and continued occupancy of low-rent public housing.

THE SPECIAL HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE SHOULD INVESTIGATE JUST WHAT IS GOING ON IN CLEVELAND UNDER URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, this past fall the Special Housing Subcommittee held 2 weeks of hearings on urban renewal, including a review of the criticism by the General Accounting Office of activities surrounding the proposed Erieview project in Cleveland, Ohio. At the time, I urged a trip to Cleveland to look firsthand at the developments in question, and was assured by the chairman that such a trip could and would be undertaken. The fact that this trip has been postponed a number of times from tentative scheduled dates is, I am sure, not due in any way to a lack of interest or sincerity on the part of my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS]. Congressional business has simply not allowed the time for it.

In my opinion, however, the need for such a thorough investigation is even more imperative now than before. Last fall we had no housing bill before us for deliberation; this spring we do, and we need an acquaintance with the facts in the field before, not after, any executive session of the committee on housing legislation. Last fall, we were only concerning ourselves with the criticism of the General Accounting Office with respect to one project, Erieview, which we were assured would still receive the overwhelming support of the citizens of Cleveland in a forthcoming vote on a bond issue for the continuation of the project. This spring, we know that the bond issue not only did not receive the two-thirds support claimed for it, but actually had a majority of the citizenry voting against it.

What is more important, in terms of the needs for a complete investigation, is that there are six other urban renewal projects in Cleveland. These projects, individually, could all use a thorough review. I am convinced, moreover, from even the cursory examination of the facts available to us on paper and in press reports, that the overall urban renewal program of the city of Cleveland must be looked at in the composite, and and needs a complete airing. I believe the committee should hear from those still living in slums, and learn about projects that have defaulted or been salvaged through extraordinary measures. I believe we should know the opinions of local real estate people, office building and apartment owners, tenants in rent strike areas, private developers who have had to sit on the sidelines—in general, the people whose views have been too long neglected in congressional surveys of the urban renewal process. And I think that Cleveland is the place to start.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you an example of what I mean by the need to hear from those people other than the city and Federal officials we have already listened to, and what I mean by the need to go out into the field to see the facts as they really are in their entirety. When Mayor Ralph S. Locher of Cleveland appeared before the Special Housing Subcommittee on October 24, 1963, he told us that Cleveland had attacked the problem of slums first, beginning in 1954. He said:

> From this program came Longwood—Garden Valley—and the St. Vincent charity projects, which have already removed 350 acres of the worst slum conditions in our city and put in these locations, alone, over 1,300 rental apartments financed under section 221(d); offered land for the inclusion of 500 units of public housing so that in these rebuilt portions of the city, families living in public housing are not physically separated from families of higher income—new shopping centers, new churches, sites for new schools, new hospitals, new community colleges to provide greater opportunity for higher education, new community-wide service centers like the Boy Scouts and the Salvation Army.

Mayor Locher then went on to justify the change from emphasis on residential renewal, the principal and priority purpose of the Housing Act of 1949, to urban renewal projects concentrating on com-

mercial and industrial development. He said:

From 1953 to 1959, Cleveland had sufficiently stemmed the spread of further blight by financial assistance from the Federal Government under title I and unassisted rehabilitation programs—and by 1959 the housing supply had been increased to the point of matching the need—that the city of Cleveland could turn its community attention to its central business district.

Then when the Urban Renewal Commissioner, William L. Slayton, appeared before the Committee on November 21, 1963, he addressed himself to the Cleveland situation. It might be appropriate to note at this point, that although Mr. Slayton severed all ties with his former employers when he became Commissioner in 1961, he was directly involved in the planning of the Erieview project. In answer to one of my questions referring to the apparent emphasis on commercial rather than residential renewal in Cleveland, Mr. Slayton had this to say:

I think you will have to take a look at the Cleveland program as a whole, and if you go to Cleveland you can take a look at it. The Cleveland program has had considerable to do with housing conditions within the city, and their projects primarily have been concerned with housing conditions.

I am in hearty agreement with Mr. Slayton that we must look at the Cleveland urban renewal program as a whole, and that we could do so if the subcommittee were to go to Cleveland as he suggests. However, I think the record should be set as straight as possible, with the limited facts at our disposal here in Washington, as to the actual nature and condition of the Cleveland urban renewal effort.

Besides Erieview, a massive renewal project for commercial downtown involving 4,700,000 square feet of office space, and 5,500 units of luxury apartments, there are six projects underway or completed in the city of Cleveland. The one completed, Longwood, actually began in the planning stage in September of 1950, contrary to the 1954 date supplied by the mayor as the starting point for renewal efforts in the city. Its plans were completed in 1954, but the project itself was not considered complete until 1961. Within the project lie 828 units of lower middle income housing under the 221(d) program. This is one of the two projects in the country which have been involved in modification agreements in order to save the project, according to information supplied me in a letter from the Housing and Home Finance Administrator dated March 11, 1964. I would think that on our trip to Cleveland we might want to look into the present status of the project, why it was forced to resort to a modification agreement, and why the whole Longwood project took 11 years to complete.

The second project begun in Cleveland was the St. Vincent's Center, involving the displacement of some 1,640 Negro families and 184 white families. This project's planning was begun in September 1953, and only completed 6 years later in 1959, and the project itself is incomplete to date. Apparently the 11-year record of Longwood is about to be broken. At the hearings in November, I asked Mr. Slayton about the status of the project, originally intended as a major residential project, since there had been some controversy in Cleveland itself over the status of the project. He supplied the following reply for the record:

The city has experienced some difficulty in disposing of the land designated for residential reuse and we understand that it is presently considering changing the plan to permit disposition to a college for development as a campus. Any such change would require official amendment of the plan and approval by the Urban Renewal Administration. No proposed plan amendment has as yet been received by the URA.

I think on our trip to Cleveland, we ought to look into the present status of this project to see what campus is to be located there; why in the space of 11 years no one could find any residential developers; and what has happened to the families forced to move from the cleared areas.

The next project started in Cleveland was the Garden Valley project, in 1955. This involves an area of primarily open space, and a contract was entered into between the city and the Federal Government within a year and a half from the time planning began. Since there were already two other projects underway, for the same residential purpose, it might be interesting to find out why a third was started so quickly and easily. In any event, Garden Valley is the home of another 221(d) project, although that project did not start out that way. Instead, it started out as a normal 220 project, ran into financial difficulties, low rental occupancy rates and was bailed out by switching to the 221(d) program. Unfortunately, it went into default last fall anyway. The project consists of 398 units. I think it is worth the while of the committee to explore the reasons for its default, its low occupancy rate, the bursting of an inadequate sewer, the lack of an access road and other improvements promised by the city, and the problems facing the present tenants and those who were forced to move out due to the conditions of the project.

You will recall that these are the three projects pointed to with such pride by the mayor of the city of Cleveland in testimony to the House Special Housing Subcommittee, and upon which he relied to prove his claim that by 1959 Cleveland had taken care of its housing needs and could move on to commercial renewal in Erieview. None of these were completed in 1959; only one is now. One project is under consideration for a possible switch in status from residential to a college campus because of no takers in the residential development status. As for the other two, you will recall that Mayor Locher specifically mentioned the 1,300 units of 221(d) housing, again as proof that housing needs had been taken care of by 1959. In the first place, the program did not come into existence until the 1961 Housing Act—and from the looks of the program in Cleveland it probably should have been overlooked that year, too. In any event, the 1,314 units now either in default or subject to a modification agreement form the basis for Mayor Locher's statement that Cleveland could move on to the higher and more profitable things like downtown commercial renewal.

The saga of Cleveland, Ohio, is not complete, however. In December of 1956, planning began on the East Woodland project, planning was completed in 1960, and the contract between the city and the Federal Government was signed in that year. East Woodland began as a residential project, despite the warning of the Federal Housing Administration under the Eisenhower Administration that it was a poor environment for new housing. The commercial and industrial land in the area was bought up and cleared, a program still in its final stages today. Some fifty homes in the area were encouraged to stay on if they would rehabilitate themselves, and considerable work has since gone into many of these homes. The city fathers, however, have now decided to change the purpose of this project from residential to commercial, remove the rehabilitated homes, and try to put back the commercial establishments they moved out in the first place. I detailed this whole chaotic mess in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 26, 1964, on page A1583, through newspaper articles, and an editorial.

Since my comments, officials have admitted their mistake, 8 years later. They are now trying to justify the change and the mistake, however, according to newspaper reports from the Cleveland papers which I will include at the end of my remarks. Cleveland's Urban Renewal Director, James M. Lister, I understand, has prepared an answer to my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the request of Commissioner Slayton. In it he has written that shortly after the adoption of the East Woodland plan, in June of 1960 "a change in the housing market began to occur in Cleveland, which has become more and more intensified. There is now an ever-increasing supply of housing available at almost any rental level."

He continues:

It is only logical, therefore, that serious consideration must be given in the East Woodland project to a reevaluation of whether the proposed reuse is in reality a realistic one.

The change in the housing market Mr. Lister refers to, undoubtedly includes the efforts to start Erieview I. According to figures I have received from the Urban Renewal Administration, Erieview I began its planning in December of 1960, finished its planning in January 1961, and signed a contract between the local public agency and the Federal Government on March 3, 1961. Considering the length of time for other projects, and the expectation of 18 months for planning indicated by Federal brochures on the subject, this 3-month period for a project as complex as Erieview I must set some sort of a record. Some planning of a general nature for the commercial downtown section had begun beforehand, and there is a technique used by the Urban Renewal Administration to pay for prior expenditures if there is prior acquiescence to this effort. I would be interested, as I am sure the committee would be, in this strange coincidence of

dates between the start of Erieview and the change in the housing market that Mr. Lister now sees in retrospect, forcing the change in the status of East Woodland.

There is another interesting angle to the East Woodland story. By changing the project purpose, Cleveland now gets an industrial and commercial redevelopment project, with the Federal Government paying three-quarters instead of only two-thirds of the cost. This is so because Cleveland has now been declared a high unemployment area under the Area Redevelopment Act, a change in status which itself is an interesting labor market move by the Department of Labor.

Two more interesting developments deserve the attention of the Special Housing Committee:

First. Mr. Lister has discouraged a plan by a local redeveloper to provide housing for at least 70 persons now living in the East Woodland area or who want to move back in on an 8- to 10-acre tract on one edge of the 36.4-acre area.

Second. According to the Cleveland Press of April 4, 1964, there appears little doubt that the change in status will be acceptable to the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Urban Renewal Administration. The paper states:

> The Federal Government urged the change because of difficulties with similar developments elsewhere.

I think the committee should be informed, as it was not informed at the recent set of hearings on housing legislation, as to what "similar difficulties" have been encountered, where they have been encountered, and why.

Despite the fact that the urban renewal director for the city of Cleveland has told us that housing in all income categories was plentifully supplied by 1960, planning began in July 1961, and a contract was signed between the city and the Federal Government in November of 1962, for the University-Euclid project which is residential in scope. This project was not mentioned by Mayor Locher in his testimony, and I can understand why. The location of one of the two major rent strike areas in the United States is within the project. On December 27, 1963, the Ohio Forum, a weekly newspaper serving the Negro community of Cleveland, published a list of citizen demands on urban renewal in the Hough rent strike area. I will include the full set of demands following my remarks but there are several comments that deserve special attention.

After noting that both clearance and rehabilitation have "lagged behind schedule" in the project area, the citizens state:

> 1. All city codes (including the housing code) should be enforced throughout the entire Hough area. Additional inspectors should be hired to do the job. A record of progress should be available to the public.
>
> * * * * *
>
> 3. We understand that both staff and money are available to do the job in University-Euclid. Why isn't it being speeded up? What are the standards for rehabilitation? How are the staff trained? We understand that only 17 buildings in the past year are completed in phase I. Only 2 of these are multiple dwellings.

These are questions which merit the examination of the Special Housing Subcommittee in an on-the-spot investigation. I would like to hear from the people in the Hough area, many of whom, apparently, have been shoved into this slum area from other areas cleared by the city for commercial projects or high-income apartments. The Hough residents observe:

> 6. A major concern of urban renewal is relocation. We urge the relocation committee to make its primary focus the location of substantial housing which is as good as the housing which people will have in the Hough area when it is renewed. We protest the process of "Negro removal" which has gone on in the other renewal areas creating more slums such as Hough.

I think it might be appropriate at this point for me to observe that the housing amendments offered by the Republican minority on the Special Housing Subcommittee provides for new rehabilitation assistance, new efforts in the area of housing code enforcement, and a whole range of relocation assistance, including relocation, on a nondiscriminatory basis. The relocation aids follow exactly the recommendations of the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. Since these provisions will be offered as amendments to the administration housing bill in committee, I think it is absolutely essential for the committee to look into an area such as University-Euclid, and the Cleveland urban renewal program in general, before any decision is made on housing legislation this year.

The latest project in Cleveland emphasizes again the determined trend away from residential renewal to commercial and industrial redevelopment. The Gladstone area, to be entirely industrial-commercial with planning begun in July of 1961, had its contract signed between the city and the Federal agency on November 20, 1963. This contract was signed after the defeat of the Erieview bond issue at the polls, after the great rise of residential development which, as Mr. Lister had noted, made East Woodland's plan obsolete, after the default in Garden Valley on the 221(d) project, after the rent strikes in the Hough section of the University-Euclid project, and after 10 years of futility in the St. Vincent's Center project area.

According to the testimony of Commissioner Slayton on November 20, 1963, the very day the Gladstone contract was signed, the Urban Renewal Administration instituted a new policy in July of 1962. He stated before the Special Housing Subcommittee, while his subordinates were working away in Cleveland:

> In July of 1962, an additional major requirement was instituted to provide as much assurance as possible, even before the planning of an urban renewal project is initiated, that the performance of the local public agency on projects already underway evidences its capacity to undertake an additional project. Now, before the URA reserves capital grant funds for any additional project, it carefully evaluates the performance of the local public agency on its existing projects.

I do not know what kind of "careful" evaluation was done by Mr. Slayton's staff with regard to Cleveland, Ohio, if the Gladstone project for commercial and industrial urban renewal could be signed the very day that Mr. Slayton was proudly telling us of this new "major requirement." The citizens of Cleveland, the taxpayers of the United States, and the Congress which must pass on new urban renewal legislation this year, deserve a full explanation and investigation by the Special Housing Subcommittee.

The trend of the Cleveland projects, as I have observed, is toward commercial and industrial redevelopment, and away from the housing needs of our citizens. Cleveland proves the point that, I am afraid, is equally as true on a national scale, which is the reason for the Republican minority's housing bill provision putting housing needs on a priority basis. Discounting the Longwood project, which was begun in the planning stage at least before 1954, when commercial renewal projects were authorized, Cleveland has received or will receive, an estimated total of $15,814,000 for nonresidential redevelopment out of an estimated total of $27,696,000 for all projects. This is 57.1 percent of the total, in contrast to the requirement in the Housing Act that on a national level, only 30 percent of the funds can go for predominately nonresidential projects.

I think it is about time the Special Housing Subcommittee found out just what is going on in Cleveland under urban renewal.

The newspaper articles I have referred to follow:

[From the Ohio Forum, Dec. 27, 1963]

CITIZENS' DEMANDS ON URBAN RENEWAL IN HOUGH AREA

There are two major areas of urban renewal—clearance and rehabilitation. The University Euclid urban renewal project has lagged behind schedule in both areas. As residents of the Hough area we are concerned about the entire community and feel that code enforcement and other measures should not be limited only to phase No. 1.

In respect to the phase No. 1 area we demand that the following steps be taken immediately to speed up both clearance and rehabilitation.

CLEARANCE

1. Hearings on the purchase of property could be speeded up by waiving the third hearing and setting up a subcommittee of city council to deal with these procedures, possibly the urban renewal committee.

2. Buildings which are vacant on city property should be torn down immediately. (There are several vacant buildings in this area now.)

3. Condemned buildings on private property should be demolished through enforcement of a city ordinance which requires the property owner to do so. Also, city ordinances would be enforced to force absentee landlords to demolish condemned properties and there should be strict enforcement of nuisance ordinances.

4. Efforts should be made to beautify the vacant land after property has been torn down.

REHABILITATION

1. All city codes (including the Housing Code) should be enforced throughout the en-

tire Hough area. Additional inspectors should be hired to do the job. A record of progress should be available to the public.

2. The entire Hough area should be declared a rehabilitation area under title 1 of the Housing Act. We strongly urge the reopening of the Superior-Chester urban renewal office.

3. We understand that both staff and money are available to do the job in University Euclid. Why isn't it being speeded up? What are standards for rehabilitation? How are the staff trained? We understand that only 17 buildings in the past year are completed in phase 1.

Only two of these are multiple dwellings.

4. All city services need to be improved including health, sanitation, garbage disposal, police protection, etc.

5. The percentage of deteriorated housing in the Hough area has increased more rapidly in dwellings owned by absentee landlords than those which are owner-occupied. A large scale program to upgrade maintenance of absentee-owned properties would greatly improve the morale of the residents in the area. We deplore the seeming "don't care" attitude of City Hall, and in the face of deterioration of property.

6. A major concern of urban renewal is relocation. We urge the relocation committee to make its primary focus the location of substantial housing which is as good as the housing which people will have in the Hough area when it is renewed. We protest the process of Negro removal which has gone on in the other renewal areas creating more slums such as Hough. We urge the enactment of a fair housing law for the city of Cleveland which could be helpful in the dispersal of Hough residents throughout the entire Cleveland area—west and east, thus eliminating the perpetuation of low-income Negro ghettos. Only as this is consciously avoided will we eliminate the need for a continued urban renewal program for generations to come.

7. We request that urban renewal work more closely with the other community institutions to build the morale of the community. The job of urban renewal is to provide the buildings in which people can have decent housing. There are other institutions in the community which are charged with the responsibility of providing recreation, group work and community organization programs. When such needs arise these agencies should be asked to cooperate in working in areas of rehabilitation so that urban renewal can do its most important work.

8. We reject the planned action for the demonstration area for rehabilitation. We demand that a location in the center of the project Phase 1 be selected.

9. We urge the full use of area residents, particularly semi-skilled and unskilled unemployed workers, to work in all phases of the urban renewal program.

HOUGH AREA CITIZENS COMMITTEE,
Mrs. CHAMBERS, L.R.
Mrs. W. LEWIS, *Cochairman.*

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Apr. 4, 1964]

CITY TO MAKE NEW PLEA FOR WOODLAND FUND

The city of Cleveland will reapply for Federal urban renewal funds to rebuild East Woodland as an industrial area.

Because Cleveland has been declared a high unemployment area, the Federal Government now will pay three-quarters instead of two-thirds of the cost, Urban Renewal Director James Lister told the plan commission yesterday.

The plan commission informally approved changing the 46-acre area around Woodland Avenue and East 75th Street from residential to industrial, a change which dooms a 10-year rehabilitation effort.

Commission Chairman Ernest Bohn said: "In retrospect, I suppose we made a mistake. It should have been industrial from the beginning."

Lister said the change was prompted by inability to find financing for residential developments in the triangle, bounded by East 71st Street, Kingsbury Run, and the Pennsylvania Railroad. The Federal Government urged the change because of difficulties with similar developments elsewhere.

Under tentative new plans displayed by Chief City Planner Layton Washburn, only the block southeast of East 75th and Woodland would remain residential. The Second Mount Zion Baptist Church is anxious to stay and wishes to build a 12-unit row house for members, Washburn said.

The city now has acquired 98 percent of the parcels it must buy in the project and has torn down 80 percent of the buildings.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Mar. 31, 1964]

U.S. APPROVAL IS SEEN ON WOODLAND INDUSTRY

(By Paul Lilley)

Early Government approval is expected of city plans to convert the East Woodland urban renewal area into a slum clearance project for commercial and industrial redevelopment.

J. B. Williams, city urban renewal commissioner, said details of the plan will be submitted this week to Housing and Home Finance Agency officials in Chicago.

The East Woodland project, in the triangle pocket bounded by East 71st Street and the New York Central and Pennsylvania Railroad tracks, had been intended for residential rehabilitation and new housing.

Original plans called for keeping only 55 of the 234 structures in the area. Of those scheduled to remain, 14 have been rehabilitated to minimum code standards at a total cost of $30,000.

Should the HHFA and city council approve the new industrial use for the 50-acre area, all residential buildings in the area, including those rehabilitated, will be torn down.

The final decision to switch plans for use of the area was revealed yesterday when Williams and Urban Renewal Director James Lister rejected an offer to construct 77 dwelling units in the area.

The offer was made by Walter O'Neal, president of the United Community Development Corp. and Frank O'Brien, representative of National Homes, Inc.

O'Neal said that at least 70 persons who live in the area or who want to move back have indicated an interest in purchasing one of the homes which would cost between $13,000 and $15,000.

Lister said several other sites in the University-Euclid urban renewal area would soon be available for housing redevelopment.

O'Neal and O'Brien said they would explore the new possibilities.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Apr. 4, 1964]

EAST WOODLAND HOUSES CONFESSED AS ERROR

(By Eugene Segal)

The plan to put housing in the East Woodland urban renewal areas was a mistake, Ernest J. Bohn, chairman of the city planning commission, said yesterday.

"In retrospect we know the area should have been left industrial," he told Urban Renewal Director James M. Lister at a commission meeting.

"This points up the need to be much more careful in the future about urban renewal programs," a commission member, George B. Mayer, said.

A plan to change East Woodland back to industrial use was shown the commission. The commission and ctiy council will have to approve the change before the amended plan can be resubmitted to the U.S. Urban Renewal Administration for its acceptance.

East Woodland extends eastward from East 71st Street to the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks and from Platt Avenue SE. southward to the Nickel Plate Road tracks.

The amended plan proposes to convert all the land between East 71st and East 75th Street to light industrial use.

This will require demoliton of more than 50 homes on streets from East 71st to East 75th, north and south of Woodland Avenue SE. Owners had been told for 8 years that these homes would be allowed to remain if rehabilitated. About $30,000 had been spent on fixing the houses.

The new plan provides a buffer against proposed industry for the Community Apartments at the southwest corner of East 79th and Woodland. It was to provide a protective environment for the apartments that the East Woodland renewal project was devised in the first place.

A tract west of the apartments, at the southeast corner of Woodland and East 75th, will be sold to the neighborhood Mount Sinai Baptist Church, which, Lister said, wants to build a new church and 12 dwelling units.

Lister said the Greater Cleveland Growth Board reported that if East Woodland land was made available at the right price in 6 months, "many small industries" would want it.

Lister gave commissioners copies of a statement explaining reasons for the East Woodland switch, which he prepared at the request of U.S. Urban Renewal Commissioner William Slayton.

Slayton wants it as an answer to Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, who in a statement inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD criticized what has happened in East Woodland.

Shortly after adoption of the East Woodland plan, Lister wrote, "a change in the housing market began to occur in Cleveland, which has become more and more intensified. There is now an ever-increasing supply of housing available all over the city of Cleveland and available at almost any rental level.

"It is only logical, therefore, that serious consideration must be given in the East Woodland project to a reevaluation of whether the proposed reuse is in reality a realistic one."

Lister continued that it was not a waste of money to have purchased dilapidated industry which has been removed or to continue to purchase and remove remaining deteriorated buildings "which would not be good neighboring development to any new industrial investment."

RESULTS OF ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a questionnaire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the results of my annual questionnaire to the attention of my colleagues. Out of over 89,000 questionnaires mailed to my constituents, 10,650 have been returned to date.

The results are as follows:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Are you in favor of selling wheat to the Soviet Union on credit terms?	13	82	5
2. Do you favor making concessions in Panama?	19	76	5
3. Do you approve of the manner in which the administration is handling the Cuban situation?	16	71	13
4. In general, do you approve of the way the administration is handling our foreign affairs around the world?	14	72	14
5. Do you feel foreign aid spending should be substantially reduced?	81	11	8
6. Do you favor U.S. recognition of Red China?	11	78	11
7. In your opinion, is the United Nations an effective organization?	39	41	20
8. Do you approve of the way President Johnson and McNamara canceled the Dyna-Soar?	22	62	16
9. Do you favor President Johnson's veto of a bill requiring imported Canadian lumber to be labeled as such?	18	65	17
10. Do you approve of the plan to make our low-cost Pacific Northwest power available to California?	35	39	26
11. As a result of the Bobby Baker scandal, do you feel legislation should be passed to prevent "conflict of interest" by Senators as well as their employees?	74	13	13
12. Would you favor a thorough investigation of the U.S. State Department?	66	21	13
13. Do you approve of Federal legislation requiring registration of firearms?	43	49	8
14. Would you favor compulsory medical care for the aged under social security with the cost paid for by increased taxes on employees and employers?	29	59	12
15. Do you approve of Federal aid to education at the high school and elementary levels?	32	59	9
16. Would you favor an amendment to the U.S. Constitution which would reverse the Supreme Court prayer decision?	55	32	13

STATEMENT BEFORE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ON PRAYERS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of my statement before the House Judiciary Committee on April 22, 1964, pertaining to the subject of prayers in public schools:

Mr. Chairman, in the committee's deliberations on the several resolutions introduced pertaining to prayers in public schools, no doubt it will be your privilege to listen to the views of some of the most sincere people ever to appear before this committee.

As I look at a copy of my resolution here before me, I notice the subject matter is brief and the lines are few, as compared to many of the measures we consider each day. Gentlemen, this observation in no way reflects the simplicity of this question or the far-reaching effects this legislation has on present and future generations.

While it is my hope the committee, in its wisdom, will see fit to favorably report this measure, I hope, too, there will be sufficient time to allow all interested parties an opportunity to be heard, so that when all the testimony is in, there will be no doubt in your minds with regard to the proper course of action.

In furtherance to this matter, I think the Supreme Court erred. The hundreds of thousands of communications that have poured into Washington from constituents all over America verify the fact that the American people are downright scared—if this decision is not reversed and prayers are not restored to the classrooms of our public schools.

In all of my years it has been my privilege to serve in the Congress, I know of no other single issue that has received the wide attention that this issue on prayers has received. Gentlemen, we cannot fail the good people of our land that are looking to us for help.

I want to express my appreciation to the committee for this time to register my views on this legislation.

TRANSPORTATION TO MEET NEEDS OF AN EXPANDING AMERICA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to be present Monday night in my congressional district to hear an outstanding address to the Richmond (Va.) Traffic Club by our distinguished colleague, Representative OREN HARRIS, the extremely capable chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This excellent speech by Chairman HARRIS was enthusiastically received by a large crowd gathered for the club's "Railroad Night" and under permission to extend my remarks I include his remarks in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of all our Members:

TRANSPORTATION TO MEET NEEDS OF AN EXPANDING AMERICA

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and friends of the Richmond Traffic Club, I am highly honored by your invitation to be with you on this occasion. I am especially glad to be with you this evening in paying tribute to the railroads, one of our basic common carrier modes of transportation. I compliment you for this occasion, and particularly those of other modes, who join in the salute to this great industry.

I am especially pleased to be here since this event coincides with what could very well be a turning point in regulatory law—our consideration of new and modern transportation legislation.

Though your traffic club has arranged special tribute to the railroad industry, I would like to make it abundantly clear that what I have to say is not only applicable to the railroads, but equally so to the airlines, bargelines, motor carriers, and freight forwarders.

In joining you of the transportation industry this evening, in saluting America's great railroad industry, one of our Nation's oldest as well as its biggest single common carrier, on this, their night in Richmond, I would like to give primary attention to proposed legislation which I think is long past due.

I welcome this opportunity to discuss this bill with you which is past due, because it is fair, it is reasonable, it is right, and in the best interest of a sound common carrier system, to more equitably serve the needs of the American people.

Anyone who fails to recognize that the transport industry is now undergoing some of the most far-reaching changes in its history—changes which point toward a future that, despite many current problems, should be no less tremendous than the past—assumes the posture of an ostrich with his head in the sand.

The forward-looking, competitive carriers in this country are resigned to revolutionary endeavors, for in our expanding America there is a vast role to be played by every form of transportation, and a great future for each of you. The Nation needs and must have all of you.

This underscores in my mind the fact that the transportation progress on which every citizen of this country depends is a product not of Government officials or of us legislators, but of you in transportation. We in Government can only draw up the rules of the contest, and blow the whistle against fouls. The rest—the innovations, the new services, the forward moves—is up to you.

That you have done remarkably well is a visible phenomenon of our times. What a fabulous transportation industry you have developed for this Nation. What wouldn't the Soviet Union, for example, give to have such an immense, diversified, and sophisticated nationwide system of land, air, and water transportation. Indeed, it appears that America has a 30- to 40-year lead on the Communists in transportation development, and we intend to stay ahead.

Even as you in transportation are faced with daily challenges to continue these developments in transportation and distribution on which the whole American productive system rests, so, too, are we in government faced with the challenge to keep the rules of the game—our transportation laws and procedures—abreast of the times and the people's needs.

It may seem at times that our laws have a built-in inertia, a resistance to change, and this is true especially in view of the seemingly constant acceleration of technological changes within the industry the laws cover. With a longer look, however, we can see that the laws have been repeatedly broadened and altered in a conscientious effort by Congress to make them fit the growing needs of our expanding Nation and its changing transport industry.

Even in our pioneer days, government took a hand in the development of canals and turnpikes—and then, in time, of the fire-breathing iron horse moving over metal rails. It was recognized in those earlier years that a general common carrier system, making transport services available to all the people at fair rates and charges, was indispensable.

The Interstate Commerce Act, of necessity, passed in 1887, was indeed basically intended to strengthen the essential services of the railroads to the public. This act was followed in subsequent years by numerous amendments which tightened regulatory control in some cases and increased its horizontal reach in others, to include motor transport, then inland waterways carriage, then freight forwarder operations.

These rules of the game, as I said before, were meant to foster the development of a great common carrier system which would

serve everyone everywhere in the United States. I submit that this has been done, and with a degree of success that is astounding. Yet we must not be blinded by the pyramiding physical and structural developments in transportation to the grave problems that have simultaneously arisen to plague the industry.

Going back only as far as 1922, when your traffic club was founded, it is startling to note the wide shifts in relative positions of the different forms of transportation. It was in those years of the early twenties that motor trucks and buses really began to take hold in the intercity transport market. And the airplane, having just found its wings in the First World War, began nibbling at intercity travel volume.

I suppose anyone with a good clear crystal ball at that time could have foreseen the ultimate end these developments would spell out for the overriding position of the railroads in nationwide transportation. Yet that crystal ball would have had to be ingenious indeed, for it was not until the decade of the 1930's that the competitive trends then set in motion were to combine with the overall depression of traffic to create a real crisis. Moreover, in that third decade of the 20th century still another development arose which was to portend still more competition in transportation, and this was the great pickup of Government spending as a public works measure on inland waterways so that the inherent advantages of this mode could be available to our people.

And so, now as we stand in the sixth decade of this century, we must ask, how is our common carrier system doing? What is the state of our transportation law? What more can be done to strengthen both?

I said earlier that we may now be at a turning point in regulatory law in transportation. Actually, it may well be that the turning point came with the legislative action of 1958 and that, today, we are trying only to move a little further along the course then set. For the 1958 amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act that concerns us most today sought to set a new standard for the Interstate Commerce Commission to employ in competitive rate cases. We intended thereby to give the forces of competition in transportation more leeway, so that low-cost carriers would get a clear chance to utilize their advantages and pass the lowest possible freight rates on to the shipping public.

Two years ago this very month, the late President Kennedy, in a special message to Congress, admirably summed up many of the current problems besetting transportation and suggested a number of legislative remedies for the inequalities existing in our laws. Among these was a recommendation which sought again to make transport price competition more effective by extending to all carriers, including railroads, those exemptions from regulation now accorded by law to motortrucks when hauling agricultural products and to barge lines when hauling bulk commodities.

Extensive hearings on both sides of the Capitol followed the President's recommendations, both in the last Congress and in the present one. All transportation and affected interests were heard, in some cases repeatedly, or had abundant opportunity to be heard.

After the tragic assassination of last November, President Johnson entered the picture with a letter urging congressional action to equalize the impact of Federal regulation among competing carriers. The President recognized, as has virtually every other impartial spokesman in this field, that the serious inequalities in our regulatory laws and procedures have their greatest impact on our common carriers, and that our equalizing goal becomes increasingly urgent with each passing year.

Simple justice, as well as practical economies, demands we follow through on this task. However, it seems to me that the greatest threat to resilient and expanding common carriers lies not in the competition of other public carriers, but in the skyrocketing growth in this generation of do-it-yourself transportation. Obviously, such private transportation serves many useful purposes and can be expected to remain a large factor in transportation and distribution. However, we in Government must make certain that "own-account transport" does not wax fat on defects in law which penalize and hold back common carriers.

When we weigh the question of whether Government should equalize regulatory treatment of the different forms of transportation either by extending regulation to those carriers now exempt or by reducing it on those carriers already regulated, we should keep in mind the Nation's boom in own-account transportation. Indeed, if regulatory equality is to be our primary aim (and I think we should strive for equality in all Government policies for both the sake of fairness and to avoid waste and distortion in relative rates of carrier development), then we are compelled to move in the direction of ending unnecessary restriction simply because, under tight regulation, no common carrier can ever hope to meet freewheeling own-account transport on anything approaching equal terms. In other words, even if all for-hire carriers were regulated alike, this could prove extremely detrimental if a major result were further inducements to shippers to turn to owning and operating their own vehicles to haul their own products.

Since the economics of own-account transport are judged in terms of direct costs to vehicle buyers and users, it is also crucial that for-hire carriers be allowed so far as practicable to shift more rapidly to charging on the basis of their own costs, and to set rates as low as possible in order to prevent further traffic slippage to shipper-owned vehicles.

I have been astounded how few people who come before our committee seem to realize these elemental facts of economic life. Indeed, I sometimes wonder if there is not some weird malady that makes an otherwise conscientious and devoted public servant somehow acquire a different point of view when he joins a regulatory agency, and ofttimes causes him to see only the virtues of regulation instead of the virtues of competition. Proper regulation is synonymous with preserving a strong transportation system.

The point in all this, I think, is that perhaps all of us—not only the regulators but legislators and you transportation people and users alike—are equally guilty of looking at the regulatory problem in too narrow, too shortsighted terms. Perhaps, we should widen and extend our vision to look at transportation in its truly functional terms of serving people and give it the freedom to change and grow to meet the great diversity of national needs in this era of almost incredible change and challenge. Perhaps we all need something like England reached for when it sought to join the European Common Market—which Prime Minister Macmillan characterized as "taking a cold shower."

We should not change for change's sake any more than we should regulate for regulation's sake. Yet, I cannot escape the feeling that transportation as a whole desperately needs another fresh breath of air and a new look at itself, its ways of applying and interpreting laws, and its problems and potentials.

It was in this climate and with this background that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on February 18 reported out H.R. 9903. I will not go extensively into the provisions of this bill, for you in transportation know fairly well the details. But I would like to discuss generally the major problem areas in which we sought to come up with affirmative, constructive policies.

First of all, we faced up to the problem represented by the exemption from regulation allowed motor trucks but no other carriers in hauling agricultural commodities, by deciding to achieve equality of treatment by completely deregulating all hauling of agricultural commodities. As a practical matter, it seemed to the committee that any attempt to extend regulation to motor carriers in this field was doomed to failure since farm and other groups had indicated they would resist this.

As for the problem posed by the exemption given bargelines, but no other carrier when hauling commodities in bulk, it seemed to us that deregulation in this area was too drastic a step to contemplate—that neither the carriers nor the Nation generally was prepared to take such a step with all the competitive jolts and marketing rearrangements this might entail. So, we decided the more practical present course lay in tightening up the exemption somewhat by subjecting bargelines to regulation if they hauled more than one dry bulk commodity in a barge tow.

As for the commodities clause which prevents railroads but no other carrier from hauling goods they own, we suggested outright repeal since virtually everyone seemed to be in agreement that it was desirable to end this inequity toward rail carriers.

Finally, we recommended a number of changes in law to tighten up rules and enforcement procedures against illegal truck operations, again with the overall aim of strengthening the common carrier truck services on which all shippers rely.

Let me repeat once again that the House Commerce Committee members felt that these were the longest steps the Nation was prepared to take toward regulatory equality and to reduce the trend toward excessive private carriage so-called "gray area" and illegal carriage, taking $12 to $15 billion annually from our common carriage system. We felt that H.R. 9903 was a sound approach as well as a constructive compromise package which should win general backing, with strong likelihood of early congressional passage. Reflecting this was a virtual unanimity among the 33 committee members in reporting the bill to the House.

This action also had the approval of our farm organizations, the railroads, the motor carriers, freight forwarders, the airlines, certain grain companies, substantial shipper groups, the Department of Commerce, with the exception of the treatment of grain—the Interstate Commerce Commission, other Government agencies, and the President of the United States. We thought we had done a fairly good job.

What happened since February 18 is somewhat discouraging. In place of unanimity, a weird fragmentation process set in as disaffected groups, each with perhaps a single objection to the bill, combined into an alliance against change. They named their group the "Antimonopoly Transportation Conference." In reality, the elaborate title covered disparate interests, each fearful of loss in a particular area built up around the inequities and restraints in present law.

Some bargelines complained against the tightened exemption from regulation.

Grain trading interests saw a threat to marketing procedures and profits in the transportation deregulation of agricultural commodities.

The coal industry opposed repeal of the commodities clause.

Then several port interests got into the act because of unfounded fears of a reshuffling of the direction of export traffic.

Even an ICC staff memo was circulated on the subject.

When I went before the Rules Committee asking for clearance for House consideration of the bill, I was requested to accept certain changes which I thought to be appropriate and would meet some of the fears and objections raised by certain Members, but still maintain the concept of the bill.

As an example, in repealing the commodities clause, I agreed to accept an amendment that would continue prohibition against railroads transporting their own coal, resulting in the treatment of this commodity as we provided in the transportation of grain.

I agreed to an amendment that would exempt two bulk commodities a bargeline could haul in a single tow and continue to be exempt from regulation.

Then to add greater stability and certainty in grain marketing, I agreed to an amendment that would require all carriers to file grain rates with the Interstate Commerce Commission 15 days prior to a movement instead of 30 days afterward.

I further agreed to an amendment to completely satisfy the Household Movers Conference, thus meeting their objection and settling the differences with them and the State regulatory agencies.

Any further concessions, except possibly on strengthening discriminatory practices or in the field of increased maximum rates, would, in my opinion, be contrary to the public interest.

There is one source of opposition that we cannot pacify further, however. Nor do I believe it is in the public interest to try to do so. These are the grain market speculators who trade on the difference between the published railroad rates for moving agricultural products and the actual final rates they pay to unregulated or gypsy transport, in order to increase their profit margins. These grain speculators are even taking all taxpayers for a ride since many of the affected grain movements are of U.S.-supported products. They are both directly opposing H.R. 9903 and stirring up others' opposition out across the country. If people would wake up and realize they are being used by these self-seeking interests, there is no question in my mind that this bill would pass.

But on April 9, the House Rules Committee gave these interests temporary comfort by postponing action on clearing the bill for a floor vote.

Gentlemen, this was not the last act in the drama.

I am convinced that the approach embodied in H.R. 9903 is the only sound and possible one to take at this time, and I pledge my most earnest and wholehearted efforts to see it become law. There is no reason why it should not; there is good reason why it should, for we have agreed to the several changes to meet what appear to be the just needs and fears of opponents, without doing violence to the objective sought.

You in the transportation industry, both users and carriers, can and should be helpful in bringing about the passage of this most worthy and desirous legislation. I repeat, it represents a sound approach. I intend to bring about its approval in this Congress if I can appropriately. If not, and the Lord wills that I return in the next Congress, I will continue my efforts toward our final goal.

SHAKESPEARE'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today is the 400th anniversary of the birthday of William Shakespeare.

This is to be acclaimed as an event of great importance not only for the high standards of expression he set for us all but for the value of communication between people of all nations.

Shakespeare's plays have been translated into many languages making his command of human nature and artistic expression available nearly everywhere on earth.

He is to be honored as one of the best spokesmen for the English speaking people to all people, despite nationality or cultural background. Perhaps it is through the communications of cultural excellence such as this that we will eventually establish a common bond among men where the true sharing of the suffering and delight common to all human beings rises over political and economic differences.

BUSINESS PEACE CORPS SPARKED BY HARTKE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, American businessmen will have a unique opportunity to make a direct contribution to the development of the less-developed countries through a new Executive Service Corps being established with the help of the U.S. Government. The idea behind this proposal is that the key problem in many less-developed countries is the lack of trained manpower, especially managerial and entrepreneurial personnel, and that American management can make a distinct contribution to development by helping remedy this deficiency.

I think this is one of the best ideas for contributing to the development of less-developed countries which has been devised. I am particularly pleased that the senior Senator from my own State of Indiana has been responsible for initiating this new plan, and for securing action by the U.S. Government. During a trip to Africa in 1962, Senator VANCE HARTKE discovered that the development of Africa was being held back by the lack of trained manpower. It seemed to him that this was a golden opportunity for American business, in cooperation with the U.S. Government, to render technical assistance of a kind which American businessmen are peculiarly well-qualified to give. On his return, Senator HARTKE urged the Department of State to look into the matter. This resulted in a study which was concluded in the fall of 1963. The Agency for International Development then convened a conference of leading businessmen and business organizations to discuss the project. As a result of the conference, David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and Sol Linowitz, head of the Xerox Corp., assumed cochairmanship of a committee to establish the Executive Service Corps as a private, American business enterprise backed up by the U.S. Government.

Other members of the organizing committee are: Mr. C. D. Jackson, vice president, Time, Inc.; Mr. John H. Johnson, president, Johnson Publications; Mr. D. A. Kimball, chairman, Aerojet-General; Mr. William S. Paley, chairman, Columbia Broadcasting System; and Mr. Ray Eppert, president, Burroughs Co.

The basic idea of this program is simple and straightforward. One of the greatest needs in the developing countries is clearly the kind of technical and managerial and entrepreneurial know-how which is essential to the growth of private enterprise. Most of these countries are seriously lacking in this kind of know-how. At the same time, there are in the United States many men of considerable business experience who are either retired or in a position to take some time off and who are more than willing to make their know-how available to help the United States and the free world advance along private enterprise lines.

As currently visualized the Executive Service Corps would seek to make qualified U.S. business personnel available to meet four major needs in developing countries.

First. To provide consultant or actual operating services to medium-sized local private business firms in the developing countries which cannot get needed high-level manpower locally and which cannot afford to employ Americans in any normal commercial way because of the high costs in hard currencies which are normally involved. Such services might include, for example, a production man, or a marketing man, or a financial man, or even a general manager for a local manufacturing, distribution, or similar enterprise.

Second. To provide similar services to smaller local firms on a multiple basis by working as staff members of development banks, development centers, productivity centers, and other similar organizations designed to serve local private enterprise.

Third. To work with local individuals or groups of entrepreneurs who see a good opportunity to develop a new local industry or other commercial facility and have some of or all of the necessary capital, but lack the know-how to develop a full financial and technical plan for the new enterprise and to get the new operation financed and launched.

Fourth. In some cases to provide independent high-level teams which would work out of local development banks or other appropriate institutions in developing countries to make broad surveys of industrial development needs and to identify specific situations in which more specialized U.S. managerial or technical talents might usefully be applied.

The major distinguishing features of the proposed new operation as compared

with existing AID technical assistance and Peace Corps programs will be that the personnel will be available to help private enterprises directly and the personnel will be available to do actual operating jobs as distinguished from purely advisory to governments. A third major difference will be that the members of the corps will come as individual volunteers not as U.S. Government representatives in any sense.

An effective Executive Service Corps can fill a major gap in the coverage of existing U.S. public and private activities in relation to the developing countries and can thereby make a highly significant contribution to the U.S. national interest in assisting these countries to develop as orderly free societies.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an article from the April 4, 1964, New York Times, "Industry Forming a Group Like the Peace Corps":

INDUSTRY FORMING A GROUP LIKE THE PEACE CORPS: PROGRAM URGED BY JOHNSON—BUSINESSMEN WILL GO TO NEEDY LANDS AS ADVISERS

(By McCandlish Phillips)

An oversea business corps modeled on the Peace Corps is being formed by industry at the suggestion of the Johnson administration.

The Executive Service Corps expects to be in operation by late summer. Its central office will probably be in New York.

The corps would draw mostly on newly retired executives who are not ready to be put out to hammock. They would go overseas on special tasks for periods ranging from 3 months to 2 years, or longer.

Volunteers would be assigned to semideveloped countries to assist in the expansion of industries owned there. That would include most of South America and the industrial awakening regions of Africa and Asia.

The program will not include European or other fully developed economies, nor would it take in primitive areas.

An organizing committee has been named, headed by David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and Sol Linowitz, chairman of the Xerox Corp.

The purpose of the Executive Service Corps will be to serve the broad national objective of accelerating the development of other countries along private enterprise lines, which the administration believes will be the quickest, and best for them as well as for the United States.

At the same time, it will provide a challenging outlet for useful service to men who have been put on the retirement lists of American industry. Many men are being retired at the age of 62 or even 60, although they consider themselves at the height of their power.

Mr. Linowitz said that management and technical men would be made available to oversea industries as advisers, supervisors or on-the-job managers, according to local need.

Pay will not be on the scale to which retired businessmen had been accustomed, but most volunteers will presumably have savings and pension incomes.

They would be paid an adequate cost-of-living wage by the concerns for which they worked, in addition to travel and insurance cost. The corps might provide a small additional stipend.

The corps would be a private, nongovernmental corporation. To get it off the ground, the Government stands ready to provide initial funds until, hopefully, the business community underwrites the whole enterprise.

In his foreign-aid message to Congress on March 19, President Johnson declared: "We must do more to utilize private initiative in the United States—and in the developing countries—to promote economic development abroad."

He said then that the Administration was "encouraging the establishment of an Executive Service Corps."

The primary responsibility for getting the organization going has rested with the Agency for International Development (AID), the semiautonomous unit headed by David E. Bell that runs the foreign-aid program within the State Department.

The agency put the organizing committee together. Besides Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Linowitz, its members are: C. D. Jackson, vice president of Time, Inc.; William S. Paley, chairman of the Columbia Broadcasting System; Daniel A. Kimball, president of Aerojet-General and former Secretary of the Navy; John H. Johnson, president of the Johnson Publishing Co. of Chicago, and Ray Eppert, president of the Burroughs Corp.

An official of the development agency said: "We did the groundwork, and when we asked the private community to take over, they very quickly did and we're now standing in the wings, ready with a little money when they ask for it."

TO SEND 1,000 ABROAD

No budget has been drawn. The aim is to get about 1,000 men overseas in the first 30 months, probably at a cost of several million dollars, of which the Government will provide the greater part.

The Development Agency has assigned Thomas O. Thomas, a 37-year-old member of the corps' planning staff, to New York to act as liaison between the Government and the organizing committee.

Mr. Thomas said the idea for the corps "has so many parents it is hard to pin its origins down," but he, and others in the project, credited Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat of Indiana, with having urged the initial study that showed the concept to be potentially workable.

THE RAYBURN OFFICE BUILDING FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the act originating the Rayburn Office Building for the Members of the House of Representatives was approved April 22, 1955. I was not a Member of Congress in 1955 and I was not a Member of Congress in 1956. Public Law 24, 84th Congress, H.R. 4903, approved April 22, 1955—69 statute 41–42. Additional House Office Building Act of 1955, $5 million appropriated. Passed House, March 18, 1955, no rollcall vote. Public Law 624, 84th Congress, H.R. 11473, approved June 27, 1956—70 statute 366. Legislative Appropriation Act, 1957, $10 million appropriated. Passed House, May 29, 1956, no rollcall vote. I am for economy in and out of Government. I have never tried to justify waste and extravagance. We have five children.

FOREIGN AID

On Wednesday March 25, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the present Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee of which I am a member. He emphasized that in his opinion there currently is being given by the Congress not enough military assistance in the foreign aid program. I quote a portion of his statement:

As the Joint Chiefs have just completed our exhaustive annual review of requirements, the shortcomings of the current $1 billion MAP program are fresh in my mind. A continuation of military aid at this level indefinitely will offer us but three options: A gradual reduction of indigenous military capability in strategically important areas of the free world; a buildup of U.S. forces at a far greater cost to compensate for the loss in indigenous strength; or, the acceptance of inadequate military strength to support our national interests in some quarters of the world. I can assure you that there are no reserves in the pipeline or elsewhere which can make any substantial contribution to relieving the requirement for the appropriation of substantial new funds by the Congress. I would say that the experience of the current year has demonstrated the inadequacy of the reduced level.

Such comments as these convince me that the fiscal year 1964 program has been inadequate to permit the development of friendly forces which are required in our own national interest. With this experience in mind, the 1965 program of $1 billion can only be regarded as a holding operation of borderline adequacy.

In closing, I wish to state that from my viewpoint as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the sharply reduced fiscal year 1964 MAP program was a significant exception to the strong support the Congress has ordinarily given to our national defense programs. In my opinion, a further reduction of the fiscal year 1965 program below $1 billion would be a tragic emasculation of a program vital to our national security interests. The fiscal year 1965 program before you has the strongest support of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and on their behalf, I urge the authorization and appropriation of the full program submission.

I wish to say I have confidence in Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor and I have tried to help him and our Secretary of Defense get the amount of military assistance which they have felt is the minimum for the security of our country.

I quote the pertinent portion of a letter which was written to me January 22, 1964, by Col. Clyde M. Dillender, Jr., of the Department of Defense:

All in all, the foreign assistance programs of the United States are important to our national security and should be continued.

To replace this vital asset for collective security with comparable and similarly deployed American troops would involve a totally unacceptable drain on our manpower and monetary resources. It would send the defense budget soaring and add to the taxpayer's burden an amount many times the cost of military assistance which makes possible the accomplishment of our own forward strategy with minimum expenditure in men and money. Even more significantly, it would require the drafting of many more young men, interrupting their education, disrupting family life and depriving the economy of the fresh manpower essential to vigorous growth.

On April 8, 1963, Hon. Robert McNamara, Secretary of Defense, appeared

before the Foreign Affairs Committee of which I am a member. I enclose a portion of the record of the hearing.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Now, with reference to that foreign aid which is not known as military aid, how would you compare it along this line or what statement would you make about it?

Secretary MCNAMARA. Mr. BECKWORTH, I can make the statement I did with respect to other portions of the defense budget because I have reviewed every dollar of the $53½ billion budget in great detail.

I have not reviewed every dollar of the total foreign aid program in equal detail and therefore I cannot properly assess for you the relative importance of a dollar of military assistance versus a dollar of economic assistance. They are both required in my mind.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Would you say the economic aid that you know about is less important, equally as important, or more important than that military assistance that you are talking about?

Secretary MCNAMARA. I would make the same statement with respect to the economic aid that I did with respect to military assistance. I believe we are providing economic aid in such a way that it directly relates to our national security. I don't believe that we as a nation with a gross national product of over $550 billion need concern ourselves with our ability to finance actions that we think are directly related to our national security.

I realize that this is not directly responsive to your question, but I am not in a position to respond by comparing a dollar of economic aid with a dollar of military aid.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 20, 1964.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: For the President, may I acknowledge your letter of April 18 expressing your support of efforts to obtain a full workload for the Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory at Daingerfield.

We are encouraged by the favorable response from NASA, and you may be assured of our interest in exploring every possibility for the continued use of this facility.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
Special Assistant to the President.

SOVIET PERSECUTION OF JEWS CONDEMNED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution, on which I hope the Committee on Foreign Affairs will take immediate action. In the past 24 months it has become abundantly clear that the Soviet Government has singled out its Jewish citizens for persecution. The promises of egalitarianism proclaimed at the time of the October revolution and written into the Soviet constitution were first ignored by the late unlamented dictator, Joseph Stalin. His particular brand of anti-Semitism culminated in the infamous "doctors plot" shortly before his death.

While the excesses of Stalin were condemned by Nikita Khrushchev at the 20th Communist Party Congress in 1956, we now see that a new brand of anti-Semitism has forced its way through the Party line and expressed itself in the persecution of Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union: It takes the form of singling them out for extreme punishment for alleged economic crimes, of confiscating synagogues, of closing Jewish cemeteries, of arresting rabbis and curtailing religious observances, of discriminating against Jews in cultural activities and higher education and of the prohibition against the baking of matzoth during the Passover holiday—and of preventing Jews from living by the traditions of their faith.

It is clear that the Soviet Government and the Communist Party have fostered and encouraged these acts. The Congress should adopt this resolution condemning religious persecution by the Soviet Union and should call upon the Soviet Government, in the name of decency and humanity, to cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses and to permit the free exercise of religion by all within its borders.

RELIGION AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, just the racial aspects of the civil rights bill, now pending in the Senate, have all but obscured its religious significance.

And yet, if the bill becomes law, its effects upon an individual because of his religious affiliation may be dramatic.

Opponents of the measure contend the bill carries authority to force employers to hire according to a person's religion.

Its supporters deny this. They say the very essence of the bill is to outlaw that practice.

Which opinions, as can be plainly seen, are about as diametrically opposed as opinions can be.

What is the truth?

It is not easy to find.

Consider parts of two sections of the bill, pertinent parts which seem to bear on this facet of the argument. They are sections 701 and 704.

The first, section 701, reads:

> The Congress hereby declares that the opportunity for employment without discrimination of the types described in section 704 * * * is a right of all persons.

Section 704 reads:

> It shall be an unlawful employment practice to hire or to discharge any individual * * * with respect to his * * * religion.

On the face of it, that seems clear enough. The bill seems to say it shall be an unlawful employment practice to discriminate against a person because of his religion.

Unfortunately, the key word—discriminate—is nowhere defined in the bill. It just is not there. So, a person is left with his own interpretation as to what is, or is not, discrimination.

Were it otherwise, were this word defined, perhaps most of the argument could be resolved.

But it is not so, so we must go with what we have.

Not to discriminate, it would seem to a reasonable person, means fair, equal, and proportionate treatment to all.

To be unfair, to treat people unequally, not to treat them proportionately, it seems, would be to discriminate.

Few Americans, of whatever persuasion would question that definition of the word.

Given that interpretation, then, how shall it be enforced?

How, for instance, does an employer make certain he is not guilty of discrimination? How does he graduate the religious affiliation of his employees so that each is treated fairly, equally, proportionately.

Does he take some standard statistical table and determine what percentage of the American people are Baptists, what percentage are Catholics, what percentage are Seventh-day Adventists? And then hire accordingly?

The bill does not help him. It just says he is not to discriminate.

Consider it from another point of view.

Most employers have little knowledge of the religion professed by the individuals they employ. American employers do not care what is a man's religion, or few do.

With that in mind, assume an employer is told by a Federal inspector he is guilty of discrimination because he has a disproportionate share of, say, Methodists on his payroll.

How shall he go about rectifying the situation?

The bill does not answer that question, either. It says only that the employer is not to discriminate.

Must he, forthwith, discharge a given number of his Methodist employees to enroll those of some other religion, whatever religion the inspector finds underemployed by his firm?

Or will he be given a period of grace? Will he be made to know he is guilty of discrimination but that the Government in its "reasonableness," will forbear immediate enforcement of the law and let the process of attrition work? That hereafter he is not to hire Methodists but hire instead, as openings occur, those of other specified religions, until religious balance has been achieved?

Is that how it is to be?

Suppose, during this grace period, an exceptional workman—the sort the employer needs—makes application for employment. And suppose he professes Methodism. Is that man to be denied the job he would, otherwise, fill?

Those who oppose the civil rights bill say, under its provisions, that is precisely what would happen.

Supporters of the measure contend such hypothetical questions are propounded only to make the bill appear ridiculous.

That may be. But an oblique denial does not answer the question: Does the bill, or does it not, carry that sort of power? That is the question.

The preponderance of evidence seems to indicate it does. What else can nondiscrimination mean unless it be equal and proportionate treatment? Are its supporters prepared to say it does not mean these things? That, since the bill will be "reasonably" enforced, we should have no concern for its power.

If this is so, if the bill is to be "reasonably" enforced—as opposed to strictly enforced—we face a situation even more acute than the bill's detractors claim.

For, then, we would have a law which would permit an agent of the Federal Government to render, on his own, decisions as to the law's enforcement as well as its meaning. And that is tyranny.

Under that circumstance, we would have abrogated the rule by law and would have substituted the rule by man.

Rule by man was the sort of government the Germans knew under Hitler, the sort the Russians know, today, under Khrushchev.

Whatever the good intentions of the sponsors of the civil rights bill, it seems the burden is on them to clarify these perplexing frightening questions.

THE LATE HONORABLE THOMAS J. O'BRIEN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI].

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, in evaluating the political career of Congressman THOMAS O'BRIEN, who for 28 years served as a Member of this body from Illinois, one must realize the fact that he dedicated his political career to serving his constituency, many of whom were steeped in poverty and naturally looked to labor and welfare organizations for their social progress and economic protection. The splendid racial traits of his paternal Irish ancestry dominated his character, and he held to the hard, stern rules of loyalty to party and organization. His whole life was devoted to the development of its political strength and labor's unity of purpose. Nothing would upset him more, as dean of the Illinois Democratic delegation, if even one member disagreed with the party's stand on a question, and voted with the opposition.

He believed that loyalty to party and leadership was the only course for him, and he followed it. This was the one characteristic that remained predominant throughout his whole career; he could no more abandon it than to repudiate the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church. He resented anyone who unsuspectingly inquired of him about his attitude on a certain piece of legislation favored by the Democratic administration. In anger he would reply "mind your own business—who said I was against it? Am I not an administration man—get out."

Although physically wasting away from the middle of last term, hospitalized for long periods and returning for a short time in this term, his legislative duties were always uppermost in his mind—not even thoughts of regaining his health were as important to him. Although physically hardly able to walk without support this spring on his return to the House, his clear and alert mind, flashed through the haze of a prolonged illness, and in appearance he seemed vigorous and healthy.

Upon his return to the hospital, and even though complications were progressive, he showed the acuteness of his mental capacity, but as he said in his jocular homely way—"I'm living on borrowed time—old age is getting me." This is so true he succumbed just to Anno Domini.

Mr. O'BRIEN was liked and respected by his colleagues on both sides throughout the years of his service.

He was strong and wise in party delegation councils and was practical in his support of administration policy.

Mr. O'BRIEN was forceful in his appeal for action. He had the ability to handle and direct men.

Throughout his long career, Mr. O'BRIEN could be relied upon to do his duty, to serve his constituency, and to support labor.

He always did what he thought was best, and whatever task he undertook, he did well, and whatever he accomplished for others was appreciated. He was rewarded with a strong feeling of loyalty on the part of the recipient.

He died happy in the thought that from humble beginnings he had left the memory of a loved personality whose service added to the dignity and power of his State and his Nation's prestige for public good.

Mr. O'BRIEN was a natural leader and had something warm and appealing about him that attracted Congressmen to him, and he instilled in each a sense of confidence—this acceptance made him a leader. Mr. O'BRIEN never violated his word or promise to anybody. He was sensitive sometimes to newspaper criticism, but never displayed any anger or temper toward his press critics, although in several rare instances he was outspoken and used forceful language in outbursts within the political group.

He pursued a quiet and steady life of activity, accomplishing many things with valuable results to his city and State. Unfortunately, it was only in recent years that his works have come to public notice. But, he did not expect or desire publicity—he was satisfied with the love and admiration of his fellow citizens and colleagues.

Once you crossed Mr. O'BRIEN, you learned to regret it—he disliked a double dealer. He rarely condemned another, but he never forgave a deep hurt either. He was a rugged individual who was firm, spoke and thought straight through to you, and the sincerity of his words were from his heart. No political trickery—his answer was "Yes" or "No." The great leader of Illinois was a real man in every sense of the word—and his word was law to the leaders of his party at home. Mayor Richard Daley and deceased Democratic leader, Patrick Nash, were his closest friends.

Mr. O'BRIEN might not be so well known to the Nation, but he certainly held the esteem and admiration of the business, professional, and political leaders of his State interested in national affairs.

By his silence, you would know him—he rarely, if ever, presented himself before his colleagues for a speech, for he was a man of action and wasted no time in voicing empty phrases, or indulging in a show bordering on sensationalism. He was no exhibitionist.

He lived simply with his darling wife, Nettie. They were an ideal couple. His brother-in-law, John, and his secretary, Mr. Miley, were ever at his side. My wife Jeannette, my son Michael, and I extend our heartfelt condolences to Mrs. O'Brien and her brother John. Now that he is gone the Illinois delegation and the Congress do not seem the same.

The people of the Nation, the State of Illinois, and city of Chicago, have lost a distinguished citizen and leader whose whole life was dedicated to the highest service to his fellow man.

I have written these few stanzas as a tribute to his memory:

The sky's cloak many secrets hold
Nor heaven's mansions God unfolds
From earth's mortal eyes.
E'en to souls that cloud its lofty spires.

Its purples, grays, and deep blues
Or slender slivers of tinted golden light
Fading with darkening shadows seal the moon at night
Bringing evening sadness as fleeting stars blend with darkest hues.

Beyond this firmament his soul has passed today
With God's blessing for which many pray
Seeking its sacred way to Kingdom come,
To reap the glory for a life of service done.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIBONATI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], have permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, we have lost a fine colleague in the death of THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, whom I always admired.

He was a good man in every sense of the word, whose friends and supporters would, I am sure, have elected him to any public office he might have sought within their jurisdiction.

Certainly his long public career, both here in the Congress and back in his home area, bespeaks the affection and confidence of his constituents.

One of TOM O'BRIEN's great qualities was his capacity for loyalty to the cause he served. Let it be said of him that he kept the faith through the years to the party he represented, to his district, and to his State.

While it was not my privilege to work with him on the great Committee on Ways and Means, I can appreciate that the ability he brought to his assignment as an accountant enabled him to make significant contributions to the work of that committee.

Mr. Speaker, a long and useful career as a pubic servant has ended in the passing of TOM O'BRIEN, but I trust those dear ones he leaves behind will be consoled in their loss by the knowledge that he gave so much of himself to help make this world a better place for all of us.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, after a prolonged illness, God in His wisdom has taken our beloved friend, TOM O'BRIEN, to his great reward. In our selfishness, not wanting to be denied his presence with us, we mourn his passing. We should not mourn for him. He would tell us, in the noble, kindly, courageous language of one of Dicken's characters: "It is a far, far better rest that I go to, than I have ever known."

Those of us who attended the funeral services held for him in his home city of Chicago were deeply moved by the love and respect with which he was held by the people of Illinois. It may be said that he devoted his entire life to the public service of Illinois. He was a State assemblyman and a State bank examiner. He also served as sheriff of Cook County.

That he served in the Congress for 28 years bespeaks the quality of the man and the high quality of his service to the people he represented in the great city of Chicago. TOM O'BRIEN and I differed on many legislative questions that came before us. He and I were political opponents. But our political differences and our differences on legislative issues never at any time or in any way disrupted our long-continuing friendship. He respected my views, and I respected his.

With the passing of TOM O'BRIEN I have lost a good friend, and we have lost an able legislator. We of Illinois have lost a distinguished public servant. He will be greatly missed. He will be long remembered.

To his fine wife and family, I extend my sincere sympathy.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIBONATI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, members of the Illinois delegation in the Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, join in this memorial this afternoon to THOMAS J. O'BRIEN with a deep sense of sadness and a sincerity that bespeak their love and admiration of a great man.

The sense of affection we Illinois Members had for TOM O'BRIEN is shared by the entire membership of the House of Representatives. In my own 20 years of service in this body I have never known a man who was more universally respected.

TOM O'BRIEN's judgment and political sagacity was outstanding and he had foresight in the outcome of political matters which was not short of amazing. His perceptiveness and ability to sense situations gave him many successes in his legislative career. Ever mindful of the welfare of the State and Nation he served, he was vigorous and wise in support of progressive causes.

He was the source of much wisdom and helpful direction to hundreds of younger Members of this body through his 28 years of service here. Only 19 Members of the present membership of the House have served longer than the dean of the Illinois delegation.

He was a kindly man. He was a considerate man. He was a good man. These qualities were evidenced in all his actions. These qualities were quickly recognized by all who knew him. In public life, in private life, they were readily discernible.

I suppose that of his many fine qualities the one which won for him the everlasting respect of all his colleagues in the House of Representatives was that of the reliance which could be put upon his word. It could be truthfully said of THOMAS J. O'BRIEN:

> His words are bonds:
> His oaths are oracles.

His fellow Members on both sides of the aisle, from every section of this great country, will miss him sorely and his place in our hearts will leave an aching void.

To his devoted wife, Nettie, brave and most gracious of ladies, Mrs. Price and I extend our most sincere sympathy.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIBONATI. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in tribute to one of the finest couples that it has ever been my privilege to know. TOM O'BRIEN was a great legislator. Few Members of this House ever dared to challenge him on a legislative question and those who did always found themselves outvoted. He was a Christian gentleman who entertained a loyal devotion to his friends, his city, his party, his country, and his God.

It was my privilege to serve with TOM O'BRIEN on the Appropriations Committee, of which he was a member before he was assigned to Ways and Means. Although he seldom made a speech, he was always effective in the subcommittee, the full committee, and on the floor of the House.

TOM was blessed with a long and happy married life. His wife was a charming companion. They were an ideal couple whose tender devotion for one another was beautiful to behold as they journeyed down the pathway of life together.

With the passing of TOM O'BRIEN, the city of Chicago has lost an able Representative, the Democratic Party has lost a valiant warrior, the United States of America has lost a patriotic and dedicated public servant and we have lost a colleague whose friendship I cherished. I extend my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. O'Brien and with her and the host of his friends in the House mourn his loss to the Nation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIBONATI. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this Chamber and, indeed, the whole country, which has suffered such severe bereavements in the year of tragedy, was struck one of the severest blows of all with the news yesterday of the passing of our respected and beloved colleague, THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, of Chicago. I sometimes wonder when an American, a legislator, a friend, like TOM O'BRIEN passes from the scene, whether the hardest hit are those, like the Members of this House, who have been so close to him and worked with him so collaboratively, or whether the greater sufferer is the field of Federal legislation, or the people of his district, or his State, or our country. For me the fact that I shall never again counsel with TOM O'BRIEN, that I shall never again consult him on politics in Chicago, in Illinois, and in the country, and that this friend, this counselor, this guide, is gone from us forever, is as hard to adjust myself to as any tragedy of the last decade.

If I speak of the death of Representative O'BRIEN from this personal sense of loss I know that in this House I shall be understood, for I was not alone in my respect and affection for him. For me this great and good man represented the integrity, the wisdom, the understanding of his fellow man, that is so indispensable to genuine success in the politics of our country. The influence of TOM O'BRIEN on the great events of his time, events which have shaped the history of the United States and the world in the 28 years that he served with us, was effective without being spectacular. In a thousand ways this dean of the Democrats of Illinois was the persuasive voice of sound judgment and good sense that played an important role in final decisions for the good of our country and the free world. For the great leaders of this House and for me in hours of great crisis, to have TOM O'BRIEN sit in when decisions were to be made, to have him at one's elbow, was a source of comfort and of reassurance, and a bulwark to the massive responsibilities that all of us frequently have to shoulder.

I remember TOM O'BRIEN well when he was first elected to the 73d Congress and recognized at once an ally and a friend, a legislator who would serve his country indefatigably and diligently and who would always hold close his sense of responsibility to the people of his district. For this loyalty to one's own, this recognition of regard for those who elect one to office, this feeling of mutuality, is the heart of American politics, because loyalty is not divisible and those who are loyal to their district cannot then be disloyal to their country. A man who is honest is honest not merely in some of his dealings but in all of them because that is or is not one's nature. And TOM O'BRIEN was the soul of political, intellectual, and personal honesty.

It happened, as we all know, that his specialized background in the field of banking and finance, and his intimate and technical knowledge of accounting, made him invaluable in what is perhaps the greatest function this House is called upon to perform, the fiduciary function. For TOM O'BRIEN understood banking and finance on the prodigious levels of the needs, the revenues, the problems of taxation, social security, and the expenditures of the Government of the United States. He knew it in terms of the crises that afflicted our country and the free world, and he knew it in terms

of the critical and pressing situations of war. Again and again, it seemed to me, he risked his physical well-being, indeed, life itself, in his devotion to the needs of his position on the Committee on Ways and Means. Here his service, as we all know, was senior and outstanding, and his counsel translated itself into the vital areas of the history of the United States in his time. His skill and his talent were outstanding on the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue and Taxation. Many of us felt a personal sense of impending doom when Representative O'BRIEN, back in 1962, suffered a heart attack when he was a guest of President Kennedy and the President's aid, Lawrence F. O'Brien, aboard the Presidential yacht *Sequoia*. This was a desperate hour for us all. And all of us felt an immense relief when he overcame this attack and seemed well on the path to recovery. There were periods of course of diminished activity, but this great and seasoned legislator never lost his zest for life nor his enthusiasm for politics and his devotion to the public interest.

It is impossible under the agony of this moment to make an adequate assessment of the meaning of the life and service of a great American like TOM O'BRIEN. For more than half a century I have known no other interest than the interest of politics and the safety, the peace, and the prosperity of my country and for me the greatest contributors to that safety, that peace, that prosperity, are men of the depth and stature of TOM O'BRIEN. He was one of those statesmen, knowledgeable and informed in the problems of the budget and of appropriations, who could from that specialized vantage point see the total needs of the United States and gage its goals and its future accordingly. Yet with all his lofty understanding of the great vistas of modern statesmanship, he appreciated the problems of the grassroots and the home folks, and he knew, as only the choice few knew, how to make democracy work for all the people. I pray to Almighty God that He will send us in this Chamber another American who can with equal dedication and competence fill the place of this most distinguished citizen of Illinois, this statesman, this remarkable servant to the interests of the people.

Further, the beautiful life that he and Mrs. O'Brien led was an inspiration for all others to follow. Mrs. McCormack and I would meet them, while Congress was in session, at Mass each Sunday while TOM and Mrs. O'Brien and Mrs. McCormack and I were attending the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass at St. Patrick's Church. Their life was a beautiful one, traveling the journey of life together, sweethearts always, sweethearts before marriage and sweethearts during the blessed married life that they had. It was a good example for all others to follow.

From a personal angle, I have a great feeling of consolation that will always remain in my mind, because I visited our late friend, TOM O'BRIEN, at the hospital 2 days before he died, the Sunday before he died. I think I was the last one of his colleagues that served with him that visited him at the hospital prior to his death. At that time I realized the end was coming. While he was not unconscious he was not conscious; he was not aware of my presence in the hospital room. Mrs. O'Brien and her brother were there. It will always be a source of great consolation to me that I visited him 2 days prior to his death.

If we could all take the journey into the great beyond with the confidence in our minds that TOM O'BRIEN had of reaching that place in eternity that holds for all who lead a good life, we could approach the end of the journey of life with great happiness and satisfaction.

I extend to Mrs. O'Brien in her bereavement the profound sympathy of both Mrs. McCormack and myself.

Mr. LIBONATI. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, TOM O'BRIEN was my friend for over half a century. We walked together, as it were, from youth into the gathering years of age. It is hard to accept the truth of his physical passing. TOM O'BRIEN had always seemed so indestructible. Even on the last day of his life when the report reached us that he was sinking, I refused to believe that the danger in TOM O'BRIEN's case could be real. To the last I honestly believed he would beat off the ailment that had stricken him and that he would return to execute with faithfulness and vigor his duties in the House, on the Ways and Means Committee, and as our beloved dean in the 89th Congress.

TOM O'BRIEN had many virtues, but I would say the strongest was that of loyalty. Mr. Speaker, indeed a man may possess all the other virtues, and if he is without the virtue of loyalty he is a pauper in character. That was TOM O'BRIEN's credo. TOM O'BRIEN lived a life of loyalty in its finest expression—loyalty to his fine and noble wife, his life's companion, and to his family, loyalty to his State, his city, his Nation, his church, and his party, loyalty to his friends and the causes of labor and of humanity that he championed.

Mr. Speaker, TOM O'BRIEN never broke his word—never. He was well into the eighties and he never broke his word and he never forgave anyone who he believed had broken his word to him.

Mr. Speaker, TOM O'BRIEN will be missed in this House. He will be missed in Chicago. I remember him first as a young man in his late twenties. He had run as an independent for the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois and had beaten Benjamin J. Mitchell, the regular Democratic incumbent. Those were rough days. There were conventions—no primary elections. Young O'BRIEN's victory was a real upset. He went down to Springfield and served for two terms. Then he called Ben Mitchell in—and this should be remembered—showing the tender heart that beat in TOM O'BRIEN's bosom—TOM called him in and said, "Now, Ben, you always liked it in Springfield and it sort of broke your heart when I beat you." Ben said, "Yes, TOM, it did." And TOM O'BRIEN said, "Well, Ben, I am going to quit and give you back your job." And he did. I know of no better story from true life to convey the sweet tenderness of TOM O'BRIEN. Ben Mitchell had his ups and his downs after that, but TOM O'BRIEN was in his corner all the way.

Ten years later he returned for three more terms in the State legislature in Illinois. But meanwhile something had happened that was unusual in Illinois. In 1912 we elected a Democratic State administration—the first that we had had in 20 years, and this, thanks to Teddy Roosevelt and his Bull Moose splitting of the Republican Party. A young man who had been a telegraph operator, a handsome, popular, and able young fellow, Jim Brady, was elected State auditor. The first thing Jim Brady did was to call in TOM O'BRIEN and make TOM O'BRIEN a bank examiner.

TOM O'BRIEN performed that function of bank examiner so well that he was retained by the two succeeding Republican State treasurers after the end of the administration of Brady.

I am thinking back a good many years now. TOM O'BRIEN and I were close friends for over half a century. We had many things in common—peculiar little things. I never eat butter, do not like gravy, keep away from dressings, and have been that way since childhood. TOM O'BRIEN never ate butter, did not like the sight of it, and with him, too, gravy and dressings were off the reservation.

That is a small thing but when one does not conform even to the usual habits of appetite I suppose the sense of affinity grows with another similar nonconformist and it tends to draw you closer and closer together.

Mr. Speaker, my heart is broken. But, Mr. Speaker, it will mend—as I think of TOM O'BRIEN and meditate on the years of our warm and close friendship as we traveled together from youth to the advancing years of age and I deny to myself that he is gone and I sit in my chair in this Chamber, hearing the sound in my ears of the living voice of the immortal TOM O'BRIEN.

Mr. Speaker, to the sweetheart of TOM O'BRIEN's youth and every day and every moment of his adult life, to Mrs. O'Brien, goes my deepest sympathy. Nor can I forget in this time of deep grief John Kaufer and Jim Milley who worked with TOM O'BRIEN all these rich years in the service of his constituents.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I share the sorrow of my beloved Speaker and our beloved colleagues from the great State of Illinois and the city of Chicago over the loss of one of the illustrious men of this body.

As I listened to the eloquent words of the distinguished and venerable gentleman from Chicago, Mr. O'HARA, who has just taken his seat, in describing his lifelong association with TOM O'BRIEN, I realized how inadequate would be my effort to pay tribute to the inimitable TOM O'BRIEN.

The passing of our late beloved colleague TOM O'BRIEN has left a void in this

House that can never be filled. After the Lord made TOM O'BRIEN, He broke the mold. Like Napoleon, he had no model, and no successor.

In many respects TOM O'BRIEN was the most extraordinary man I have ever known. Born in the 19th century, he carried the traditions and wisdom of another era and applied them with great effect to the fulfillment of 20th century human and political aims. While TOM seldom took the well of the House, this Chamber has never known a more successful legislator. He was a man calm and composed, yet with a determination as hard as nails. When he concentrated his efforts on a legislative problem, its solution became a certainty. He balanced these qualities with boundless fidelity in his allegiances. He belonged to the old school which held that loyalty is a two-way street. In a legislative battle he was an ally who inspired confidence in his comrades. When TOM O'BRIEN went with you, he went all the way. His word was better than a bond.

One of the hallmarks of TOM O'BRIEN's personality and character was his legendary loyalty to the Democratic Party. He gave his party unfaltering support. It was perhaps one of the great loves of his life. Yet with all his partisan commitment, he was a kindly man who loved his friends without regard to party affiliation. He respected the views of every human being regardless of whether he agreed with them or not. His long years as a public servant were an unbroken record of achievement on behalf of his fellow man. The leader of the great Chicago delegation, he wielded such influence as has been held by few men who have ever served in this House.

Many of us sought Mr. O'BRIEN's help and counsel over the years. He had our confidence, our trust, and our deep affection. As for me, he was my friend and close adviser from the moment I first came to the House. I treasured his friendship as I respected his wisdom and admired his rare talents.

TOM O'BRIEN's great city of Chicago, throughout many decades an important factor in the political life of this Nation, has lost an irreplaceable son. This House has lost one of its truly distinguished Members. The Nation has lost a great and respected legislator.

I join the gentleman from Illinois in his expression of sorrow and I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. O'Brien, the devoted and wonderful helpmate of our late beloved colleague.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of my dear friend, THOMAS J. O'BRIEN.

Mr. O'BRIEN represented the Sixth Congressional District of Illinois since 1932 with the exception of the years 1938 to 1942 when he served as sheriff of Cook County, Ill. He had served in the Illinois Legislature 50 years ago.

During his tenure as a Member of the House of Representatives, he first served as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, then chaired by the eminent Sam Rayburn. When he returned to Congress in 1942 he became a member of the important Committee on Ways and Means wherein he was the third ranking majority member and a conferee.

During his service on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce he became a very close friend of the chairman, Mr. Rayburn, and this friendship was retained until Mr. Rayburn's death. Mr. O'BRIEN was one of the motivating forces that made Sam Rayburn majority leader in 1936 which was the first step toward Mr. Rayburn's elevation to Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. O'BRIEN was a serious as well as an able and efficient public servant, and during his long service in the House made an imprint that will not soon be forgotten.

I have had the privilege of knowing Mr. O'BRIEN intimately for over a score of years and found him a loyal and true friend. Mrs. Murphy's family have been neighbors of Mr. and Mrs. O'Brien for many years in the Austin community of the city of Chicago.

Mrs. Murphy joins me in extending our sincerest sympathy to his devoted wife Nettie, and to Mr. O'BRIEN's personal family. May God's eternal light shine upon him and may his soul rest in peace.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the Illinois delegation in paying tribute to a great American.

The passing of our colleague, Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, not only grieved his numerous friends but it also signified the end of an era. Very few Americans enjoy the privilege of actively serving their city, county, State, and Nation over a period of almost 60 years. TOM O'BRIEN served in one of the city courts of Chicago before he was elected to the Illinois State Legislature in 1905. He was elected to four terms in the Illinois State Legislature beginning in 1905. He was afterward a State bank examiner and held various offices in the city of Chicago and Cook County up until he was first elected to the 74th Congress in the early thirties.

Congressman O'BRIEN was a leader of the Democratic Party not only in Chicago and Cook County but also had great influence in party circles throughout the State of Illinois. He learned his politics and was a student of government at an early age and possessed the extraordinary commensense and personality to win friends and keep them. He possessed that rare quality of loyalty to his political party, his leaders, and his associates both in and out of government. When TOM O'BRIEN made a promise or gave his word, it did not need to be in writing and his reputation was such that his promise was as good as a Government bond. He possessed that keen sense of judgment and understanding of human nature that he shunned contacts and relationships with people who, in his judgment, were not reliable and of the highest character.

Many successful Government officials, business and professional men in Illinois owe their start to the help and recommendations of TOM O'BRIEN. Governors, mayors, and both local and national leaders consulted with him on matters of policy and politics for over a half a century.

Congressman O'BRIEN was a clean living man, enjoyed the best of health up until he was stricken with a heart condition a year ago last August at the age of 84. The older Members of Congress especially will certainly note his absence from the floor of this House. Thousands of longtime friends in Illinois will miss him and all who were fortunate enough to enjoy his acquaintance have lost a true friend.

I wish to extend to Mrs. O'Brien and to his family my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join the Illinois delegation and the rest of my colleagues in paying tribute to TOM O'BRIEN and in expressing my deepest sympathy at his passing.

Politically Mr. O'BRIEN and I were, of course, on the opposite sides of the aisle. TOM O'BRIEN was a partisan and he was me his, because he never let his political differences I always considered him my friend and I believe he always considered me his, because he never let his political partisanship interfere with his friendship and his love of his fellow man. He tried to be of help under all circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, TOM O'BRIEN was a great gentleman. He was a great American. I shall miss him.

Mrs. Byrnes joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to his wife in this very difficult hour.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my profound sorrow at the passing of my esteemed friend, Hon. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, dean of the Illinois congressional delegation. For 29 years he has served his constituents, his State, and the Nation with dedicated devotion and performed his duties and responsibilities in Congress with outstanding effectiveness. His high ideals, leadership, and cooperation have won the respect and regard of all who have been privileged to serve with him in the House. We will all miss this truly great statesman, and I join in extending my sincere condolences to his family.

I will particularly miss the hand of friendship and assistance he has extended to me through my years in the House. I early learned that he was a man whose word could be absolutely relied upon; it was as firm as the Rock of Gibraltar. TOM O'BRIEN, through his leadership of the Illinois delegation, extended his cooperation and help to many of us, and throughout America, the many works, projects, and legislation of local importance which he materially assisted, will remain a monument to his memory.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join in paying tribute to our late colleague, THOMAS J. O'BRIEN—an outstanding citizen of Illinois and of the Nation.

While I served with him here in the Congress for only a brief period I came to appreciate and to respect the esteem in which he was held.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of a colleague is always an awesome experience. In the passing of THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, I experienced not only the loss of a colleague in this honorable body, the U.S. House of Representatives, but the passing of a gentleman who was both admired and loved.

When THOMAS J. O'BRIEN was elected sheriff of Cook County, I was aware of his service in this high office. When he was elected to the 78th Congress, I became even more aware of the prominence which this public servant had acquired, for he had been a Member of Congress and had chosen to serve the county of Cook as sheriff at a time when his experience was demanded at home. When he had completed his work there he returned to Congress and has served 11 consecutive terms with distinction since his return.

To his wife, Nettie, and to his brother, Dennis, to his many other relatives and friends, no words of mine—or yours—can soften the blow of his going. No recital of his contributions or his leadership will dull the sense of emptiness which overwhelms those who know today that his seat among us is vacated.

To them and to you, my colleagues, I say the name and memory of THOMAS J. O'BRIEN are inscribed and hallowed in this Chamber, henceforth.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIBONATI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our late departed friend, TOM O'BRIEN. I am so sorry that he is not in this Chamber with us any more.

Mr. Speaker, my acquaintanceship with TOM goes back to some 16 years ago when I first came to Washington fresh out of college, to serve as administrative assistant to my predecessor. We had occasion to talk with one another whenever the Illinois group met. I can recall his having mentioned how good it was for one to get started here in Washington at such an early age and that there was a bright future for those who in his words "played his cards right."

Mr. Speaker, TOM O'BRIEN was a great one for reminiscing and telling the younger generation what it was like in "the good old days."

His was a varied career in public service, and loyalty was a hallmark with him. He wasn't the most talkative individual, but what he did say was well reasoned and sincere. He was always very kind and considerate of the other fellow's viewpoint as long as he was a gentleman in expressing it. He loved people, and I do not remember how often he told me after being elected to Congress, "Young man, you just keep smiling; it's good for everyone around you."

Mr. Speaker, the sermon at his funeral a few days ago, which was so eloquently delivered, told in capsule form, far better than I can here today, how wonderfully composed this man was with so many fine human qualities. In essence the sermon said that all of us could take a leaf from TOM O'BRIEN's book of life and that we should strive to emulate those things for which he stood.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying respects here today to a great man, one whom I shall surely miss seeing in this House and one who has made such a big imprint upon the political life and history of the city of Chicago, and the State of Illinois, and in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIBONATI. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of loss that I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Representative TOM O'BRIEN, of Illinois.

When I first came to the House of Representatives 6 years ago, he was already long established as a senior Member whose counsel was sought and whose advices were heeded. It was my good fortune to make his acquaintance early in my first term. During the intervening years, the benefit of his experience was frequently at my disposal, and from observation of his conduct I learned the full meaning of the phrase "able, courageous, and devoted public servant."

His passing from the roster of the House will be felt with special sorrow by all of us who had reason to know his uncommon generosity of spirit.

I take pride in having known him and in having merited his friendship, and I join in extending to his family and friends my deepest and most sincere sympathy.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIBONATI. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the great tribute which has been paid to the memory of our late colleague, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, by so many of the Members of this House indicates the love and respect which he enjoyed among his fellow legislators. The fact that he was elected and reelected for term after term, even after he had become an octogenarian is proof positive that he had served his people and his State and Nation well.

As a Representative of the youngest State of the Union, I join those who served with him for nearly three decades in the Congress in paying tribute to the late THOMAS J. O'BRIEN. This Nation is richer for having had him as a citizen.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my deepest sorrow on the passing of our colleague from Illinois, Mr. O'BRIEN. When I came to Congress 26 years ago, I met Mr. O'BRIEN and within a few weeks I learned to love and respect him. In my opinion, he was one of the most effective and solid Members of this body during the 26 years I have had the privilege and opportunity to serve in the House. I do not know of any man who has contributed more to mankind and to our Nation in this legislative body than did Mr. O'BRIEN of Chicago.

Mr. O'BRIEN talked to me on numerous occasions during the years we served together in this body concerning legislation he was personally interested in having the House take favorable action upon. I do not remember voting against any bill that my good friend Mr. O'BRIEN personally requested me to support when he was of the opinion that it would be for the best interest of his people and Illinois.

I know we have had some valuable Members of the House during my lifetime; however, I do not know of anyone that enjoyed more prestige and full confidence of his fellow Members of the House than our good friend, the late TOM O'BRIEN.

We shall all miss his excellent guidance and his presence in this body during the remainder of the time we are privileged to serve in the Congress of the United States.

I express my heartfelt sympathies to the members of his family.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my distinguished colleagues in paying a deep and sincere tribute to the memory of our beloved colleague, Congressman O'BRIEN from Illinois. I will never forget his courtesy to me when I first came to Congress, nor his continuing courtesy ever since.

He was one of the kindest and most thoughtful persons I have ever known and to his widow and family, my deepest sympathy in their loss which is shared by the entire House of Representatives.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, there is a special sense of loss felt in our bereavement at the death of Representative THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, the oldest Member of the House of Representatives.

He was a capable leader of his delegation from Illinois, a valued counselor to his juniors in the House, a loyal member of his party, and a valued friend to all who knew him.

He had a long and successful career of public service. He first came to the House of Representatives in 1933; he served as a member of the Illinois House of Representatives, as a State bar examiner, as a deputy collector of internal revenue, and as the elected sheriff of Cook County.

His was not the oratorical style in public life, but the taciturnity that betokens ability, the silence that commands respect, and the human understanding that gains friendships.

On April 30 he would have been 86 years of age. In those many years he achieved a distinguished record of achievement in every office which he held. He was beloved not only by his

colleagues in the House but by his constituents in his district. They were voting in the Illinois primary to return him to his 15th term in Congress at the very time that he passed beyond the reach of their approval and of all earthly rewards. Yet, knowing the veneration in which he held the House, and the store which he set by the approval of the constituents of both parties whom he represented so long and so well, this was the very time that he himself might have chosen to end a career of honest and able service to his country, to his party, and to his district.

Yet his memory will long be with us, and shall serve as an example of the levels of legislative achievement that lie within the range of men who are quiet, dedicated, and sincere. He was all of these things, and embodied these virtues as well as others to the fullest.

He will be missed, but he will not be forgotten.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, last week brought to a close one of the most distinguished careers in the annals of this body. The death of TOM O'BRIEN, of Chicago, shocked and saddened us all. It was a particularly heavy loss to those of us who knew TOM well and worked with him for so many years.

Mr. Speaker, anyone at all familiar with the mechanics of the House of Representatives realizes that it is not enough just to be a skilled orator or a parliamentary genius to succeed. Of equal, if not paramount importance, is the ability to earn and maintain the respect of one's colleagues. No one in this Chamber can deny that TOM O'BRIEN mastered this facet of congressional life. His word was his bond, and, when on those rare occasions he took to the well of the floor to speak, the House listened attentively.

His shrewd judgment was often sought by his colleagues, and his political advice was the envy of Members of this body on both sides of the aisle.

TOM O'BRIEN was the epitome of public service: dedicated to the people he represented, selfless, honest, and above all, skilled in his chosen career.

The Ways and Means Committee on which he served so long will miss him dearly; the House, which he loved so deeply, will miss him even more.

Mrs. Kirwan and I extend our sincerest sympathies to his belowed widow.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, a fine and trusted friend has left us; a gentleman in every sense of that word. His loyalty and devotion to his country was unquestioned. TOM O'BRIEN will be greatly missed here. Mrs. Trimble joins me in deep sympathy to Mrs. O'Brien and other members of the family.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the death of TOM O'BRIEN came as a terrific shock to me, as I am sure it did to every Member of this House. In his death I have lost a very dear and valued friend.

I can well remember when I first came to the Congress 14 years ago, TOM O'BRIEN was already a seven-term veteran—a broken 7-year term, I might add, as TOM had taken time out from his duties in the Congress to serve a 4-year term as sheriff of Cook County. When I first came here, even though I was on the other side of the aisle, TOM O'BRIEN constantly went out of his way to help the freshman from Champaign. His advice and counsel guided me over many a rough road. I believe I am a better Congressman because of his help and guidance.

TOM O'BRIEN and I disagreed on many issues, but there was never the slightest touch of bitterness in that disagreement. He was not that kind of man. The warmth of his person—his friendliness—his outgoing nature—his love of all mankind—would not permit him to carry a grudge. TOM O'BRIEN was sincere and steadfast in his beliefs. He was a loyal friend.

Deeply religious, his inner strength gave of itself to those with whom he came in contact. And TOM—dean of the Illinois delegation—gave unstintingly of himself in his service to his district, his State, and his country. His presence will be sorely missed.

I wish to join my colleagues in extending deepest sympathy to his widow in this hour of her bereavement.

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, only so much can be said on the loss of a wonderful man like TOM O'BRIEN. You could take all the good words, all the phrases, and all the poems spoken and written when one of our loved ones passes away, compile them all together, and pick out the very best. Only this would be suitable for TOM.

A few years ago, when I came to the Congress as a freshman, I met TOM O'BRIEN for the first time. His sincerity and dedication to his job were truly superb and caused one of the greatest impressions made upon me by anyone since coming to Washington.

TOM was a Christian, a statesman, and a politician, all rolled into one. I, like many others, will miss him very much for a long time.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, TOM O'BRIEN was a great American and a dedicated Congressman. He was outstanding in the tradition of his great State and the Windy City that he loved.

This Congress is a better place because of TOM O'BRIEN. This Nation is a greater country because of his service to his city, State, and Nation.

TOM O'BRIEN loved public service. He liked to do things for his fellow citizens. He was genial and affable. TOM O'BRIEN was a gentleman.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in deepest sympathy to Mrs. O'Brien and to his constituents whom he loved.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our late, beloved colleague, TOM O'BRIEN. I spent many pleasant hours in discussions with him, but principally listening to his recounting some of the experiences of a long and useful life. Truly, a part of Americana passed from the scene with the passing of TOM O'BRIEN.

TOM had many good and great qualities, not the least of which was one in which I believe he took greatest personal pride. Early in my work in Washington I learned that when TOM O'BRIEN said something or gave you his word, you could forget about it because he was very proud of the fact that he had never broken his word once he had given it. This most admirable quality is only one of the many good qualities he had that endeared him to all of us who knew him well. He is truly going to be missed, and Mrs. Herlong and I want to take this opportunity to express our deepest sympathy to his faithful and loving wife in her, our, and the country's great loss.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the tributes to my late colleague in the House and on the Committee on Ways and Means, Representative THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, of Illinois.

Representative O'BRIEN had a most distinguished career of public service in his home county, his district and the Nation. He was respected and revered by his people. He was a leader of his State's delegation in the House. He was beloved by his colleagues.

I, of course, became acquainted with Representative O'BRIEN when I first came to the House in January 1955. I came to know him better after joining the Committee on Ways and Means in this Congress. My conviction that Representative O'BRIEN was a most effective legislator grew each year that I observed him at work.

Representative O'BRIEN inspired everyone with whom he came in contact. The record of his accomplishments will stand as a lasting monument to his memory.

It has been a privilege and honor for me to serve with him, and I share deeply in the sorrow that has befallen his family, his constituents, and his colleagues because of his passing.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my heartfelt respects to my departed friend and distinguished colleague from Illinois, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN.

The people of Illinois have lost a great and dedicated Representative in the Congress. The Nation has lost a splendid American whose record of service in the House of Representatives will be a lasting monument to his name.

I first met our departed friend when I came to the House of Representatives in 1957. I was greatly impressed by his kind and gentle manner and by his desire to be of help in every way possible. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN was a Christian gentleman, whose sterling character and warm personality made him esteemed by all who were privileged to know him.

His many years in the Congress of the United States and his service as sheriff of Cook County, Ill., were performed with a steadfast devotion to duty and a sincere desire to discharge the faith and trust which his constituents had placed in him. He excelled as a Representative, and he made a great record of which his State and Nation may take just pride.

THOMAS J. O'BRIEN has responded to the last rollcall. Though he will not be among us here in the House in the days that lie ahead, his memory and the things for which he stood will long be an inspiration to all of us. I extend to the members of his family my sincere condolences in their great loss. May divine providence comfort all of them in their bereavement.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable sorrow and personal grief

that I call the attention of the House to the absence of our beloved colleague, THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, of the Illinois Sixth District, who last Tuesday, April 14, passed on, from this world to the next.

The loss of TOM O'BRIEN is one that we shall find particularly hard to abide, in the troublous times ahead. His leadership, which extended far and beyond his own State delegation, will be missed by all of those with whom he worked, and his friendship, good humor, and generosity will be missed by many hundreds who knew and loved him as a person.

TOM O'BRIEN was the headman of the Illinois Democratic delegation for many, many years. He was also a high-ranking member of the House Ways and Means Committee, in which capacity his influence reached to extraordinary lengths—partially as the result of political know-how, partially in consequence of personal appeal.

The business of the Ways and Means Committee is, of course, vital to the welfare of the country. To this group falls the task of whipping into shape the various and sundry tax bills, which so deeply affect the economic condition of the American people. As third-ranking Democrat on the Ways and Means Committee, TOM O'BRIEN was in a position to defend the pocketbook of the consumer and the small businessman against the wishes of wealthier interests. For whenever a tax bill came up for consideration in committee, he was on hand to insist upon justice for the little man, and to prevent the power of wealth from determining the disposal of revenue problems.

So much was TOM O'BRIEN revered and so great his influence in the matter of taxation, that when he suffered a heart attack 2 years ago, and subsequently was confined a good deal of the time in the Bethesda Naval Hospital, his hospital room became a regular gathering place for a multitude of colleagues.

Slight of build and famous for his quiet demeanor, TOM O'BRIEN was nonetheless a veritable thunderbolt of a man in political circles. His convictions were firm, his principles impeccable, his knowledge of politics unsurpassed by any Member here today.

Born and reared in Chicago, TOM O'BRIEN became in time a lawyer, State legislator, and State bank examiner, before his first election to Congress, in the year 1933.

During his service in the House, he had the opportunity to play a major part in numerous legislative battles against the foes of human betterment. That is to say, he was, at one time or another, confronted with a need to engage in conflict with the forces of economic depression, place and privilege, and military assault, all of which he sought, with voice and vote, to put down, as firmly, forcefully, and conclusively as possible.

TOM O'BRIEN not only talked democracy, he meant it, for himself and everyone else. His labors in behalf of the poor, the minorities, and the sick in spirit, were well known to the people in his district, and throughout the whole of his favorite town of Chicago.

A friend of the late Speaker Rayburn, TOM O'BRIEN was one of the leaders in the battle of 1961 to help both the Speaker and President Kennedy in their fight to enlarge the House Rules Committee, in the interest of justice.

Prior to that, he joined in promoting the New Deal measures of the early 1930's, the Fair Deal measures of the 1940's, and the New Frontier campaign, launched by President Kennedy and carried on, today, by President Johnson.

In economic matters, TOM O'BRIEN was always the friend of liberal reform. And when it came to national defense, he again could be found in the forefront of the fight, endorsing the anti-Nazi policies of the Roosevelt administration, supporting the American war cause with everything at his command, then turning to throw his weight, full force, against the Communist menace, at home and abroad.

At his funeral in Chicago, at St. Thomas Aquinas Roman Catholic Church, a great many House Members were on hand, for the sake of paying tribute to a man who did them honor. For he was involved in the great game of professional politics, as are they. And, by the nature of his conduct, he manifested a warm glow in which others of his profession well can bask today, with due thanks to the departed hero—a strong man, a liberal man, a man of great heart and great attainments: The late THOMAS J. O'BRIEN.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of deep personal sadness that I rise to pay my respects to the memory of our distinguished colleague, THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, of Illinois. As a new Member in the 75th Congress, I felt privileged to count Congressman O'BRIEN not only as a close friend, but also as a valued mentor, and my sentiments toward him have increased tremendously with the intervening years.

Mr. O'BRIEN was, in a very real sense, the last of his illustrious kind. He was truly one of God's noblemen. As a dedicated American, he has served his country, his constituents, and his party with great distinction in this body for more than a quarter of a century. In my association with him for 12 years, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, it has been my privilege to observe and benefit from his serious application to the many problems that we have faced and to which he brought the wisdom derived from a keen mind and from his earlier experience with the governments of the State of Illinois and its important Cook County. His colleagues could not help but be inspired by his actions and character.

His actions were always of the highest degree of integrity—always direct and always successful to the point to which he was heading. His character was impeccable and, with it, came the qualities that have made him, and the few before him and the fewer afterwards, the greater. He seldom spoke but, having done so, thereafter implemented his few words by the action that meant decisive success for the things that, to him, were paramount—word, bond, and deed—and a better world for his having served it.

The Members of this body have lost a most valued, unique, and irreplaceable colleague and friend. To the members of the Illinois delegation, particularly, I express my condolences upon the passing of the beloved dean of their delegation. His counsel and friendship will be sorely missed. To his bereaved widow and family I extend my most heartfelt sympathy. It is difficult to convey to them by either the spoken or written word the deep feeling of sorrow which I share with them and with Congressman O'BRIEN'S host of friends. The knowledge that it is so shared may to some degree lighten their burden but not mine, for he was always and always will be an inspiration to one, such as I, who always needs a guiding light. His light will always shine, and I, I hope, will always be the better for having served and sat with a great and good man, THOMAS J. O'BRIEN. He will rest in the peace he deserves.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our beloved colleague, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, is a great loss to all of us in the Illinois delegation. He was a giant in the House, although his work we all know was carried on quietly behind the scenes rather than in a flamboyant, public fashion.

As spokesman for the Democratic members of the Illinois delegation, he worked closely with Members of our side of the aisle whenever important matters affecting Chicago and the State of Illinois required coordination. He was a gentle, kind gentleman, especially helpful to new Members, and always willing to pass on to others the wisdom he had acquired in his years of experience in the Congress.

TOM O'BRIEN was especially effective in legislative developments leading to the Cal-Sag project. He could always be counted upon to battle effectively for the causes he held to be sound.

Those of us who were fortunate to work with him realized his tremendous, sterling qualities, his stanchness, and his well-earned reputation for keeping his word. His passing is, in effect, a loss to the citizenry of the entire country since we can ill afford to lose such an outstanding leader in this House as was TOM O'BRIEN.

May I also mention, Mr. Speaker, that his wife was extremely helpful to Mrs. Derwinski when she arrived on the scene as a freshman wife, and Mrs. Derwinski joins me in expressing deepest sympathy to Mrs. O'Brien and the family.

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened to learn of the death of our venerable dean, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN. The news came to me and to the other members of our delegation as we were in our districts on primary day in Illinois. Had he been able, TOM O'BRIEN would have been "in the precincts" also as he had been all of his life. There was no other life but politics for TOM and his experience and insight gained over the many years was such that he had few rivals in his field.

My recollection of this man who was my friend and political mentor goes back to my youth on the West Side of Chicago. There the name of TOM O'BRIEN was already one to be reckoned with on the political scene. Some 30-odd years ago I cut my political teeth as a

precinct captain in TOM O'BRIEN's own precinct. Much of what I have learned about politics had its basis in my work at the precinct level under his guidance. When I came to the House in 1961, I valued very highly my longtime friendship and association with him; and I then again looked to him in learning my new job.

I treasure the memory of what I later learned was perhaps TOM's longest speech. It was in my behalf before the Democratic caucus shortly after I entered the House. He described me as a "regular fellow" which in his laconic way was quite an accolade and meant more to me than any flowery speech or compliment that has come my way.

He was a very human person and although he held his own counsel, his taciturn manner hid a wonderful sense of humor and a quick mind which were very much in evidence to those of us who were close to him.

The many things he accomplished for his city, State, and country will not be found in the speeches he made nor the legislation he introduced. For he was not one to work in the spotlight but rather he labored quietly and effectively in the legislative councils of the House.

He was respected and his ability to get things done made him a friend and favorite of the late, great Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn, who possessed the highest regard and confidence in TOM. He was most effective in his key position as a ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee. He performed an invaluable service to Chicago, and the State of Illinois by seeing that our Democratic Members received choice committee assignments which, as we all know, are so important in representing our constituency. He was most proud, in all probability, of O'Brien Locks on the Calumet River, dedicated in his honor for his efforts and assistance in promoting the Illinois Waterway System.

But more than all this, THOMAS J. O'BRIEN epitomized a time and an era that is rapidly disappearing if not already gone forever. He was an "old school" politician whose career ranged back over half a century. He first entered public service in 1907 upon his election to serve in the Illinois State Assembly and, over the years, in many similar capacities culminating with 14 terms as a Representative in Congress from the Sixth District of Illinois.

In retrospect, I somehow feel that he perhaps would have preferred for us to be eulogizing him in a simple and direct manner as a man whose loyalty to his country, party, and friends could never be questioned and as one who could be depended upon to get the job done, no matter how difficult or unpleasant it may have been.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our departed colleague, THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, a great man who was my very dear friend.

TOM O'BRIEN, dean of our delegation from Illinois, commanded the respect of each one of us, for his greatness was his character. He was a kind and understanding man, whose actions reflect a glory that is achieved by only a chosen few. It might be said that he lived among us as a symbol of what is expected of every human being in his existence on earth, and that the "Maker" of men kept him with us for 85 years so we would benefit from his guidance.

His dedication to public life began at an early age. He was only 20 when he served as a constable, but from that moment on his destiny was continuous service to his fellow men in representing their wishes for good government. His brilliant career saw him serving in the Illinois State Legislature for four terms, and as a State bank examiner, before his election to the U.S. House of Representatives. in 1933. He left this body in the late thirties to successfully serve 4 years as sheriff of Cook County, Ill. He then returned to Congress in 1942 and served faithfully till he received his call to join his Maker.

How can one measure his worth in terms of words? It is too difficult, for his deeds are too outstanding to be fittingly described. TOM was looked upon with high esteem by the people he served so well. The respect he gained is best illustrated by his nomination to serve two congressional districts as representative of the people on Chicago's West Side. He chose the Sixth District where he grew in stature with each passing year, and gained the love of many generations of constituents who recognized his worth and endorsed his actions.

To say that he was an outstanding public servant seems so insignificant, and does not really measure up to this devotion to his tasks. He had that certain extra something that placed him in a class by himself. He was never too busy to listen and he was available to all that sought his advice and help. His one great characteristic, which made him a nobleman, so to speak, was his humble manner in which he conducted himself. He sought no public fame, as such, and expected no rewards for his labors. He was satisfied in knowing that he could help his fellow man in time of need and this became his purpose in life. I am sure that there are many of us here today whom TOM has helped, and it could well be that we would still not be here without his experienced guidance.

We have lost a great leader, but more important we have lost a great friend. The kind of friend that does not happen along but once in any lifetime. We all know that one day we will be called from this earth, and that TOM had a long, rich life, but it is very difficult to accept the fact that he will no longer be with us to guide us with his wisdom in the many important decisions we still must face. For now he is only a memory, but I hope that his memory will give us the strength that we will need to complete our tasks in the same gallant manner that the sheriff displayed in his years of service as a Representative in Congress.

My sympathies go to his family in this, their darkest hours. They shall miss him, but I hope their sorrow will be eased in knowing that their beloved TOM has his own niche in this great country's history. And that without him we may not have enjoyed the greatness with which we have been blessed, for he was truly an outstanding statesman that cannot be replaced.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the passing of THOMAS J. O'BRIEN marks the loss of a great Congressman. We of the Illinois delegation looked up to him as our dean, leader, and mentor. He was always ready to advise and assist on congressional matters, great or small. Always a man of his word, he enjoyed the respect and admiration of every Member of Congress in the House and Senate. His guidance was sought on many occasions by the leaders of our Nation.

Illinois will miss this honored man and his accomplishments in the representation, not only of his district but of his State and country.

I personally suffer the loss of a close and dear friend. We often sat in counsel together, seeking his sage wisdom and deep interest in all of our problems.

THOMAS J. O'BRIEN was one of the few living persons in whose honor a national monument was dedicated—the Thomas J. O'Brien lock and dam on the Calumet River.

In our sadness Mrs. Kluczynski and I express profound condolences to his wonderful wife, Nettie, who spent many devoted and loving years bringing him the comfort and deep affection that made him a good and true public servant.

May his soul rest in the heavenly peace he so richly deserves.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in expressing my sorrow at the death of Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN. He was a gentleman in every sense of the word.

Not only was he the leader of the Illinois delegation in the House, but he was always a very powerful figure in Illinois politics. He was a sheriff there for many years. I was pleased to enjoy his friendship, and mourn his loss.

His services will be missed, and I join in extending my condolences to his family and friends.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our dear friend and esteemed colleague, THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, brings to all of us a sense of deep personal loss and grief. If TOM had lived a few more short weeks he would have celebrated his 86th birthday. He lived a long and fruitful life of dedicated public service. As the eldest of our colleagues, he was truly our senior in more than years. TOM was a senior legislator, a senior statesman whose parliamentary skill and whose depth of wisdom made him one of the most valuable Members of this great body.

It is not enough to speak of TOM's skills and abilities without also paying tribute to those other warm and human qualities which had won our affectionate esteem, lasting friendship, and admiration. TOM O'BRIEN was always ready to extend a helping hand to new Members of the House. His great personal integrity won and kept our trust. His innate modesty kept him from taking the lead in debate, but added to his quiet effectiveness in committee and on the floor. He was a tower of strength to his party and to his State delegation, of which he served as dean for so many years with the greatest distinction.

TOM's passing leaves a void in our ranks that will be felt for a very long time. The impact of his unselfish service among us and the warm feeling of friendship we had for him will cause us to cherish the most pleasant memories of our service together in the Congress.

TOM's widow, in her grief on the passing of her dear husband, must find some consolation in the knowledge that her sense of loss and sadness is shared by all his colleagues and the host of his other close friends, both in and out of official life. To Mrs. Thomas J. O'Brien, I extend my deepest personal symathy and condolences in our mutual great loss.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, the death of THOMAS J. O'BRIEN is a great loss to the Nation and the Congress but his passing is most keenly felt by those of us who served with him on the Committee on Ways and Means.

TOM dedicated his life to public service and during his illustrious career as an Illinois State legislator, sheriff of the city of Chicago, and as a Member of this House, many honors came to him. But I believe the one he cherished most was his membership on the Committee on Ways and Means.

It was my good fortune to know TOM before I became a Member of the House. I recall, after my election in 1946, I went to see him, seeking assistance in securing a committee assignment. We immediately became good friends and through his efforts on the Committee on Committees, I was assigned to the committee of my choice. Some years later, it was my privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Ways and Means, and there I learned that TOM's candidates for committee assignments were generally always successful. The reason for this was that he had the respect and confidence of all of the members of the committee.

I came to know TOM as a courageous man of deep conviction. He was ever mindful of his responsibilities to his beloved district in Chicago and the people of Illinois. Yet he was equally cognizant of his responsibilities to the Nation as a whole. He believed in the fundamental principles of our Government and had a deep faith in the Democratic Party, which he loved.

With his attentive ear and vigilant eye, he acquired knowledge which enabled him to use his words sparingly but with maximum effect. He had a remarkable facility for evaluation and summation of testimony, and a real talent for uniting facts with practical reasoning. He could always be depended upon to apply his vast experience toward the solution of the difficult issues before our committee.

It was an honor to serve with and to know TOM O'BRIEN. He was a stanch friend, a dedicated public servant, and an outstanding citizen. Mrs. Karsten joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. O'Brien and the other members of the family in their great sorrow.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the passing of our esteemed colleague, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, of Chicago, Ill., leaves us all with a feeling of profound sadness. He will be sorely missed in his district and in this body. TOM O'BRIEN has been a senior and stanch Member of the House of Representatives for many years. Those who have been privileged to know him over this period of time have admired and respected his strength of character, his fortitude, his dependability, and his devoted service to the people he represented and to the Nation.

TOM O'BRIEN first served on the Committee on Ways and Means beginning March 26, 1944. He has served on the committee most of the balance of the years since that date. I have worked with him both as a member of the committee and as chairman of the committee for many years. He was conscientious and diligent in attendance at committee meetings; he was sparing in his use of time of the committee, and he was utterly and completely reliable and dependable when he stated his position on an issue. I will miss him on the Committee on Ways and Means, and I am deeply moved by his passing. I will miss his able and devoted and loyal service.

Those of us who have been privileged to serve with him are aware of the qualities of character and integrity which he possessed, and little we can say here today will add or detract in any way from the enviable record which he has built over the years for his State and Nation. That record will stand as a monument to his devotion to his people and to his friends and to his loved ones.

My deepest sympathy to Mrs. O'Brien and to the surviving members of his family.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, our esteemed colleague so recently departed.

He was indeed a most distinguished Member of this body, an outstanding American, and a good friend.

TOM O'BRIEN's life was in the pattern of other great "men of the House," that is, those individuals whose dedication to this legislative body has been so complete and intense that their service here becomes a vocation in the highest sense of the word. TOM O'BRIEN was such an individual.

He gave unstintingly of himself toward the enhancement of the goals and objectives of the House. His efforts were ever directed toward strengthening this representative democratic organ.

The press has reported that Mr. O'BRIEN was a powerful Member of this body. And so he was. But it was not power based on coercion or threats, for he was a quiet man and mild in manner. His power was based on respect—the respect of his colleagues for his ability, his honesty, and his wisdom.

But more than just a distinguished Congressman, TOM O'BRIEN was an outstanding American. Throughout his career, he worked for the progressive legislation that has made both his party and his country great.

Elected to Congress during the great depression, he quickly gained notice as an able proponent of the Roosevelt administration programs which wrought such a vast sociological change in our Nation and brought our greatness to fruition.

In the years that followed, he served well the forward-looking programs of President Truman, President Kennedy, and, most recently, President Johnson. Always a battler for the rights of the common man, TOM O'BRIEN could take pride in his last years that he had played an important part in opening up economic, educational, and social opportunities for millions of his fellow Americans.

But it is as a friend that I best remember TOM O'BRIEN. His friendship, his counsel, his assistance in my early days in Congress are an indelible memory. My debt to him, no amount of gratitude can pay.

Yet it was not simply during my first years in Congress that he extended his generous help, but, indeed, until his final illness.

It was my privilege to have been able to serve as an honorary pallbearer at Mr. O'BRIEN's funeral, along with a number of other colleagues. We who witnessed his requiem services and his burial know how deep and genuine was the regard of the people, of all stations, for this good, generous, and quiet man.

We are richer because of his many years among us, and much the poorer for his passing.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, many years ago Teddy Roosevelt was heard to say, "The first requisite of a good citizen in this Republic is that he shall be able to pull his own weight."

America has had a brimming abundance of good citizens—men and women who have devoted years of their lives to public service. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN of Illinois, was such a citizen. He came to Congress in an era when this country needed every available human resource to resurrect its faith in the future.

He came to Washington prepared to give his talents and energies to restoring to America its self-confidence and to lead it to unprecedented prominence among the nations of the world.

His was not a flamboyant personalty. He knew that a higher purpose was served in doing a job well when it needed doing, than by shirking his responsibilities and failing to make difficult decisions when it took an extra measure of courage to make them.

During this time he represented the people of Illinois' Sixth District faithfully, earnestly, and with enormous distinction. As the years passed, his constituents could see reflected in his actions the leadership which was so natural a trait with him. His contemporaries in government on both sides of Capitol Hill recognized this faculty for quiet mastery of trying situations and came to rely upon it. TOM O'BRIEN was always there in an emergency.

He was here in this Chamber throughout the most trying crises of the past three decades, and always it was his ability to keep perspective on the future which influenced his colleagues and constituents.

He was a great friend to new Members of Congress and his word was trusted and relied on, regardless of politics. He worked throughout his life to improve conditions which needed changing and he

was more than an able legislator—he was in every sense a leader.

His convictions were strong; his good causes were legion, and he stood four-square for the United States.

In the dark days of World War II, General MacArthur once said, "There is no security on this earth. Only opportunity." TOM O'BRIEN lived his life in an effort to expand that opportunity for people everywhere—in every community and State in America. He was quietly, but inevitably, in the forefront during passage of all the great humanitarian legislation of the past three decades.

Chicago will miss him for a good long while to come. And I believe the country, also, will mourn this quiet man who did so much for others in the span of a single lifetime. I am proud to have known him. My life is richer for having served with him in the House of Representatives. I like to think that the legacy of his dedication to the art of statesmanship is a legacy from which all of us can benefit, for the greatest of all arts is the art of giving ourselves in the service of others.

TOM O'BRIEN followed the code of duty, honor, country. We would not be true to his memory and the memory of the great Americans who have preceded him into history if we failed to do less.

Mrs. Pucinski joins me in extending our deepest condolences to Nettie O'Brien and to his family.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved and greatly saddened to learn of the passing of my dear and valued friend and most esteemed colleague for many years, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, of the great State of Illinois.

He was indeed a dear friend of mine, and I cherished the warmth of his friendship. He was one of the most exceptional, valuable Members of this House as well as an exceptionally popular and beloved colleague, conspicuous for his loyalty to his convictions and his friends.

TOM O'BRIEN commanded the deep respect of every Member of the House for his ability, for his forthrightness, and his patriotism. His public contributions were many and marked. He was truly unique in his lovable, personal qualities, outstanding in ability and the wide sweep of his interests and his effective service to his district, State, and Nation.

There was an indefinable aspect to TOM O'BRIEN'S greatness. It had to be apprehended rather than described, because it was embodied in the sum total of personal traits, habits, loyalties, and special talents which constituted the ethos, modus operandi, and thought and action patterns of this great leader.

TOM O'BRIEN carried in his generous, unselfish nature no residue of juvenile frustration, no Freudian complexes, no compulsive emotions, no mean irrelevant prejudices rattling around in the closets of his subconscious. He could well be classified, in the philosophical sense, as an Aristotelian realist, not seeking rockets or spaceships, even as he realized their intrinsic worth to our defense, but with his feet planted squarely on the ground, watching the stars for portents of greater light, judging the world around him with an uncanny eagerness and the studied accuracy of a great man seeking to do good.

Devoted service such as his, steeped in high faith, warm courage, and patriotic zeal, he exemplified in his public and private life the high code by which he lived: God and country, party, family, and friends, with the emphasis on the first, and with the sacred concept of loyalty, permeating every motive, every thought, every objective.

He was a most valuable member of the great Ways and Means Committee and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and enjoyed the confidence of his colleagues and the leadership of the House. He performed many outstanding and special services and supported and advanced many meaningful pieces of legislation.

TOM O'BRIEN was very dear to me during the years I have been in the Congress. I esteemed and cherished him profoundly. He was beloved, respected, admired wherever he was known. The warmth of his heart, the radiance of his personality, the compassion and generosity of his impulse have been everlastingly impressed upon the annals of this great body and in the hearts of all those of us who were privileged to know and to love this good and noble man.

In his passing, the Nation has lost a great leader and I have lost a noble friend. With very heavy heart, I extend to his beloved and grieving family—his gracious helpmate and wife, Nettie, and all his dear ones, my most heartfelt sympathy for the truly irreparable loss which has come to them. I join his dear ones and a host of others in mourning his passing, and sad of heart, pay tribute to his noble aspirations and illustrious achievements.

The contributions of TOM O'BRIEN are not measurable by finite standards. They will live and fructify here in the historic precincts of this House, inspiring and guiding the House toward noble goals, exalted ends, and warm human fellowships, as an undying inspiration for others to carry on the bitter fight that must be fought, if in our generation we are to preserve and sustain the glories, benefits, and blessings of free representative government. Such are the treasured bequests of that kind and generous gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN.

May the good Lord grant him eternal rest and peace in his heavenly home.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will always remember TOM O'BRIEN as a kind, gentle man with a great heart and a keen sense of loyality. It was my privilege to sit with him on the Ways and Means Committee and to witness at first hand his personal devotion to the work of the committee and the Congress.

TOM O'BRIEN loved his job. Politics was his life—but to him, politics meant public service and devotion to the broad social objectives of his party. He attended committee meetings with great loyalty. He never failed to stand up for his friends.

TOM O'BRIEN had great political power, but he did not use it ruthlessly, rather with restraint and with deep feeling for his fellow men.

TOM O'BRIEN was my friend. His passing has left an empty place in the hearts of all of us here. To his devoted wife and family, I offer my most sincere condolences.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, with deep sorrow and regret, I join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to the memory of our late colleague, THOMAS J. O'BRIEN. Throughout a long and distinguished career of public service, THOMAS O'BRIEN was notable for his dedication and perseverance. He served his State and Nation well.

I take this opportunity to extend my sincere sympathy to his family and loved ones. May God's blessings sustain them in their loss.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, of the many personalities who appear and disappear with regularity on the American political scene, few leave a mark which time does not obliterate.

Surviving this test of time which is so discriminating on the American political scene requires certain human ingredients which the late THOMAS J. O'BRIEN possessed in depth. He had a way of achieving his goal and purpose without oratorical persuasion, fanfare, or publicity. He was a quiet, soft-spoken man who decided what had to be done and then did it.

My acquaintance with TOM O'BRIEN goes back 25 years—many years before I became a Member of the House. This acquaintance was renewed when I became a colleague of his in the Illinois congressional delegation in 1956. Later I became a colleague of his on the House Ways and Means Committee but illness befell him shortly after this time.

While we frequently assumed different positions on legislative issues and differed in our political philosophies, I became very fond of TOM O'BRIEN and treasured a mutual respect and friendship which grew over the past 8 years.

He was kind and helpful wherever it was possible and, above all else, he was a man of his word.

I shall miss TOM O'BRIEN as will his constituents and colleagues. To his good and devoted widow and members of his family, I offer my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join our colleagues of the Illinois delegation and the other Members of the House in paying tribute to the late TOM O'BRIEN. Through his experience in public life, his dedication to the needs and the principles of the people of his home State and of the Nation, he gave of himself in many ways to build a fine record of constructive contributions to the work of the Congress.

It is possible in the House to observe at close hand the men whose integrity and leadership have earned for them a reservoir of power which is critical in the issues which divide our parties. Throughout my years in Congress I learned to respect the ability and experience of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN]. His public service covered almost 60 years. He worked hard for the people he represented and for the State and city he loved so well. Mrs. Daddario and I extend our deepest sympathy to his bereaved family.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I mourn the passing of our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN]. TOM O'BRIEN was one of the elder statesmen of the House of Representatives. Although he was not widely known outside the Capitol, he was recognized by those who understood the workings of the House of Representatives to be one of the most influential men in this distinguished body.

His way was not the way of the flashy or of the vociferous. He was undemonstrative but he was effective. He was quiet but he was influential. His outstanding qualities were frankness and reliability. One always knew where one stood with TOM O'BRIEN because he minced no words and was candid to a marked degree. Above all, his word was his bond and when he pledged that word, nothing could turn him from his undertaking.

TOM's success and prestige came the hard way. All his accomplishments were due to his own efforts and people of his district and of the city of Chicago showed their appreciation by consistently supporting him in overwhelming fashion at the polls.

TOM's memory will always remain with us here in the House of Representatives and that memory will be a pleasant one.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation, Congress, and Illinois have suffered a very great loss with the death of our distinguished colleague, THOMAS J. O'BRIEN.

As dean of his State's delegation, he was a good neighbor and a good friend to me and to the State of Wisconsin. He will be sadly missed.

His long life was dedicated to public service. He served on every level of American government with distinction: on the local level as sheriff of Cook County, on the State level as a representative in four general assemblies, and on the Federal level in two periods in this House extending over more than 27 years.

Throughout his career, he displayed a dedication to progressive government. Though TOM O'BRIEN was not noted for his oratory, his wisdom and experience were always a pervasive influence for good in this body and in the Ways and Means Committee.

As a stanch member of his party, he was often a major force in the accomplishment of its programs and policies. His was a proud record of building good government.

The voters of the Sixth District of Illinois knew his mettle well. It was ironic, yet a real tribute, that he was being renominated once again by the people of his constituency when he died Tuesday at Bethesda Naval Hospital.

His achievements in Congress were enhanced by the able assistance he received over the years from his brother-in-law and aid, John Kaufer.

Today, I want to extend my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. O'Brien and to Mr. Kaufer.

Mr. BOGGS. The passing of our beloved friend, TOM O'BRIEN, leaves an aching void in many a heart all over this land. Friends like TOM O'BRIEN are all too rare in this life; they stand out like sierras along our skyline.

Throughout a long, rich life, he walked always with rectitude, honor, and humility. A man of determination and strong will, he had the courage also to be a gentle man, a man with a heart full of love for his fellow men, individually and en masse.

Here is a man to whom service was a joy, a man who reveled in trying to make his generation worthwhile and his country better. For all the long years that I was privileged to claim his as a great friend, I marveled at his sound commonsense, his rocklike convictions, and his unshakable loyalty to his friends. For many years I sat beside him on the Committee on Ways and Means, and as I watched him year after year trying to do justice to all who came to plead before that committee, I learned much from his patience, his tolerance, his sense of fair play.

Oh, how all of us will miss this beloved man—this man whose like we will not soon see again—this devoted husband of a great, lovely lady, Mrs. O'Brien—this fearless servant of his people—this dedicated patriot. TOM O'BRIEN enriched the lives of us all. We all are so much better for his having lived.

To his widow, on behalf of Lindy and myself, I extend our deepest sympathy and our prayers.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad privilege to join my colleagues in paying my tribute and respects to the memory of TOM O'BRIEN.

TOM returned to the House of Representatives and was sworn in when I was in 1943. We became good friends, serving together on the Committee on Appropriations for two terms.

He was a constant friend. It always seemed to me that his contacts with all his colleagues did not hurry to short and poor conclusions—but were the more lasting because they came from the tough fiber of a very human heart. TOM O'BRIEN was a gentle spirit such as we cherish while they live and derive warmth from remembering. All of us will miss him.

To his wonderful wife and constant companion, Nettie, and to John Kaufer, his brother-in-law, and to the rest of his family, Mrs. Horan and I extend our sincere and deepest sympathies.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of an outstanding Member of this body, THOMAS J. O'BRIEN. Throughout his many years of public service, Congressman O'BRIEN served Illinois and our Nation with faithfulness and devotion. Elected a State representative to the 45th general assembly, he continued as State representative for 8 years. In 1932 he was elected to the 73d Congress and was reelected to two additional terms before returning to Illinois to become sheriff of Cook County. After completing a 4-year term as sheriff, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN] again ran for Congress and was elected to the 78th Congress, serving continuously since that time. In the present Congress he was third-ranking majority member of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee. His long service to his district, State, and Nation will long be remembered by Democrats and Republicans alike. I extend to Mrs. O'Brien and to the other members of his family my sincere sympathy. An editorial in Chicago's American of April 7 states well the feelings of the residents of Illinois regarding the loss of Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN.

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS J. O'BRIEN

Representative THOMAS J. O'BRIEN's death Tuesday deprived Illinois and Chicago of a dedicated, influential champion in Congress. O'BRIEN, at 85, was dean of the Illinois congressional delegation and the oldest Member of the House; he was first elected to Congress in 1933 and had been reelected ever since, except for 4 years as sheriff of Cook County. He was planning to run again—his name was on Tuesday's Democratic primary ballot—and undoubtedly would have been returned to his seat. Representative O'BRIEN was one whose worth did not go unappreciated.

O'BRIEN led and won a battle vital to Chicago—the fight to widen the Cal-Sag Channel, allowing a freer flow of shipping from Lake Michigan through the channel and the Illinois Waterway to the Mississippi River and down to New Orleans. We mourn the loss of a good man who fought well for all of us.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is always with a heavy heart that we rise to speak of a colleague who will no longer join us in this Chamber. It is with a sense of deep loss that we memorialize the passing of one of the true leaders of our body. So it is today, for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN] was indeed one of those leaders.

When I first came to the House 16 years ago, TOM O'BRIEN was already a respected and admired Member of the House. Already he had served many terms in the House, as well as in the general assembly of his State.

We all know well the close bond that existed between our late beloved Speaker, Mr. Sam, and TOM O'BRIEN. There was that same dedicated, intensely dedicated, spirit of service to their Nation and to their colleagues, that same indomitable courage that allowed them always to adhere to their principles and beliefs.

TOM O'BRIEN was a quiet man. But his quiet manner could not hide his noble character, his breadth of vision, his courage and his faithful, generously-given service to his constituents. He was always kind and gracious, and wise, in his counsel when we sought him out.

He will no more be among us, this gentleman from Illinois. But his spirit will never leave us. We who have been privileged to serve with him will always be the richer. So long as we continue to enjoy such colleagues as he, the continued greatness of this body is assured.

Mrs. Rodino joins me in extending our sincerest sympathy to his devoted wife, Nettie, and to his family. May he always go with God and his soul rest in peace.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, TOM O'BRIEN was a friendly, loyal, wonderful man. He was a natural leader and yet one of the kindest of men. There was something warm and personal about him

which made him easy to know and which quickly instilled confidence.

I do not believe anyone in the Congress possessed more close and devoted friends or could call on more vigorous support from those friends when the occasion demanded it.

Through a long lifetime of participation in public life he was wise in the ways of government and his counsel was invaluable, yet because of his quiet, self-effacing attitude it was hard to realize that he had given 28 years of valuable service here and that only 19 Members of the present membership of the Congress had served longer than he.

As dean of the House delegation of the great State of Illinois he was their accepted leader and his State has lost an able representative, an effective leader, and a strong patriot.

Many have served here. Few have enjoyed the confidence and the friendship which were given to TOM O'BRIEN. His record is like a pleasant interlude to be remembered happily and warmly throughout the years to come.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to join my colleagues in expressing profound regret at the passing of our esteemed colleague and my dear friend, the Honorable THOMAS O'BRIEN.

His long career here in the House, culminating in serving as dean of the Illinois delegation, was marked by devotion to duty, courage, loyalty, and conscientiousness. He was a leader of men, one who commanded their confidence and respect.

His presence and his leadership, along with his warm friendliness, will be greatly missed in the House.

I pray that God will bless and comfort his wife and family forever and a day.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, TOM O'BRIEN was a man of outstanding integrity and loyalty. He was a dependable colleague whose word could be relied upon and who always delivered what he promised. It was these fine qualities of his that enabled him to serve with such distinction in his native county, State, and in the Congress. His public service covered a span of many years, which included 4 terms in the State Assembly of Illinois and a term as sheriff of Cook County in addition to the 14 terms for which he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. He was renominated in the Illinois primary for yet another term on the day that he passed away.

TOM O'BRIEN has been a longtime political leader of his party both in Chicago and in the House of Representatives. He was considered the leader of the Illinois democratic delegation for many years and was respected by Members on both sides of the aisle.

TOM was particularly helpful to me as a newcomer to both Congress and the Ways and Means Committee and as one who was seeking advice. My short friendship with him on the committee was most gratifying, and his suggestions and assistance were both constructive and helpful in my indoctrination.

TOM'S many friends will miss his leadership and good judgment, and Illinois has lost a fine native son. I, too, have lost a kind and helpful friend, whose cheery smile I shall miss, and to whose family I extend my deepest sympathy in their sorrow.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those of my colleagues in paying tribute to the late THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, a good and dutiful public servant. In his continuous and dedicated service to his city, State, and Nation he has set a high example for all of us of a life well lived. We mourn his passing and we shall miss him, and we hope that we shall be able to live up to his high principles of devotion and loyalty to his fellow man. I extend my heartfelt sympathies to his family and loved ones.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with a profound sadness and a heavy heart that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed colleague, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, of Illinois. His passing will be a great loss, not only to his beloved State but to the entire Nation.

He was a wonderful friend, and I shall always remember the many happy occasions I was privileged to be in his company. TOM and I served together on the Subcommittee on Appropriations of which I am presently chairman, and in the year 1947 the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], TOM O'BRIEN and his lovely wife, Nettie, and I visited a number of the countries in Western Europe in connection with our duties as members of the House Appropriations Committee. It was a very pleasant journey and experience that I well enjoyed, and a deeper friendship and a closer relationship resulted with TOM and Nettie O'Brien.

TOM O'BRIEN was a dedicated legislator who was greatly admired for his honesty, his wisdom and his exceptional ability. He was respected by all the Members of this House, regardless of which side of the aisle they were on.

To his devoted and lovely wife, Nettie, I extend my deepest sympathy and prayers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the late THOMAS O'BRIEN, and also that they may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD, and in both instances to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ARA AND THE SUGARBEET INDUSTRY

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the Red River Valley of Minnesota and North Dakota has been left out in the cold again, thanks to another case where the Area Redevelopment Administration has meddled in the domestic sugarbeet industry.

Allocations of sugarbeet acreage have now been made to Aroostook County, Maine, and to the Phoenix area in Arizona. These are the final commitments under the national sugar beet acreage reserve provisions of the Sugar Act.

The 33,000 acres allocated to Aroostook County, Maine, is the second instance this year where sugarbeet allotments have gone to areas where ARA has spent taxpayer money to set up new plants in direct competition with the established beet-growing areas of the country such as our Red River Valley.

ARA granted $50,000 last year for a technical assistance study to investigate the economic and engineering feasibility of establishing a sugarbeet industry in Aroostook County after granting over $118,000 for similar studies in Cayuga County, N.Y. And now both areas have received acreage allotments, which is proof enough of our warning last year that when ARA conducts a study, sugarbeet acreage is bound to follow, no matter what it does to the established growers. It is another case of those who have worked for years on the local level to develop the sugarbeet industry having to pay the consequences of area redevelopment programs.

It also was interesting to note that the other acreage allocation just announced, in the Phoenix area of Arizona, is for 20,000 acres on land developed under a reclamation-irrigation project. This brings to almost 500,000 the number of sugarbeet acres now on irrigated lands, or approximately four times the number of sugarbeet acres in the Red River Valley of Minnesota and North Dakota.

I certainly hope our Red River Valley growers, and other established growers across the Nation, will let the Area Redevelopment Administration and the Department of Agriculture know where they stand on such sugarbeet allocations that are hurting their own potential. This sorry situation has gone on long enough and it is time to show their displeasure.

NATIONAL FOOD COMMISSION PROPOSED

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution to establish a 15-member bipartisan National Commission on Food Marketing to study the food industry from the farm to the consumer.

The Commission would include representatives of general farm organizations, processing and retail industries, and organized labor, as well as Members of Congress.

A thorough, impartial study will bring facts to light and benefit farmers, processors, merchants, and consumers.

Vast changes have occurred in recent years in the U.S. system of producing,

processing, and distributing food. Some of these changes are the result of Federal farm programs and other laws. Others are technological.

Other far-reaching changes have occurred in foreign trade. Beef imports are rising rapidly.

We have lost valuable cash markets abroad for U.S. food products, and trade negotiations for better foreign markets so far have been disappointing.

What are the effects of these changes on farm and consumer prices? The farm parity ratio—which measures prices paid against prices received—has dropped each of the last 3 years while consumer food prices have risen.

What are the effects of these changes on our competitive marketplace system and the family-farm structure of agriculture?

Serious charges have been made concerning the influence of chainstores over livestock prices.

What are the effects and influences of specification buying, contract farming, and vertical integration? The public is entitled to the facts, and all segments of our vast food industry will benefit from better public understanding.

THE UNTOLD STORY OF COAST GUARD'S FLOOD RELIEF IN THE OHIO RIVER VALLEY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, behind the stories carried by newspapers, radio and TV on the recent floods in the Ohio River Valley, lies another important story which has not been told. It concerns the work of our oldest and most humanitarian armed service, the U.S. Coast Guard, which, by its efforts helped keep down the toll of life and property which would otherwise have resulted from this disaster.

Because I believe that the American people have a right to know of the fine work of the Coast Guard, a report has been prepared at my request summarizing its efforts during the emergency.

In anticipation of recurring annual floods, resulting from the usual heavy spring rains in the Ohio River Valley, the Coast Guard maintains continuous contact with other pertinent agencies in planning a concerted course of action. They are the Corps of Engineers, American Red Cross, State civil defense agencies, National Guard and other relief units.

The planning paid off handsomely when torrential rains began on March 3 in the densely populated Ohio River Valley. On March 9, when flooding appeared imminent, the 2d Coast Guard District with Headquarters in St. Louis, Mo., established flood alerts in the Huntington, W. Va., and Cincinnati, Ohio, areas. Shortly thereafter, disaster control groups were activated from mile 129.1 to Cairo, Ill.

As an emergency measure, the Coast Guard created four separate group commands with jurisdiction over specified areas of the Ohio River and its tributaries within an 852-mile portion of the river.

On March 9, crests above flood stage were predicted by the Corps of Engineers. These remarkably accurate predictions enabled the Coast Guard to deploy its forces with maximum efficiency and greatly facilitated its task of coordinating flood relief activities. In general, these consisted of control of water releases, sandbagging of critical dikes and timely evacuation of persons within the disaster area. Local officials in Louisville, Ky., declared a state of emergency, followed by similar declarations by municipal and State officials in other areas. State civil defense groups, Red Cross, U.S. Army, National Guard and other relief agencies were alerted by the Coast Guard on March 9. Through this highly effective relief network, warnings were disseminated to critical areas.

At the flood alert stage, each Coast Guard group commander had certain forces, consisting of personnel, flood relief boats and available vehicles at his disposal. In each instance, these facilities were made available to civil defense officials, requesting boats for emergency evacuations or for other missions of an urgent nature. Civil defense officials were also informed that additional Coast Guard personnel and equipment would be made available if needed. Through this "backup" action, local groups were assisted in carrying out relief missions.

During the entire operation, Coast Guard group commanders maintained constant communications with such other agencies as were active in the various localities. Situation Reports (SITREPS) were filed periodically with Coast Guard district headquarters.

As a result of all of this fine planning and coordination of which most people are unaware, there was no loss of life in an area which constitutes an important part of the American heartland. In every case, operations were conducted with speed and efficiency and nature's cruel caprice was thwarted. Untold human tragedy was averted, and that, I believe, deserves official commendation.

PERSONAL FINANCIAL STATUS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, on April 29 of last year, I followed the example of Congresswoman EDITH GREEN of Oregon, and other Members, by inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a full disclosure of my personal financial status. I promised then to offer such a statement each year, so long as I remain in Congress.

I remarked last year that by the very nature of his calling, a public official places himself in a status that is different from the ordinary citizen. Having filed recently for reelection, I feel that the voters of my California district are entitled to know that I am free of financial ties that might influence my actions as their Representative.

Under California's community property law, my wife and I jointly own a residential rental property on three acres, zoned commercial, in Poway, Calif.; equity in a family home in San Diego, and in a commercial lot in Imperial County, Calif.

My salary as a Member of Congress represents more than 90 percent of our total income.

As I further promised last year, my personal income tax returns are available for scrutiny, if requested, by the press or any other responsible body.

URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in view of the position taken by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce on this Nation's very fine urban renewal program I feel it important to note that the U.S. Chamber's views are not necessarily reflected by the local chambers throughout the country.

The urban renewal program has long enjoyed the support and confidence of the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce in my district of Nashville, Tenn.

And I note, from the following resolution, that the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce shares the view held by the membership of the Nashville Chamber.

I include in my remarks here, a copy of that resolution, and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

Whereas Atlanta's urban renewal program has been instrumental in recent years in helping to remove blight from the face of this great city; and

Whereas this cooperative Federal-local program has enhanced the tax digest of the city of Atlanta by making possible the rehabilitation of substandard structures and the construction of millions of dollars worth of new buildings where slums once stood; and

Whereas the availability of urban renewal property has recently provided ideal sites for proposed new multi-million-dollar public facilities such as a new municipal auditorium and a municipal stadium; and

Whereas the Federal Urban Renewal Agency has most recently approved redevelopment of 106 acres of property in the area known as Buttermilk Bottoms where the new municipal auditorium will be constructed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, through its executive committee, does hereby commend the U.S. Congressman from the Fifth District of Georgia, the Honorable CHARLES LONGSTREET WELTNER, and the mayor and aldermen of the city of Atlanta, for their close cooperation in diligently

pursuing this project to fruition; and be it further

Resolved, That the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce expresses its appreciation to officials of the Federal Urban Renewal Agency, both at the regional and national level, for their cooperation with local officials.

RAWSON HAVERTY,
President.
OPIE L. SHELTON,
Executive Vice President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. MAY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), beginning today, for an indefinite period, on account of hospitalization.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. SHRIVER), for 1 hour, on Monday, April 27, 1964.

Mr. PATMAN, for 60 minutes, on Monday and Thursday next; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CURTIS.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHRIVER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. BARRY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOWDY.

Mr. ST. ONGE.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. HEMPHILL.

Mr. MULTER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 27, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1978. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for 1965 for the Federal Aviation Agency. This amendment would provide appropriations of $75 million each for the fiscal years 1965 and 1966 (H. Doc. No. 195); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1979. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on an examination of contracts and excessive costs incurred because of extended contractor-furnished technical services and other deficiencies in administration of contracts for electronic air traffic control simulator systems, Federal Aviation Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1980. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 29th Annual Report of the Securities and Exchange Commission covering the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, pursuant to the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, approved June 6, 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1981. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relating to an amendatory contract for the performance of work on the Florida project, near Durango, Colo., pursuant to 70 Stat. 274; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. Report pursuant to 57 Stat. 380; without amendment (Rept. No. 1337). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 9653. A bill to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 4487. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1958, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides; with amendment (Rept. No. 1339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 11018. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital of 1,500 beds at Bay Pines, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 11019. A bill to provide that the words "In God We Trust" shall be placed on certain Federal buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.R. 11020. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 providing pay comparability between employees in the Federal Government and employees in private industry; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 11021. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water and air pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITENER (by request):

H.R. 11022. A bill to increase the loan authorization for the construction of District of Columbia highways and to increase the District of Columbia motor-vehicle fuel tax; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.J. Res. 1009. A joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Food Marketing to study the food industry from the farm to the consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. Con Res. 294. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the recitation of nondenominational prayers and Bible reading in the public schools; to the committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 703. A resolution condemning persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts presented a memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass legislation granting medical assistance to the aged under the Federal Social Security Act, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. TOLLEFSON introduced a resolution (H. Res. 704) providing for sending the bill H.R. 11001 to the Court of Claims, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

869. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Helen M. Vise, secretary, office of county auditor, Spartanburg, S.C., to amend section 574 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, so as to require members of the Armed Forces to furnish proof to the State where they are presently stationed that they have paid current taxes on their personal property to the State where they claim domicile, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1964

(Legislative day of Monday, March 30, 1964)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. INOUYE).

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

At the Inn of the Morning we would wait for Thee, Thou guide of our pilgrim way.

We thank Thee for this new day, for its new strength and vigor, its new hopes, and its new opportunities. Help us to

meet its joys with gratitude, its difficulties with fortitude, its duties with fidelity.

When great ideas whose day has come beckon us to be their servants, save us from giving ourselves to the dead past, rather than to the creative present and to the living future.

In the tangled tragedy in which all human life is caught, help us in these trying days, rising above all that is base and small, to work together in glad and eager harmony for the honor, safety, and welfare of our Nation and of all the peoples of this stricken earth who unite in mutual good will, dedicated to the golden goal of opening the gates of a new life for all mankind.

In the Master's name, we bring our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 22, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Gavin R. Argue, to be postmaster at Apalachia, N.Y., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 10939) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 10939) making appropriations for the Department of Defense 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.

ORDER FOR MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in a moment I shall suggest the absence of a quorum; but, first, I wish to propound a unanimous-consent request: I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the quorum call, there be a morning hour, wherein statements will be limited to 3 minutes; and that the morning hour continue in operation for up to 1 hour, but that that period may be extended by either the majority leader or the minority leader at the conclusion of 1 hour, if needed, and if other Senators are waiting at that time to submit morning business; provided further, that the morning-hour period will not authorize the meeting of committees under rule XXV.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask why the Senator from Montana proposes to limit control of the morning hour, for the benefit of Senators who have insertions to make in the RECORD, to the majority leader and the minority leader. They might not be in the Chamber throughout that period, for they have many pressing demands upon them and many important duties to perform; therefore, it is obvious that they might not be in the Chamber throughout that period.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If I were in the position of the Senator from Alabama, I believe I would raise the same question that he has raised. But he is fairly well aware of the dialog which occurred the other night.

This proposal would apply only to today; and it is based on the proceedings of yesterday.

Mr. HILL. Why have the proposed agreement apply only to today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then I would ask that it be applied to the remainder of the week.

Mr. HILL. Then certainly I would have to object to it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then I would make the request for today, only.

Mr. HILL. But I do not know why the Senator from Montana proposes to limit the control to the majority leader, for Senators on this side of the aisle. Will he not include in his request a proviso that, in his absence, the control for Senators on this side of the aisle will be allowed to some other Senator who might be acting in his place?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, yes—the majority leader or any other Senator acting for him, in the exercise of that responsibility.

Mr. HILL. Is that definitely understood?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, as modified? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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 called the roll; and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 161 Leg.]

Aiken	Bartlett	Bennett
Allott	Bayh	Bible
Anderson	Beall	Boggs
Burdick	Javits	Pearson
Cannon	Johnston	Pell
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Prouty
Church	Keating	Proxmire
Cooper	Kennedy	Ribicoff
Cotton	Kuchel	Robertson
Dodd	Lausche	Saltonstall
Dominick	Long, Mo.	Scott
Douglas	Magnuson	Simpson
Fong	Mansfield	Smathers
Goldwater	McGee	Smith
Gore	McGovern	Sparkman
Gruening	McIntyre	Symington
Hart	McNamara	Talmadge
Hayden	Metcalf	Walters
Hill	Monroney	Williams, N.J.
Holland	Moss	Williams, Del.
Hruska	Muskie	Young, N. Dak.
Humphrey	Nelson	Young, Ohio
Inouye	Neuberger	
Jackson	Pastore	

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is absent during convalescence from an illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are detained on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Montana is recognized.

AMENDMENT OF ALASKA OMNIBUS ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Alaska Omnibus Act, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Alfred C. Bean, of Corona, Calif., relative to appropriations for foreign aid; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

A resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO PASS LEGISLATION GRANTING MEDICAL ASSISTANCE TO THE AGED UNDER THE FEDERAL SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the 88th Congress of the United States to pass legislation granting medical assistance to the aged, funds for such assistance to be raised under the Federal Social Security Act, and eliminating the paupers' oath; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, adopted, March 30, 1964.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"Clerk.

"Senate, adopted in concurrence, April 2, 1964.

"THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate a concurrent resolution passed by the General Assembly of South Carolina concerning the retention of the Soil Conservation Service office in Spartanburg, my home city. The Department of Agriculture is currently studying plans to move from Spartanburg to Fort Worth, Tex., the cartographic services now being rendered South Carolina and eight other southeastern States. It is my opinion and the opinion of the General Assembly of South Carolina that adequate service cannot be rendered South Carolina or these other States out of Fort Worth, Tex., and that the plans to move this office are false economy.

Mr. President, I send to the desk this short concurrent resolution passed by the General Assembly of South Carolina and ask that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE HONORABLE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, TO RETAIN THE UNIT OFFICE OF THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE IN SPARTANBURG, S.C.

Whereas it is reported that certain unit offices of the Soil Conservation Service are to be consolidated; and

Whereas the unit located in Spartanburg, S.C., has a Division of Cartography and of Engineering and Watershed Planning which serves seven Southeast States and Puerto Rico; and

Whereas the removal or consolidation of this office would have a disastrous impact upon the agricultural and conservational economy of the entire Southeast: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, is respectfully requested to retain the unit office of the Soil Conservation Service in Spartanburg, S.C.; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of Agriculture, the U.S. Senators from South Carolina, and Members of the U.S. House of Representatives from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, there has been forwarded to me by the House of Representatives of South Carolina a concurrent resolution requesting the National Park Service to authorize the South Carolina Confederate War Centennial Commission to erect a flagpole at Fort Sumter honoring the Confederate defenders of the fort, and to provide for the flying of the Confederate flag thereon.

It is my intention to bring this situation to the attention of the National Park Service and ask that it agree to the concurrent resolution request.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with my remarks, this very brief resolution concerning the flying of the Confederate flag at Fort Sumter, which I send to the desk for appropriate reference.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE TO AUTHORIZE THE SOUTH CAROLINA CONFEDERATE WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION TO ERECT A FLAGPOLE AT FORT SUMTER AND TO PROVIDE FOR THE FLYING OF THE CONFEDERATE FLAG THEREON

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the National Park Service is requested to authorize the South Carolina Confederate War Centennial Commission to erect a flagpole at Fort Sumter honoring the Confederate defenders of the fort, and to provide for the flying of the Confederate flag thereon; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Director of the National Park Service, Mr. George Hartzog; the Superintendent of the Fort Sumter National Monument, Mr. E. J. Pratt; and to all Members of the Congress from South Carolina.

Attest:

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2762. A bill to provide for the establishment of a mint of the United States in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2763. A bill for the relief of Jakob Blagaich (also known as Jakov Blagaic); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 2764. A bill with respect to the proof of value necessary in the case of certain mining claims located prior to July 23, 1955; and

S. 2765. A bill to amend the act relating to the multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands in order to provide that certain varieties of sand and gravel shall be considered as valuable mineral deposits under the mining laws of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 2766. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant rights of storage and transportation on flood control projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 2767. A bill for the relief of George Tillson Weed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S.J. Res.174. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh-water commercial fishery resources of the United States, its Territories, and possessions; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

ESTABLISHMENT OF A MINT IN THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide for the establishment of a mint of the United States in the State of Illinois and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2762) to provide for the establishment of a mint of the United States in the State of Illinois, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, recent studies by the Banking and Currency Committees and a private consulting firm show a tremendous need for the increased minting of U.S. coins; 4.1 billion coins are to be minted during the current fiscal year, but we will need an annual production of at least 5.1 billion by 1970, 7.0 billion by 1975, 9.6 billion by 1980, and 17.8 billion by 1990. Even these estimates may be far too conservative.

To mint the 4.1 billion coins needed this year, the two existing coinage mints at Philadelphia and Denver must oper-

ate virtually 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Legislation passed last year authorizes appropriations which will be used to expand present facilities or replace inadequate existing ones at the Philadelphia Mint. But it is clear that even with expansion and nearly full-time operation of the Denver and Philadelphia mints we will run far behind the rapidly growing demand for coins. The extraordinary demand for more and more coins is not simply a result of general economic growth and population increase, but is due also to technological developments and cultural changes such as use of coin-operated vending machines and increased leisure time and recreational activities.

Illinois is the center of the great midwestern commercial area, and I have received strong protests from area businessmen that the supply of coins is inadequate. Location of the third mint in Illinois would help to make certain that the Midwest has an adequate supply of coins and would permit economies to be realized by the Federal Government and the taxpayer in distribution costs.

I urge the Public Works Committee and the Treasury Department to plan now for construction in Illinois of the third mint.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION PERTAINING TO THE MINING LAWS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, in 1955 Congress enacted Public Law 167 which provided that "common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, or cinders shall not be deemed a valuable mineral deposit within the meaning of the mining laws of the United States so as to give effective validity to any mining claim hereafter located under such mining laws."

The principal purpose for this legislation was apparently to remove the possibility of unauthorized and fraudulent locations by speculators who had no interest in developing mining operations, but were only interested in acquiring title to surface land.

I believe sincerely that this is a sound purpose. My concern today, however, is not with the intent of Public Law 167, but with the interpretation given it by the Department of the Interior since its enactment.

The decisions rendered since 1955 have been equally as restricting on bona fide sand and gravel operations as on the fraudulent operators. Regulations have been drawn which have greatly impaired and, in fact, threatened to totally cripple the construction and building industry in Nevada and other Western States.

Section 7 of the 1955 act provides that there be no limit or restrictions on existing rights under valid mining claims. In spite of this, however, the Department of the Interior has consistently ruled that those claims validly located prior to 1955 must meet a marketability test at a date not later than the time of the act. This flatly violates the historical idea that an operator was entitled to locate and protect his reserves even though he did not in fact remove and market them prior to the time he sought patent.

An arbitrary date is set by the Department ruling at which time any operator, no matter how well intentioned, must be able to prove that he could have economically mined the materials located.

In an area expanding at such an accelerated rate as is Nevada, the effect of the Department's ruling is a serious threat. In my State, for example, 86.9 percent of the total area is controlled by the Federal Government. All Western States have a significant, though lesser, amount of land in public domain. It is imperative, therefore, that, to meet the demands of growth, we have access to the materials held in these lands.

I am not proposing that carte blanche permission be given any operator to remove minerals. I am proposing that more reasonable interpretations be given to existing law and that certain clarifications be made in order that valid mining operations can be conducted.

The first bill which I send to the desk, therefore, would simply provide that a "valuable mineral deposit" within the meaning of the mining laws can be proven by establishing that such deposit was marketable at the time application for patent was made. This bill would only apply to claims located prior to July 23, 1955, the date of enactment of Public Law 167.

The second bill deals with the interpretation of the term "common varieties" as applied in the 1955 act. The Department in this case has held that all sand and gravel was of a common variety and therefore not locatable under the Minerals Act.

In my judgment, such interpretation is not realistic and does not take into consideration the type of materials which are needed by the construction industry. The adoption of this position again seems to ignore the intent of Congress at the time it passed Public Law 167, for had the purpose been to eliminate all varieties, the language would have been so worded. Congress, in fact, added the word "common," however, to indicate that only common varieties were excluded leaving all special varieties of building materials subject to the mining laws.

I therefore send to the desk a second bill which would clarify the intent of Congress in this connection.

May I point out that in terms of mine units produced, the sand and gravel industry is the largest member of the mining family. In 1963, according to the U.S. Bureau of Mines, the industry produced 831 million tons valued at $838 million.

The executive director of the American Society of Planning Officials, Mr. Dennis O'Harrow, has pointed out that if the present sand and gravel production should remain static, there would have to be produced 25 billion tons in the next 30 years. With the anticipated increase in population, however, he estimates that it will be necessary to produce 42 billion tons during that time period. By 1993, annual production would have to be approximately 2,100 million tons.

I believe these figures will dispel any erroneous notions that although gravel is commonly found and not regarded as valuable, it is a vital natural resource and an important, essential element to our economy. It is an unrenewable resource that needs to be used with prudence but needs to be available to the honest operators who seek to keep pace with the demands of our growing population.

Mr. President, I ask that these bills be held at the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

The bills, introduced by Mr. CANNON, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

S. 2764. A bill with respect to the proof of value necessary in the case of certain mining claims located prior to July 23, 1955; and

S. 2765. A bill to amend the act relating to the multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands in order to provide that certain varieties of sand and gravel shall be considered as valuable mineral deposits under the mining laws of the United States.

SURVEY OF THE MARINE AND FRESH WATER COMMERCIAL FISHERY RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing and directing the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh water commercial fishery resources of the United States and its contiguous waters.

Twenty years ago this month President Franklin D. Roosevelt approved a notable and similar joint resolution sponsored by our late distinguished colleague from North Carolina, the Honorable Josiah Bailey, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce.

The survey proposed by Senator Bailey was made and was of material benefit to our fisheries industry during the years immediately following World War II.

Since then many new conditions and circumstances have arisen affecting the living resources of the adjacent seas and the many industries utilizing these resources.

The catch of fish for industrial purposes increased until last year then dropped off half a billion pounds.

The catch of food species has consistently declined. Last year it dropped 11 percent from the previous year.

The depletion of favored food species is occurring not only in waters that are the mainstay of our own fisheries, but around the world.

From 1961 to 1962 the world salmon catch declined 220,000 metric tons, a drop of 29 percent. World catches of halibut, sole, and flounder fell 8 percent.

A few years ago the sardine industry of California was a great and prosperous industry. Now it is gone—disappeared for reasons as yet unknown. Perhaps other ocean species there can replace it.

External pressures also are threatening the fishery resources in many of our

adjacent waters. Massive foreign fishing fleets from overseas are penetrating our richest fishing grounds—grounds where Americans have been fishing for more than 300 years.

The survey proposed in the joint resolution would include not only a comprehensive inventory of resources, but studies of production, processing, distribution, transportation, marketing, and storage methods and facilities, and findings on the effects of overfishing by foreign fleets on employment and the national economy.

Should facts warrant, they could lead to international agreements toward conservation of these resources on an optimum sustained yield basis.

The 78th Congress wisely and promptly passed Senator Bailey's joint resolution directing the initial survey of our fishery resources. It is my hope that the joint resolution may be similarly expedited.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 174) to authorize and direct the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh water commercial fishery resources of the United States, its territories, and possessions, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

CIVIL RIGHTS — AMENDMENT TO TITLE II AND TITLE X (AMENDMENT NO. 514)

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me at a later time to the bill H.R. 7152. I ask that the amendment be read, ordered to remain at the desk, and to be printed so that it may be eligible for consideration in the event a cloture motion is presented on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment (No. 514) submitted by Mr. SALTONSTALL is as follows:

On page 9, beginning with line 15, strike out all through line 24 on page 10 (section 204) and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"SEC. 204. (a) Whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage in any act or practice prohibited by section 203, a civil action for preventive relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order, may, subject to the provisions of this section, be instituted (1) by the person aggrieved, or (2) by the Attorney General for or in the name of the United States if he receives a written complaint signed by the person aggrieved and if he satisfies himself that the purposes of this title will be materially furthered by the filing of an action.

"(b) In any action commenced pursuant to this title, the court, in its discretion, may allow the prevailing party, other than the United States, a reasonable attorney's fee as part of the costs, and the United States shall be liable for costs the same as a private person.

"(c) Except as otherwise provided in this section, in the case of any complaint received by the Attorney General alleging a violation or threatened violation of section 203 in a place where State or local laws or regulations forbid the act or practice alleged, the Attorney General shall, prior to referring such complaint under subsection (d), notify the appropriate State or local officials of such complaint and, upon their request, afford them a reasonable time to act under such State or local laws or regulations to prevent, or bring about a discontinuance of, such act or practice.

"(d) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the Attorney General shall refer each complaint received by him alleging a violation or threatened violation of section 203 to the Community Relations service established by title X of this Act. If he has given notice of such complaint to State or local officials under subsection (c) and such officials have requested time to act under State or local laws or regulations, he shall refer such complaint to the Service only if he determines that the prevention or discontinuance of the act or practice alleged has not been secured by such officials within a reasonable time. The Attorney General may institute an action under subsection (a) with respect to any violation or threatened violation of section 203 alleged in a complaint received by him only if (1) after the expiration of the ninety-day period beginning with the referral of such complaint to the Service, he determines that the Service has been unable to bring about a voluntary discontinuance of the act or practice alleged in such complaint, or (2) prior to the expiration of such ninety-day period, the Service certifies to him under section 205(b) that it has been unable to bring about a voluntary discontinuance of such act or practice.

"(e) The Attorney General shall not be required to give notice of any complaint under subsection (c), or to refer any complaint under subsection (d), if he determines that there are no reasonable grounds to believe that there has been a violation, or to believe that there is a threatened violation, of section 203. The Attorney General shall not be required to give notice of a complaint under subsection (c) if he determines that in the particular case the delay consequent thereto would adversely affect the interests of the United States or that such notice would prove ineffective, in which case he shall certify such determination upon referral of such complaint to the Community Relations Service.

"(f) If the person aggrieved has filed a complaint with the Attorney General he may not institute an action under subsection (a) with respect to a violation or threatened violation of section 203 alleged in such complaint before the expiration of the ninety-day period commencing with the referral of such complaint to the Community Relations Service by the Attorney General under subsection (d), unless prior to the expiration of such period the Service certifies to the Attorney General under section 205(b) that it has been unable to bring about a voluntary discontinuance of the act or practice alleged in such complaint.

"SEC. 205. (a) The Community Relations Service shall make an investigation of each complaint referred to it by the Attorney General under section 204(d). If as the result of its investigation of any complaint, the Service finds any act or practice alleged therein which in its judgment constitutes a violation or threatened violation of section 203, it shall endeavor by conciliation and persuasion to bring about a voluntary discontinuance of such act or practice.

"(b) If the Service determines, before the expiration of the ninety-day period commencing on the date on which a complaint is referred to it, that it is unable to bring about a voluntary discontinuance of the act or practice which it has found to constitute a violation or threatened violation of section 203, it shall certify such fact to the Attorney General."

On page 11, line 1, strike out "205" and insert "206".

On page 52, line 11, strike out ", not to exceed six in number,".

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for perhaps 3 or 3½ minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I object. If the Senator's time expires before he has concluded his speech, he might make his request again.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

The purpose of this amendment is to provide a means on the Federal level by which the Attorney General shall attempt to secure voluntary compliance with the provisions of title II prior to instituting court action. It provides an opportunity for the parties concerned in a dispute over an alleged discriminatory practice to try initially to resolve the problem with the assistance of the Community Relations Service. It is certainly hoped that the advantages of using this means to settle a dispute rather than a long and costly court suit will be recognized by the parties involved. If voluntary compliance cannot be obtained through conciliation and persuasion within 90 days, the aggrieved party and the Attorney General are then free to institute civil action.

Mr. President, I support the purpose of title II, but I sincerely believe that it will prove in the best interests of all of our citizens and the communities in which these disputes arise to attempt to secure voluntary compliance with the provisions of this title before initiating court action.

DETAILED EXPLANATION

My amendment amends section 204 of title II of H.R. 7152 to provide that the Attorney General, prior to instituting an action on a complaint alleging a violation or a threat of violation of section 203, shall refer the complaint to the Community Relations Service established by title X of this act. The Community Relations Service shall have a minimum of 90 days in which to investigate the complaint and to bring about a voluntary discontinuance of the alleged act or practice, unless prior to the expiration of this period the Service certifies to the Attorney General that it has been unable to secure voluntary compliance. If the Attorney General determines that the Service needs additional time at the end of 90 days he may so grant it.

The amendment includes the language in the pending bill which permits the Attorney General to give notice of a complaint received by him to State or local officials and, at their request, give them a reasonable time in which to secure a discontinuance of the act or practice alleged in the complaint. It provides that he shall not be required to

give such notice or refer any complaint to the Community Relations Service if he determines that there are no reasonable grounds to the complaint. He is also not required to give such notice to State or local officials if he determines that in the particular case the delay would adversely affect the interests of the United States or would prove ineffective. In such a case, my amendment provides that he shall certify this determination when he refers the complaint directly to the Community Relations Service.

Where a complaint has been filed with the Attorney General, my amendment restrains the aggrieved party as well as the Attorney General from instituting action for preventive relief while the case is pending in the Community Relations Service.

To enable the Community Relations Service to carry out the function described here, the amendment strikes the limitation contained in title X of six permanent employees for the Service. The decision on the size of this Service will be made through its annual appropriations.

Mr. President, Massachusetts, in 1865, became the first State to enact a public accommodations statute. This law, which has been amended several times since its original enactment, is considerably broader in scope than what is pending before us today. The Massachusetts law provides for criminal penalties. However, in addition, in 1950, the provisions of this law were placed under the jurisdiction of the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination. This commission has authority to seek voluntary compliance with the provisions of the law. Thus, although the Massachusetts statute provides a criminal penalty, the principle of seeking voluntary compliance in such cases prior to enforcement by the courts was recognized in our State and has worked well.

I believe the amendment has value to title II of the act.

INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF DOMESTIC BEET SUGAR AND MAINLAND CANE SUGAR WHICH MAY BE MARKETED DURING 1964, 1965, AND 1966—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 515)

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to S. 2657 to increase the amount of domestic beet sugar and mainland cane sugar which may be marketed during 1964, 1965, and 1966.

My proposed amendment would complement S. 2657 by amending the Sugar Act of 1948 to include for calendar years 1965 to 1969 increased quotas for domestic sugar producing areas by one million short tons raw value. Further, section 302(b) of the Sugar Act of 1948 would be amended by striking out 1966 and inserting 1969.

Mr. President, the purpose of these changes in S. 2657 is to permit allocations to be made from the sugar beet acreage reserve from 1967, 1968, and 1969, as well as increasing the marketing quotas for the beet area for 1967, 1968, and 1969. By so doing, this would allow the acreage required to produce 65,000 tons of sugar in each of the 3 years and thereby provide for four new sugar beet factories under the acreage reserve provisions of the Sugar Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 515) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

INCREASED AMOUNT OF DOMESTIC BEET SUGAR AND MAINLAND CANE SUGAR WHICH MAY BE MARKETED DURING 1964, 1965, AND 1966—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2657) to increase the amount of domestic beet sugar and mainland cane sugar which may be marketed during 1964, 1965, and 1966, introduced by me on March 19, 1964.

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

TRIBUTE TO SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT S. McNAMARA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara holds what is one of the most difficult jobs in the country after that of the Presidency itself. It calls for daily decisions which vitally affect the defense of our Nation—the very preservation of peace and our national integrity.

Secretary McNamara has served with great dedication and determination. He has administered the Department of Defense ably and intelligently. He has discharged his responsibilities with great sensitivity to the vital interests of our country. He has acted without partisanship—a Republican in a Democratic administration—in his public responsibility.

Robert McNamara has not been infallible—nor can one expect him to be—but he has always sought to make decisions based on facts and in the light of what he believes to be the public interest.

His actions and his words have sometimes rankled and invited strong opposition. He is not a diplomat. He is not a pawn. He is not a dissimulator.

There are those who question his decisions but none can question his motives. He is a man of integrity and courage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Neal Stanford entitled "The Pentagon Boss," which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of April 21, 1964, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE PENTAGON BOSS

(By Neal Stanford)

The most controversial man in Washington today is Defense Secretary Robert McNamara. It just is not possible to be neutral about him. You either admire him or deplore him.

Here is a Republican (at least he was a Republican) being seriously mentioned as President Johnson's choice for his running mate on the Democratic ticket.

Here is a Phi Beta Kappa Harvard professor running the $50 billion-a-year Pentagon, and running it more efficiently than it has ever been run, and with a firmer hand and keener mind than anyone can recall.

When that proper Bostonian and Beacon Hill Senator from Massachusetts, Republican LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, speaks warmly of a Democratic administration Cabinet member that is news. Yet Senator SALTONSTALL tells the Secretary: "I have been here 18 years now and if you are making those annual savings of billions of dollars you tell us, you have done some job. I congratulate you."

That economy watchdog on defense spending, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, who has been trying for years to get Defense Secretaries to cut waste, says flatly: "It wasn't until McNamara took over in the Pentagon that we've made any progress against military waste."

Secretary McNamara, it is not widely known, talks back to Congressmen on the Hill with a sharpness and abruptness that is unheard of. Just the other day he took on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, asserting: "We are asking for only $1 billion for foreign aid solely because the Congress has made it crystal clear it is unwilling to appropriate a larger amount." When Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Republican, of New Jersey, broke in to say he didn't like the words "solely" and "crystal clear" and was "appalled by such a statement * * * it is incomprehensible * * * most unwise. I resent it and think it is offensive," the Secretary replied: "That's exactly what I said."

But the Congressman unwisely persisted, arguing that the Secretary had failed in his basic responsibility to inform the Congress, and charging: "You are running from battle before it begins." This brought the sharp retort from the Secretary: "I never run from a fight, and my record before Congress supports that."

Abrupt and sharp as he may be, the Secretary, however, sometimes has Congressmen falling all over themselves to praise him. For a Senator to be at a loss for words is unique, and possibly unethical. But here is Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the powerful Armed Services Committee, telling the Secretary to his face: "I cannot find words to express my admiration of the administrative efficiency that you have shown." Yet Secretary McNamara is the man that refuses to spend those extra millions the Senator and his colleagues vote for development of various new weapons systems. Possibly the fact that the Senator paid the compliment and made the admission at an executive session explains it. But the Senator is too old a hand in Washington not to know that yesterday's executive comment is today's newspaper headline.

But if Senator RUSSELL was at a loss for words with which to praise the deceptively boyish Secretary of Defense, not so Senator ALLEN ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, who said unqualifiedly: "It has been my privilege to be in Congress for 27 years and I do not know of any time that I have been confronted with a witness who is more informed than McNamara," and that is a sweeping statement for it includes such greats as John Foster Dulles, George C. Marshall, Dean Acheson, and Robert Lovett. Senator ELLENDER possibly paid Secretary McNamara his greatest compliment, however, by adding: "He kind of disarms you by being so well informed."

But all Senators do not love and admire this wonder-boy emigrant from Detroit's Ford empire, as most any day's comments by GOP presidential aspirant Senator BARRY

GOLDWATER shows. In his dispute with the Secretary over the reliability of U.S. ICBM's, the Arizona Senator calls the Pentagon boss irresponsible, and even charges him with dishonesty. To which the Secretary fires back that it is completely misleading, politically irresponsible, damaging to the national security to talk that way.

Yes, you can't be neutral about Secretary McNamara, you are either for him or against him, all the way. (And with L.B.J., it's all the way.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the article is indicative of Secretary McNamara's exceptional attributes for public service and of the high esteem in which he is held by the Members of the Senate.

MORAL CONDUCT OF THE FUTURE GENERATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, this is the second month in which the Senate has been engaged in debating the civil rights bill. Many say it is the most important measure that has been before the Senate in years.

I do not question the importance of the issue, although personally I feel that there are no constitutional rights, in either State or Federal Constitution that cannot be preserved, regardless of race, color, religion, sex, or any other reason, by enforcing the laws which we now have.

In my opinion, a far greater issue was discussed before our breakfast group by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE]. He opened his discussion by saying:

My friends, Edmund Burke believed that the character of the next generation can be predicted—and is in fact determined—by the prevailing sentiments and behavior of the youth today.

I see in the galleries those who are engaged in training Catholic youth to grow up into good citizens. But unfortunately, too few of them are in the parochial schools.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the excellent statement made before our breakfast group yesterday by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE].

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

My friends, Edmund Burke believed that the character of the next generation can be predicted—and is in fact determined—by the prevailing sentiments and behavior of the youth today.

This is more than just the expression of a philosophical principle. It is indeed a warning and a challenge to all who are concerned with the future of young people. And to me it is a reminder of the wisdom that we find in the 22d chapter of Proverbs, the 6th verse:

"Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it."

My friends, lately I have become increasingly concerned about the morality and discipline of our young people. I wonder if the American people, in the rearing of their children, aren't straying from the teachings of their fathers, if they aren't becoming unmindful of the fact that "children are the heritage of the Lord" and therefore must be instructed according to His word.

Judging from the number of recent national magazine articles and widespread publicity dealing with the moral conduct—or misconduct—of our youngsters, it appears that this is a matter of growing concern throughout the country. And it should be.

The moral fabric of a nation is only as strong as its weakest fibers.

Certainly the situation is not as dismal or hopeless as some would have us believe. I will not endeavor to paint such a picture this morning. However, neither is it all bright and rosy. In my opinion, things are far from what they should be with growing numbers of our children.

I am aware that such a charge as this usually brings an angry outcry proclaiming that "we are not all bad." This, of course, is true. We have in America—in our high schools and colleges—a vast and praiseworthy army of fine young men and women who are the products of good homes and Christian training. We are proud of them, and we place great trust in them. I certainly would not go so far as the California school superintendent who branded a certain class of so-called delinquents as "the cult of the slob."

On the other hand, I cannot subscribe to the theory that errant young people of today are only misunderstood and really act no differently than those of any previous generation. Nor can I believe that boys and girls of today are the unfortunate victims of unhappy circumstances and uncertain times, and therefore not responsible for what they think and do.

Certainly, this is a complex and insecure age in which we live. But, I think the problem which I wish to discuss with you this morning is much more than merely a symptom of this period in our history.

My friends, I fear that standards of morality have been greatly lowered. I see signs that the value of restraint and individual responsibility has fallen to what could be an alltime low. If this is true, it could be a great tragedy, and I contend that it is one for which we have sown the seeds and which is now beginning to bear a bitter fruit in our children.

Somewhere at sometime, something has gone amiss when we see in a respected national magazine a symposium on the merits and demerits of chastity. The matter is treated as though it were no more than the vestige of an outmoded virtue.

Recently, Newsweek magazine devoted its entire cover story to morals on the campus. The article stated, and I quote:

"Chastity remains a virtue for most of today's 4½ million college students; but for a significant—and growing—minority the question has become academic."

No, all is not well with our children when we read of organized gangs of teenagers roaming the streets in search of a fight or a party to crash, or when we see that the final whistle at a football game is often the signal for mayhem.

All is not well when our city streets are unsafe after dark, and when our parks must be vacated at sundown by law-abiding citizens and their families.

The number of crimes and acts of violence perpetrated by persons under 18 years of age increases each time the statistics are compiled.

Somewhere along the line, the training of our youth has gone sour when they think it is great sport to wreck havoc in a cemetery by tipping over tombstones; when the height of pleasure is achieved in the desecration of a church; when policemen are hired for high school dances to see that drinking doesn't lead to disorder; when teenage pregnancy occurs much more frequently than illegitimate birth rates show.

Authority, whether it be in the police, in the school, or in the home, has become the object of ridicule. In many young circles, you are considered a square if you adhere to the rules of established order or acquiesce to the commands of your elders.

Unfortunately, much of today's unruly or abusive conduct by young people is dismissed as only boyish behavior, and in one form or another, such showing off happens all the time. This is true. It does happen over and over again. Yes, these things occur every day, and this is exactly what I am talking about. This is what I am concerned about. It goes directly to the point I wish to make.

When children are not taught respect and obedience, when the doctrine of responsibility is not instilled in them in the home, when despairing and apparently helpless parents allow their offspring to do pretty much as they please, how can they be expected to act responsibly and honorably outside the home?

If children are allowed to disobey their parents with impunity and act in such a belligerent and disrespectful manner as to undermine authority in the home, how can these young people be expected to respect any authority outside the home?

If they can scorn their adults, can they not also thumb their noses at the law and trample on the rights and property of others? They can and they do.

"Boys will be boys," we are told by the apologists. So we forgive and forget. We absolve them of all responsibility because they are young and exuberant and strong-willed. Boys will be boys, but soon they will be men, and all men must learn that ours is an ordered society and all of us might at one time or another bend our will to established authority. Otherwise, there would be chaos and anarchy.

We also hear the explanation that young people today have too much time on their hands, and consequently they are idle because they don't have enough to do. There is idleness all right, and it is true that this certainly can—and often does—lead to waywardness. But this is not because there isn't enough to do. The fact is that too many young people today aren't given enough to do. Virtually everything is done for them, with the car keys and spending money thrown in as a bonus.

Here is what a Prince William County, Va., police chief says about idleness and teenagers:

"Always, we hear the plaintive cry of the teenager: What can we do? Where can we go? The answer is: Go home; hang the screens; paint the woodwork; rake the leaves; mow the lawn; shovel the walk; wash the car; learn to cook; scrub the floors; repair the sink; build a boat; get a job; help the minister, priest, or rabbi, the Red Cross, or the Salvation Army; visit the sick; assist the poor; study your lessons; and then when you are through—and not tired—read a good book.

"Your parents do not owe you entertainment. Your village doesn't owe you recreational facilities. The world doesn't owe you a living. You owe the world something. You owe your time and energy and talents, so that no one will be at war or in poverty, or sick and lonely again. In plain simple words, grow up, get out of your dream world, quit being a crybaby, start acting like a man or a lady."

"An idle soul shall suffer hunger," the Scriptures tell us, and I am of the same mind as the poet who said that "nothing is so certain as that the evils of idleness can be shaken off by hard work."

Perhaps the theory most commonly advanced to explain the unrest of our young people is the fact that these are troubled times and the future is uncertain. This leads to fear and insecurity which for some reason is supposed to be an excuse for rebelliousness and defiance.

"The emergence of a strong single Europe—a true superpower for which the resources are indeed available—could present Western unity with thorny problems unless tightly integrated in the Atlantic framework."

"These considerations do not suggest," according to the council statement, "that the United States should reverse its course and start opposing European unification. What they do suggest is that the United States cease to pressure its European allies toward any particular brand of unity and concentrate rather on exploring with them the fields, forms, and degrees of unity with us that would be mutually advantageous."

"The prime goal of future U.S. policy must be to capitalize on and to stimulate every shared interest that unites the free nations of the West and moves them forward toward one Atlantic community. A U.S. policy that made collaboration on an Atlantic scale its guiding standard should * * * be able to take the edge off any inward directed and exclusive 'Europeanism'."

In particular the council cites the following areas on which agreement is of basic importance: "(1) strategic policy, including control of nuclear weapons, (2) trade policy, including agricultural policy, and (3) financial policy, including the strengthening of the West's monetary system."

In pointing out that these objectives can be accomplished without elaborate new institutions, the paper concludes: "The immediate need * * * is * * * the will to use better what we already have. We need a new determination—shown by acts rather than words—to develop greater Atlantic strength and unity. The United States must now show this will and determination, stop the disintegration of NATO, resume the initiative shown by the Truman and Eisenhower administrations, and begin to lead again."

The members of the Critical Issues Council are: Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, chairman; Elliott V. Bell; Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, U.S. Navy, retired, Arthur F. Burns, Albert L. Cole, James H. Douglas, Marion B. Folsom, Thomas S. Gates, T. Keith Glennan, Oveta Culp Hobby, Walter H. Judd, Mary P. Lord, Clare Boothe Luce, Deane W. Malott, James P. Mitchell, Gen. Lauris Norstad, U.S. Air Force, retired, Don Paarlberg, C. Wrede Petersmeyer, Samuel R. Pierce, Jr., Charles S. Rhyne, Raymond J. Saulnier, Lewis L. Strauss, Walter N. Thayer, Henry C. Wallich.

CRITICAL ISSUES PAPER NO. 3

(By the Critical Issues Council, Washington, D.C.)

After the bitter experience of two world wars, followed immediately by the challenge of the cold war, the United States was compelled to make an historic decision: that it could no longer afford to stand aside or go it alone if it was determined to preserve its freedom and independence.

Allowing Eurasia and the adjoining islands to fall under hostile control would, in the end, make America's own position untenable. Thus, aggression against friendly and allied nations has come to be recognized as an attack against the United States. To deter such an attack—if necessary, to defeat it—the power of the United States had to be thrown into the balance.

The task of protecting the free world thus became a United States responsibility, and a United States commitment. The commitment endures. It is an inescapable obligation of leadership. But we cannot discharge our responsibility alone. In the world today we need the closest coordination with our allies in all matters of common concern, if we are to win the future.

I

NATO: THE CORNERSTONE OF WESTERN DEFENSE

The North Atlantic alliance is an unparalleled achievement of cooperation for common defense. It had its immediate origins in the crises of 1948–49—the Berlin blockade and the Communist takeover of Czechoslovakia—and the urgent needs of free world security. In meeting these needs, in containing the aggressive thrust of the Soviet Union, the alliance has been a notable success. But the basic requirement continues. NATO's very success has greatly enhanced its potential to cope with broader fields.

The preamble to the North Atlantic Treaty reaffirms the faith of a community now encompassing 15 free nations:

"In the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments.

"They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law.

"They seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area.

"They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security."

The alliance has provided both the sword and the shield in whose shelter the nations of Europe have been able to recover from wartime devastation, to preserve their freedom, and to enjoy levels of prosperity unprecedented in history.

For the United States, the alliance represents a genuine triumph of bipartisan foreign policy. Throughout a succession of national administrations, and with consistent congressional and popular support, this Nation has committed itself unreservedly to the interdependence of free-world security. Our willing and massive contributions of men and material have effectively underwritten this commitment.

1. Essential to U.S. security

The United States did not join the alliance just to save Europe from the imminent menace of communism. We returned to Europe, and we remain there today, because its defense is essential to our own—because the two are indivisible. A sense of interdependence and of community rapidly evolved into an alliance which today embodies the sum of its combined resources, whether military or economic or intellectual, and a potential for peaceful order and orderly growth matched nowhere else.

The alliance has succeeded: its immediate goals have been substantially accomplished. Under NATO, 15 free nations have been able to harmonize their sovereign interests into a common cause, build a powerful force-in-being, establish a supporting complex of bases and logistical networks, and take important steps toward development of a common strategy covering the use of nuclear and other weapons.

But this momentum is not now being maintained. Confidence, on both sides of the Atlantic, is being shaken. Dedication to the goals of allied strength and unity is giving way to a growing disunity and distrust. Seeds of disintegration are now undermining this bulwark of free-world security.

In so critical a situation, the primary burden falls upon the leader—to assess his own shortcomings, to reaffirm clear and consistent policy goals, and thus to take up his full responsibility. U.S. leadership appears fitful and inconsistent; it resorts too much to gadgetry rather than the establishment of sound and enduring relationships, built on a basis of mutual respect among sovereign equals.

Confidence within the alliance must now be restored—on both sides of the Atlantic. This requires that the United States must continue to bear major material burdens. We must put aside expediency and crude interallied "arm-twisting" and mobilize within the alliance all its latent resources of will and unity of purpose. If we are to guarantee our own security, there is no alternative. The costs, however great, are the price we must pay to preserve our future progress in freedom.

2. The continuing Soviet threat

The alliance is above all a pact of mutual assistance against a Soviet attack on the territory or armed forces of its member nations. Its foremost purpose is to deter, and if necessary to defeat, such an attack. And this must continue to be so, as long as the military threat from the East remains.

As a purely military pact NATO might not survive, should its members ever lose confidence in its ability to enhance their security against attack or come to believe that the threat from the East had ended. But the alliance extends beyond the military field: the treaty itself calls for cooperation in other fields, cooperation which is indispensable if only to assure the essential solidarity required for effective collective defense. NATO, the most vital of our transatlantic institutions, is thus the natural nucleus for an emerging pattern of Atlantic relationships and an evolving community of shared interests.

The military threat from the East is not ended. Thus, the leading question is: Does NATO as it stands adequately insure our security, the security of the United States as well as its Allies? If it does not, we—the United States and its Allies—must now make the necessary changes.

3. The means of deterrence

Deterrence of attack, against any part of the free world, is indivisible. As the threat is poised against all, so too must the burdens of an effective response be shared by all. Yet the particular situations differ greatly, in North America and in Europe, both as to specific vulnerabilities and the "mix" of forces that must be available to meet a varied range of aggressive acts. Without the projection of North American military might across the Atlantic, the exposed territory and eastern boundaries of the European allies would be in immediate jeopardy.

Even on grounds of sheer national self-interest, the heavy burdens placed on the United States in the defense of both North America and Europe are inescapable. If Communist power in the world is to be held in check—and for America to remain free—all free nations must be able to rely on the strength the United States is able and willing to commit to the commom security.

With world responsibilities of such vast scope, the United States must bear its share, perhaps what appears to be a disproportionate share, of the defense burden required if NATO is to reach its basic objective. The alternative would be to retreat to a Fortress America position. Such a position served U.S. interests, and served them well, only as long as other friendly nations were able to balance or defeat any hostile powers. Today, given the realities of international life, it would mean U.S. isolation and the alienation of like-minded peoples—until, when all others had succumbed, America would find itself facing a Communist-dominated world, superior in resources and in power.

4. The need for supplementary deterrents

But now, 15 years after NATO's establishment, its task of protecting the freedom and independence of the non-Communist nations of Europe—and of our friends and allies on other continents—has been rendered immensely more arduous. Two new factors have radically changed the context. First, the power of the leading Communist states has grown greatly since the early postwar period. More important still, the acquisition of long-range nuclear striking forces by the Soviet Union has raised questions as to the credibility and thus the deterrent effect of U.S. retaliatory threats to intervene with its

strategic forces—the West's most formidable military instrument—against any but massive attacks on oversea members of the Alliance.

Strategic nuclear forces are essential. But, however impressive in themselves, alone they are not sufficient. There is urgent need of supplementary deterrents—specifically, of very sizable forces deployed in Europe and on the oceans adjoining the European Continent, forces with a conventional capacity but supported by short- and medium-range nuclear weapons. Such forces must be on the spot if every kind of provocation, especially nuclear blackmail, is to be met with effective countermeasures. This requires that the threat of their use and, if deterrence should fail, the effectiveness of their use must be credible both to friend and foe.

So demanding is the military task now facing NATO that it must be able to count on all its members for whatever efforts are needed to attain the goals of the alliance. The allies of the United States made substantial commitments at a time when they were struggling to emerge from the devastation of the war. Yet, given their extraordinary economic recovery in recent years and the degree of internal stability they have attained, there remains a painful lag in the exertions of some of them. This fact stands in sharp contradiction to the interests at stake. On both sides of the Atlantic, it must be understood that a Communist conquest of even the smallest part of Europe would be a catastrophe for all.

5. The burden must be shared

This Nation must bear a share of responsibility for the failure of some European nations to meet the force requirements set by NATO. In part, the allies have been lulled into complacency by overreliance on the United States—on our support, our aid, and our deterrent. The words and actions of the United States which exaggerate some new era of "reconciliation" with the Soviet Union have helped foster a sense of "euphoria" and relaxation. The United States has failed to convince its allies that the military efforts demanded of them would add substantially to their security.

Europe sometimes voices a suspicion that any increase in European forces would merely signal the reduction of U.S. forces presently stationed there—forces the Europeans regard as the indispensable mainstay of their security. It is not so much that any specific number of U.S. divisions represents a "sacred" and inflexible commitment. But the overall need has been fixed after long interallied deliberation, and our basic commitment to the indivisible defense of Europe and the United States is indeed sacred. Unless and until these NATO force levels are filled by our allies, the burden falls upon the United States as the inescapable requirement of our own security.

An additional burden is that of a persistent imbalance in our international accounts, to which the costs of maintaining U.S. forces in Europe are a contributing factor. The defense of the dollar is in a very practical sense part of our grand strategy. A weak dollar would weaken the United States politically, and therefore militarily. The United States must seek out, therefore, all possible means to reduce the balance-of-payments cost of our forces abroad, without weakening our military or political posture. We must continue to press our allies, whose economic resources are rapidly rising, to accept a larger share of the burden of common defense. The greater the burden they will bear, the closer we will come to narrowing the payments gap—to the benefit, ultimately, of all the nations of the free world.

If it should be thought that the threat of U.S. troop withdrawals would act as a spur to needed European efforts, the likelihood is that, in the present psychological situation, it might lead to precisely the opposite result. It would tend either to arouse a sense of defeatism or else lend impetus to attempts—wasteful and militarily unpromising though they may be—to substitute independent strategic deterrents for the American nuclear umbrella. The mere hint of U.S. withdrawals, even if falsely interpreted as pointing toward future U.S. disengagement from the Continent, thus adds fuel to the doubts that are undercutting NATO's solidarity and deepens the crisis of confidence through which the alliance is now passing.

6. Control of NATO's nuclear capability

In the perfect alliance—which never has and never will exist—this problem would solve itself. That nation which commands all but a minute fraction of the alliance's aggregate nuclear resources would manage them in the common interest. It would decide when and where and how nuclear power would be used—and whether it would be used at all.

But even so honorable a nation as the United States cannot expect to be taken wholly on trust by other honorable nations in matters involving their very existence. Then, too, for many in Europe—and not just the French—some participation in the control of nuclear weapons has become a symbol of sovereignty.

In this sense, the nuclear question is but the tip of a vast iceberg consisting of unresolved problems of the political control of the totality of NATO's strategic resources. The question is even more one of relationships—the precise terms governing a partnership of sovereign nations, equal in pride and independence if not in direct ownership of major resources. Indeed, this very sense of independence among all the members of the alliance is no mark of failure; it is the inevitable consequence of NATO's profound success.

The practical question remains, however: By what further means shall we implement the formal understanding reached at the NATO heads-of-government meeting in December 1957, to establish nuclear stockpiles in Europe and to equip allied forces with delivery systems—but with the warheads in the custody of the United States, the donor nation. The means of mutual defense, both European and North American, were thus to be shared. While much was done in the years immediately following 1957 to carry out this proposal, the alliance must now decide how and by whom political and military control shall be exercised.

The concept of a NATO nuclear force under NATO command was projected as one possible solution, with the precise working arrangements left to interallied negotiation. Since 1960, this has been presented in the form of a multilateral force, the MLF. This proposal, originally conceived as a working concept for further consultation, has in recent years tended to be used more as a pressure tactic. But the essential disharmony concerning nuclear control remains; and the concept of MLF has, in fact, heightened it, rather than serving as a first step toward an eventual solution around which all the allies might compromise their legitimate differences.

We must now translate the concept of collective defense into a workable solution—into practical terms of how and by whom authority and control are to be exercised, and extended to cover all forces and all weapons, conventional and nuclear. In the last 3 years, there has been no real progress toward this goal. In fact, we have clearly retrogressed.

We cannot believe that either the ingenuity or the will is lacking to perfect workable arrangements in a way that satisfies the interests of all, including Germany and the other nonnuclear members of the alliance. The goal is plain: to make of NATO's nuclear capability the pillar of allied unity it should be, rather than the source of disintegration it has been allowed to become.

7. Toward greater unity

The disarray within NATO must be overcome. What is needed is the restoration of faith in the effectiveness of collective defense as the best road to national security. Such faith and mutual confidence are indispensable bases for solidarity in an age of nuclear weaponry with its unprecedented threat to national survival.

Solidarity can exist side by side with great differences in power. But it requires full respect for the sovereign interests of all. Our allies are demanding more than merely to be kept informed about decisions over which they have no control, more also than "consultation" in which their views carry weight only if they conform with U.S. preconceptions. What they want is real participation, a true share in the process by which decisions vital to all are reached. This is what they have every right to demand.

In turn, the United States can provide the effective leadership and forceful initiative that corresponds to its resources—and which its allies expect and applaud—only if it enjoys a high measure of freedom of action. Allied participation in planning, decision-making, and strategy must go hand in hand, therefore, with a clear recognition that the United States must be able to act, swiftly and decisively, in any emergency in which the strategic protection of the entire alliance is at stake. The ultimate decision on the use of nuclear weapons, to the effective, must be almost instantaneous. To be acceptable, it must be based upon close and meaningful consultation with our allies throughout the period leading toward that decision.

Confidence must be restored on both sides of the Atlantic. As in all matters of common concern within the alliance, the primary burden falls up the United States. As the leader, we must show wisdom in approaching all these critical problems—never falling back on the easy extremes of petulance or arrogance. We must show understanding to all the nations of the alliance—a patient recognition that no two have precisely the same background and history, the same interests or ambitions. We must show strength where and when strength is required—based always on conviction and principles, clear to friend and foe alike, and never on mere expediency.

The sum of these qualities of leadership will be a heightened sense of responsibility—to the Alliance, to ourselves, and to the cause of freedom.

II

THE UNITED STATES AND ITS INDIVIDUAL ALLIES

A Europe of multiple sovereignties has its apparent drawbacks, particularly when compared with some imagined federal European union patterned on the American model. But it must be accepted as a fact, and dealt with in a spirit of understanding and accommodation.

The United States must not play one European ally off against another—even though the temptation to do so may at times be great. Nothing could be more detrimental to the Alliance than an invidious competition among European nations for special favors from the United States or, worse still, for favored treatment by the Soviet Union. The U.S. strengthens its role of leadership if it convinces all of its allies that they can count on loyal U.S. support whenever their particular interests are consistent with the interests of the Alliance as a whole.

Attempts on the part of any member of the Alliance to gain special favors from the Soviet Union would necessarily lead to grave disunity. The United States can do much to prevent any such "race to Moscow" by setting an example of self-restraint in its own dealings with the Kremlin. While it would be unacceptable to the United States

if its allies assumed the right to veto any bilateral Soviet-American negotiations or accords, bilaterialism cannot be kept a monopoly of the superpowers. It will always tend to arouse a certain suspicion of special deals at the expense of others. In the interest of interallied confidence, the United States will be well advised, whenever the way is open for accords with the Kremlin that would be advantageous to the West, to make sure that its allies are given full and early insight into the negotiations.

1. The United States and Canada

Our relationship with Canada is probably closer than with any other nation. United States trade with Canada is larger than with the entire Common Market. The two governments are linked by numerous high-level joint boards and committees. Yet, we must take into account Canadian fears of domination, whether political, economic, or cultural, by her larger neighbor. The more we heed her voice in formulating policies on matters of common concern, the better off we both will be. Beginning in 1958, there have been frequent working meetings among cabinet officers of the two countries, bound together less by formal agendas than by an earnest desire to deepen the habits of consultation.

2. The United States and Britain

The special relationship with Britain assumes more importance in French eyes than it does to either Britain or the United States. It is not a matter of formal institutional arrangements, and two allies divided by common language do have their differences. Basically, the cordial relationship between the two countries derives from a deeply rooted similarity of values and approach which is shared by Canada and, to varying degrees, by our other allies. Differences arise when the two governments diverge in such matters as their estimate of the chances of accord with Moscow or in their attitude toward East-West trade.

In dealing with the United Kingdom, we must bear in mind its concern for close ties not only with the Common Market but also with other European countries, with the Commonwealth, and with ourselves. Far better than urging Britain to press for admission to the Common Market—and later, perhaps, to a European political union—would be to explore with her and with the other countries of Europe means of developing an economic association that would take more fully into account the interests of all free nations.

3. The United States and France

In the case of France, it is obvious that the relationship has deteriorated to a point that gravely endangers the alliance itself. This is the more disconcerting because France has agreed with the United States that the Alliance is indispensable for French security, at least for the forseeable future, and has taken the opportunity on several occasions to prove her firm alinement with the United States in resisting Soviet pressures and provocations.

Little is gained by stressing the real or alleged incompatibilities of French and American "grand designs." Instead, it is necessary to examine the practical steps that can be taken to give France and other countries that sense of independence without which De Gaulle claims there can be no genuine partnership.

Nobody can appreciate better than he what it took in the way of national authority, and of determination at the helm, to pull France back from the abyss of anarchy and interminable colonial warfare—and to do so without resorting to Fascist abuses of dictatorial power. Moreover, engaged in restoring French national self-confidence as a prerequisite of domestic stability, he opposes supranationality—which is what integration means to him—and rejects anything implying American or Anglo-Saxon special privileges.

There is a limit beyond which the independence of any member becomes incompatible with common allied action. But Franco-American amity is too precious, in terms of overriding Western interests, to be allowed to become the victim of dogmatic preconceptions or unsubstantiated mutual accusations.

4. The United States and Germany

Relations with Germany have been extraordinarily cordial since her defeat at the hands of the wartime Allies—so consistently cordial, in fact, and so valuable because of Germany's new-won power, wealth, and stability, that a mutually satisfactory German-American relationship should present no difficulty. Yet, such a view errs toward overoptimism even as the view of French hostility toward NATO and the United States errs in the opposite direction.

It is true that no group of influence in Germany today is cool or opposed to Western orientation. All parties are convinced of Germany's need for U.S. protection, preferably within the framework of NATO. The German military effort is becoming ever more substantial. Economically, Germany is doing enviably well.

Yet, when all is said, Germany remains a partitioned country, exposed to grave dangers in West Berlin, strung along the frontier of a Soviet empire both aggressive and superior in strength, and still suffering under the suspicion of neighbors both east and west of any German defense efforts that are reminiscent of her past nationalism and militarism.

Under these circumstances, what Germany needs least of all is to be courted by a United States in competition with France, nor made to bear responsibilities beyond what she feels to be her present capabilities. We must make it plain to the German people that their vital interests are America's vital interest, too, and will be firmly defended. Those interests are the freedom of West Berlin, free access to West Berlin, and the freedom of the people of the Eastern Zone, once they are rid of Communist oppression, to determine for themselves whether they wish to reunite with West Germany. In addition, the United States should help Germany to gain the confidence of her neighbors in the East, and become a magnet drawing them back into Europe instead of a source of apprehension that tightens the Soviet grip.

5. The United States and Italy

Relations with Italy have, on the whole, been excellent since the war. As a democratic country with a succession of governments firmly opposed to communism at home and abroad, she has contributed to the strength of both NATO and the Common Market. Internal difficulties in finding a stable majority to govern the country and in mastering the problems posed by a very large Communist vote persist, however, and make it particularly important that she be assured of sympathetic U.S. understanding and of a respected place in the councils of the West.

Preoccupation with the major Allies should not deflect attention from the many smaller European countries, some allied, some neutral, that exert a far from negligible influence on the course of European political and economic development and on U.S. foreign trade. The United States should take full advantage of the fact that sheer self-interest ranges most of these lesser countries on the side of those who, like the United States, are opposed to exclusive economic or political arrangements.

Moreover, their spiritual alinement with the West is a valuable contribution to the cause of Atlantic unity. Most of these countries have been notably successful in preserving internal stability, free institutions, and a prosperous economy. In an age of ideological warfare, these are assets which make up for the lack of military strength. The United States has much to gain from the reputation, a deserved one, of being a protector of the weak and a champion of freedom and prosperity for all.

III

EUROPEAN UNIFICATION

The unification of Europe, let us not forget, is a matter for Europeans to decide among themselves. U.S. interest is natural; but U.S. pressure, toward any particular form of unity will just as naturally be resented and, thus, strain the bonds of the Alliance as a whole.

Throughout the postwar era, successive American governments supported by congressional and public opinion have vigorously promoted European unification, especially favoring efforts pointed toward a federal or supranational political structure. The United States can take a measure of credit for the achievements of the dynamic European movement that set up the European Communities of the Six, the Common Market (EEC) foremost among them.

The question today is not whether the Six are reaping the full benefits they anticipated from such integration. It is, rather, whether the United States has a continuing interest in promoting further advances toward unification limited to European nations, or to some of them, and particularly toward European military and political integration. If it does, a further question arises concerning the extent and the form such integration should take. It can no longer be taken for granted that what is good for the narrow circle of countries seeking a powerful political merger will necessarily serve the purposes of those other allies with whom they are alined in the crucial task of collective Atlantic defense.

The chief original motives behind U.S. enthusiasm for European unity have lost their urgency, and much of their justification. A new European psychological unity, plus advanced weapons technology, have made intra-European wars all but unthinkable. Effective economic unity does not appear, if the Common Market is a fair standard, to depend on prior political integration. And whatever fears we had of the resurgence of Germany's militarism have been allayed by her membership in NATO and her reconciliation with France, the hereditary enemy. We must now reappraise our view of European unity—particularly if achieved along Federal or supranational lines—in terms of America's own interests. And foremost among them is its overriding interest in Western strength and solidarity, within the framework of the Atlantic world.

In the economic sphere, where integration has gone beyond mere speculation and blueprints, we are forewarned of some of the problems that might result from a tightly integrated protectionist Europe. Such an attitude poses dangers to other European nations, as well as to North America and the entire free world. While the United States has been prepared, in theory, to suffer sacrifices on the altar of European unity—a theory hardly confirmed by the harsh facts of the "chicken war"—it agreed to pay the price only in the expectation that economic integration would lead in turn to political integration. No such integration is presently in sight. Even if it were, its own compatibility with U.S. interests, and those of the alliance as a whole, can no longer be taken for granted.

The problem of European military integration also demands searching reappraisal. No one would question that more unification in such fields as standardization of weapons and forces, of logistical support, and the pooling of resources is desirable from the viewpoint of NATO. But U.S. support of a nuclear deterrent, other than NATO's, would

be hard to square with our objections to nuclear proliferation, and with our continuing search for arrangements by which all members of the alliance may share in the control of all weapons, both conventional and nuclear.

Despite continued and acknowledged U.S. influence, differences such as those now plaguing United States-French relations might well be reproduced on a still larger scale if a genuine integration of Western Europe along supranational lines were to take place. Such a political structure would have to be based on a surge of European nationalism and on strong leadership at the center. The emergence of a strong single Europe—a true superpower for which the resources are indeed available—could present Western unity with thorny problems unless integrated into the Atlantic framework.

1. A new standard: Atlantic unity

Greater unity in Europe is desirable, insofar as it strengthens the Atlantic Community; developments in Europe that weaken Atlantic unity are undesirable. This must be our guiding standard. For example, military unity of the whole or of a part of Europe, independent of NATO, would be clearly undesirable. Political unity, of even a part of Europe, must be carefully planned within a wider framework in order that it strengthen Atlantic unity. Even in the economic field, where regional arrangements can and do prove valuable, economic progress for all should be sought on the widest practical basis.

These considerations do not suggest that the United States should reverse its course and start opposing European unification. This is, in any event, a matter for Europeans to develop in their own way. What they do suggest is that the United States cease to pressure its European allies toward any particular brand of unity and concentrate rather on exploring with them the fields, forms, and degrees of unity with us that would be mutually advantageous.

A U.S. policy that made collaboration on an Atlantic scale its guiding standard should, by that token, be able to take the edge off any inward-directed and exclusive Europeanism. Such a policy would support the deep-seated and welcomed European desire for greater unity in a direction that would strengthen the transatlantic bonds on which the United States and Europe depend for their mutual security and their economic progress. It would assure Europe and the United States alike of success in the competition with their common Communist adversaries, and thus fulfill the rich promise of the alliance, in fields beyond the military and on a base that exploits the broadest possible community of interest.

IV

ATLANTIC UNITY

Today's challenges demand the greatest possible unity of freemen everywhere to meet problems with which no nation, alone, can now deal adequately. But we state it as a major premise that first priority must be put upon maximum unity in the Atlantic world, with respect to political, economic, and military matters alike.

This family of nations—the United States, Canada, and Western Europe, bound together by strong ties of common heritage and history—forms the core of free world unity. The prime goal of future U.S. policy must be to capitalize on and to stimulate every shared interest that unites the free nations of the West and moves them forward toward one Atlantic community.

Since 1945 emphasis on unity for Europe has enabled Americans to sound progressive and alive to the call of the times, without suggesting that the United States itself accept any new ties with others. Behind the enthusiasm for unity confined to Europe there lay both concern and overconfidence—concern that the United States would be pushed around if closely linked with Europe, and overconfidence stemming from the belief that we were so rich and powerful as not to need others. Both sentiments are now out of touch with reality.

The membership, extent, form, pace, and method of any purely European unity is something for Europeans to decide. Attempts by the United States to impose its preferences can only lead to reaction against outside meddling. The chief question for Americans is: how much unity of others with us is in our interest? And we must also ask ourselves: what are to be the respective roles of Europe, united or not, and of the nations of North America within this broader Atlantic world?

The United States is not exclusively an Atlantic nation and cannot become one without neglecting its interests in the Western Hemisphere, in the area of the Pacific, and in other parts of the world. The same holds true, though to a lesser extent at least for Britain and France.

This means that special transatlantic ties should not be exclusive and inward directed. They should give the countries involved a firmer base from which to operate, both against adversaries who need to be held in check, and toward friends—such as Japan, the developing countries, or the American Republics—who need access to and support from the advanced countries of the Atlantic area.

1. An "evolving" community

Rather than looking toward the construction of elaborate new "supranational" institutions, the United States must be ready to build upon the foundations of practical, workable interdependence. There is already evolving a free-world community of shared interest which compels us, day-by-day, to deal with urgent problems. In addition to NATO itself, its institutions include the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund, each with a different membership but with a common core of Atlantic nations.

The term "partnership"—which has been stressed since 1961 to indicate one of the chief characteristics of a workable Atlantic Community—is useful, if it is not made to suggest a partnership of equal powers, or one necessarily limited to two partners only. A partnership of two provides no adequate place for Canada or for those European nations—possibly including the United Kingdom—that may decide to stay out of some future United Europe. While it may be flattering to Europeans to hear American statesmen speak of an impending equal partnership, they know this must remain at best a remote goal.

What the Europeans want today—and have every right to want—is participation of their countries with an equal voice in the formulation of policies that are of vital concern to them, whether they bear on the Atlantic area or on other parts of the globe. This right is reciprocal: If our European partners are to be protected against surprise moves by the United States that could endanger their security, the United States must be consulted, in turn, before European action is taken that could adversely affect its interests.

2. A broader partnership

Harmonization of policy must extend beyond foreign policy to all matters of common concern. Three matters on which agreement is of basic importance are: (1) strategic policy, including the control of nuclear weapons; (2) trade policy, including agricultural policy as typified by the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations; and (3) financial policy, including the strengthening of the West's monetary system. These are all problems of great difficulty and complexity. Their solution depends on continuous and patient effort, strengthening the "habit of consultation," and the will to reach agreement in the common interest.

We must not shy away from experimenting with novel organizational devices if and where they can serve to symbolize and strengthen unity. The immediate need, however, is not for new or more elaborate institutions but rather the will to use better what we already have. We need a new determination—shown by acts rather than words—to develop greater Atlantic strength and unity. The United States must now show this will and determination, stop the disintegration of NATO, resume the initiative shown by the Truman and Eisenhower administrations, and begin again to lead.

President Eisenhower well stated the goal in his farewell message to the NATO Council:

"Together we must build a Community which will best safeguard the individual freedom and national values of our various peoples and at the same time provide effective means of dealing with problems with which none of us, alone, can now deal effectively."

A bold new initiative is necessary. Let us proclaim the goal of a true Atlantic Community adequately organized to meet the political, military and economic challenge of this era. Let us invite our allies to explore with us the best means of creating such a Community, beginning with a critical survey of existing institutions and the formulation of proposals for their reform and simplification, and such new institutions, as may be necessary. We have pushed too long for greater unity, for others. Now let us lead toward greater unity of others with us.

(NOTE.—Not every member of the Critical Issues Council, its task force, or Republican Citizen Committee necessarily subscribes in every detail to all the views expressed. The council endorses its papers as a substantial contribution to public awareness of current critical issues and to the presentation of positive solutions.)

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 22, 1964]

GOP PANEL'S WORD TO UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON.—A blue ribbon Republican panel called yesterday for bold U.S. leadership to reinvigorate the Atlantic alliance instead of its current policy which "appears fitful and inconsistent."

A harsh report on the U.S. role in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization came from the Critical Issues Council of the National Republican Citizens Committee.

At a news conference on the report, Gen. Lauris Norstad, former NATO commander, said the Atlantic allies were asking questions about the "consistency and obscurity" of U.S. policies.

ATTITUDE

General Norstad, who headed the task force that wrote the report, said the administration sometimes tried to meet problems by resorting to gadgetry, such as a plan for reorganization.

Asked how greater cooperation could be gained from France while President de Gaulle heads that country, he said there was the matter of attitude and sensitivity in the policy of the United States.

He said he disagreed with the French President on a number of issues, but that we can't blame all of our problems on De Gaulle. He added that General de Gaulle spoke for France and reflected European concern about American policies.

The GOP group, headed by Dr. Milton Eisenhower, brother of the former President, and including former NATO commander Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther (retired), said:

"The mere hint of U.S. withdrawals—even if falsely interpreted as pointing toward future U.S. disengagement from the (European) continent—adds fuel to the doubts

that are undercutting NATO's solidarity and deepens the 'crisis of confidence' through which the alliance is now passing."

The council, issuing its third critical issues paper, works in cooperation with the Republican National Committee, but its views do not reflect official GOP policy.

In issuing a report on "The Atlantic Alliance and U.S. Security," the panel indicated that additional U.S. troops and naval units armed with short- and medium-range nuclear weapons are urgently needed in Europe.

The extra forces could be ready for conventional warfare or used to offset Soviet nuclear blackmail, the council said. It contended that long-range nuclear missiles are unsuitable for meeting small-scale Communist aggression.

While other NATO members should be urged to do their share, the group said, the United States "must bear a share of responsibility for the failure of some European nations to meet NATO force requirements."

The Republicans charged that the Democratic administration had failed in the last 3 years to convince allies to assume a greater share of the burden to insure the security of all NATO members.

They urged that the United States concentrate on strengthening the Atlantic alliance for mutual security and let European nations work out continental unity.

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON—SPEECHWRITER

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, from time to time in recent weeks there has been speculation in the press about a supposed White House search for a master speechwriter. I suggest that the search need not go on. There is already a speechwriter in the White House—the President himself. The proof lies in the extemporaneous remarks delivered by the President at the White House reception for the American Society of Newspaper Editors. It seemed to me there shone in these remarks of the President the fire and clarity that marked the day-to-day utterances of our majority leader of old. The President who found it in his heart to say, in the rose garden: "These are the stakes: To make a world in which all of God's children can live, or to go into the dark" will find, I am certain, that his efforts to communicate with the American people, and with all people everywhere, will not be in vain.

Mr. President, with pride that it was in this Chamber, by the Members of this body, that the talent in the man who is now our President was most keenly appreciated, I ask that the extemporaneous remarks to which I have referred may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S SPEECH TO EDITORS AT WHITE HOUSE RECEPTION

Ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate your coming here today. The reason I wanted you in the rose garden is simply because if we had gone inside the White House Lady Bird would have insisted that I turn on all the lights.

I want you to know Lady Bird.

Mrs. JOHNSON. It is such a pleasure to welcome you here today, and I am so glad that Washington is turning its loveliest face to you. It is grand for us to have the opportunity to be with you. Thank you for coming.

The PRESIDENT. Now I would like for you to know my oldest daughter, Lynda Bird.

Miss LYNDA JOHNSON. He said I was on the record, but after coming after my parents, who always make such good speeches, I want to plead the fifth amendment because I am afraid anything I would say would incriminate me.

But we certainly are glad to have you here—we don't think we could have a better setting—people who write the stories about some of us who try to live the things you say about us. As I said before, it is good to have you here.

The PRESIDENT. Luci, my teenager, will be coming along a little later. She is being interviewed by a magazine at the moment. I want you to know her, too.

We are going in shortly to the White House, so you can pick up your candles in a box over there.

We had a preacher back home who dropped his notes just as he was leaving his church one time, and his dog jumped at them and tore them up. When the preacher went in the pulpit, he apologized to his congregation and said, "I am very sorry, today I have no sermon. I will just have to speak as the Lord directs. But I will try to do better next Sunday."

DELIVERED SPEECH AS LORD DIRECTED

I don't have a speech today. I just intend to do as George Reedy directed at the press conference this morning—to speak as the Lord directs. I thought I might talk to you about this job which fate has thrust upon me.

I am the President of the United States, the only President you will have, God willing, until January of next year. One of the hardest tasks that a President faces is to keep the time scale of his decisions always in mind and to try to be the President of all the people. He is not simply responsible to an immediate electorate, either. He knows over the long stretch of time how great can be the repercussions of all that he does or that he fails to do, and over that span of time the President always has to think of America as a continuing community.

He has to try to see how his decisions will affect not only today's citizens, but their children and their children's children unto the third and fourth generation. He has to try to peer into the future, and he has to prepare for that future.

If the policies he advocates lack this dimension of depth and this dimension of staying power, he may gain this or that advantage in the short term, but he can set the country on a false course and profit today at the expense of all the world tomorrow. So it is this solemn and this most difficult responsibility, and it is always hard to interpret confidently the future patterns of the world.

There are always critics around imploring the President to stick to the facts and not to go crystal gazing. Some of them tell me to try to keep my feet on the ground, if not my head in the sand.

But this is the point: The facts include today, the overwhelming ability in irresistible forces of change have been unleashed by modern science and technology, and the very facts dissolve and regroup as we look into them. To make no predictions is to be sure to be wrong. Whatever else is or is not that certain in our dynamic world, there is one thing that is very sure: Tomorrow will be drastically different from today. Yet it is in all of these tomorrows that we and our children and our children's children are going to be forced to live. We have to try to see that pattern; we have to try to prepare for it.

MUST IGNITE FIRE IN BREAST OF LAND

The President of this country, more than any other single man in the world, must grapple with the course of events and the directions of history. What he must try to do, try to do always, is to build for tomorrow in the immediacy of today, for if we can, the President, and the Congress, and you leaders of the communities throughout the Nation, will have made their mark in history. Somehow, we must ignite a fire in the breast of this land, a flaming spirit of adventure that soars beyond the ordinary and the contented, and really demands greatness from our society, and demands achievement in our Government.

We intend to seek justice because that is what the Nation needs. We intend to create hope because that is what the Nation needs. We intend to build opportunity because that is what the Nation deserves. We intend to pursue peace relentlessly because that is what the world demands.

These are the simple aims of our purpose. These are the forward thrust of our objective. But to start on this adventure, we must begin and we ought to begin today. Justice is a universal beginning for a great society. Justice is undone and untended in too many in our land.

Our Nation will live in tormented ease until the civil rights bill now being considered is written into the book of law. The question is no longer, "Shall it be passed?" The question is "When, when, when will it be passed?" We cannot deny to a group of our own people, our own American citizens, the essential elements of human dignity which a majority of our citizens claim for ourselves. Civil rights are not a luxury to be accorded to many. They are an obligation under our Constitution that is owed to all, for the bill before the Senate is only the validation of our moral, national commitment.

I want to repeat here today again, again, and again for the record what I said at Gettysburg last year: One hundred years ago Lincoln freed the Negro of his chains, but he did not free his country of its bigotry, for until education is blind to color, until employment is unaware of race, emancipation will be a proclamation, but it will not be a fact.

TRYING TO PRESERVE HUMANITY RESOURCE

We are trying to preserve our national resource of humanity, also. Some call it, and choose to refer to it, as a war on poverty. Well, it is a war, and poverty is the enemy. But the real objective is the preservation of our most precious asset—over 9 million American families at the bottom of the heap. It is not a program of giveaway. It is not a program of doles. It is a program that is concerned with skills and opportunities, with giving the tools for the job of growth, in making taxpayers out of tax eaters. We are investing in opportunity and giving them the skills to seize it.

For the first time in America's history, poverty is on the run and it is no longer inevitable and its elimination is no longer impossible, because it is right, we are fighting this war because it is wise, we are committed to winning it, and our strategy is to reach deep to the core and to the cause of the poverty. Having confronted it, then destroy it. In every aspect of this program, the cooperation of National, State and local governments is the passkey to action and the channelway for success. The Nation shall be the beneficiary, because by raising the average productivity of 11 million poverty stricken wage earners by only $1,000 a year, we would add $15 billion to the Nation's annual output.

Forty-nine percent—a hideously high figure—49 percent, one out of every two young men that are Americans who are examined for the draft, are found lacking physically, mentally, and morally. It is a senseless act of shameless neglect to ignore this intrusion on our satisfaction as a Nation.

ELDERLY CITIZENS NOT TO BE BARRED

But even as we try to invest our youth with the commitment of new opportunity, we are

equally determined that elderly citizens are not barred from dignity, are not vacant of hope. There must come from the Congress soon legislation for medical assistance for senior citizens. There is hardly a home in America today where a son, or a daughter, or a relative does not brood over the possible avalanche of medical expenses for their mothers and their fathers, or their uncles or their cousins, or their aunts. The dread of an impossible expense burden burns deep in the consciousness of practically every American home.

Is it a wild unreasonable proposal to ask that out of the average earnings of workers that are now more than $100 per week for over 70 million that they put $1 a month into social security, their employers do the same, making $2 a month? The Government contributes nothing. Is it asking too much for this bountiful country to prepare a law so that older folks can face illness when it inevitably comes and face it without the chill foreboding of an empty purse or an inadequate insurance policy? Under this plan, citizens know they did it for themselves without a Government handout. Because it is just, because it is right, because it is part of the good society to construct prudent programs, with vision, based on common sense and common decency, this bill is high on the agenda of our American purpose.

To build good Government, the first and most urgent need is good people. The pay bill soon to be debated in the Congress reaches into the very essence of urgency if this Government means to retain excellence and quality. On my desk tonight there are now dozens of resignations from some of the most brilliant and able men in the Government. They have run out their financial string. Each year they have gone into debt and each month now compounds their financial agony. They must quit to find higher incomes in private industry, and this Government suffers the harsh and irretrievable loss. To deny this pay bill is to invite mediocrity.

CAREER OFFICIALS DESERVE PAY RAISE

We cannot do the great things that this great Nation must do to develop a great society unless we, as a Nation, have the men to do them. Congressmen, Members of the House and the Senate, deserve twice what they get. Career officers, appointed officials, all deserve more money for jobs which too often demand long hours and ceaseless work. Don't make them steal or quit or go along borrowing when they are doing the job for you.

There is also in the Congress the legislation to adjust our immigration laws. The quota system is outworn. We want skilled people who can do jobs that need to be done, and we do want families reunited.

These are but a portion of our catalog of aspirations, for in the months and the years ahead, there will be new challenges and greater difficulties. Now we must attend to the duties that demand our attention. Right now, as you know, in the room across the hall, we are engaged in intensive collective bargaining sessions day and night in which we are trying to help railroad labor and railroad management solve their problems themselves in accordance with our free enterprise system.

A strike would cost us the loss of 7 million jobs in a very short time. A strike would cost us a downturn in our gross national product of 10 to 15 percent. A strike would cost us great dangers in health throughout the Nation. A strike would almost paralyze our entire system.

BARGAINING TEMPO TRIBUTE TO SYSTEM

The tempo of that bargaining that is taking place has stepped up considerably, and I believe this is a tribute to the free enterprise system. Sometimes I feel the free enterprise system is something like the weather—everybody likes to talk about it, and write about it, and we don't do enough about it. We have here in this case an opportunity and a responsibility to do something about it. That opportunity and that responsibility can be discharged, if we cooperate in helping the people on both sides, and not attempting to handcuff them by taking an extreme position which will provoke reactions that would break down the collective bargaining processes.

No group in all this Nation has a greater investment and responsibility than you, the leading editors of this Nation. The wounds of this Nation must be healed. The breaches in this Nation must be closed. And from this unity of this Nation must come the wisdom and the courage to reach beyond the commonplace.

The world is no longer the world that your fathers and mine once knew. Once it was dominated by the balance of power. Today, it is diffused and emergent. But though most of the world struggles fitfully to assert its own initiative, the people of the world look to this land for inspiration. Two-thirds of the teeming masses of humanity, most of them in their tender years under 40, are decreeing that they are not going to take it without food to sustain their body and a roof over their head.

And from our science and our technology, from our compassion and from our tolerance, from our unity and from our heritage, we stand uniquely on the threshold of a high adventure of leadership by example and by precept. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit," saith the Lord. From our Jewish and Christian heritage, we draw the image of the God of all mankind, who will judge his children not by their prayers and by their pretentions, but by their mercy to the poor and their understanding of the weak.

CANNOT CANCEL THAT STRAIN

We cannot cancel that strain and then claim to speak as a Christian society. To visit the widow and the fatherless in their affliction is still pure religion and undefiled. I tremble for this Nation. I tremble for our people if at the time of our greatest prosperity we turn our back on the moral obligations of our deepest faith. If the face we turn to this aspiring, laboring world is a face of indifference and contempt, it will rightly rise up and strike us down.

Believe me, God is not mocked. We reap as we sow. Our God is still a jealous God, jealous of his rightousness, jealous of his mercy, jealous for the last of the little ones who went unfed while the rich sat down to eat and rose up to play. And unless my administration profits the present and provides the foundation for a better life for all humanity, not just now but for generations to come, I shall have failed.

If there is judgment in history, it rests on us, according to our generosity or our disdain. These are the stakes, to make a world in which all of God's children can live or to go into the dark. For today under the shadows of atomic power it is not rhetoric but it is truth to say that we must either love each other or we must die.

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

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

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 163 Leg.]

Aiken	Case	Hart
Allott	Church	Hickenlooper
Bartlett	Cooper	Hill
Beall	Dirksen	Holland
Bennett	Dodd	Humphrey
Bible	Dominick	Inouye
Boggs	Ellender	Jackson
Burdick	Fong	Javits
Cannon	Gruening	Jordan, Idaho
Keating	Morse	Saltonstall
Kennedy	Morton	Scott
Kuchel	Moss	Simpson
Magnuson	Muskie	Smathers
Mansfield	Nelson	Smith
McCarthy	Neuberger	Sparkman
McGee	Pastore	Symington
McGovern	Pearson	Walters
McIntyre	Pell	Williams, N.J.
McNamara	Prouty	Williams, Del.
Metcalf	Proxmire	Young, Ohio
Miller	Ribicoff	
Monroney	Robertson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota with the understanding that I do not yield my right to the floor.

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

MRS. L.B.J.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the review of Ruth Montgomery's new book, "Mrs. L.B.J." This is a fine biography of Mrs. Johnson and it is, in fact, the first full length book which has been written about the First Lady. The review was written by Oveta Culp Hobby, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In her book Ruth Montgomery captures the grace and charm of Mrs. Johnson and presents her as a warm, thoughtful, and talented wife, mother, and now First Lady of the United States. I commend this book to the Members of the Senate.

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

CHATELAINE OF THE WHITE HOUSE

(A review by Oveta Culp Hobby)

"MRS. L.B.J."—BIOGRAPHY BY RUTH MONTGOMERY

Because of the suddenness of her entry into the White House, Mrs. Lyndon Baines Johnson has been the subject of an incredible number of newspaper and magazine articles within a short 4 months—so numerous, in fact, that at first it would seem superfluous to publish a book about her at this time.

But as this book proves, it is all the more necessary, because it is needed to offer an orderly sequence of the events of her life, and to provide a context into which the many interviews and anecdotes can be set.

Lady Bird Johnson is an unusual woman in any time, in any country. Few could have done so well and so warmly in the complex role she has been called upon to fill from the day of her marriage. Old Texas friends and close Washington friends know that and have deep respect and admiration for the woman they call Bird.

As a distinguished Washington correspondent who has known and frequently covered Mrs. Johnson during the last 20 years, Ruth Montgomery was splendidly qualified to write this first book—the first in this new era of White House history.

Because of their long and pleasant association, the author knows, for instance, how deliberately Mrs. Johnson has always held herself to a lifelong regimen of growth. And she is aware of how many old Washington friendships and associations are a part of the new White House existence. Mrs. Montgomery and Mrs. Johnson have shared the

Washington scene, which gives the author insight into her subject.

More remarkable is the author's grasp of Texas. She has seen and understood that though the President and his wife were born and reared in the same State, they came from backgrounds as diverse as though one had been born in Wyoming and the other Mississippi. She has caught the phrasing and the inflection of Mrs. Johnson, and her prose changes style and pace when she shifts from Mrs. Johnson as her subject to the President.

A slim volume, the book reflects many past interviews and experiences with the Johnson family as well as recent research among their family and friends. It includes stories and anecdotes not already familiar to the public, and it gives the familiar events in accurate and official version.

No one can write about Mrs. Johnson without giving way to a few adjectives—warm, thoughtful, gracious, efficient, serene. But as much as possible, the author uses facts and anecdotes to create her portrait.

The author indirectly suggests the link between the ante bellum plantation wife who managed an entire community of people and affairs as a routine part of her housekeeping, and the modern Mrs. Johnson who could expand and manage a ranch in Johnson City, a television network in Austin, a Senator or Vice President's house in Washington—and still be a gentle, soft-voiced, gracious woman to her husband, children, and friends.

More forthrightly, she says that Mrs. Johnson is "perhaps the most experienced chatelaine ever to become First Lady."

The book has all the swift readability of good journalism. Beginning slowly, almost gently, in a nostalgic account of Mrs. Johnson's childhood on the old country place outside Karnack, it picks up speed with the entrance of the tall, lean, compelling Lyndon Johnson; by midbook the reader is riding the self-propelled skyrocket that swept President and Mrs. Johnson to the Nation's highest post.

"Mrs. L.B.J." is a work of candid admiration. Those who know Mrs. Johnson personally, whether closely or casually, will find it valid and colorful.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, with the understanding that he does not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield with that understanding.

THE JOHNSON MAGIC SCORES AGAIN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week I noted how only one man could have secured a postponement of the threatened rail strike. That man was the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson. And he delivered.

Similarly, there was only one man who could have achieved a settlement of the dispute itself, the President of the United States. And he delivered.

Surely this rail settlement must stand as one of the most remarkable achievements in the field of labor-management relations in this generation. The entire Nation owes a great "thank you" to the President who assumed the leadership in reaching this solution and to the railroads and brotherhoods who bargained and negotiated in good faith until a solution was achieved. This is surely an outstanding testament to the basic soundness of our free enterprise system and to the viability of free collective bargaining. Congratulations are due to all participants.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the New York Times of April 23, 1964, commenting on the successful rail settlement be printed at this point in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that other editorials commenting on the President's activities in foreign aid, the balance of payments, the President's recent press conference, and civil disobedience be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 23, 1964]

SUCCESS ON THE RAILROADS

Thanks to President Johnson and his special mediators, the most frustrating industrial dispute in the Nation's history has ended on a note of success for labor, management, and the country. The railroad agreement announced at the White House last night did more than avert a costly strike; it kept alive public confidence in the capacity of employers and unions in this key industry to resolve their mutual problems through collective bargaining.

True, an accord made under intense Presidential pressure after 5 years of governmental involvement is something less than a total triumph for free decision-making. Yet it is precisely because the past record was so barren of any sign of capacity for forward movement through voluntary agreement that the pact looms as an enormous achievement for the President and the men whose ingenuity and persistence brought about a contract both sides were prepared to sign.

They hammered into the consciousness of carriers and unions alike a recognition that this was the Rubicon for collective bargaining in an industry whose troubles had already forced Congress to pass the first compulsory arbitration law in the Nation's peacetime history—the law to resolve the conflict over railroad "featherbedding."

The specific terms of last night's peace have not yet been officially announced. Plainly, the unions got a more advantageous deal than they would have if they had accepted the original recommendations of a Presidential panel 2 years ago. In that sense, they are the gainers from their unbroken record of negativism to all Federal settlement proposals. Yet both sides are bound to benefit, in the long haul, from the limited start made toward modernizing work rules and pay practices unchanged since the days of the Iron Horse.

They will benefit, too, from the acceptance of direct responsibility for establishing the standards that will prevail in their industry. For four decades both sides have become so accustomed to relying on the White House to make all the important decisions in their labor-management affairs that another failure would have brought insistent clamor for legislation to put them under permanent Government restriction. In a period of stress for democratic institutions, the proof the railroads and the unions have given of ability to compromise in the public interest represents a meaningful contribution to the defense of free decision-making. It is also a remarkable personal victory for the President in his first big strike test.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 23, 1964]

FIGHTING FOR FOREIGN AID

President Johnson has taken the offensive on his foreign aid program. In two separate speeches, he made the point that foreign aid is an "act of necessity" and went on to warn that he will continue to demand supplemental appropriations if Congress fails to provide the $3.4 billion he is requesting. The administration cut out all of the waste and pared all of the frills from the foreign aid package, the President insists, relieving Congress of the necessity of wielding its own economy ax.

Congressional opponents of foreign aid are unlikely to be impressed by these assurances. On the contrary, they will probably make a great show of finding something they can describe as unnecessary expenditure, and then proceed to cut into the bone. In an election year, those who can cut spending on foreign aid have the extra incentive of winning votes, an incentive that unfortunately does not apply to the program's defenders.

But Mr. Johnson says he will not bargain over the program. In taking a firm stand against further cuts, he is fighting for the very principle of foreign aid. For the issue is not whether one program or another deserves support—there will always be disputes over the relative merits of different projects—but whether the United States can afford the cost of foreign aid. On this score, the amount requested by the administration is truly the bare minimum.

When Mr. Johnson first announced his trimmed-down request for foreign aid, we argued that he could only get what he asked for by refusing to compromise. We welcome both the President's determination to rule out any haggling and his threat to keep coming back to Congress if it persists in carrying out false economies. This is the way to preserve the vital role that foreign aid can play.

[From the Washington Post]

A BETTER BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS POSITION

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

NEW YORK, April 19.—There is an intricate, but definite, relationship between these recent developments: (1) the fact that the interest rate on 91-day Treasury bills in last Monday's auction fell below the 3.5 percent Federal Reserve bank rate for the first time since last November, (2) the preliminary evidence of a sharp improvement in the international balance of payments in the first quarter and (3) the efforts that are now being made by the European Common Market countries to formulate a coordinated program to curb inflation pressures.

The current status and the outlook for these matters have a bearing on the outlook for business activity and investment policies. To discuss them intelligently, it is necessary to review briefly, the events of the past 8 months, beginning with the introduction of the administration's interest equalization tax proposal last summer.

In a discussion of this and other germane national policies last August, it was concluded in this space that: "The logic of the situation, therefore, suggests that the course has been set leading to improvement in the balance-of-payments situation."

Last October, Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon said: "The added incentives for use of capital in the United States (resulting from the tax reductions) will enhance the relative attractiveness of investment here for Americans and foreigners alike. The increased productivity associated with rising investment, together with greater incentives to develop and market new products and to apply more rapidly the fruits of our vast research capabilities, will reinforce the efforts we are making to increase our exports."

The writer emphasized at that time that the official statements of Government policy indicated that the encouragement of investment in the United States was one of the objectives. "It is significant that these policies do not rely on sharply rising Federal Government expenditures and/or persistent inflation as sources of economic growth."

In reporting from Amsterdam last November 25, it was noted that the prosperity in

Europe "contains serious elements of inflation that are now visibly threatening its continuation"—in contrast with relative price stability and a better control of costs in the United States. "I no longer have any doubt that the U.S. international payments deficit is well along the road to elimination—very possibly sooner than any anticipations that I have heard from Washington officials."

Against this background one can more easily understand why the European Common Market countries are now trying to design a coordinated program to curb inflation pressures. We can also find in it part of the explanation for the recent sharp improvement in the U.S. international balance-of-payments position. The recent softening of short-term interest rates in this country is, in part, one of the effects of this improvement.

It has been necessary that our national credit policies be influenced by the international balance-of-payments problem, in addition to the dictates of the domestic situation. The decline in the balance of payments reduces—at least temporarily—the possibility that credit might have to be tightened to cope with that specific problem.

Several valid arguments are being presented to discourage the acceptance of the first quarter improvement in our balance-of-payments figures at face value. It is premature to say that this problem has been solved. The first quarter statistics were helped by the abnormal shipments of grain to the Communist countries. There is also an abnormality in the low level of capital exports insofar as it is being caused by the proposed interest equalization tax.

Nevertheless, we should not overlook the fact that part of the improvement was the tangible result of well-designed policies. Our international trade balance probably has been helped by our relative price stability in contrast with continued inflation in Europe. The improved relative attraction of investment in the United States vis-a-vis Europe must be having a favorable influence on international capital flows. There has been a very distinct improvement in the confidence in the American dollar, which encourages cash balances to build up here instead of in Europe.

* * * * *

[From the Washington Post]

JOHNSON—AT STAGE CENTER

(By Douglas Kiker)

WASHINGTON.—It was a production that was kept on the straw-hat tryout circuit for a long time, but it opened to good notices when it finally was given its national premiere yesterday.

President Johnson, after meeting reporters in nearly every other conceivable place, held his first press conference yesterday in the State Department auditorium. Just as John F. Kennedy used to do.

"Ladies and gentlemen," he said, kicking it off, "I have come before you today for a regular scheduled, televised, notified-well-in-advance press conference. I did not drive myself over here. But I did have to cancel an informal meeting with some tourists at the [White House] gate."

It was the best attended Presidential press conference in history. There were 512 people there, many of them visiting firemen in Washington for the annual convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

In fact, their presence in town was the big reason why Mr. Johnson chose to hold his first weekday meeting with the press yesterday.

Mr. Kennedy's largest audience came on August 30, 1961, when 437 correspondents showed up to hear his comments on the newly constructed Berlin wall.

Juts about everybody conceded that John F. Kennedy's auditorium stage technique was flawless, and there was speculation that Mr. Johnson was hesitant to appear in contrast.

A REAL PRO

The thoroughness of the preparation for his debut made Richard Burton, rehearsing Hamlet up in Toronto, look like an amateur.

Mr. Johnson held a series of unannounced press conferences in his office, in his press secretary's office, in the Cabinet Room, in the White House East Room, in the White House movie theater, and in the front yard of his Texas ranchhouse before he decided he was ready to play the Palace.

The result was a polished performance yesterday that drew favorable comment from nearly everyone who saw him.

Why, he looked right smart up there, blue suit, blue striped tie, wearing his spectacles to read his opening statement, but then slipping them into his pocket later during the session.

That opening statement was crammed with statistics that glittered like stars in the Texas sky, and it was short, to the point, and quickly read.

He fielded some pretty tough questions, answering those he liked, and passing off those he wanted no part of.

He appeared sure and confident, in command of his job and his audience.

He stacked up pretty well—that was the common opinion here.

No more the caretaker President. It's the Johnson administration now—that was the impression he left.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 18, 1964]

CONTEMPT FOR LAW

Violence, lawlessness, and civil disobedience as forms of protest have been roundly and fittingly condemned by President Johnson, by the Democratic and Republican floor leaders of the civil rights cause in the Senate and by the most effective and trusted of the country's Negro leaders. Whether their warnings will be heeded by the restless mass of Negro citizens and by the reckless men striving to propel them into anarchy remains to be seen.

Civil disobedience—the kind of action called for by that irresponsible offshoot of the Congress of Racial Equality in Brooklyn, involving a wanton waste of the city's water supply and the projected disruption of traffic at the opening of the World's Fair—is a tactic which may have utility for majorities in rebellion against the oppressive rule of a minority. It can have no possible utility in a situation like that in America where a minority is striving for majority recognition of rights guaranteed by a Constitution.

It is one thing for people to breach laws which they believe to be unjust and unconstitutional for the purpose of testing their validity in court; but it is a quite different thing to violate reasonable and incontestably valid laws for the purpose of disrupting the normal and lawful life of a whole community. Attempts to inflict wanton and indiscriminate injury on a community cannot be tolerated by responsible governmental authorities. They must be resisted—by whatever degree of force may be required.

It is, nevertheless, incumbent on those who condemn such civil disobedience, to recognize its causation. It grows out of frustration and despair; it grows out of ignorance and a susceptibility to demagogy which are the consequences of segregation and other forms of racial discrimination and deprivation; and it grows out of a helpless fury at the interminable charade on Capitol Hill where another minority is pursuing an obstructionism of its own by its own peculiar brand of civil disobedience.

But none of this can in any degree condone or justify the folly of the Negro threats of violence and disorder. They constitute utter folly because through their invocation of counterforce they are inevitably doomed to defeat. And they constitute utter folly, too, because they reflect a contempt for law on the part of a minority which can enjoy its rights only under a rule of law.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I note by the heading on the Bipartisan Civil Rights Newsletter that today is the 38th day of debate on H.R. 7152, and the 21st day of the filibuster. The debate which has aroused the interest of the citizens of this country, though, has gone on for many thousands of days. In general, I am strongly in favor of debate. When it is directed to the issues and the substance of the matter being examined, it constitutes an important part of the legislative process. However, when the discussion is rambling, dilatory, and designed more to mislead than to educate, then I believe that the time has come to replace fiction with truth and opinion with fact.

As is clear, I am sure, to my distinguished colleagues, there has been much enlightening and extended discourse on constitutional law and the legislative procedure in this Chamber. But, despite the erudite explanations of each title of the civil rights bill, the misconceptions and distortions concerning this legislation are not easily overcome.

Debate on the civil rights bill is not limited to Members of this body. The news media of the country have done an admirable job of bringing to public attention the issues involved in this struggle for human rights. The information thus provided has been eagerly greeted by those who realize that a basic fact of good citizenship is keeping abreast of the issues facing the country.

Nevertheless, rumors and fantastic allegations against the civil rights bill, and those who support it, have been widely disseminated. Shadowy organizations with unrevealed sources of income have financed misleading newspaper advertisements and publications attacking this bill. While we in this Chamber engage in reasoned—if prolonged—debate, others less reasonable are engaged in a guerrilla war against civil rights where propaganda is the chief weapon and the use of half-truths and distortions, the instruments of deceit.

As the article entitled "Rights for Sale" which appeared in the Sunday Washington Post, April 19, 1964, so clearly details, no one really knows how much money is being spent, and by what organizations, to defeat this legislation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted into the RECORD at this point.

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

RIGHTS FOR SALE—MILLIONS GOING INTO LOBBYING

(By Robert E. Baker)

No one really knows how much money is being spent throughout the Nation to support and fight the civil rights bill now before the Senate. But it is safe to say that the total will run into the millions by the time the battle is over.

The biggest apparent single spender is the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms (CCFAF), the headquarters lobby for the attackers, which dealt out $192,000 in the first 3 months of this year.

"Oh, ours is a most modest operation," said John J. Synon, director of CCFAF. "Our spending is nothing compared to the other side."

But Marvin Caplan of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights disagrees: "I wish we had the money they've got." And Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., vice chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, said the procivil rights forces haven't spent enough money to "put in your eyes," that most of the work is voluntary.

ADS AND PAMPHLETS

The CCFAF launched its anticivil rights campaign last July and since has spent more than $325,000, most of it in hundreds of newspaper ads and more than a million pamphlets.

In its latest lobbying report filed with the House of Representatives, the CCFAF said it spent $85,000 for newspaper advertising in the first 3 months of this year and $72,000 for printed matter.

Its thrust was aimed at States where Negroes are few and other States where there are white racial minorities potentially opposed to the bill. One expenditure was $2,428 for ads in a Polish newspaper in Chicago.

Lobbies are required to list the source of contributions of $500 and more. The CCFAF's report for January, February, and March showed that it received $142,581.16 from the Mississippi State Sovereignty Commission, a State agency formed to preserve segregation. At one time it helped finance the White Citizens Councils.

But the commission contends that only $10,000 of its contributions was from State funds and that the rest was from private sources. Reporters in Jackson tried to track down the private sources but were told that the money was in the form of cashiers' checks and that the names of the contributors were not recorded.

Official State commissions in Florida and Alabama also have contributed a total of $13,000 to the CCFAF. The Plaquemines Parish (La.) Council, headed by political boss Leander Perez, who built a stockade in the swamps for arrested racial demonstrators, has appropriated $5,000 in taxpayers' money to the CCFAF.

But all this support of the CCFAF does not give the full picture of the money being spent against the civil rights bill.

The Jackson, Miss., Junior Chamber of Commerce has sent out pamphlets all over the country. In February, founder Robert Welch of the ultra-right-wing John Birch Society urged his units around the country to place newspaper ads opposing the bill under such names as "the Blanktown Committee To Preserve the American Republic," and to write the CCFAF for material.

One such ad popped up in Indiana under the sponsorship of "the Fort Wayne Committee To Preserve the American Republic."

Guessing how much money the pro-civil-rights forces are spending is an almost impossible task, primarily because of the diversification of the organizations involved.

The Leadership Conference on Civil Rights is not a registered lobby. It operates from a small office here with expenses since last summer running less than $50,000. But the success of the CCFAF in stirring opposition to the bill caused the conference to answer with a pamphlet, "Some Questions and Answers on the Civil Rights Bill." It has distributed 250,000 copies at a printing cost of $25,000.

The conference comprises 80-odd organizations ranging from labor unions to fraternal groups interested, at least in part, in civil rights progress. Few of the organizations are registered as lobbies; those that are by no means limit themselves to the civil rights bill.

The NAACP, for instance, lists its Washington bureau as a lobby. Big contributions in the last 3 months of 1963 included $6,000 from the Council for United Civil Rights Leadership and $2,000 from a Philadelphia fraternal club. But less than 2 percent of the NAACP's income is directed to lobbying for the civil rights bill.

CONVOCATION OF PREACHERS

Both the pro- and anti-civil-rights forces are trying to inspire letters to Senators from the grassroots. The Leadership Conference on Civil Rights is bringing in State delegations, one at a time, to talk to Senators. Churchmen also are beginning to make their presence felt in favor of the bill, which the CCFAF's Synnon is quick to acknowledge.

"The National Council of Churches is precluded from lobbying by its tax-exempt status," said Synon. "But it is lobbying all right."

The council, however, points out that one-fifth of 1 percent of its budget—$40,000—goes to its Commission on Religion and Race and that only a small portion of that sum can be charged directly to support of the civil rights bill.

Synon said also that the seven civil rights organizations of the Council for United Civil Rights Leadership in New York collected $800,000 in pledges last summer for the civil rights fight. But it turns out that half of that amount actually was pledged by foundations for the support of various programs ranging from voter education to job opportunities for Negroes and that a very small portion of the $800,000 has been spent in support of the civil rights bill.

Said a spokesman for the NAACP, one of the council organizations: "It may seem ironic, but the NAACP ended the year 1963 with $268,000 tied up in bail bonds, most of it in Mississippi, which has so far contributed $260,000 to the anti-civil-rights lobby."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It is no secret that one of the most effective weapons of political warfare is propaganda. For centuries, men have been stirred to action by an inflammatory word, a seditious pamphlet, or a provocative publication. Used as a means of arousing interest, enlightening individuals, and enlisting supporters, propaganda serves a useful and worthwhile function. That species of propaganda, however, which relies on distortion, misrepresentation of facts, and unfounded assertions must be rejected by all those who seek the truth.

Unfortunately, much that has been written against the civil rights bill is intended not to enlighten, but to confuse. Rather than appealing to logic, the propaganda published by those who oppose this legislation appeals to prejudice, since unfounded diatribes often arouse more opposition to a measure than reasoning. The logical and objective statements of fact made in rebuttal seldom dispel completely the fantasies implanted in men's minds by misleading propaganda. In a free society, the reason of men ought to govern their prejudices, but the sad truth is that such is not always the case. The Nation has witnessed recent examples of mob violence and outbursts of racial hatred which testify to the terrible chaos which results when reasoned discourse has been suspended.

In the course of this prolonged debate, several of my colleagues have commented upon the propaganda campaign being waged to defeat this civil rights legislation. Despite their efforts to unmask the vicious hate literature masquerading as reasoned analysis of the bill's provisions, a flood of anticivil rights propaganda—some of it patently false—continues to flow into the North, without having received the point-by-point refutation which might expose to everyone's view its deceptive and fallacious arguments.

However, it is not surprising that the opponents of civil rights have expended so much of their energy in an effort to convince the public that the provisions of the civil rights bill are antagonistic to the beliefs held by a majority of the American people. Lacking popular support, unsuccessful in its attempts to secure the votes necessary to defeat this legislation, the minority has tried to camouflage its weakness in its propaganda.

The American people are not so easily deceived. Neither are the Members of this body. The noise made by those who oppose civil rights legislation bears little relation to their numbers. The impressively large vote in favor of this bill by the House of Representatives makes it unquestionably clear that there is widespread bipartisan support for H.R. 7152. No amount of propaganda can conceal the fact that those in opposition to the bill are in the minority. This is obvious to those who support this bill, but it is a point that deserves to be stated again and again, so that there can be no doubt in anyone's mind that the overwhelming majority of citizens favor this legislation and wish to see it voted upon by the Senate.

A well-financed minority has purchased invidious advertisements in New York newspapers attacking the civil rights bill. The able and distinguished Senators from New York have demonstrated that those anticivil rights ads, paid for by the Mississippi State Legislature, do not represent the views of the vast majority of the voters of their State. I need not comment further on these advertisements because they have already been discussed by my colleagues and have received wide attention from the news media.

Less well known to the general public is the fact that other advertisements, similar in character, have appeared in small newspapers throughout the country. These ads attacking the civil rights bill were paid for by various local chapters of an organization calling itself the Committee To Preserve the American Republic. The ads ask the reader to write for more anticivil rights propaganda, and list two addresses. One address is the Washington headquarters of the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedom, located across the street from the Senate Office Building. The clandestine operations of this organization have already been discussed by other Members of this body. The other address to which readers are directed to write is American Opinion,

Belmont, Mass. American Opinion is the publication of the John Birch Society. What two organizations could better demonstrate that the extremist views of those who oppose civil rights are not shared by the large majority of American citizens?

These advertisements, all of them containing essentially the same copy, have appeared in the Birmingham, Ala., Independent, the Fort Wayne, Ind., Journal-Gazette, the Summit, Miss., Sun, the Angeles Mesa, Calif., News Advertiser, and, I am sorry to add, in two newspapers in New Jersey, the Red Bank Register, and the Burlington County Times. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this ad be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

(Ad appearing in Burlington County Times, Feb. 29, 1964)

EVERY VOTE FOR "THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963" IS A NAIL FOR THE COFFIN OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC

A recent president of the American Bar Association has solemnly declared: "The proposed extension of Federal executive and administrative control over business, industry, individual citizens and the States by the package of legislation called the Civil Rights Act of 1963 exceeds the sum total of all such extensions by all decisions of the Supreme Court and all acts of Congress from 1787 to June 19, 1963. When future generations look back through the eyes of history at this legislation they will recognize 10 percent of 'civil rights' and 90 percent extension of raw Federal power."

The results of this legislation would be enormous suffering by, and oppression of, both our white citizens and our Negro citizens alike; and such turmoil, rioting, bitterness and chaos as benefits only the Communists—or a Federal Government drunk with its drive for power. For a free copy of a brief analysis of this legislation by highest legal authority, write to Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedom, suite 520, 201 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. For a full understanding of the background, forces, and purposes behind this legislation, send $1 for the civil rights packet to American Opinion, Belmont, Mass.

In the meantime, the last bulwark against this act is the hard-pressed opposition within the U.S. Senate. If you oppose this Civil Rights Act of 1963, make your protest known, emphatically and immediately, by telegrams and letters, not only to your own Senators but to as many other Senators as you can. The address in every case is simply Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

This advertisement has been paid for as a public service by the Burlington County Committee To Preserve the American Republic, Post Office Box 105, Riverton, N.J.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield, without in any way jeopardizing his right to the floor or denying to him any of his parliamentary privileges under the rules of the Senate?

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have asked the Senator to yield because he is commenting upon advertisements that have been appearing throughout the Nation, advertisements which have been the subject of discussion in the Senate, and which I feel are grossly unfair, and have so stated.

I believe the Senator from New Jersey would be interested to know that during the time the advertisements first appeared, there was a deluge of mail highly critical of the civil rights bill, mail that reflected the distortions that were evident in the advertisements. But since that time, I assure the Senator from New Jersey, the entire picture has changed, so far as correspondence is concerned. In my office, where the mail was running about 2 or 3 to 1 against the civil rights bill a month ago, it is now running better than 3 to 1 in favor of the bill. I am pleased to note that much of the mail is coming from business leaders or people engaged in business, and from church people.

Today I received a visit from a number of clergymen of different denominations. Next Tuesday, April 28, in Washington, D.C., there will be a meeting at Georgetown University, at which the three great religious faiths of America—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—will be represented by their spokesmen. Those spokesmen will be members of the clergy. All of this tells me that some rethinking is taking place and that the time that has been used in the debate has not been to the advantage of the opponents but of the proponents.

I speak for others who have spoken to me of similar developments in their own offices. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who stepped out of the Chamber a moment ago, spoke to me of his experience with respect to correspondence from his State, as I have spoken of the experience with respect to my State. The whole picture has changed. People are speaking up for the civil rights bill. They understand its provisions, because the newspapers have been publishing excerpts and detailed discussions of those provisions.

I commend the Senator from New Jersey for his statement. I know he has been in the forefront of the battle for human rights and for the enactment of civil rights legislation; and he represents a great State in which the laws are designed to protect human rights and to assure equality of treatment.

I am confident that the pending bill does not contain any provision that is not already the laws in New Jersey. I have also said that about the laws of my own State; and in examining those of other States, we find that a majority of the States of the Union already have laws which are equal to or broader than or more encompassing than the provisions of the pending bill.

So I thank the Senator from New Jersey for his statement. It means a great deal to have him speak out, because he is a respected and recognized leader in the area of civil liberties and civil rights, and his word and his position on this subject are very convincing and very persuasive.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who is, in fact, the leader of the proponents in this debate, in which we are attempting to obtain Senate passage of the civil rights bill. I am sure that no one could discharge that responsibility more effectively or more fairly than he.

Later, I shall develop a comparison between the rights and opportunities provided by the laws of New Jersey and the rights and opportunities protected by the pending bill. The Senator from Minnesota is eminently correct: the laws of New Jersey are far more comprehensive, in every department of this subject, in protecting individual rights.

I also wish to commend the Senator from Minnesota for his references to recent expressions of opinions in the States. The advertisement, to which I referred, appeared in the Burlington County Times, in February. The mail I received was then more than 2 to 1 in favor of the civil rights bill; but since the debate has begun, we have found that there is a better understanding of what the bill will do. For example, for the period April 11 through April 17, I received from residents of New Jersey only 98 letters in opposition to the bill, whereas, in the same period of time, I received from New Jersey residents 363 letters in favor of the bill.

I have had a tabulation made in connection with my mail on the civil rights bill; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Incoming civil rights mail

	Out of State anti	Out of State pro	New Jersey anti	New Jersey pro
Mar. 20–27	216	6	114	198
Mar. 28 to Apr. 3	153	6	81	146
Apr. 4 to Apr. 10	107	7	80	277
Apr. 11–17	138	7	98	363
Apr. 18–24				

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I do not question the right of individuals to place the ads or the right of the newspapers to print them. But I do question the subterfuge which accompanies the conscious attempts by a few people to deceive the American public. Who paid for these ads? What is the role of the John Birch Society in the campaign being waged to defeat this bill? These questions are not likely to be answered, because those opposed to civil rights require the veil of secrecy in order to promote their aims. They shun the spotlight of publicity, because the fantasies and illusions they create appear more frightening when they are seen as grotesque and shadowy images. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a story appearing in the New York Times, on April 21, 1964, which shows the importance of secrecy to the anti-civil rights propagandists, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 1964]

BIRCH DRIVE SEEKS RIGHTS BILL DEATH—CAMPAIGN BY LETTER AND AD PUSHED—MEMBERS URGED TO TALK AGAINST MEASURE

(By Ben A. Franklin)

WASHINGTON, April 20.—The John Birch Society has called on its members to continue a "massive" letterwriting and advertising campaign against passage by the Senate of the civil rights bill. The campaign is re-

ported to have produced already "half a million messages to Washington."

In the March issue of the John Birch Society bulletin, official monthly magazine of the conservative group, Robert H. W. Welch, Jr., the society president, made his first appeal to members of local chapters. He urged them to organize "the most massive protest—by mail, telegram, by advertising, by the distribution of literature, by personal conversations, and in every practicable way—that we have ever undertaken with regard to any legislation."

Meanwhile, as the Senate entered the 35th day of debate on the civil rights bill, the minority leader, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, said that he would begin calling up his amendments to the fair employment section of the bill in midweek.

Mr. DIRKSEN said that the first amendment to be called up would be one of the less controversial of the 11 he will offer.

Tomorrow, Senator DIRKSEN will make known the text of the only amendment that would greatly weaken the fair enployment practices section. This concerns the procedure to be followed in pressing a complaint against job discrimination. At issue is the question of whether the Fair Employment Commission can file suit for the complainant, or whether the aggrieved must file on his own.

Both the March and April issues of the bulletin include the layout of a suggested three-column newspaper advertisement. The bulletin suggested that the ads be given "scrupulous proofreading (that) eliminates all typesetting chances of errors."

USE OF NAME SHUNNED

The bulletins also suggest that the ads should not carry a John Birch Society identification. In the sample format, the sponsoring group is "The Blanktown Committee To Preserve the American Republic, 1123 Main Street, Blanktown, Any State."

The suggested headline for the advertisement says:

"Every Vote for the Civil Rights Act of 1963 Is a Nail for the Coffin of the American Republic."

In the bulletin's April issue, Mr. Welch commented on the reaction to his March appeal to the membership by saying that "Washington is gasping at the results" of the letterwriting campaign.

"It is our guess," he went on "that our members are responsible for pouring more than a half a million messages into Washington during the last month and will pour in that many more before this fight is over."

The suggested text of the advertisement contends that "when future generations look back through the eyes of history at this legislation they will recognize 10 percent of 'civil rights' and 90 percent extension of raw Federal power."

The ad urges readers to help block the bill by writing "emphatically and immediately, by telegrams and letters, not only to your own Senators but to as many other Senators as you can."

If the bill passes, the ad went on, its consequences would include "turmoil, rioting, bitterness, and chaos as benefits only the Communists."

The ad also says that "a brief analysis of this legislation by highest legal authority" is available free of charge from the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms, Inc.

The committee is the most active and best financed registered lobby against the civil rights bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in addition to newspaper advertisements, anticivil rights letters, editorials, and other forms of propaganda manufactured in the South have been sent to citizens in my State to create an impression that there is widespread opposition to civil rights in New Jersey. In one case, which I regard as particularly shocking, someone decided that one of my constituents could not adequately express his views on the merits of this proposed legislation, and so took the novel—and strictly illegal—step of forging his signature to a communication expressing opposition to civil rights. Happily, my response to the card unmasked this deception. However, I doubt that this is the only instance of this disturbing invasion of privacy. My colleagues may well wish to ascertain, insofar as possible, how many of the letters they receive are truly sent by their constituents. Write in votes are one thing; write-in constituents are quite another.

There is some evidence that this insidious propaganda bombardment has had an effect on the opinion of some voters in New Jersey. Certainly this material may mislead and delude some portion of the electorate, even though there are presently much more effective civil rights regulations in my State than those proposed in this moderate bill.

As evidence of the confusion being created by segregationist propaganda, I point out that I have received a number of letters from individuals who object to provisions which are not even contained in this bill—and, in some cases, they oppose provisions which are specifically excluded by the bill—simply because they have been deceived by the propaganda. The following letter is typical of many I have received:

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: Our main objection to the question is the "busing." What sense does it make to force a white or colored pupil, from their neighborhood school, to a school 2 to 3 miles away * * * busing should be forbidden.

That letter was written to me, despite the fact that section 401(b) in title IV of H.R. 7152 specifically prohibits the busing of students across town, in order to achieve racial balance in the public schools. That provision clearly relates to busing, and legislatively prohibits busing in order to achieve racial balance in the public schools. Of course I wrote to that effect to my correspondent, and I hope a reasoned answer to him will clarify his misconception in regard to this area.

The influx of anticivil rights propaganda into my State has led some people to believe that the enactment of this proposed legislation would have some pernicious effect on their way of life. This assertion bears absolutely no relationship to the truth. The fact is that the laws presently on the statute books in New Jersey which bar discrimination in public accommodations, public facilities, education, and employment, are far more comprehensive in their guarantees of equal treatment than is any provision of this bill. The passage of civil rights legislation by Congress would add or detract nothing from the statutes already in effect in New Jersey. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that a tabulation comparing the provisions of H.R. 7152 with existing New Jersey statutes be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

COMPARISON OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL WITH NEW JERSEY LAW

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL	NEW JERSEY LAW
Title I—Voting	
No official shall apply different standards in qualifying people to vote in any Federal election. No official shall deny the right to vote to any individual because of immaterial errors or omissions in any step of the voting process. Section 101(2), page 2.	No discrimination practiced in any election.
No official shall give a literacy test without putting it in writing and retaining copies of the test for 22 months. Section 101 (a), page 3.	No literacy test required.
Establishes a rebuttable presumption that all persons who have completed the sixth grade are literate. Section 101(b), page 3.	
Requires expeditious handling of all voting cases and authorizes the Attorney General or the defendant to request a three-judge court to hear the case initially with direct appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. Section 101(d), page 4.	
Title II—Public Accommodations	
Prohibits discrimination in specific places of public accommodation whose operation affects interstate commerce or whose practices of discrimination are supported by State action. Covers hotels, motels, restaurants, cafeterias, lunch counters, gasoline stations, theaters, stadiums, and all facilities that are part of a covered establishment. Enforcible by civil action brought by Attorney General or persons discriminated against. Page 6.	Includes all of the establishments contained in the bill, but in addition, applies to places of safety or shelter, public conveyance, garage, public bathhouse, public boardwalk, skating rink, hospital, public library, retail stores, swimming pool, and billiard parlor.
Private clubs or establishments not open to the public are specifically exempted from coverage. Page 8.	No person shall publish any notice or advertisement to the effect that the public accommodations of any place are denied to any person on account of race, creed, color, or national origin.
	Civil suits may be brought and violators are liable to a fine of up to $500. In addition, violation constitutes a misdemeanor and is punishable by a fine of up to $500 or imprisonment of up to 90 days, or both.
	Private clubs are exempted.

Title III—Public Facilities

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL	NEW JERSEY LAW
Prohibits discrimination in public facilities owned, operated, or managed by the State or subdivision thereof.	Discrimination in all public facilites prohibited.
Authorizes Attorney General to institute or intervene in civil actions whenever he receives a complaint of discrimination.	Criminal penalties are identical to those for violation of public accommodations section above.
Authorizes the Attorney General to intervene in any case already filed by individuals seeking relief from the denial of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, or national origin.	

Title IV—Education

Directs Commissioner of Education to conduct a national survey as to the availability of equal educational facilities at all levels of public education.	Prohibits discrimination in all public schools, including academies, colleges, and universities.
Authorizes Commissioner of Education to give technical assistance to desegregating school districts that request help.	Prohibits discrimination because of race, religion, or color in private secondary and post-secondary schools.
Prohibits the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.	
Authorizes the Commissioner to set up special training institutes to teach school personnel how to deal with special educational problems occasioned by segregation.	
Authorizes Commissioner to make grants to school boards for in-service training or for employing desegregation experts.	
Authorizes Attorney General to initiate or intervene in school desegregation cases if he receives a complaint and the injured parties are unable to pursue their legal remedies.	Provides that a member of a school board who votes to exclude an individual from a public school on account of race, creed, color, or national origin, may be fined up to $250 or sentenced to 6 months in jail, or both.

Title V—Civil Rights Commission

Extends the life of the Commission 3 years and 4 months, and directs the Commission to serve as a national clearinghouse for civil rights information and to investigate general allegations of voting frauds not related to racial discrimination.	Permanent State agency, Division on Civil Rights, with full legal powers to prevent and eliminate discrimination within the State.

Title VI—Federally Assisted Programs

Directs all Federal agencies to require the elimination of discrimination under all aid programs and negates provisions of any Federal law that is contrary. Authorizes termination of aid to effectuate this directive, with the approval of the President and after 30 days following the filing of a report by the agency with the committee of the House and Senate having legislative jurisdiction over the agency.	All State public works contracts shall contain a nondiscrimination clause.
	A deduction of five dollars shall be made for each calendar day during which any employee is discriminated against, or intimidated.

Title VII—Fair Employment

Establishes an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to receive or to initiate complaints alleging discrimination in industries affecting interstate commerce.	Prohibits discriminatory practices in employment by any employer or labor organization with six or more employees or members.
Prohibits employers and labor unions with 25 or more employees or members from discriminating in their hiring and firing policies.	Upon complaint, administrative board may issue an order requiring compliance with law. Violation of board's order is a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of up to $500 or by imprisonment of up to 1 year in jail, or both.
Empowers Commission to eliminate discriminatory practices by conciliation and persuasion and to take the case to court if necessary. After a trial de novo, the court may order compliance.	

Title VIII—Voting Census

Directs the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a survey of registration and voting statistics by race, color, and national origin in such areas as may be designated by the Commission on Civil Rights.	Not applicable.

Title IX—Appeal Procedure

Provides for appeals from Federal court orders which send civil rights cases back to State courts.	Not applicable.

Title X—Community Relations Service

Establishes a Community Relations Service in the Department of Commerce to provide informal assistance to individuals or communities requiring help in resolving civil rights problems.	Conciliatory functions performed by Division of Civil Rights.

Title XI—Miscellaneous

Authorizes money to carry out the act.	Not applicable.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, fortunately, most citizens in my State are aware of these facts. And, having the facts at hand, they have not been fooled by the fictions of others. This is reflected in the mail I receive, which has consistently run more than 3 to 1 in favor of civil rights legislation. This is encouraging, and demonstrates the reliability of an informed and intelligent electorate. Nevertheless, the false accusations and rumors being spread about this bill should not be allowed to go unchallenged.

Frankly, I do not understand the basis for the objections to the bill. There has been no subversion of liberty in New Jersey as a result of our equal opportunity legislation. There has been no invasion of privacy or trampling of property rights because we have equal accommodations laws. There has been no disintegration of the democratic process because the voting regulations in New Jersey apply equally to all citizens. On the contrary, the foundations of democracy have been strengthened, the protection of property and personal rights has been guaranteed, and the two races have established a basis of mutual understanding. The debate on civil rights has been over for a long time in New Jersey. We faced the problems of discrimination, and attempted to settle them in a reasonable fashion.

These laws have not ushered in a utopia, but the experience of New Jersey and the experience of 29 other States with similar laws, provides some reasonable basis for rejecting the claims that chaos and calamity would result if this legislation were enacted. We should rather consider, in all soberness, our obligation to enact legislation that will serve the interest of all citizens, and return to the Negro population the rights which have been too long denied them.

A moment ago I mentioned the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedom, and the misconceptions which have resulted from that organization's propaganda activities. I would like to address myself specifically to the distortions and unfounded assertions contained in a pamphlet prepared and distributed by the coordinating committee entitled, "Unmasking the Civil Rights Bill." The pamphlet is a compilation of charges and allegations that the civil rights bill will destroy the freedoms, rights, and economic interests of various groups in America—bankers, farmers, the press, businesses, and labor unions. Of course, the bill will do none of these things, but some opponents apparently feel that this approach is more persuasive than a discussion of the merits of the proposed legislation. Perhaps the confusion created by this propaganda can best be removed by an examination of the charges made in this particular pamphlet.

POINT-BY-POINT EXAMINATION

Charge: The civil rights bill was railroaded through the House Judiciary Committee and has not received the careful consideration and thorough discussion it deserves.

Fact: That statement is erroneous. Senators see piled before me a visible ref-

utation of this ridiculous statement. In fact, as it was placed here on my desk there was a moment when I feared that the data would be visible, but the Presiding Officer would not be able to see me.

The pile would reach higher than I stand behind my desk. I can just about peer over and observe the distinguished Presiding Officer.

A subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee held 22 days of public hearings on civil rights bills between May 8, 1963 and August 2, 1963. During that time it heard 101 witnesses, including 2 Senators and 26 Congressmen. It received an additional 71 statements from interested parties. The hearings and statement run to some 2,649 pages of printed record. In addition to the public hearings, the subcommittee studied the bill for 17 days in executive session. The full Judiciary Committee considered the bill in executive session for 7 days. The House Rules Committee held 9 days of public hearings and took testimony from 39 witnesses, covering 518 pages of printed record. A subcommittee on the House Labor Committee heard 33 witnesses in 10 days of public hearings, covering 557 pages of the printed record on a bill to prevent discrimination in employment. Title VII of the present bill is in part based upon those hearings. The House of Representatives debated H.R. 7152, when the bill came to the House from the Rules Committee, from January 31, 1964 to February 10, 1964. Each title of the bill was debated separately and thoroughly. One hundred fifty-five amendments were submitted; 34 were adopted.

As for the bill's consideration by the Senate, the Commerce Committee held 22 days of hearings on S. 1732, a bill dealing with discrimination in public accommodations. It heard the testimony of 47 witnesses, took 81 additional statements, and compiled a printed record of over 1,500 pages. The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee held 7 days of hearings on S. 1937, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment, heard 55 witnesses, and compiled a written record of 578 pages.

The Senate Judiciary Committee held hearings for 11 days during July, August, and September of last year on bills identical to H.R. 7152. It heard testimony from 5 witnesses, took additional statements, and compiled a record of 483 printed pages. That committee also held hearings for 6 days in May and June on bills relating to the extension of the Commission on Civil Rights and compiled a record of 467 pages. It heard testimony from 29 witnesses and received 5 additional statements.

Thus, there was a total of 87 days of public hearings, 309 witnesses heard, and 161 statements filed. There are almost 7,000 pages of printed record discussing the provisions of the bill. So as not to add further to these statistics, I have not bothered to compile the number of speakers in the House who have addressed themselves to the bill. The RECORD of the House between the dates of January 31 and February 10 was filled entirely with statements concerning the bill. The RECORD of the Senate has been filled since March 6 almost totally with statements by both sides on this issue.

Mr. President, it took me about 5 minutes to read that impressive log of statistics of the full and complete committee discussion and floor debate on the proposed legislation. I do not know of any measure that has been more completely considered than the civil rights bill that is before the Senate.

For comparison, I ask unanimous consent that two tables showing the number of witnesses, the number of days of hearings, the number of statements and the number of pages of printed record which were compiled during consideration of the 1957 and the 1960 civil rights bills be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL, 1957

1. House Committee on Judiciary: February 4–26, 8 days of hearings, 108 witnesses, 20 statements, 1,299 pages of hearings.

2. House Committee on Rules: May 2–May 17, 9 days of hearings, 25 witnesses, 231 pages.

3. Senate Committee on Judiciary: February 14–March 5, 13 days of hearings (7 days discussed in committee), 68 witnesses, 12 statements, 930 pages.

Total: 57 days, 201 witnesses, 32 statements, 2,460 pages.

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL, 1960

1. House Judiciary: March 4–May 1, 17 days of public hearings, 95 witnesses, 14 statements, 960 pages.

2. Senate Judiciary: March 28–29, 2 days, 3 witnesses, 1 statement, 178 pages.

Total: 30 days, 18 witnesses, 15 statements, 1,138 pages.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. As is plain to see, there is no comparison between the extent of the examination given the bills then and that received by the legislation we are presently considering. In fact, we have expended more than twice as much time on this bill as we did on the other two measures combined.

PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

I now wish to speak of another charge which has been made in the committee's propaganda to which I have referred. The charge is about as follows:

It is contended that hotels, restaurants, and theaters would lose their right to serve whomever they choose; that they would have to deal with objectionable customers.

Fact: The bill does not require any establishment to serve unkempt, intoxicated, or disorderly persons, whatever their race, religion, or color. Title II of the bill merely requires that business establishments whose operations affect interstate commerce and which presume to serve the public, provide these services without distinction as to race.

The reaction to these provisions is surprising indeed. Not only do 30 States and the District of Columbia already have similar laws on their statute books, but there are precedents for such laws in the South. Southern opponents argue that to open places of public accommodation to Negroes would overturn the longstanding, immutable folkways of southern history.

A CLOSE LOOK AT SOUTHERN HISTORY

This assertion is contradicted by the fact that the policies of segregation are not immutable folkways which arose during the period of slavery, nor did segregation come into being during or immediately after the Reconstruction period.

I think this is important to point out. I do not believe that aspect of southern history has been brought out in the debate.

This misconception has had the effect of clothing segregation with the sectional pride that grew out of the period when the South emerged from the chaos and bitterness of the Reconstruction. In this manner many of the guardians of segregation have been able to defend their racial views with unusual zeal and clothe them with an appealing, but fictional historical validity.

As a matter of fact, however, at a time when the hardships of slavery and the bitterness of the Reconstruction formed a vivid memory for both races, the race policies in the South were far milder than they later became. There exists convincing historical evidence that the races lived in comparative harmony for almost two decades after the demise of the Reconstruction, and that the South showed little interest in promoting or accepting Jim Crow policies.

When, in 1879, Sir George Campbell, a Member of the British Parliament, scrutinized the South for racial tension, he commented, with some surprise, that Negroes shared public facilities and that—

> The humblest black rides with the proudest white on terms of perfect equality, and without the smallest symptom of malice or dislike on either side.

A writer in the Atlantic Monthly, who signed himself, "A South Carolinian," corroborated Sir George Campbell's observation:

> Negroes are freely admitted to the theater in Columbia and to other exhibitions, lectures, though the whites avoided sitting with them if the hall be not crowded. In Columbia they are also served at the bars, soda fountains, and ice cream saloons.

Thus, those who view the civil rights movement as a radical departure from the past are mistaken. In fact, the sit-ins and other demonstrations at lunch counters and theaters represent an attempt by the Negroes to reclaim lost rights.

In his study of Mississippi, Historian Vernon Warton noted that saloons served whites and Negroes at the same bar and that restaurants served dinner to both races in the same room.

Throughout the State, moreover, cemeteries held both whites and Negroes. Warton indicated, however, that in about 1890 Negroes began to be excluded from saloons, restaurants, parks, and cemeteries.

So there was a period running up to 1890, following the Reconstruction, in the South where the races lived together in these areas of public accommodations.

Unfortunately, the latter-day practice of segregation has been perpetuated rather than the more enlightened

customs which characterized earlier decades. Perhaps one of the most interesting bits of evidence of southern resistance to segregation can be seen in an editorial which appeared in 1897 in the Charleston News and Courier, the oldest newspaper in the South.

South Carolina seems to have been one of the most enlightened States in this regard. In opposing a plan for separation of the races on trains, the editorial said:

> As we have got on fairly well for a third of a century, including the period of Reconstruction, without such a measure, we can probably get on as well hereafter without it, and certainly so extreme a measure should not be adopted without added and urgent cause.

The editor then called attention to what he considered the absurd consequences to which such a law might lead once the principle of Jim Crow was conceded:

> If there must be Jim Crow cars on the railroads, there should be Jim Crow cars on the street railways. Also on all passenger boats. * * * If there are to be Jim Crow waiting saloons at all stations, and Jim Crow eating houses * * * there should be Jim Crow sections of the jury box, and separate Jim Crow dock and witness stands in every court. * * * And a Jim Crow Bible for colored witnesses to kiss. It would be advisable also to have a Jim Crow section in county auditors' and treasurers' offices for the accommodation of colored taxpayers. The two races are dreadfully mixed in these offices for weeks every year. There should be a Jim Crow department of making returns and paying for the privileges and blessings of citizenship. Perhaps the best plan would be, after all, to take the short cut to the general end * * * by establishing two or three Jim Crow counties at once, and turning them over to our colored citizens for their special and exclusive accommodation.

In reducing the proposed law to its absurd consequences, back in 1879, in Charleston, S.C., the editor doubtless believed that he had dealt the Jim Crow principle a telling blow. There was, however, another irony in his argument of which the author was unconscious. For what he intended to characterize as the absurd soon became a reality. Apart from the Jim Crow counties and the Jim Crow witness stand, all the other consequences suggested by the editor in derision were put into practice.

By the late 1890's the advocates of Jim Crow began to gain ascendancy in southern society. As late as 1900, the only Jim Crow law that had been adopted by a majority of the Southern States applied to passenger trains. South Carolina did not adopt this law until 1898, North Carolina in 1899, and Virginia in 1900.

Segregation tragically was extended to other areas; North Carolina and Virginia adopted a law requiring segregation on streetcars as late as 1901, Louisiana in 1902, Arkansas, South Carolina, and Tennessee in 1903, Mississippi and Maryland in 1904, and Florida in 1905.

A park law adopted by Georgia in 1905 appears to have been the first venture of a State legislature into segregated parks. Not until 1914 were circuses and tent shows segregated by law; this law required separate entrances, exits, ticket windows, and ticket sellers.

PUBLIC LAW 78—STRONG PRECEDENT FOR PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

I have gone into this matter at some length in order to clear away the prevailing misconception that segregation is as indigenous to the South as the magnolia blossom and the mint julep. But aside from the historical precedent and refutation that the equal accommodations provision of this bill would have disastrous results on an established way of life, there is other strong proof that no irreparable harm would result from this bill's passage. I refer to a law, already in effect, which extends the same guarantees provided by this bill to foreign nationals and Americans of foreign ancestry.

Mr. President (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair), paradoxically, many of the Senators who are most strenuously opposed to the public accommodations section of H.R. 7152 have voted 7 times in the last 12 years in favor of a public accommodations provision that is even more comprehensive than title II of this bill.

The public accommodations provision given such strong support for so long by the Congress is contained in Public Law 78, a law establishing a program to import Mexican farmworkers. This provision, known as article 8 of the 1951 migrant labor agreement, is an irrefutable precedent for title II of the pending civil rights bill. Article 8 has been enforced in numerous instances, and is still in effect today.

I wish to read part of the article, to crystallize the conclusions I am making:

ARTICLE 8—PROHIBITION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

> Mexican workers shall not be assigned to work nor permitted to remain in localities in which Mexicans are discriminated against because of their nationality or ancestry. Within a reasonable time after the effective date of this agreement and from time to time thereafter, the Mexican Ministry for Foreign Relations will furnish the Secretary of Labor a listing of the communities in which it considers that discrimination against Mexicans exists. If there is concurrence by the Secretary of Labor that there is such discrimination in any such area, he will not issue, or where appropriate will withdraw, the authorization provided for in article 10.
>
> If the Secretary of Labor does not concur, the appropriate Mexican Consul may request a statement signed by the chief executive officer or officers or the chief law enforcement officer of the community in which the Mexican workers are to be employed, pledging for the community that:
>
> (a) No discriminatory acts will be perpetrated against Mexicans in that locality; and
>
> (b) In the event that the Mexican Consul reports the existence of acts of discrimination against any Mexican because of ancestry or nationality, the local governmental officers who signed the statement will have such complaints promptly investigated and take such community and individual action as may be necessary to fulfill the community pledge.
>
> The Mexican Government will permit employment in such areas if such pledges are furnished.

Under this provision, an agency of a foreign government, the Mexican Ministry for Foreign Relations, may impose severe economic sanctions against anyone who discriminates against Mexican citizens or Americans of Mexican ancestry. Furthermore, it can also take direct action against a local American community to prevent discrimination against American citizens.

These antidiscrimination provisions have been enforced many times. In Slaton, Tex., in the summer of 1960, for instance, the Labor Department investigated and found that discrimination against Mexicans was being practiced by restaurants, bowling alleys, and by the city officials who refused to desegregate certain public facilities. At that time, the matter was satisfactorily resolved without the necessity of removing the Mexican nationals under contract in the area.

In the summer of 1961, a formal complaint was made by the Mexican Government alleging that the Slaton City swimming pool was being operated on a "white only" basis, and that American schoolchildren of Mexican ancestry were being denied the use of that public facility. Negotiations with city officials were conducted in an effort to eliminate this discrimination. The Mexican Government requested the immediate removal of all Mexicans working in the Slaton area. Through negotiations with Slaton city officials, the situation was eventually resolved in 1962 when the city of Slaton opened its swimming pool to all members of the public.

This is but one instance: Similar nondiscrimination cases have involved restaurants, movie theaters, and barbershops. In fact, a significant number of Texas counties have been declared ineligible for braceros by the Mexican Government.

On the basis of these facts, it would appear that article 8 of Public Law 78 goes far beyond the public accommodation proposals in the civil rights legislation. Unlike the public accommodations provision of the civil rights bill, which only prohibits discrimination by businesses that affect interstate commerce, Public Law 78 prohibits discrimination regardless of whether interstate commerce is involved.

Yet, many of those who now contend that the public accommodations provisions of the civil rights bill will destroy the property rights of businessmen have expressly affirmed the more stringent nondiscrimination provisions of Public Law 78 for more than 12 years. The workability of equal accommodations laws is well demonstrated by these and other examples where the discrimination barriers in the South have been torn down.

If the public accommodations section of H.R. 7152 is unconstitutional, it would seem clear that the nondiscrimination provisions of Public Law 78 are equally unconstitutional. For under both provisions, businessmen would not be allowed to discriminate against a minority without being subject to governmental

sanctions—a cutoff of the labor supply or civil suits.

It is simply poor logic to argue that it is unconstitutional to deny public accommodations to a Negro citizen, but that it is constitutional to provide public accommodations to Mexicans. The constitutionality of a public accommodations law cannot turn on the severity of the governmental sanction or on the ancestry or the color of the customer. Yet, that seems to be the argument advanced by those opposed to civil rights legislation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator know that under the Bracero Act the only thing involved is whether braceros will be allowed to go to that particular community, and that there is no penalty of any sort assessed against the merchant or the community that does not treat Mexicans fairly? The only question is the question of availability of help under the Bracero Act. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is correct, but I am surprised at the Senator's expression, "The only thing involved." The Senator well knows, coming from one of the greatest agricultural States, that the whole economic life of the growers of fruits and vegetables depends on the supply of labor. In the past, in certain areas, growers have told us that they would fail and go out of business unless they could have the bracero labor supplied under Public Law 78. True, it is "the only thing involved," but it is a very important thing. An available supply of labor is critical when harvest comes along.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield further for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida for a further question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator know that under the pending bill the penalty which would be imposed for discrimination as to color would go much further following the bringing of an injunction suit, and following the trial for criminal contempt proceedings, without a jury sitting at the trial, and the possibility of grave punishment that exists, whereas no such thing is involved in the bracero legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, under the bill before us, if it becomes law, an individual who discriminates can insure that he stays in business by opening his doors to the public. The effect of the Public Law 78 provision against discrimination can be far more harsh than title II because the sanctions under Public Law 78 affect an entire community. A grower having no discriminatory intent, or carrying out no discriminatory act, could be denied needed Mexican workers merely because someone else—another grower or merchant—decided to discriminate against Mexican-Americans. Yet the nondiscriminator could do nothing about it. As an individual, he would be more severely affected and imposed upon by the antidiscrimination sanction than the individual restaurateur, who discriminated, would be. In the pending bill, it is not what is done next door or downtown that justifies a penalty; it is what a man does himself. Under the civil rights bill the businessman controls his own business destiny. That is not so under Public Law 78.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the restaurateur felt that the admission of persons of the other color would destroy his business, and he refused to conform, would not he be subject to an injunction and to a criminal contempt proceeding without a jury trial; whereas no such procedure would lie against a merchant, or even a community, which discriminated insofar as braceros were concerned?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. In the one case a grower who is in one of these communities may lose his labor supply. Under the pending bill the restaurateur can have his establishment locked up. Either way, we have a governmental sanction being imposed. I find it easier for an individual to control his destiny under the bill than under the other situation.

Of course in terms of business, there is the fear of losing business. Up our way it is good business to have the accommodations open to all orderly persons. One does not turn away a cash customer because he happens to have a different colored skin. His money will buy the same amount of corned beef as the money of anyone else will buy.

Mr. HOLLAND. I see no comparison whatever between the two situations, because under the Bracero case there is no penalty to be visited upon the individual who has a free right to decide whichever way he wishes to go. The Government cannot bring a suit against him, as it would be possible for the Commission to do under the provisions of the pending bill. There is no possibility of punishment by criminal contempt without a jury trial. It seems to me that the two situations are not at all alike. There is certainly no penalty of any kind that the Government threatens to visit against the individual who refuses to conform.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There is another difference between the two provisions. Under the proposed civil rights legislation before the Senate, the American Government brings the action to enjoin a violation in the public accommodations section. Under article 8 of the Public Law 78 agreement, however, the Mexican Government can put an American grower out of business. So far as the triggering authority is concerned, I would rather have it home based. I would not want to put any grower in an area where he must absolutely rely on Mexican labor, and where the Mexican Government could put him out of business for the discriminatory act of a third person.

Mr. HOLLAND. Has not the Senator admitted that several counties in Texas, which do not qualify for braceros, have continued to live and prosper without knuckling under to that provision?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I cannot speak about the prosperity. Both Senators from Texas have stepped out of the Chamber temporarily. Perhaps we could inquire of them. Once in a while, when it serves the advantage of certain parts of the debate, we find that there are areas of Texas that are very hard hit, and not as prosperous as other areas. There may be a ready supply of labor. Perhaps it is labor of Mexican ancestry but of American citizenship, which is close by. Of course there does not have to be any agreement under such a situation, because there is a local supply, and there need not be any import of labor from Mexico. Perhaps all this is becoming academic, because Public Law 78 is in its phaseout period—its last year—and will not be renewed.

In order to relieve any anxiety on the part of growers, particularly in California—I know that people in California are major users of the braceros—I am working on a program which would bring order where growers think there might be chaos, the program would operate through the U.S. Employment Services and would match workers with jobs. It would set up a system allocating the supply of loan to the job demand.

The Senator from Florida and I have discussed this situation. We have cooperated in many programs. Some of the benefits are already being provided in the States. I refer to services like those provided under the Health Migrant Act—Public Law 87–692. I see our employment service stabilization bill—S. 527—as offering the same kind of hope to agricultural communities.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has conceded, has he not, that he is trying to take the braceros away from the growers and is not visiting any destruction on them?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. On the braceros?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; on the growers. His effort is to take all braceros away, is it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes; and replace the braceros with qualified American farm workers.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is no destruction in connection with the braceros?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. No, when we have the mechanics such as S. 527 which would bring qualified farmworkers to Texas or California, where they are needed. There is a gap that we are trying to fill.

I am happy to have had this exchange with the Senator from Florida. I hope that we may soon be able to get on to other important matters before the 89th Congress convenes.

I should like to deal with one other charge that is being made:

Charge: Banks could not operate under the bill without undue hardship because the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Veterans' Administration would all cease their dealing with the bank if either the bank or one of its depositors were guilty of discrimination.

That is the wildest charge of them all.

Fact: The provision in the bill forbidding discrimination in programs receiving Federal financial assistance is limited to Federal grants, loans and contracts; it expressly excludes insurance or guaranty contracts. Thus, the charge is refuted. The bill does not affect the Veterans' Administration guarantee program; it does not affect the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; it does not affect the Federal Housing Administration insurance program. As to programs which are affected by the bill, only the distributor of Federal funds could be penalized, never the ultimate recipient.

CUTOFF OF FEDERAL FUNDS

Charge: The bill places arbitrary power in the hands of Federal bureaucrats who can cut off all Federal assistance to State agencies and programs which practice discrimination.

Fact: Far from granting arbitrary power to any branch of the Federal Government, title VI of H.R. 7152 represents an attempt to prevent States which receive Federal funds from using those funds arbitrarily by discriminating against Negroes who would otherwise benefit from State and Federal programs. The cutoff of Federal assistance to State agencies is a last resort, and can be employed only after attempts to secure voluntary compliance with the law have failed. Moreover, the President must give his consent to the agency's proposal to end its assistance to a State, and even then, the aid is not halted until 30 days after a complete report has been filed by the agency with the House and Senate committees having legislative jurisdiction over the agency's activities. With these procedural safeguards written indelibly into the bill, it is difficult to understand how the opposition to this legislation can claim that the Federal Government is exercising arbitrary power when actually what it is attempting to do is to secure compliance with the constitutional guarantees provided for all citizens.

Senators who complain about the arbitrary cutoff of funds should know that more Federal funds are being held up because of this filibuster than are ever likely to be cut off by any Federal agency. It is the conscious obstruction by a few which is preventing the Senate from conducting its business in a normal and orderly manner. Appropriation bills cannot be passed. Other important pieces of legislation cannot even be considered, because the pending unfinished business cannot be brought to a vote.

Public works projects and manpower development and training programs, to name only two examples, have come to a halt across the country because the funds to finance these programs have been exhausted, and no new funds can be authorized. Many unemployed workers who could return to work, if these programs were functioning, remain idle. The plans for accelerated public works projects that would help to revitalize highly depressed areas in New Jersey are not even being reviewed because there is no prospect that funds to finance them will be available in the foreseeable future.

Thousands of workers, unemployed because of the rapid advances of technology and automation, eager to be retrained for new skills, cannot receive that instruction because of the action of a few Members of this body. It is ironic that those who oppose the civil rights bill, and who, by their use of the filibuster, are actually cutting off funds for needed programs, come from those States which would benefit most from these programs.

Charge: Under the bill, veterans' benefits, pensions, unemployment compensation, and social security benefits to individuals may be cut off when individuals engage in racial discrimination.

Fact: Social security benefits are paid directly by the United States to the ultimate beneficiary. The United States does not discriminate in paying social security benefits. For like reasons, title VI will not affect veterans' compensation and pensions, civil service retirement, railroad retirement, and similar programs involving direct payments from the United States to the beneficiary.

Unemployment compensation is administered by State agencies, some of which receive Federal aid. Under the bill, a State agency administering an unemployment compensation program which participates in the Federal unemployment trust fund would be prohibited from denying payments to otherwise eligible beneficiaries because they are Negroes. It is difficult if not impossible, to see how anyone could legitimately object to that.

Another charge that has been made and used by propagandists—these charges have saturated northern New Jersey and have warped the opinion of those who do not know the real facts about the proposed legislation—is that Federal personnel will dictate decisions of homeowners and realtors concerning the building, occupancy, renting, leasing, and sales of homes.

Fact: The principal sources of Federal assistance to private homeowners and realtors are the FHA and VA insurance and guarantee programs—both of which are specifically exempted from coverage in this bill. It is as straight, clear, and simple, as that.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Charge: The bill impairs freedom of speech and of the press because it prohibits editorial opposition to desegregation.

Fact: Nothing in the bill prohibits opposition to desegregation or criticism of it. In its original form, the bill would have prohibited inciting, aiding, or abetting violations of the act—a type of provision that is found in many statutes, and which has nothing to do with criticism or opposition to a law, but only to the manner in which that opposition is demonstrated—that provision was eliminated by amendment by the House of Representatives.

Certain opponents of this bill have also contended that its passage would lead to the restriction of free speech and freedom of the press, which are guaranteed by the first amendment. Fears are expressed that persons and newspapers who urge the maintenance of segregation would be subject to fine and imprisonment. Nothing, of course, could be farther from the truth. It should be clear that the Civil Rights Act and other Federal legislation is subject to the commands of the first amendment. No word in H.R. 7152 even suggests that freedom of speech or of the press will be curbed, and no such word could stand the test of constitutionality if it were there.

Instead of raising such false fears, it would perhaps be well for certain opponents of the civil rights bill to recognize where the true threat to freedom of expression lies. For the November 6, 1963, edition of the Washington Post reports that television stations in Atlanta and Shreveport refused to carry a CBS network program because certain actors in the program expressed opinions concerning racial segregation which were at variance with opinions held by some persons in the South. Such action is hardly the best way to promote freedom of expression.

A far more serious threat to first amendment freedoms has taken the form of actions for libel which have been instituted by public officials of certain Southern States against newspapers and persons who have expressed opinions in opposition to segregation. The New York Times of April 4, 1964, reports that at least 17 such libel actions seeking damages totaling $288 million are now pending in Southern States. The use of the law of libel to obtain unjustified and inflated damages from biased and inflamed jurors is a perversion of the law and a serious threat to freedom of expression. The U.S. Supreme Court recently reversed a judgment of an Alabama court which had awarded $500,000 to an official of Montgomery, Ala., for alleged damages suffered by an advertisement which appeared in the New York Times. In his concurring opinion in this case, Justice Goldberg stated:

> The opinion of the Court conclusively demonstrates the chilling effect of the Alabama libel law on first-amendment freedom in the area of race relations.

Before the opponents of this bill argue that H.R. 7152 violates the first amendment, they would do well to put their own house in order and stop using the law of libel to silence opinion that is crit-

ical of the practices of racial segregation.

Charge: Boards of trustees of schools would be denied the right to handle students and teaching staffs in any way they chose.

Fact: Public schools are, of course, forbidden to discriminate under the Constitution. These schools are built by the tax money of all; they must be equally available to all. They are not the private preserve of local boards of trustees; they belong to all the people. Unfortunately, many of those who see the bill as an invasion of liberty actually want license to take unconstitutional action. The bill would not grant them that license. Nor should it do so. All of us should begin to realize that when we speak of a gulf between the races we are referring for the most part to an economic gulf. An economic gulf which can best be bridged by education. Let us stop fighting about the color of the child who sits next to our son and daughter and begin discussing how we can work together to improve the quality of all our schools.

VOTING

Charge: The bill takes away the rights of States to determine qualifications of voters.

Fact: Under the bill the States will continue to determine the qualifications of voters. The bill has no effect on this established right. It simply requires that the same standards for determining qualifications be used for Negroes as are being used for white applicants. It would prohibit, as it should, the practices of some local officials who regularly turn down all Negroes, including teachers and college graduates, because of "illiteracy," while granting the vote to white persons who can neither read nor write.

Hopefully, it will also eliminate blatant cases of discrimination, such as the one involving the blind Negro woman who was assisted in filling out her voting registration form by a polling official, and then was disqualified for "failing to fill out the voting form properly."

Injustice of that kind would be dealt with by the bill.

The Constitution prohibits such practices, and this bill will make certain that this constitutional prohibition against double standards is obeyed.

However, I should like to point out what I consider to be a serious omission in this bill—an omission which can be corrected by an amendment which I intend to offer at the appropriate time. I refer to the fact that the bill, while acting wisely to correct the above cited violations of voting rights in Federal elections, does nothing about State and local elections. I believe that the same prescriptions now made to apply to the election of Federal officials should apply to the election of State and local officials. The Negro in the South seldom gets to see his President or his Senator, and I may add, neither does the voter in the North; and if this debate does not soon terminate, this fact may well prove unfortunate for some of us.

However, the Negro in the South does get to see his sheriff and his local judges and other officials of the county or those in the city hall quite often. These are the people he is interested in helping elect and I intend to offer an amendment which will give him a fair chance to register and then do as his conscience may direct.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

Mr. President, it is also charged that employers, including farmers, will have to hire employees according to race to establish racial balance in every job classification; and it is said that quotas will be imposed, forcing businessmen to hire incompetent and unqualified personnel.

Now I turn to the fact: For some reason, the fact that there is nothing whatever in the bill which provides for racial balance or quotas in employment has not been understood by those opposed to civil rights legislation. They persist in opposing a provision which is not only not contained in the bill, but is specifically excluded from it. Those opposed to H.R. 7152 should realize that to hire a Negro solely because he is a Negro is racial discrimination, just as much as a "white only" employment policy. Both forms of discrimination are prohibited by title VII of this bill. The language of that title simply states that race is not a qualification for employment. Every man must be judged according to his ability. In that respect, all men are to have an equal opportunity to be considered for a particular job. Some people charge that H.R. 7152 favors the Negro, at the expense of the white majority. But how can the language of equality favor one race or one religion over another? Equality can have only one meaning, and that meaning is self-evident to reasonable men. Those who say that equality means favoritism do violence to commonsense.

Let me quote some arguments, which I am sure Senators will find familiar, being used against H.R. 7152. These quotations are not taken from the pamphlet distributed by the Coordinating Committee, although they might very well have been. Rather, they are excerpts from a legal brief submitted by counsel for Jones & Laughlin Co., in the N.L.R.B. against Jones & Laughlin case, decided by the Supreme Court in 1937. The brief reads, in part:

> The petitioner's order constituted an unlawful interference with the right of the respondent to manage its own business * * * the question of retaining or discharging an employee involves delicate consideration of discretion which the law is loathe to attempt to weigh. The facts of the present case show the dangers of bureaucratic interference. * * * This is clearly an interference with the normal right of the respondent to manage its own business, because it is a dictatorial usurpation of the respondent's discretion to determine the capabilities of its employees.

As everyone is aware, that fallacious argument was rejected by the Supreme Court; but today it is being repeated virtually word for word against the civil rights bill. Yet, in the more than 25 years since that Supreme Court decision, there has been no effort to repeal the National Labor Relations Act because it threatens the individual's right to manage his own business. Today, no one would say that the National Labor Relations Board has taken over the management of businesses. Neither has it sought to determine the capabilities of employees. Rather, it has accomplished its initial goal, the facilitating of orderly collective bargaining. Likewise, title VII of the bill has only one purpose—the elimination of racial and religious discrimination in employment.

Finally, let me attempt to put to rest the wholly spurious argument that H.R. 7152 would establish compulsory employment quotas, by pointing out certain relevant facts which should demonstrate the baseless nature of this objection to the bill. The Supreme Court has ruled, in numerous cases, that racial discrimination in the selection of juries is unconstitutional. In case after case, where it has been demonstrated that Negroes have been systematically excluded from serving on juries, the Supreme Court has declared such practice a violation of constitutional procedure. No individual may be prevented from serving on a jury on account of his race. But this does not mean that every jury must contain a Negro. The Court's decision does not establish quotas for juries. Neither does the Court demand that prospective Negro jurors be given preferential treatment over prospective white jurors when a panel is chosen. In fact, the Supreme Court has flatly rejected the notion that there must be racial quotas for juries. In *Akins* v. *Texas*, 325 U.S. 398 (1945), the Court ruled that there need not be any direct correlation between the number of Negroes on a particular jury and the number of Negroes in the community.

What is true in the case of juries is also true in the area of employment. H.R. 7152 does not require that every employer with more than 25 employees hire a Negro or a certain percentage of Negroes. It is possible that although a particular jury or a particular business will contain no Negroes, no charge of discrimination will be made. But businesses, like juries, may not systematically exclude Negroes, when the only ground for exclusion is the color of a man's skin.

So I think the experience with juries is on all fours with what will be the situation in the case of employment. In practice, I know this is true in New Jersey, which I am so proud to represent. No quotas are applied there.

There is an absolute absence of discrimination for anyone; and there is an absolute prohibition against discrimination against anyone.

Charge: The bill vests almost unlimited authority in the President and his appointees and is a vicious interference with private and State rights.

Fact: Authority granted to Federal officers is carefully limited in every section of the bill and thorough judicial review is provided for. The bill specifically provides for the use of State remedies where possible—title II, section 204(c). It emphasizes the use of consultation and mediation—sections 204

(d), 602, 707(a), 1002—and the dissemination of information—sections 403–405, 504. It seeks not to subvert, but rather to uphold the liberties of all American citizens.

And, if State laws, commissions, and means of enforcement are already operating effectively within the State, the Federal authorities will defer to them. Personally I would prefer to see each State take the necessary actions to protect the freedom and dignity of its citizens; however, the constitutional rights of citizens cannot be indefinitely suspended because a State refuses to act.

Charge: The bill is unconstitutional and contrary to the spirit of the Bill of Rights.

Fact: On the contrary, the civil rights bill is designed to guarantee and protect constitutional rights. For too long the rights of Negroes have been denied and abridged. The testimony and findings in hundreds of court cases demonstrate beyond the shadow of a doubt that Negroes are being deprived of their right of free access to Government facilities in violation of the 14th amendment; their right to freedom of speech and petition in violation of the 1st amendment; their right to the equal protection of the laws, to due process of law, and even to the security of their persons and that of their families.

H.R. 7152 would provide a remedy against these abuses; it would rectify some of these injustices; it would restore the balance in favor of observance of the Constitution where observance is now sadly lacking. And it would accomplish these goals without infringing upon the constitutional rights of any citizen.

The supporters of this bill have contributed to the debate so that the American people will have a clearer understanding of what this legislation means and why it must be adopted. In undertaking to provide a free exchange of views, the Senate has admirably fulfilled its responsibility to inform and educate the citizenry concerning the great problems facing the Nation. However, the Senate has not fulfilled its primary responsibility as a legislative body; namely, to take action so that those problems may be resolved. The civil rights bill must be brought to a vote. Only then can the issue which now divides us be decided.

But now the Senate stands immobile, unable to fulfill its responsibility. Meanwhile, there is growing restlessness in the country. Some of it is well-directed and inspiring, like the prayer vigil now going on here in Washington. Some of it is ill-advised and embarrassing and dangerous, like the stall-in at the World's Fair.

We must give our Negro citizens the privileges which have been so long denied them. We must grant them full and equal citizenship. We must enact this bill, not because we are forced to do so, not because of sectional concern, but because, in the words of our late President, John F. Kennedy, "It is right."

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I intend to seek the floor in my own right in a moment, but before the Senator from New Jersey yields the floor, I wish to say that I had an opportunity to hear the entire address that he has delivered in the Senate this afternoon. I wish to express my own personal appreciation for the research, study, and time that the Senator from New Jersey has obviously given to the subject. He has made it possible for many of us to come to a better understanding and a better appreciation of the issues that are at stake.

During the years that I have had the privilege of knowing the Senator from New Jersey, going back to the time when he was a Member of the House of Representatives, I have known of no person in public life who has demonstrated a greater and more consistent concern for the entire range of human rights. The same broad humanitarian philosophy that has made him a leader in working for better standards for American labor, and for our rural citizens, and for a higher quality of life for our people in the cities has also helped to explain the great interest he has taken in this all-important area of human rights. I wished to commend the Senator before he yielded the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to my good friend the Senator from South Dakota.

I yield the floor.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, at a later stage in the debate on the civil rights bill I hope to outline briefly my own views on the important issues that are raised in the bill.

THE URGENT NEED FOR CONVERSION PLANNING

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the attention of the Senate on another subject which in some ways is related to some of the issues in the civil rights debate. Last Monday in a speech before the Associated Press in New York, President Johnson announced a 40-percent cutback in the production of enriched uranium, which is the material from which nuclear warheads are constructed. At the same time Premier Khrushchev announced a parallel cutback in Russian nuclear production. On the following day Prime Minister Douglas-Home pledged Britain's support and cooperation in the reduction of nuclear materials production.

The reaction, so far as I know, in practically all countries, both here in the United States and overseas, was enthusiastic. Most commentators have recognized that the cutback would not in any way affect the balance of power between the great nations, nor would it interfere in the least with the enormously destructive power either of the Soviet Union or the United States.

President Johnson made that point quite clear in his speech.

Nevertheless, there is genuine cause for satisfaction in the announcement of these reductions. We all know that it is not weapons, but the will to use them, that cause wars. The awesome power of nuclear weapons may give the great powers pause, but the terror of weapons has never yet prevented a war. As long as fear and mistrust exists between nations, the danger of war will be ever present. The coordinated announcement of cutbacks in the production of nuclear materials, while not significant in military terms, was an important step toward reducing the tensions that pervade our world, raising the hope that international conflicts may more easily be resolved without resort to force.

However much we welcome the chance to reduce our production of the weapons of war, we must recognize that such a cutback is not without attendant difficulties. Many people in this Nation, indeed, whole communities, are dependent on the production of enriched uranium for their livelihood.

The recent reduction, plus earlier announced reductions in nuclear materials production, have directly affected over 400 jobs in Portsmouth, Ohio; Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Paducah, Ky. In addition, the reductions mean a cutback in the need for privately supplied electrical power amounting to over $30 million, thereby affecting employment in that industry. There is no doubt that this loss of employment will inevitably spread out through the adjacent communities, compounding the problem.

The threat of economic distress hangs over many other areas of this country heavily engaged in defense production. In a democratic nation such as ours there is always the danger that the legitimate concern of the people of such areas may influence decisions that ought not be the subject of economic pressures.

In other words, our level of defense spending ought not to be geared to economic pressures. It ought to be geared to providing the needs of our military defense, and for no other purpose.

Since 1950 this Nation has spent over half of its entire budget each year in preparation for war. Many voices, including that of President Eisenhower, warned of the dangers of a military-industrial complex that was easy to build but very difficult to dismantle. It was Karl Marx who predicted that capitalist countries would have to spend more and more on the production of arms in order to prevent economic collapse, and that this would propel the world inevitably toward war. In this, as in so many of his theories, Marx was wrong. There is nothing inevitable about the production of arms in America. The dangers of our world require that we be militarily strong, and we are strong. But there is neither need nor excuse for saddling our taxpayers with the cost of construction of superfluous weapons that add little if anything to our military strength.

President Johnson was clear on this point when he told his New York audience on Monday:

We must not operate a WPA nuclear project just to provide employment when our needs have been met.

In our determination to prevent waste in our military program, and to avoid provocations that increase world tension, however, we must not abandon those of our people who have become dependent on military programs for their income and for their livelihood.

Through its defense programs, the Federal Government has brought entire communities into a dependency from which they cannot escape, in my judgment, without assistance. Where will they get that assistance when the inevitable shifts and cutbacks take place?

Secretary McNamara has been clear about the role of the Department of Defense. In an appearance before the House Armed Services Committee in January of this year, Mr. McNamara said:

The Defense Department cannot and should not assume responsibility for creating a level of demand adequate to keep the economy healthy and growing. Nor should it, in developing its programs, depart from the strictest standards of military need and operating efficiency in order to aid an economically distressed company or community.

Mr. President, I think that statement is unassailable. I cannot see how anyone could quarrel with the Department of Defense in considering that it is its responsibility to provide for the military defense of the country at the lowest possible cost, and without regard to considerations of providing jobs, or doing the various other things to stimulate the economy which are not within the proper role of the Defense Department. We would be in a sorry state if our Defense Department were subjected to the pressures of economic need in carrying out its mission to defend our Nation.

To meet the Government's responsibility to those communities that have become dependent on defense contracts and installations—and they have done a good job in meeting the country's defense needs—I introduced a bill on October 31 of last year to create a National Economic Conversion Commission. It would be the task of this Commission to develop proposals to lessen the impact of a defense cutback, such as the one announced last Monday by President Johnson, and to work with local and State leaders, to work with defense contractors in developing alternative production plans so that employment and income can be maintained. The bill, now before the Commerce Committee, has 12 cosponsors in the Senate, the latest one being the Senator from Maryland, who asked that his name be added to the bill yesterday. Twenty-two Members of the House have since introduced identical bills in that body. The President has created a special executive department committee, known as the Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament, to coordinate executive department conversion planning.

The proposed legislation has the support of the Republicans and Democrats alike. This is a bipartisan problem. We are proposing a bipartisan solution.

Mr. President, considerable interest has been shown by Congress and by the President. Moreover, the public, and some sections of the press have also been concerned about the problem that I am discussing. I have received literally thousands of letters from people in every single State in the Union since the introduction of this legislation last fall, supporting the concept of a Conversion Commission. I have received literally hundreds of copies of letters which have been sent to the President of the United States and to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Commerce Committee. Many of these letters are from people who have been affected by the loss of jobs because of the reduction in defense spending, or people who fear the loss of their jobs because of proposed reduction in military spending.

There have been numerous articles in the press. I ask unanimous consent that two articles that appeared in the New York Times last week, one of which contains a useful table showing the importance of defense-space business to 34 large contractors, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as being representative of many others.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 12, 1964]

ECONOMISTS SEE AN END TO ARMS INDUSTRY BOOM

(By Will Lissner)

The bottom isn't falling out of the defense business, at least not yet, but the growth is, economists who have been studying the effect of recent cutbacks on the arms contractors report. This is forcing the country and the defense industry to think about the economics of a transition from an economy sparked by a munitions boom to one projected forward and upward by a newly strengthened civilian economy.

The small group of economists who have been preparing for the transition laugh at the industry leaders who as one put it, "approach the wailing wall, rend their garments, don sackcloths and ashes and recite from the Book of Lamentations."

These economists have been reporting recently on their studies in a variety of places, to the Senate Subcommittee on Manpower, before the Electronics Industries Association in Washington last month, in a symposium in the current issue of the bulletin of the Atomic Scientists and in several economic reviews.

THREAT TO PROSPERITY SEEN

In these reports they emphasize that adjustment to a peace that is breaking out ever so gradually is no light matter: It could threaten the country's prosperity. But the economists emphasize that it need not and, indeed, could underpin it.

John Silard of the United Automobile Workers legal staff, who was special consultant for the Senate Labor Committee on Defense Industry Conversion, points out that "today we are on the threshold of a serious national confrontation."

"Soon," Mr. Silard says, "we will be ready for a new policy of technological advance, which will facilitate the return to a peacetime pattern of national economic life."

Dr. Murray L. Weidenbaum, senior economist of the Stanford Research Institute and formerly with the Budget Bureau and the Boeing Co., recently completed for the Defense Department a study of defense conversion potentials.

He has tried to make clear to the defense industry the size and nature of the transition problem. The industry's nervous system suffered telling shocks from the nuclear test ban agreement, the decline in the next year's budget, the sharp reduction in new funding for strategic forces, impending closure of defense installations and indications of more cutbacks to come.

This, Dr. Weidenbaum emphasizes, is not a disarmament or even arms-control type of situation. Speculation is general that the defense budget may possibly decline as much as $5 billion over the next 5 years. He pointed out:

"Were this five-by-five situation to come about, it would mean no more than a 10 percent reduction from the current level, or a return by 1970 to the 1962 level of defense spending.

"Now, 1962 was by no means a depressed situation. In fact it was significantly higher than the post-Korean plateau in defense spending that characterized the Eisenhower administration."

DECLINE IS PREDICTED

Dr. Weidenbaum estimates that, taking future peaks and valleys into account and using dollars of constant value, the military budget will decline by several billion dollars in the next few years.

Then, he figures, it will begin a relatively slow increase so that between now and 1975 the military budget will rise at the average annual rate of 1 percent. This contrasts with a likely increase in total output of goods and services during that period of 3½ percent a year.

Thus the defense market outlook is for maintenance of a high level of defense demand in an area of the economy that is no longer a major growth area but rather one characterized by continued instability and fluctuation.

Archibald S. Alexander, assistant director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, who has responsibility for his agency's economic program, believes there are three broad alternative courses for future defense spending.

ALTERNATIVES ARE GIVEN

First, if no substantial disarmament agreements are reached but the weapons inventory becomes fairly complete and no crises require calling up additional men, the prospect is for a gradual decrease in defense spending.

This cut would be small in terms of actual dollars but larger in terms of percentage of total output, Mr. Alexander says. Offsetting steps needed, he holds, would be those that are needed today when companies and employees involved in shifts are hard hit, except that the blow would fall within a contracting industry.

The second alternative, Mr. Alexander says, is a substantial decrease under step-by-step disarmament. Dr. Weidenbaum estimates that the total net reduction in U.S. security expenditures under this alternative would be about $40 billion over a 12-year period.

This, Dr. Weidenbaum points out, would involve a decline of roughly $6 billion a year in the crucial introductory 3-year period of maximum impact. Then it would drop more gradually to the $20 billion annual level by 1975.

A net reduction of defense expenditures of $6 billion a year is about 1 percent of the total annual output of goods and services. It would be a far smaller percentage of total output than was represented by the defense cuts after World War II and after the Korean

war, Dr. Weidenbaum points out. The defense cut of post-World War II was 30 percent of total output; the post-Korean defense cut was 3 percent of it.

But this could cause a serious slowdown, he warns, and, if not offset, might well generate a total decline of several times that amount in the national economy.

Mr. Alexander's third alternative is a total decrease, which he points out could only occur if much of our defense industry was obliterated in a major war—which he hopes is unlikely.

Dr. Weidenbaum takes as a more realistic version the type of post-World War II disarmament to a level under $10 billion, but finds even this unlikely.

Barring new freezes in the cold war, the prospect is for the release of an important amount of resources and men from the military to the civilian economy.

OPPORTUNITY IS HAILED

Michael Michaelis, of Arthur D. Little, Inc., chairman of a U.S. Chamber of Commerce committee on research and development, who was formerly Executive Secretary of the White House Panel on Civilian Technology, argues that this is opportunity rather than threat.

The ability of corporations now oriented to defense to combine a great diversity of scientific and technical skills for massive assaults on large-scale problems, he finds, "may turn out to be a social innovation of even greater consequence, in the long run" than the technological revolution that made it possible.

"This," he concludes, "may be the spillover from military to civilian needs that is of greatest national and social consequence if we make up our minds to use it."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 13, 1964]

DEFENSE INDUSTRY FINDS CONVERSION CHALLENGING TASK—ECONOMISTS SAY SHIFT OFFERS OPPORTUNITY FOR SPURRING LONGRUN U.S. GROWTH

(By Will Lissner)

Helping the defense industry turn its swords into plowshares is a task of major proportions, according to a group of economists who have been studying the problem for government and business.

But the conversion of defense industry resources to peacetime pursuits, as fulfillment of national security needs and the international political situation permits offers the country a "tremendous opportunity" to bolster longrun economic growth and progress, the investigators report.

The group of economists includes Archibald S. Alexander, who is in charge of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency's economic programs; Richard Nelson of the Rand Corp., a specialist in research and development analysis, and Dr. Murray L. Weidenbaum, senior economist of the Stanford Research Institute.

Their findings are set forth in a report entitled "Defense Conversion Potentials," which has been submitted to the Defense Department by Dr. Weidenbaum.

The economists say that conversion is a large problem for several reasons.

NEW SHIFT IN PROCUREMENT

For one thing, a new shift has been developing in defense business.

During the midfifties, defense procurement shifted from the automotive and ordnance type of equipment produced largely in the upper Middle West to aerospace and electronic systems on which east and west coast companies have concentrated.

But in the last 6 years the major aerospace companies, taken as a whole, have received a declining share of prime defense contracts. A rising share is being allocated to research and development and production facilities along the gulf coast.

The bulk of the work will continue to be performed at existing industrial complexes, notably in California and the New England-Middle Atlantic region, Dr. Weidenbaum believes, but these facilities cannot reasonably expect to increase their share of defense contracts.

This, he thinks, may be why a prospective downturn, or even a plateau, in overall defense spending causes such consternation among these companies.

The problem of adjusting to a gradual or substantial decline in military demand is concentrated in a few industries—ordnance, aircraft, ship construction, and electronics—the bulk of whose sales are to the Government.

This problem is compounded because these four industries cluster in a few regions, notably the west coast, where they represent a major part of the industrial base of these areas.

Defense employment is 10 percent or more of the manufacturing employment of 15 States, according to data of the Bureau of Employment Security of the U.S. Department of Labor. These are the States:

Kansas, 30.26 percent; California, 29.59; Washington, 29.07; New Mexico, 23.80; Connecticut, 22.15; Arizona, 20.58; Utah, 20.35; Colorado, 17.80; Florida, 17.19; Maryland, 15.86; Massachusetts, 13.22; Texas, 12.65; Nebraska, 11.98; Missouri, 10.81; and New Jersey, 10.79.

SAN DIEGO CITED

The concentration is far greater in certain metropolitan areas, such as San Diego, with 81.8 percent of total manufacturing employment in missiles and aircraft; Wichita, Kans., 71.7 percent, and Seattle, 52.6 percent. The figure for the Los Angeles area is 26.9 percent.

Moreover, this employment is almost wholly in facilities built for the production of specialized defense equipment. Currently about 90 percent of defense production consists of such specialized equipment.

Dr. Weidenbaum, in studying conversion potentials for the Defense Department, found that relatively few of the workers or the facilities had ever been engaged in the production of civilian goods.

Moreover, the large, specialized defense companies had sought to diversify—turning out, for example, canoes, computers, and coffins—but had not been successful except in a very few cases.

LOSSES ON JETLINERS

The only attempt at diversification of a major sort was in production of transport aircraft for the commercial airlines, the large jetliners. But the profit performance on the large jet programs has been extremely poor and the losses incurred have both depleted venture capital and reduced enthusiasm for attempts to diversify, Dr. Weidenbaum reports.

This is to be expected he says. The companies lack commercial marketing capability because they needed none. They cannot produce large volumes at low cost because they are equipped to design efficiently small numbers of large-scale systems of great technical complexity. They just cannot make plowshares and pruning hooks.

Defense industry executives said, however, that there were fields these companies could enter if demand and financing were organized.

DISCUSSION URGED

They mentioned large-scale construction, mining of undersea minerals, sea farming, space travel, integration of transportation systems, revitalization of the merchant marine, improved communications and weather forecasting, nuclear electronic power, conversion of salt water to fresh, traffic control systems, air and water pollution control, urban development and program of technical assistance to developing countries.

Mr. Alexander, the disarmament agency official, has emphasized that the country must start discussing programs for an orderly transition of defense industry to civilian work.

What is needed, he says, are coordinated Federal, State, and local programs involving participation by business and labor in policymaking, planning, and action.

Dr. Weidenbaum has suggested some lines along which such programs might be developed.

TAX REBATE SUGGESTED

The Federal Government might award defense contractors nondefense research and development contracts. It might establish new requirements for nondefense systems so that the large defense contractors' sophisticated technology could be employed in them.

The Defense Department might treat commercial product planning or the development of a commercial marketing capability as allowable costs on military contracts. Retraining of employees might also be made an allowable cost.

To help nondefense industries that lag in research and development work, the Government might arrange the transfer of research resources from defense companies to these industries.

A tax rebate might be given for commercial research and development by defense contractors. This would be similar to the recently enacted tax credit for investment in production equipment.

Joint industry-Government financing of certain types of commercial research and development might be arranged, along the lines of the Interior Department's mineral exploration program. Under this, the Government pays up to half the cost of exploration and is reimbursed out of the proceeds.

Other possibilities are long-term loans and loan guarantees for certain types of commercial research and development, comparable to existing housing, small business and similar programs; leasing of Government-owned plant and equipment on favorable terms for work in behalf of industries with little engineering activity, and technical assistance on civilian applications of military research.

Michael Michaelis of the engineering concern, Arthur D. Little, Inc., one of the economists who have been studying the problem, says that the defense industry's development of the capability of creating highly advanced systems "has endowed us, as a Nation, with new military powers, and with a sense of power."

"To apply this capability to our civilian economy," he believes, "requires a deliberate and conscious national and corporate effort."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 13, 1964]

DEFENSE-SPACE BUSINESS

Following is a table summarizing research by Dr. Murray L. Weidenbaum of Stanford Research Institute estimating the importance of defense-space business to 34 large contractors. Partly because of the nature of the business, involving classified programs, the estimates are approximate. Defense-space orders may exceed company sales when payment is negotiated later, after delivery, and the amount does not appear in the year's sales figure. In some cases the ratio of defense-space orders to total sales may not be an accurate indicator of arms program involvement because, for example, military orders may be filled from civilian production.

Importance of defense-space orders to 35 major contractors, fiscal year 1962

Company	Defense contracts (1)	NASA contracts (2)	Total (1)+(2) (3)	Company sales [1] (4)	Ratio of defense-space orders to total sales (3)÷(4) (5)
	Millions	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Percent*
75 to 100 percent:					
Republic Aviation	$332.8	$6.9	$339.7	$295.8	100.00
McDonnell Aircraft	310.9	68.5	379.4	390.7	97.11
Grumman Aircraft Engineering	303.6	24.6	328.2	357.1	91.91
Lockheed Aircraft	1,419.5	5.0	1,424.5	1,753.1	81.27
Avco	323.3	1.4	324.7	414.3	78.37
North American Aviation	1,032.5	199.1	1,231.6	1,633.7	75.39
Hughes Aircraft	234.2	9.2	243.4	[2]	[3]
50 to 74 percent:					
Collins Radio	150.1	3.7	153.8	207.8	74.01
Thiokol Chemcial	178.3	.8	179.1	255.8	70.02
Raytheon	406.6	----------	406.6	580.7	70.02
Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock	185.0	----------	185.0	267.3	69.21
Martin Marietta	802.7	1.8	804.5	1,195.3	67.31
Boeing	1,132.8	15.6	1,148.4	1,768.5	64.94
General Dynamics	1,196.6	27.9	1,224.5	1,898.4	64.50
Curtiss-Wright	144.6	----------	144.6	228.7	63.23
United Aircraft	662.7	34.1	696.8	1,162.1	59.96
Douglas Aircraft	365.6	68.4	434.0	749.9	57.87
25 to 49 percent:					
American Machine & Foundry	187.3	----------	187.3	415.4	45.09
General Tire & Rubber	366.1	66.4	432.5	959.8	45.06
Northrop	152.5	1.3	153.8	347.5	44.26
Hercules Powder	181.6	----------	181.6	454.8	39.93
Sperry Rand	465.6	2.2	467.8	1,182.6	39.56
Bendix	285.9	19.4	305.3	788.1	38.74
FMC	160.4	----------	160.4	506.5	31.67
Pan American World Airways	146.7	----------	146.7	503.9	29.11
0 to 24 percent:					
International Telephone & Telegraph	243.6	2.2	245.8	995.5	24.69
General Electric	975.9	23.0	998.9	4,792.7	20.84
Radio Corp. of America	339.6	20.2	359.8	1,742.7	20.65
Westinghouse Electric	246.0	3.4	249.4	1,954.5	12.76
International Business Machines	155.5	12.6	168.1	1,925.2	8.73
American Telephone & Telegraph	467.7	10.8	478.5	11,742.4	4.07
Ford Motor	269.1	----------	269.1	8,089.6	3.33
General Motors	449.0	1.4	450.4	14,640.2	3.08
Standard Oil (New Jersey)	180.1	----------	180.1	9,537.3	1.89

[1] Net sales for fiscal year ending during 1962.
[2] Not available.
[3] Estimated from other sources to be in excess of 75 percent.

NOTE.—In some cases, it appears that the ratio of defense-space orders to total sales in fiscal year 1962 is not an accurate indicator of the actual ratio of military-space sales to total sales.

Source: M. L. Weidenbaum, Stanford Research Institute.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the cutback in the rate of arms spending, which until recently was widely thought to depend on the rather remote possibility of a firm disarmament agreement with the Soviet Union, has already taken place in the absence of any enforceable disarmament agreement.

Representative CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, explained this development to the House of Representatives earlier this year during presentation of the scaled-down Defense budget for next year. Mr. VINSON said:

> We are reaching a point in several areas, principally missiles, where we are coming up pretty close to our total needs. And we simply do not need to buy as many of the items as we did before.

Mr. President, I think that Representative VINSON has made a point that has not been fully appreciated, that in the absence of any kind of formal agreement on disarmament, we can anticipate substantial reductions in military spending for the simple reason that we have met all of our reasonable needs in a good many areas of the defense budget.

There comes a point after awhile when one can pile missiles no higher, when one can find no room for any more nuclear weapons systems. When that time comes, there will also come the recognition that we must reduce our allocation of the defense budget, even in the absence of any kind of agreement on disarmament.

Mr. President (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair), on August 2 of last year, I suggested in a speech in this Chamber that, as far as strategic nuclear weapons are concerned, we had a stockpile sufficient to destroy the Soviet Union several times over. President Kennedy made the statement as early as June 12 of last year, prior to the test ban treaty debate, that both the Soviet Union and the United States could destroy the world several times over.

I questioned the need for the continuance of the present rate of defense expenditure. I said to the Senate at that time:

> I think we need to take another careful look at our enormous arms budget, asking ourselves: What part of this budget represents additions to an already surplus overkill capacity? What alternative uses can be made of surplus military funds for strengthening the economic and political foundations of our society?

Since then, defense expenditures have been significantly reduced, primarily in the area of strategic weapons systems. President Johnson's proposed budget for fiscal year 1965 contains $1 billion less for the Department of Defense, and $3 billion less in new obligational authority for our military program.

Writing in the April issue of Foreign Affairs, former Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric, raised the possibility of a 25-percent cut in defense spending by the end of this decade. That would figure out to approximately $12½ to $13 billion, a 25-percent proportion of our present military budget expenditure.

What would such a cutback mean to our defense-dependent communities? At my request, the Department of Defense prepared a list of major military procurement programs not funded beyond fiscal year 1963, and those that will not be funded beyond fiscal year 1964, together with the affected major suppliers and their location. I ask unanimous consent to have this list printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MAJOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS NOT FUNDED AFTER FISCAL YEAR 1963 [1]

F–105 aircraft, major suppliers: Republic Aviation Corp., Farmingdale, N.Y.; United Aircraft Corp. (Pratt & Whitney Division), East Hartford, Conn.; Collins Radio Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa; North American Aviation, Inc. (Autonetics Division), Downey, Calif.; General Electric Co., Burlington, Vt.; General Electric Co., Johnson City, N.Y.; Laboratory for Electronics, Boston, Mass.

Falcon (GAR 2B/11) missiles, major suppliers: Hughes Aircraft Co., Tucson, Ariz.; Thiokol Chemical Corp., Elkton, Md.; the Eagle-Picher Co., Joplin, Mo.

Dyna-Soar (R. & D.), major suppliers; the Boeing Co. (Aerospace Division), Seattle, Wash.; RCA, Camden, N.J.; Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., St. Petersburg, Fla.

OH–13/23 helicopter, major suppliers: Hiller Aircraft Corp., Palo Alto, Calif.; Bell Helicopter Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Indiana Gear Works, Indianapolis, Ind., Parsons Corp., Traverse City, Mich.; United Aircraft Corp. (Ham-Stand Division), Windsor Locks, Conn.

OV–1 aircraft, major suppliers: Grumman Aircraft & Engineering Co., Bethpage, L.I., N.Y.; Bendix Corp., Eatontown, N.J.; Chandler Evans Corp., West Hartford, Conn.; Collins Radio Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Motorola, Inc., Scottsdale, Ariz.; Ryan Aeronautical Co. (Electronics Division), San Diego, Calif.; Sperry Rand Corp., Phoenix, Ariz.; United Aircraft Corp. (Haminton Standard Division), Windsor Locks, Conn.

A4E aircraft, major suppliers: Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc., Long Beach, Calif.; United Aircraft Corp. (Pratt & Whitney Division), East Hartford, Conn.; Bendix Corp., Teterboro, N.J.; Lear-Siegler, Inc., Grand Rapids, Mich.; Ryan Aeronautical Co. (Electronics Division), San Diego, Calif.; AiResearch Corp. (Garrett), Phoenix, Ariz.; Melpar, Inc., Falls Church, Va.; Kollsman Instrument, Elmhurst, L.I., N.Y.; United Aircraft (Ham-Stand), Windsor Locks, Conn.; Genisco, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.

RA–5C aircraft, major suppliers: North American, Columbus, Ohio; Solar Aircraft, San Diego, Calif.; Collins Radio Corp., Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Bendix Corp., South Bend, Ind.; North American (Autonetics Division), Downey, Calif.; General Dynamics (Electronics Division), San Diego, Calif.; Garrett Corp. (AiResearch Division), Los Angeles, Calif.; General Electric Co., West Lynn, Mass.; General Precision, Inc. (Kearfott Division), Little Falls, N.J.; Westinghouse Electric Corp., Glen Burnie, Md.

KC/RC–135 aircraft, major suppliers: The Boeing Co. (Transport Division), Renton,

[1] Maintenance and modification programs may continue to be funded after fiscal year 1963.

Wash.; United Aircraft Corp. (Pratt & Whitney Division), East Hartford, Conn.; Northrop Corp. (Norair Division), Hawthorne, Calif.; Rohr Aircraft Corp., Riverside, Calif.; Ryan Aeronautical Co., San Diego, Calif; Twin Industries, Inc., Buffalo, N.Y.

Hawk missile, major suppliers: Raytheon Co., Lexington and Andover, Mass.; Raytheon Co., Bristol, Tenn.; Aerojet-General Corp., Sacramento, Calif.; Intercontinental Manufacturing Co., Garland, Tex.; Northrop Corp. (Nortronics Division), Anaheim, Calif.; RCA, Camden, N.J.; Bendix Corp., Teterboro, N.J.; Goodyear Aircraft, Inc.; Akron, Ohio; FMC Corp., San Jose, Calif.

Nike-Hercules missile, major suppliers: Western Electric Co., New York and North Carolina; Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc., Charlotte, N.C.; Intercontinental Manufacturing Co., Garland, Tex.; Thiokol Chemical Corp.; Marshall, Tex.; Hercules Powder Co., Radford, Va.; General Electric Co., Syracuse, N.Y.; Continental Can Co., Inc., Chicago, Ill.; Aerojet-General Corp., Azusa, Calif.; Elgin National Watch Co., Lincoln, Nebr.; FMC Corp., Lakeland, Fla.; Consolidated Welding & Engineering Co., Chicago, Ill.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the impact of these cutbacks is already being felt in many parts of the Nation. Prof. Seymour Melman of Columbia University has prepared a list of recent and pending layoffs in 19 major defense firms in six States. I ask unanimous consent to have this list printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Recent and pending layoffs in 19 major defense firms

(NOTE.—These data were assembled from managements, trade unions, and employees of the firms.)

New York metropolitan region:	
Arma Division:	
1963 to date layoff of production workers	690
1963 to date layoff of engineers and technicians	825
1963 to date layoff of clerical and administrative workers	200
Sperry Gyroscope:	
1963 to date layoff of production workers	1,000
1963 to date layoff of engineers and technicians	550
1963 to date layoff of clerical and administrative workers	200
Reeves Instrument	360
Republic Aviation:	
1963 to date layoff of workers	3,700
Scheduled layoff (few engineers involved)	6,000
Ford Instrument: 1963 to date layoff of production workers	430
New Jersey:	
RCA (Camden and Morristown):	
1963 to date layoff of production and maintenance	3,700
1963 to date layoff of engineers	800
1963 to date layoff of technicians	450
ITT:	
1963 to date layoff of production and maintenance	300
1963 to date layoff of engineers and technicians	280
1963 to date layoff of salaried employees	220
Bendix Aviation (Teterborough)	500
Bendix Aviation (Red Bank):	
1963 to date layoff of production and maintenance	400
1963 to date layoff of white-collar workers	400
Bendix Aviation (Homedale): 1963 to date layoff	100

Recent and pending layoffs in 19 major defense firms—Continued

New Jersey—Continued	
Curtiss-Wright (Teterborough):	
1963 to date layoff of production and maintenance	2,000
1963 to date layoff of salaried personnel	400
ITT (data and information systems): 1963 to date layoff (mostly professional staff)	500
General Precision:	
1963 to date layoff of engineers	60
1963 to date layoff of production workers	170
Impending layoff of production workers	180
Massachusetts:	
Avco (Lawrence, Lowell, and Wilmington): 1963 to date layoff of engineers and scientists (projected layoff now pending 2,500)	270
Mitre: 1964 layoff	150
Raytheon: 1963 to date layoff	8,000
California:	
Aerojet (Sacramento):	
1963 to date layoff	2,000
Pending layoff	3,000
Aerojet (Azusa):	
1963 to date layoff	800
Pending layoff	1,200
Douglas (projected layoff now pending 3,750)	------
Lockheed:	
1963 to date layoff of engineers and scientists	1,100
Pending layoff (not including 700 to be transferred to Sunnyvale)	1,500
Systems Development Corp.: pending layoff	1,000
Colorado: Martin (Denver): As of Mar. 8 layoff of employees	2,800
Washington: Boeing: 1963 to date layoff of employees (continued reduction in employment through 1964)	14,600
Total	67,085

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in addition to the mounting problems in areas losing defense contracts, many communities partly or heavily dependent on a nearby military installation face the loss of that installation in the near future.

At a recent briefing that was unclassified, Secretary McNamara reminded Senators that no community should regard any military installation as anything other than a temporary installation. I believe that if Senators would stop to reflect on that statement, they can reach no other conclusion. Many of the shutdowns have already been announced. Inevitably, more will follow in the very near future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of military installations scheduled to be closed in fiscal year 1964 or in the first half of fiscal year 1965.

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

MILITARY INSTALLATIONS WITH ANNOUNCED CLOSING DATES IN FISCAL YEAR 1964, OR IN THE FIRST HALF OF FISCAL YEAR 1965

ALABAMA

Theodore Army Terminal, Mobile, June 30, 1964.

ARIZONA

Radar site, Winslow, August 30, 1963.
Radar site, Yuma, August 30, 1963.

ARKANSAS

Radar site, Walnut Ridge, August 30, 1963.

CALIFORNIA

Air Force Plant No. 16, Downey, October 26, 1963.
Air Force Plant No. 76, Bakersfield, March 30, 1964.
SAGE Center, Marysville, August 30, 1963.
Benicia Arsenal, Benicia, August 30, 1963.
Fort Mason piers, San Diego, July 12, 1963.
Mira Loma Air Force Station, Ontario, December 31, 1964.
Marine Corps supply forwarding annex, San Francisco, July 1, 1964.
Naval Air Station, Oakland, July 1, 1963.
Naval repair facility, San Diego, December 21, 1964.
Naval Oceanographic Office, San Francisco, January 31, 1964.
Nike site 33, San Francisco, June 30, 1964.
Pasadena Area Support Facility, Pasadena, December 31, 1964.
Overseas Supply Agency, San Francisco, July 1, 1964.
Santa Rosa Island A.C. & W., Station, Santa Barbara, July 1, 1963.

CONNECTICUT

New London dock, New London, November 7, 1963.
Nike site HA–25, Hartford, September 9, 1963.

FLORIDA

Fort Village Lanham Housing, Key West, August 30, 1963.

GEORGIA

Naval Forms and Publications Supply Office, Bryon, September 30, 1964.

ILLINOIS

Nike site C–44, Chicago, September 23, 1963.
Nike site C–54, Chicago, August 1, 1963.
Naval Oceanographic Office, Chicago, October 31, 1963.

INDIANA

Air Force Plant 30, Indianapolis, September 30, 1964.

IOWA

Ottumwa Tracking Station, Ottumwa, March 31, 1964.

KENTUCKY

Camp Breckenridge, Union County, June 30, 1964.
Louisville Army Depot, Louisville, July 1, 1963.

LOUISIANA

Camp Leroy Johnson, New Orleans, June 30, 1964.
England Air Force Base radar site, Baton Rouge, August 30, 1963.
Gap filler site, Lake Charles, August 30, 1963.
Gap filler site, Weeks Island, August 30, 1963.
Overseas Supply Agency, New Orleans, July 1, 1964.
Naval Oceanographic Office, New Orleans, January 31, 1964.

MAINE

Deblois Weapons Range, Columbia Falls, April 30, 1964.

MARYLAND

Naval Oceanographic Office, Baltimore, January 31, 1964.
Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant, (DOD 148) Strawberry Point, October 31, 1963.

MASSACHUSETTS

"E" Street Annex, Boston, June 30, 1964.
Mifflin Estate, Nahant, January 3, 1964.
Naval Oceanographic Office, Boston, October 31, 1964.
Nike site B–38, July 1, 1963.

MICHIGAN

Camp Lucas, Sault Ste. Marie, June 30, 1964.

SAGE Direction Center, Sault Ste. Marie, December 31, 1963.
Nike site D–17, Algonac, December 3, 1963.
Nike site D–54–55, Detroit, August 1, 1963.
Nike site D–86, Franklin, November 1, 1963.

MINNESOTA

Radar site, Grand Rapids, January 7, 1964.

MISSOURI

Fort Crowder, Neosho, June 30, 1964.
St. Louis Ordnance Plant, St. Louis, June 30, 1964.

NEVADA

Lanham Act housing site, Hawthorne, December 1, 1963.

NEW JERSEY

Camp Kilmer, Edison, June 30, 1964.
Nike Site PH–32, Burlington, July 5, 1963.

NEW MEXICO

Radar site, Las Cruces, August 30, 1963.
Radar site, Roswell, August 30, 1963.

NEW YORK

Army Building, 39 Whitehall Street, New York, June 30, 1964.
SAGE Direction Center, Syracuse, August 30, 1963.
Mitchel Field Sewage Facilities, New York, April 30, 1963.
Naval Oceanographic Office, New York, January 31, 1964.
Building No. 2, Jay Street Annex, Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, July 1, 1964.
Niagara Falls Chemical Plant, Niagara Falls, October 10, 1963.
Nike site NY–23, Nassau County, September 12, 1963.
Overseas Supply Agency, Brooklyn, July 1, 1964.

NORTH CAROLINA

Naval Air Facility Weeksville, Elizabeth City, December 31, 1964.
Radar site, Cherry Point, August 30, 1963.

NORTH DAKOTA

SAGE Direction Center, Grand Forks, December 31, 1963.
SAGE Direction Center, Minot, August 30, 1963.

OHIO

Brookfield Air Force Station, Brookfield, November 1, 1963.
Lordstown Military Reservation, Lordstown, September 15, 1963.
Naval Reserve Training Center, Cleveland, August 1, 1963.
Rossford Ordnance Depot, Toledo, July 1, 1963.

OKLAHOMA

The 32d Air Division, Oklahoma City, December 31, 1963.

OREGON

Naval Air Landing Field, Tilamook, July 31, 1963.

PENNSYLVANIA

Lukens Steel Plant, DOD 337, Coatesville, December 15, 1963.
Naval Home wharf, Philadelphia, March 31, 1964.
Naval Reserve Training Center, Erie, October 22, 1963.
Naval Reserve Training Center, Harrisburg, June 1, 1964.

RHODE ISLAND

Nike site PR–69, Providence (Coventry), September 9, 1963.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Nike site E–01, E–20, E–40, E–70, Ellsworth, September 12, 1963.

TEXAS

Camp Gary, San Marcos, December 31, 1964.
Radar site, Eagle Pass, August 30, 1963.
Gap filler site, Carrizo Springs, August 30, 1963.
Gap filler site, Comstock, August 30, 1963.
Gap filler site, Delmita, August 30, 1963.
Gap filler site, El Paso, August 30, 1963.
Gap filler site, Palacios, August 30, 1963.
Gap filler site, Laredo, August 30, 1963.
Gap filler site, McCamey, August 30, 1963.
Gap filler site, Riviera, August 30, 1963.
Naval Oceanographic Office, Galveston, October 31, 1963.
Panatex Ordnance Plant, Amarillo, December 6, 1963.
Radar site, Pyote, August 30, 1963.
Radar site, Ozona, August 30, 1963.
Radar site, Rockport, August 30, 1963.

VERMONT

Radar site, Lyndonville, August 30, 1963.

WASHINGTON

Radar site, Fort Lawton, Seattle, August 30, 1963.
Ammunition Storage Annex, Spokane, October 10, 1963.
Sage Direction Center, Spokane, September 30, 1963.
Mount Rainier Ordnance Depot, Tacoma, July 1, 1963.
Naval Oceanographic Office, Seattle, October 31, 1963.
ADC Unit, Spokane, September 30, 1963.
Naval Harbor Defense Unit, Port Townsend, January 16, 1964.

ALASKA

Radar site, Bethel, October 31, 1963.
Radar site, Middleton Island, October 31, 1963.
Radar site, Ohlston Mountain, October 31, 1963.
Eight DEW line sites, April 30, 1964.

HAWAII

Bombing Range, Bonham Air Force Base, March 31, 1964.
Fort Ruger Theater Parcel, June 30, 1964.
Sand Island Harbor Control Post, April 30, 1964.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, we tend to discuss the conversion problem as though it were far off in the future.

The New York Times made an excellent survey last summer of 25 of the largest military contractors in the country. They found that a high percentage of those companies had done little or no thinking, little or no planning, for the time when defense contracts may be reduced, canceled, or will have expired.

It is true that certain private industries that are under contract to the Federal Government have done considerable thinking and planning in this field, but they are the exception rather than the rule. We tend to think about this as a problem that is far off in the future, when the fact is that the problem is on top of us now. It is a very real problem to a great many people in various parts of the Nation.

The facts and figures I have just placed in the RECORD—and I hope they will be studied, because they show that arms reduction is a challenge to us—urgently call for a solution.

I have asked for hearings to be held on my conversion bill, and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has promised them at the earliest opportunity.

We all know something about the legislative situation before the Senate at the present time which makes it difficult for us to open up hearings on a new subject of this kind right now; but I urge all Senators to consider this proposed legislation carefully, and to investigate the situation within their own States.

I should like to say a word about the relationship of my proposed legislation to the President's Committee which has been created by Executive action. I personally welcomed the creation of the President's Committee as an indication of the concern of the White House with this problem, and the determination of the President to meet the situation before it has a major impact on our economy. At the same time, I believe that the Congress should demonstrate its own interest in protecting those communities affected by defense cutbacks. There is no need for a multiplicity of Government agencies in this area. There is need for a single capable agency, adequately staffed and financed, with a well-defined responsibility for planning the conversion of plants and communities from a defense economy to a civilian economy. I should expect that the Commission created by S. 2274 would either supplant the President's Committee, or would upgrade that Committee and turn it into a conversion commission with legislative authority and appropriated funds. In either event, the passage of S. 2274 would give us an agency adequate to the task and charged with reporting back to Congress within a year with specific plans for dealing with the plans to which I have referred. The bill would also bring the talents and resources of local and State governments—and defense contractors—to bear on the problem of conversion.

Mr. President, I hope that with the renewed interest in the problem generated by the President's recently announced cutbacks in uranium production, together with more awareness on the part of Congress and the public, we can take swift action to prevent serious economic difficulties from following in the wake of what should be a hopeful opportunity for our country; that is, the reduction of the arms burden.

We have reached the point in our development where it is possible to relieve ourselves of a portion of the heavy burden of armaments and to do so with no loss whatsoever to our military strength. We must not let this long-sought opportunity bring economic misery to many of our people and many areas of our Nation.

With the proper planning, the economic risks of defense cutbacks can be overcome. We can no more shirk our responsibility to protect the people and the communities who built our defenses than we can neglect our responsibility to maintain our national strength.

Mr. President, in an editorial in yesterday's Washington Post, the importance of planning for conversion was underscored.

Only intelligent forward planning will prevent the blessing of disarmament from being transformed to an economic nightmare—

The Post said. We must heed that warning before events overtake us.

I ask unanimous consent that the Post editorial, which I inserted in the RECORD yesterday, be again printed at this point of my remarks, in order to preserve the continuity of my statement.

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

SWORDS INTO PLOWSHARES

President Johnson's decision to curtail sharply the production of uranium and plutonium and the announcement by the Russians that they will move in the same direction are most welcome contributions to the relaxation of world tensions. But as the threat of nuclear annihilation recedes, new economic problems are created. And while they do not pose issue of life and death, their solution, which falls well within the boundaries of our knowledge and experience, is essential to a healthy American economy.

Although national defense absorbs nearly 10 percent of our gross national product, there is scandalously little knowledge about how many jobs are involved or exactly how changes in the level and composition of defense expenditures affects the level of employment. But when individual programs are "phased out" or when the overall level of defense expenditures declines, unemployment rises sharply in areas where defense production activities are concentrated.

There is no accurate measure of the number of persons idled by defense cutbacks or the number likely to lose their jobs when defense expenditures decline $1.3 billion in fiscal 1965. But it is obvious that the problem will grow more acute as the possibilities of a genuine detente are enhanced. Former Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell L. Gilpatric writes in the April issue of Foreign Affairs that a further improvement of relations with the Soviet Union could lead to the elimination of strategic bombers and a 25-percent reduction in the defense budget by 1970.

In the event of a sharp reduction of defense outlays, a way should be found for the orderly conversion of defense industries to civilian use. A massive conversion was easily effected after the Second World War, but the path was then cleared, as it would not be now, by a huge backlog of unsatisfied consumers' demands and an equally huge pool of liquid savings.

Without the pressure of consumer demand, there are no obvious or simple formulas for converting the military airframe industry or firms engaged in producing electronic equipment. The affected companies, many of whose managements have grown lethargic as a result of dealing with one sure customer, must find civilian products and open civilian product markets.

Last December President Johnson appointed a Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament. But that body has no staff, no budget, and, as yet, precious little information about the dimensions of a problem which is likely to grow more acute. An organizational framework is required, and it would be most swiftly provided by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN'S bill (S. 2274) to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission. Only intelligent forward planning will prevent the blessing of disarmament from being transformed to an economic nightmare.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I wish to make one further general observation about the subject I have discussed; namely, the prospect of further reductions in arms spending, by expressing my own faith in the capacity of the American people and the American economy to absorb these reductions while our economy continues to move forward.

There is a wide range of unmet public and private needs to which we might devote new resources and manpower when they are found to be in excess of our defense needs.

The Senator from Connecticut, who was in the Chamber a moment ago, is now holding hearings on the problem of the pollution of air and the pollution of water, subjects which are of great interest to many of our citizens. They are problems which we ought to tackle with at least as much urgency as we have brought to bear on military programs.

There is also the problem of modernizing our railroad industry. We are all happy about the settlement of the threatened strike last night. However, this is only the beginning of many steps that should be taken to bring about a healthier and more wholesome railroad industry.

There is also the problem of mass transportation in the cities. That has been neglected. There are also the problems of weather control and weather modification.

There are unmet needs in the field of education and in the field of health, as well as in the field of urban and rural development. There are many areas to which we could turn our attention and our resources and some of our manpower once they become excess to our needs in the field of military defense.

Mr. President, if we seize these opportunities in the private sector and in the public sector, we shall find that any reduction in arms spending can open the way for new and hopeful opportunities for the American people.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KEATING obtained the floor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Delaware without losing my right to the floor.

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

FORGERIES ON TAX RETURNS IN ROBERT BAKER CASE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in March of this year Mr. Hauft, an accountant, made the charge that his name as it appeared on Mr. Baker's individual and partnership tax returns for 1961 was a forgery.

This information was submitted to the Internal Revenue Service. I have received a letter from the Internal Revenue Service dated April 23, 1964, in which the Commissioner of Internal Revenue confirms this charge. I quote:

> It has been established that Mr. Baker signed Mr. Hauft's name as the preparer of both the 1961 individual and partnership returns. This fact will be further considered as it relates to Mr. Baker's tax affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter dated April 23, 1964, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, D.C., April 23, 1964.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further reference to your letter of March 19, 1964, requesting information concerning the income tax affairs of Robert G. Baker. We advised you in our letter of March 26 that an investigation was underway by our Inspection Service of the allegation that tax returns may have ben substituted in the files of the Internal Revenue Service.

The investigation of this matter has now been completed. No evidence was found to substantiate the allegation that the Baker returns had been substituted in the Service's files. The investigation conducted by our Inspection Service, which included analysis of the questioned documents by the Federal Bureau of Investigation laboratory, shows that the returns are those originally received and processed.

It has also been established that Mr. Baker signed Mr. Hauft's name as the preparer of both the 1961 individual and partnership returns. This fact will be further considered as it relates to Mr. Baker's tax affairs.

I have forwarded a letter to Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, giving the full details of the investigation.

In addition to the return filing information given you in our letter of March 26, we can also advise you that income tax returns were filed by Robert G. and Dorothy C. Baker for the years 1953 through 1956. The returns for 1955 and 1956 were timely filed. The returns for the years 1953 and 1954 have been destroyed under the Service's destruction program, approved by the Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. Accordingly, we are unable to say with any certainly when the returns were submitted. However, there is nothing in our records to indicate these returns were not filed timely.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

MORTIMER M. CAPLIN,
Commissioner.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the letter further points out that these forgeries took place prior to the time the returns were filed. It is significant that the Commissioner specifically charges that Mr. Baker himself was the one who had forged Mr. Hauft's name as the preparer of the returns.

As evidence that forging the name of an accountant on a tax return is a violation of the law, I read a letter dated March 25, 1964, addressed to me and signed by Mr. Colin F. Stam, chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. It reads as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION,
Washington, March 25, 1964.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in response to your inquiry regarding the penalty provisions applicable in a situation where a tax return has been filed with a forged signature of a preparer of the return.

Under the Internal Revenue Code, such an offense may be prosecuted under section 7206(1) or under section 7207. Section 7206(1) provides:

"Any person who—

"(1) Declaration under penalties of perjury.—Willfully makes and subscribes any return, statement, or other document, which contains or is verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, and which he does not believe to be true and correct as to every material matter; or".

* * * * *

"shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both, together with the costs of prosecution."

Section 7207 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to fraudulent returns, statements, or other documents provides:

"Any person who willfully delivers or discloses to the Secretary or his delegate any list, return, account, statement, or other document, known by him to be fraudulent or to be false as to any material matter, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both. Any person required pursuant to section 6047 (b) or (c) to furnish any information to the Secretary or any other person who willfully furnishes to the Secretary or such other person any information known by him to be fraudulent or to be false as to any material matter shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

Such an offense may also be prosecuted under section 1001 of the Criminal Code of the United States (title 18, United States Code), which provides:

"SEC. 1001. STATEMENTS OR ENTRIES GENERALLY.—Whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact, or makes any false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or representations, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or entry, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

Sincerely yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

Mr. President, this letter clearly outlines the penalties for any person who forges the name of the preparer of a tax return.

I respectfully suggest that this is one instance in which the Department of Justice can begin taking action.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

FORGED CIVIL RIGHTS PETITIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, from time to time, during the debate on the pending measure, I have commented on the extent and contents of mail I have received on the subject from the State of New York. During the last 2 weeks however, a pattern seems to be developing in connection with printed petitions against the civil rights bill, which may be of interest to my colleagues.

About a month ago, I began to receive a number of single sheet petitions condemning the bill and urging me to vote against it. The petitions are printed on a sheet a little larger than a letter size paper. About one-third of the face of the petition contains printed matter stating that the bill would interfere with the right of homeowners to sell and lease their property; that if the bill were passed the Federal Government would supervise schools and homes and interfere with the personal liberties of individuals. Perhaps the most puzzling statement is the one alleging that the bill would bring about Federal control of an individual's right to build and occupy his home.

These charges, of course, are complete distortions of the actual contents of the bill. While the statement contains no mention of the source of these misrepresentations, or, for that matter, the source of funds which were used to have the petition printed and distributed, the allegations are of the character which appear so often in the publications of the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms. Only this month, the Mississippi State Senate appropriated an additional $50,000 for the use of this organization, so we know that they do have sufficient funds available for such a project.

As the signed petitions continued to come in, I marveled at the number of people who had been misled into believing these distortions. Each signer promptly received a letter from me explaining that the charges made in the petition were untrue and that I fully intended to support the bill. Then the return letters started to come in. Not all of the return letters, of course, were as I shall outline, but some of them, in all fairness, it should be said, expressed regret that they had been misinformed and were glad to receive my letter setting them straight. However, most of them did not reply to my letter, nor was any reply required.

The first letter I received was from a Roman Catholic clergyman, an official of the Brooklyn diocese. He said:

It is important to me to advise you that I have not communicated with you at any time regarding civil rights legislation. * * * For a long time, it has seemed to me that dishonesty might occur in the matter of representations made to our lawmakers. It is most distressing to find that such is the case and that my name has been used.

Since then, I have received a number of other letters from constituents who have expressed both surprise and indignation that their signatures have been forged. A man in Elmhurst wrote:

I am in favor of civil rights and whatever communication you received bearing my name was unauthorized.

Another simply sent my letter back with his own note:

I never sent you a message. I approve of civil rights legislation.

A father in Forest Hills stated:

I have not and will not sign any petition against civil rights. Further, I have never given permission to anyone to use my name, or my 11-year-old daughter's name—

Which, by the way, also appeared on the petition.

I have spoken on this subject this afternoon in order to advise the Senate to beware. Someone is using anti-civil-rights money to buy telephone books and mailing lists, and many of those earnest protests may represent only the wishes of those who would defeat the bill.

SPEECH OF JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER 3D, AT SPELMAN COLLEGE, ATLANTA, GA.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in a speech dedicating a new Fine Arts Building at Spelman College, Atlanta, Ga., on April 12, John D. Rockefeller 3d, noted that progress is being made in the vital areas of overcoming barriers, creating job opportunities, and providing educational and training programs that will allow the Negro and other minority Americans to achieve their full potential.

Mr. Rockefeller maintained that this progress creates responsibility for all concerned. Each American, he said, has the responsibility of practicing those precepts which will give equal opportunity to all Americans; the young Negro in turn has the responsibility of taking full advantage of his opportunities.

With great insight, Mr. Rockefeller said that the outcome of the civil rights struggle is crucial to the future of our country. "In its successful resolution there is, for each of us," he said, "an important role to play." Each of us in the Senate has his role to play and each knows full well what that role should be.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Rockefeller's speech be printed in full in the RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, often the argument is made by opponents of the civil rights bill, as it has been to all civil rights proposals in the past, that what is sought to be achieved by these measures—racial justice—cannot be obtained by law, but only by changes in human hearts. The answer is clear enough: no one contends that law is the simple, all-sufficing answer, but it is the basic, necessary first step in the direction of justice, which must be aided by wise and firm enforcement and continuous efforts at human communication and understanding.

The recent address delivered by Mr. John D. Rockefeller 3d, to which my colleague has referred, most eloquently stressed these fundamental points. I am most pleased to join my colleague in requesting that the address be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE TEXT OF A TALK BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER 3D AT THE DEDICATION OF THE JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER, JR., FINE ARTS BUILDING, SPELMAN COLLEGE, APRIL 12, 1964

I am very happy to visit Spelman College again. My family has been associated for five generations with the college as well as with the ideals of education that it serves. We are proud of the relationship and we applaud the leadership of President Read and President Manley in establishing Spelman as one of the fine institutions of education in Atlanta, and in the entire South.

Spelman always had a special meaning for my grandfather who spoke here at the ceremonies naming it just 80 years ago yesterday. The college, as you know, is named for my great-grandparents whose home was a station on the underground railroad.

It is gratifying to me that I should have the opportunity to represent my family here today, and to join with you in dedicating this Fine Arts Building to the memory of my father. His interest in Spelman as well as the United Negro College Fund is well known. But especially in our minds today was his interest in the arts to which this building is dedicated. It is most fitting that it bear his name, for art and beauty were meaningful factors in his life and he attached great importance to the place of the arts in the lives of people generally.

My hope—and I know it would be my father's hope—is that you will use this building as another means of gaining the fuller, richer life which the arts make available to us. I trust that each of you, and the future students of Spelman, will carry the knowledge and appreciation of art and culture gained here back to your families and communities.

I have wondered whether my talk today should be on the importance of the fine arts to your life and mine. But instead I have chosen a subject that is, I believe, even more important. That is the challenge of new opportunities for you and many other young people in schools and colleges across the country.

During the past 2 or 3 years, an exciting and significant social change has transformed the possibilities for the minorities of America. We are at the point of a changing tide where it is crucial that we understand these new opportunities and the responsibilities that go with them. Unless we see this new situation clearly, and act upon it with vigor, we may become lost in an undertow of violence and grief.

How America treats its minorities—and especially its Negro population—is first of all a moral question. Yet we should not ignore the far-reaching economic effects of the current struggle for equal opportunity. We should also be aware that what helps the Negro helps other minorities in all parts of America: The immigrant in New York, the migrant in the Southwest, the miner in Appalachia. And on the world scene, only a totally free America, meeting the ideals, rights, and aspirations of all, regardless of race, can maintain ideological leadership. As President Johnson stated a year ago: "Unless we are willing to yield up our destiny of greatness among the civilizations of history, Americans—white and Negro together—must be about the business of resolving the challenge which confronts us now."

Against this background, I would first like to discuss with you the three interrelated factors that, as I see it, dominate the civil rights question today: Simply expressed, they are barriers, jobs, and education.

II

As to barriers, it is clear that more and more are falling—in housing, employment, government, and education—in virtually every area of our national life. There is broad and growing understanding that, as President Kennedy put it, race has no place in American life or law.

I realize that to many of us the progress seems limited and slow—only the first steps on a long journey. In any event, it is a long-awaited beginning—a beginning that makes inevitable the day when every American will enjoy an equal freedom.

As Roy Wilkins has said, we are seeing "an awakening of the American conscience to the urgency of the civil rights issue." The barriers that remain, stand not only in the South; they stand in the North as well—the problem is not a sectional one, but a national one. It is no longer the Negro's problem; it is the problem of every American.

The Negro protest, militant and determined, is not just a struggle against a wrong. Rather, it is a struggle for a right. Its real roots are in the spirit—and the letter—of our democratic heritage. It seeks not an empty symbol nor a mere emblem of status. It seeks instead what is real and basic to the Negro and to every American: His personal dignity, his education, his job, his home.

The all-important civil rights bill is now being considered in our Senate. The attention of the Nation is focused upon the debate. While we look forward to its early passage, we must remember that the removal of legal barriers is only a first step. The laws are still to be enforced. Then, while they are being enforced and even after, still other barriers stand—these more difficult to break down. These are the hidden barriers. No law, no enforcement, no protest can erase these, for they exist hidden in the minds and hearts of people, of Negroes and whites alike. These are the intensely personal barriers of attitude, of how one man regards another, of how well or how little one man likes another. Subtle, ingrown, tangled, the sum of all our experiences, these hidden barriers cannot be removed, they can only be overcome.

They shall be overcome as whites and Negroes come more and more in contact with one another in their workaday lives, as a person of a color or a background different from ours becomes our neighbor and our coworker. Misunderstandings will be myriad since the wide gulf caused by centuries of enforced separation and indifference will take time to bridge. There will be setbacks, but there will be victories as well, each lowering a hidden barrier, each bringing nearer the day of equal freedom for all.

III

The second factor I would discuss is jobs. Here a dramatic and encouraging development has occurred across the American scene. Jobs for qualified Negroes are opening at a rate that those close to the situation would not have believed possible just a year ago.

Today, if a young man or woman has ability and initiative and is willing to give himself wholeheartedly to his work, he will find in many companies today that there is no position from which he will be barred because of race. Also, in these companies he has opportunity to rise to the higher positions, provided he has the abilities to meet the intensive competition. Such a statement would have been unthinkable only months ago.

Lately, I have discussed job opportunities with the heads of several national corporations. I am greatly impressed and gratified by their approach to this rapidly moving situation. They cited the strides their companies are making in hiring Negroes and moving them along into ever higher positions of responsibility and proficiency. This is not a record of isolated instances, but solid, hopeful evidence of the infusion of the Negro into the mainstream of American business. Yet, there is an irony that must temper optimism: The jobs are opening faster than Negroes can be found or prepared to fill them. Automation is crowding out the unskilled, calling for higher and higher levels of training and education.

At the same time, forces within industry and Government are at work to help disadvantaged minorities take advantage of the opportunities now coming within their reach. Some 150 leading companies are enrolled in the plans for progress under the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity in an imaginative and increasingly successful program to provide training and to open jobs for Negroes. The National Skills Bank, started last year by the Urban League, is helping to match individuals to jobs. In New York, an organization known as Harlem Youth Opportunities is developing a special attack on the problems there, and similar programs are beginning in other cities.

Yet a man must be responsible for his own qualifications. The help of others is often important—especially now—but in the last analysis if a man is to measure up, he must stand on his own two feet. Austin Walden, Atlanta's new judge, put it this way: "I have little concern about the difficulty of breaking down the remaining barriers in the pathway of Negro youth, but I am greatly concerned that youth prepare to take full advantage of the opportunities now opening before them. Henceforth, the young Negro will increasingly have to compete with the youth of the world. It will no longer suffice to be the best Negro. He will have to be the best man, period."

IV

So we have barriers going down and jobs opening up. The young American Negro faces unprecedented opportunities and, at the same time, the unprecedented challenge to prepare himself for them. Thus, we have the third factor in the civil rights struggle: education.

In the American dream, education has always been the watchword, the talisman, the open sesame to opportunity. Education is what our Founding Fathers so revered, what Lincoln gained by firelight, what, throughout our history, the sacrifices of one generation have earned for the next. As the leaders of the civil rights movement recognize, education is the key to the future of the American Negro as it is for all of us.

Yet, many have told me, education is the word that the young Negro of 1964 does not want to hear. He is impatient, they say. Talk of education he equates with further delay. Education to him means back to the books, wait a while—and he does not want to wait.

Every man of conscience will be sympathetic with his impatience. Yet can we speak of the opportunities which are opening and ignore what must be done to bring them within reach? Ralph McGill made this observation: "Because of the long isolation of the Negro from American life, a cultural and educational lag exists which would make it difficult for many Negroes—especially those in the rural South and those who had gone from it, untaught and unskilled to the industrial cities of the East and West—to take advantage of the rights attained."

James B. Conant has noted this cultural isolation in communities all over America. Children from these areas, he points out, are disadvantaged by isolation before their education begins; they are behind from the start, and the lag only lengthens as the pupil advances. The consequences are all too familiar. They appear especially in the adolescent years as increasing thousands of discouraged Negroes drop out of high school. They are young veterans socially crippled from the wounds of poverty and discrimination, caught tragically in the vicious circle of lack of training, lack of job, lack of hope.

That this lag be recognized and eliminated is of central importance to the Negro, to all the minorities of America, and to America itself. Every day it is allowed to exist, our Nation is wasting valuable human resources. Its correction, in the last analysis, is a matter not only of conscience but of commonsense.

It must be a foremost task of our time to equip American education with a catchup capacity that will permit our disadvantaged minorities an equal chance with all Americans to meet their basic needs and to realize their full potential. If this effort is to be really effective we must, as Dr. Conant has suggested, begin at the beginning. We must concentrate a massive effort on the beginning grades including kindergarten.

For leadership in this catchup effort we look to our educators, to the teachers and administrators, and to the citizens on our school boards. With each, we must rely on

his skill, but we must depend, to at least an equal degree, upon his heart, upon how much he truly cares about the welfare of the children.

The importance of "caring" cannot be overemphasized. I will always remember what a friend told me about a visit he made to several South American countries during the thirties. In many humble homes, alongside a revered religious symbol, he often saw a picture of Franklin D. Roosevelt. My friend one day asked a farmer why he gave the picture such a place of honor. The farmer said, "Because President Roosevelt is our friend. Because he cares about us and our problems."

Even as we begin this massive catchup effort within our schools, the urgency of the situation requires other, more immediate steps. I have in mind a proliferation of locally based projects designed to seek out promising disadvantaged boys and girls to give them the extra help they need to be admitted to high schools and colleges. There is a widening awareness of the extent of the problem and the urgency of the steps needed for its solution. Many encouraging beginnings are already underway. For example, universities and colleges such as Dartmouth, Princeton, and Oberlin are involved in such programs, as are Hotchkiss and Loomis Schools on the preparatory level. Still another promising technique to enrich our educational system is the increasing exchange between Negro and non-Negro colleges, the so-called sister-to-sister program, where, for instance, Tuskegee and Michigan are exchanging professors and students in many departments.

More, much more, needs to be done. We must look beyond our school systems if progress is to be rapid enough. Industry, labor, government, foundations, and individual citizens all have a role to play. It is essential that new and increased efforts, by both public and private agencies, be forthcoming. The objective is clear: to equip American society with the capacity to bring the new opportunities within the reach of the disadvantaged.

From this brief review of the current situation in relation to barriers, jobs, and education, it seems clear that important progress is being made—progress in the steady lowering of legal barriers, in the significant increase in job opportunities, in the growing attention to educational needs and training programs.

To me the winds of change coursing across our land carry a message of hope for the young Negro, for all Americans. This progress I see is not founded on a passive wish, but upon the realities of our day, upon the surging evidence of a turning tide.

The thought I would leave with you today is that the tide of progress, which brings us hope, also brings us responsibility. I cannot emphasize too strongly this element of responsibility. Certainly it is a collective responsibility facing our communities, our States and our National Government, but even more important, it is an individual responsibility facing each and every one of us.

As individual citizens in a democracy, our responsibility is direct and personal. In our way of life, change comes not on order from the top but by the accumulated actions of citizens working as individuals or groups across the Nation. These may be the separate actions of a town council, a church board, the president of a company, the mayor of a city, or the governors of a club. They may be the actions of a personnel officer, a union delegate, a restaurant owner, a landlord, or the driver of a bus.

When the citizens of a Nation are alert and progressive, a country moves ahead, when they are not, it moves backward; it cannot stand still. It is easy for citizens in a democracy to brush aside their responsibility on the grounds that the problems are too great or complex, the end results beyond their competence. We must remember, however, that it is what we do as parents, as voters, as workers in civic or social organizations, as holders of public office that will in the last analysis give equal opportunity to all Americans. America, we must remember, is no more than the sum of ourselves.

The individual responsibility which we are discussing applies to you young people with special impact and meaning. It has twofold implications. First, there is the responsibility to equip yourself to take full advantage of the new opportunities opening to you.

By raising your sights and reorienting your thinking, you can look ahead to a future of exciting promise. You can look beyond the older, long-open professions such as teaching. You can see the way clear to new careers in business, science, technology, and the arts, to mention but a few.

Competition will be stiff; you will be severely challenged to meet it. Many say the Negro has an "attitude deficiency"; he lacks competitive spirit, he lacks a sense of personal responsibility. The retort is that he has only lately been allowed to enter the competition, and has never had much to be responsible for. To the disadvantaged, discrimination is both a handicap and an alibi. However, it must be recognized that when the handicap goes, so does the alibi.

Your success in preparing for and meeting these new opportunities will inspire other young people in your community to similar efforts to advance themselves. And I would say to you without reservation that you can also be an example, an inspiration to the youth of all America, both Negro and white. The extent of your own success will depend very considerably upon your motivation, upon your will to win. It will also depend upon recognition that we get out of life only what we put in, and what we put in is determined largely by how well we are prepared.

Second, there is your broader responsibility to your community and to the Nation. You, and many other students like you, have been in the forefront of the Negro protest that is rewriting our laws and changing the economic and political patterns of American life. You have made protest a positive force. Now fast-changing circumstances summon you to progress beyond protest, to capitalize upon what protest has bought, to make safe and secure what is so newly won.

I do not suggest that there is no longer need for protest. I wish this were true, but laws are yet to be enforced, uncounted barriers are still to be removed. The civil rights movement undoubtedly will continue until we achieve the equal freedom that simple dignity demands. I trust, with a fervent faith, that this movement will always be distinguished by forbearance, by nonviolence, and by a deserved respect for wise leadership. The individual actions of you young people and your adherence to responsible leadership will determine to a large extent the ultimate success of the movement, and whether it will escape the tragedy of violence.

There is no question that the outcome of the civil rights struggle is crucial to the future of our country and hence to every American. In its successful resolution there is for each of us, as I have tried to indicate, an important role to play, and for you young people the responsibility is special. Yours must now be the role of the statesman who succeeds the revolutionary, of the settler who comes after the pioneer. There is in history a time for each, and to each posterity owes an equal debt. This is your great challenge * * * this is your great opportunity.

TWO SIDES OF MIDEAST ISSUES: FACT VERSUS FANATICISM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the American people have recently heard charges that our Government is taking a one-sided view of Middle East problems and that we are not fully aware of what is described as "the terrible tragedy of Palestine." We are told that we must reappraise our policies toward the Middle East and make more of an effort to see both sides of the issues.

Mr. President, I wish briefly to explore these charges. What is the terrible tragedy of Palestine—as the Arabs insist upon saying—which has been such a bar to peace in the Middle East? What are both sides of the Arab-Israeli dispute? What are Arab objectives for the future?

When Arab leaders talk of tragedy in Palestine, they are referring first of all to the Arab refugees, living in the Gaza strip and in Jordan. These refugees, so Arab leaders would have us believe, were driven from their homes by heartless Zionists and have lived in poverty and despair ever since. If this Arab view were in fact the true story, one might be more sympathetic to the publicly expressed concern of Arab leaders.

But the facts are quite different. In 1947, the United Nations approved the partition of Palestine. The Israelis, long ready for statehood and independence, accepted the U.N. resolution. The Arab states declared war and attacked the new state of Israel. The Jewish citizens of Israel, with their backs to the sea, stood fast to defend their state. The Arabs in Israel territory turned to their leaders for guidance and received very bad advice. They were told by the ex-Grand Mufti of Jerusalem and his aids to leave their homes to await the anticipated victorious arrival of the Arab armies. They were assured that within weeks they would be back to divide up the spoils of victory.

When the Arab armies were defeated these Palestinian Arabs found themselves homeless, but in Arab territory. If the Arab states had then accepted the reality of Israel's existence, many of the Arab refugees might have returned to their former homes. But, from the beginning, the Arab states refused to negotiate and make peace. Obviously, Israel could not afford to take a fifth column of disloyal and belligerent Arabs. They received shelter instead in U.N. camps along the borders of Israel and almost immediately became pawns in the bitter Arab struggle to dislodge and discredit the new State of Israel.

As individuals, these refugees at once received American sympathy and help in generous measure. Primarily the victims of jealous Arab leaders and their own fright and uncertainty, the refugees were fed and cared for by the U.N., and the United States paid most of the charges.

Now, 16 years later, the situation has changed. First, more than half of the increasing number of refugees are under 15; therefore, they were not by birth Palestinians and have no memory of life in the former British mandate.

Second, for 15 years, the Arab refugees have heard, through the idle days and desert nights, the voice of Arab imperialism and hatred for Israel. They have been told again and again over radio Cairo that Israel must be destroyed. The country that, under different circumstances might have become

their homeland—as it did become the homeland of those Arabs who ignored the Grand Mufti and remained in Israel—instead became the object of their burning hatred.

Third, for political reasons, the Arab nations have chosen to exaggerate the hardship of these people by refusing to resettle them in Arab countries, and by holding out to them the illusion of ultimate return and repatriation in Israel. Although there is ample space in many Arab lands—outside of Egypt—the Arab States have refused to offer their countrymen and coreligionists a home. To Israel and to other nations which have opened their doors to destitute refugees, this heartlessness is difficult to comprehend. Yet the Arab States prefer to use these refugees, men, women, and children, as political pawns and to insist upon their repatriation in Israel rather than to make them welcome in Arab lands.

Mr. President, to my mind that is the greatest tragedy of Palestine, and it is a tragedy that could so easily have been averted had the Arab leaders themselves shown any genuine concern for their unfortunate people who fled from Israel in 1947.

(At this point the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF) resumed the chair.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have discussed and am discussing at length the refugee problem, not because it is the real source of the conflict, but because it is the result. It is the outward symbol, continually cited by the Arabs to explain their intransigence against Israel.

The real issue, as King Hussein stated on "Meet the Press," is the existence of Zionism, that is, the historic and cherished ideal of the Jewish people to achieve a national homeland. I need not dwell upon the origins of Zionism. It was the dream of the Jewish people through centuries of discrimination and persecution. It became a practical goal of revered leaders, like Herzl and Chaim Weizmann. It became an imperative of the international conscience in the aftermath of Hitler's demoniac horrors. In a world of nationalism, it was as logical for Jewish nationalism to achieve its objective as it was for Arab nationalism.

The strength of Israel today is not alone the strength of its fortifications or the number of its soldiers. It is the strength of an idea, the restoration of a people, the renaissance of a civilization. There is no real conflict between Arab nationalism and Jewish nationalism, between the 13 Arab States with their 3 million square miles and Israel with its 8,000 square miles. Yet Arab leaders resent Israel, because an independent Jewish State in the Middle East is in direct opposition to their ambition for a pan-Arab empire extending from Africa to Asia, from the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean.

Now it should be clear that while Arabs talk of a united empire, they face serious practical difficulties in achieving it. There is no such reality as one Arab nation. There are separate Arab States, with the result that leaders are jealous of one another's prerogatives. There are differences of religion, of status, of nationality. They are sharply divided between the rich, oil-possessing states and the have-nots, like Egypt, with the largest population and the least resources. The only thing they seem to have in common is hatred for Israel. Only here can the Arab States seem to find real agreement and unity. Therefore, Arab resentment of Israel and Arab jealousy of Israel's progress have been deliberately exaggerated to promote and serve the shibboleth of Arab unity, until today hardly an Arab in the whole area is untouched by this contamination of hatred. Like Hitler's policies in Europe, Arab revanchism becomes a vicious circle. Israel is a territorial obstacle to the Arab monopoly of the Middle East; hatred of Israel therefore becomes a rallying point for frustrated imperialists; and ultimately, because it is the only point on which all Arabs can rally, hostility to Israel becomes an end in itself.

Any rational observer can see that Israel is no real threat to Egypt or Jordan, or Lebanon or Syria, as Arabs pretend. Israel's water diversion program does not deprive the Arab States of a resource which they were using or maintaining themselves, as has been charged. Israel is not responsible for Nasser's excessive military expenditures which are squandered to prop up a puppet regime in Yemen, as has been charged.

On the contrary, as one reviews closely events in the Mideast today, it is clear that Israel is concentrating its effort on constructive domestic development, while maintaining a defense-oriented military establishment, dictated by the continuing Arab siege.

Yet the Arabs refuse to sit down with the Israelis and settle any one of the specific issues in dispute—the refugee issue, or the boundary question, or the Jordan River diversion. Israel has consistently declared its readiness to take up these issues individually.

King Hussein made the point that the Arab nations do not categorically refuse to sit down with Israel. They only, as he put it, insist that Israel must first implement United Nations resolutions on the Mideast problems, as a precondition to negotiations. We hear that statement again and again.

Manifestly, such a statement is untenable, because it was the Arabs who went to war to nullify these resolutions in the first place. If all the United Nations resolutions had been implemented by both sides, the conflict would never have occurred. Moreover, 16 years have passed since Palestine became Israel. The face of the Middle East is changed, and no settlement can be made on the basis of ancient resolutions that do not reflect today's realities.

It is totally unrealistic for the Arab States to demand repatriation of Arab refugees, when the Arab States will not negotiate a peace settlement. Resettlement in Arab lands, with compensation, is the only realistic possibility for the great majority of the Arab refugees today. Acceptance of the boundaries existing today, with perhaps minor modifications, is also necessary. Use of the precious waters of the Jordan and other Middle East rivers can and should be negotiated with due regard to the rights of all riparian states. The water plan devised by President Eisenhower's emissary, the late Eric Johnston, was acceptable to the engineering experts of both Israel and Jordan. It is still the only logical and sensible plan; and, in truth, it is consistent with the water projects which both Israel and Jordan are now constructing.

The sincere way to negotiate a peace settlement is to sit together and talk, without preconditions. Any leader who would insist upon preconditions to the opening of talks is not honestly trying to resolve the issues between Israel and the Arab States; he is trying to block consideration of them and to make meaningful negotiations impossible.

So when the people of the United States are told that we should look clearly at the situation in the Mideast, at what the Arabs insist upon calling "the tragedy of Palestine," we ought indeed to take a good look. When we are told to look at both sides of the story, we should look at both sides.

What we see is very revealing. On the one side, we see Israel, a progressive nation, a haven for refugees the world over, deeply absorbed in economic development and growth within its own boundaries, a state practical enough to want good relations with its neighbors, but realistic enough to guard its own security.

On the other side, we see a band of frustrated Arab imperialists, in continual disagreement with themselves and the rest of the world, governments wasting the sustenance of their citizens for guns and rockets, wasting the days and years of fellow Moslem refugees for a political slogan at the United Nations, fanatics obsessed with the passion to exterminate those who do not conform to their singleminded dream of empire.

Mr. President, the people of the United States welcome leaders of foreign nations friendly to the United States. We listen with attention and interest to their words. But we cannot always agree with their arguments; and when we disagree, we can—and should—speak out.

King Hussein of Jordan has indeed given the American people a new insight into the Middle Eastern situation, but it is a picture that can only arouse deep concern and anxiety in this country. We once regarded him as a conciliatory Arab leader. We once hoped that he might inherit the wisdom of his grandfather Abdullah, who wanted an Arab-Israel peace. Altogether, since 1957, we have given King Hussein $461 million, in aid, mostly grants, including about $30 million in military aid. We have paid more than $150 million to provide for Arab refugees in Jordan, yet in Moscow on April 11, King Hussein's Ambassador reportedly declared in an interview:

> I will say frankly that today we believe that the U.S.S.R. can help us more than any other country.

Now King Hussein appears as the spokesman of an Arab alliance determined not to compromise, but to obstruct,

not to help others but to promote suffering, not to create, but to destroy.

What we can learn from this visit is twofold: First, that we, the United States, must reject fanaticism of any kind and look at the Mideast problem with open eyes and clear heads. We cannot allow ourselves to be browbeaten by Arab threats or wooed by Arab promises. We must recognize and emphasize again and again the fact of Israel's existence; the fact that hatemongering and military preparations by the Arab States are a definite threat to the peace of the Middle East and therefore to our own foreign policy objectives. We must understand that Arab diplomacy speaks with different voices in different lands. It is soft and persuasive in Washington, strong and nationalistic at the U.N., but bitter and belligerent in the Middle East. We must not be confused or misled by it.

I wish it were possible for all Senators to read from time to time the emanations that come out over Radio Cairo about the United States and its leaders. We must not be confused or misled by the change in pace which we find in Arab diplomacy.

Second, we must recognize the reality of the threat expressed by the Arab leaders since the Arab summit conference of January 1964. The Arabs mean what they say and they are acquiring the means, the missiles, jets and bombers to give effect to their threats. Time is not necessarily on the side of Israel or of peace if fanatic Arab nationalism is organized under a unified Arab military command, and if Arab leaders are fully armed, and attempt a deliberate wooing of world opinion for their deceptive arguments.

The United States cannot stand idly by while Arab forces seek new strength for future assaults on Israel. Our Government, preferably the President himself, should speak out and make unmistakably clear that the United States will not permit such an assault, now or at any time, and that the United States is committed to resist aggression, that the United States is determined to strengthen those who are threatened, and that above all, we want an Arab-Israel peace as soon as possible.

The need to begin negotiations, or even to begin negotiations about negotiations, grows more pressing with each day. The influence of the United States must be brought fully to bear on this question, and the Arab States must be made to understand that continued U.S. friendship and assistance is dependent upon a new attitude, an acceptance of compromise, and a willingness to talk with Israel's leaders about conflicts which could spark a serious military conflagration in the Middle East.

The situation that is rapidly developing there deserves the most careful attention. It is a grave threat to world peace. It is potentially one of the most, if not the most, explosive areas in the world, and if an explosion were ever to take place, the United States would face a world crisis of monumental proportions. We must use our best efforts today to avert such a crisis tomorrow.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida.

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

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

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 164 Leg.]

Aiken	Hill	Morse
Allott	Holland	Mundt
Anderson	Humphrey	Muskie
Bartlett	Inouye	Nelson
Beall	Jackson	Neuberger
Bennett	Jordan, Idaho	Pastore
Boggs	Keating	Pearson
Cannon	Kuchel	Pell
Case	Long, La.	Prouty
Church	Magnuson	Ribicoff
Curtis	Mansfield	Saltonstall
Dirksen	McGee	Scott
Dodd	McGovern	Smith
Dominick	McIntyre	Sparkman
Fong	Metcalf	Symington
Gruening	Miller	Williams, N.J.
Hart	Monroney	Young, Ohio

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. HOLLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a brief statement, with the usual understanding?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

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

PORTUGAL MOVES TOWARD GREATER DEMOCRATIZATION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, for some years the United Nations has been expressing criticisms of Portugal complaining that in its relationships with its colonial areas is retarding the development and growth of educational and democratic processes which will eventually prepare these regions for complete, stable, and secure independence should that be their desire. These processes in underdeveloped countries are usually much slower than desired and too frequently new countries fail to improve conditions for their citizens or to operate democratic procedures appropriately because they are "put on their own" before they are duly prepared for self-government and independence.

At times the United States has been engaged in the doubtful practice of trying to control from afar through support of abortive United Nations resolutions the relationship between Portugal and Angola. Since the Portuguese are old and honored friends of the United States and have been of great assistance in our defense effort, it is therefore gratifying to note that recent developments indicate that there is important new evidence. That the processes of democratizations are at work in Angola and in Mozambique.

Since this change has not been widely publicized in the American press and since the criticisms of earlier Portuguese policy were banner headlined, I ask unanimous consent that in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks there appear the text of a press release dated April 15, issued by the Portuguese Embassy in Washington and headlined, "Legislative Elections in Angola and Mozambique."

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

LEGISLATIVE ELECTIONS IN ANGOLA AND MOZAMBIQUE

The results of the legislative elections recently completed in the oversea Provinces of Angola and Mozambique were as follows:

ANGOLA

Legislative council: 34 representatives were elected to the legislative council, of which: 15 were elected by direct suffrage, 3 by the workers' organizations, 3 by the corporate organizations, 3 by the rural "Regedorias" (rural councils), 4 by administrative bodies of the Province, 3 by the religious and cultural organizations, and 3 by economic associations. Total, 34.

Percentage of eligible voters (direct suffrage) who went to the polls: 84.9 percent.

Economic and Social Council: 16 representatives were elected to the economic and social council of the Province, as follows: 4 elected by the administrative bodies of the Province, 4 elected by the workers' organizations, 4 elected by the economic associations, and 4 elected by the religious and cultural organizations. Total, 16.

MOZAMBIQUE

Legislative council: 27 representatives were elected to the legislative council, of which: 9 were elected by direct suffrage (the percentage of eligible voters who went to the polls was 87.19 percent); 3 representatives were elected by each of the following groups: Workers' organizations, corporate organizations, religious and cultural organizations, rural "regedorias," administrative bodies, and economic associations.

Although the majority of the representatives elected are natives of Mozambique, one of them was born in Angola.

Economic and social council: 16 representatives were elected to the Economic and Social Council, 11 of them being natives of Mozambique. These elections are not by direct suffrage, but rather by the organizations representing the economic and social interests of the voters. Thus, four representatives were elected by each one of the following groups: Workers' organizations, economic organizations, administrative bodies, and religious and social organizations.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, while the elections reported in this release are different in nature and character from the type of representative elections we are accustomed to in the United States, they do mark real progress toward self-determination and self-rule by the people involved.

In the highly significant business of making freedom function for the people generally instead of for only a few politicians or rulers at the head of a newly created nation, the educational processes of "learning to do by doing" have great and enduring values. This is what it appears is now taking place in Angola and in Mozambique. I join many other Americans in wishing the best for the continued development of these procedures and congratulate the Government of Portugal on the progress which is being made. May it continue without interruption by violence from within and without interference from without which will destroy its chances for success.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, since it is my custom to give notice to my colleagues in the Senate as to my intention, I wish to state to Senators who are present that, speaking for myself and my distinguished captain, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], there is no intention to ask for a live quorum at the end of my speech.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, that statement is based on the understanding that the Senate will recess at about 8:30 until tomorrow morning. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The acting majority leader has advised me that he would like to have the Senate recess at 8:30 this evening until tomorrow. My statement is in compliance with that understanding.

Mr. President, the pending business is the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and other Senators, which would, if adopted, provide that in most proceedings for criminal contempt in Federal courts, the defendant shall be entitled to a trial before a jury conforming as nearly as may be to the proceedings in other criminal cases. The carefully drawn amendment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia provides that trial by jury shall not apply to criminal contempts committed in the presence of the court or so near thereto as to interfere directly with the administration of justice nor to the misbehavior, misconduct, or disobedience of any officer of the court nor shall it be construed to deprive courts of their power in civil contempt proceedings to secure compliance with or to prevent obstruction of their orders as distinguished from punishment for criminal contempt.

This amendment is most timely and it brings up substantially the same issue as was passed upon favorably by a large majority of the Senate in 1957 when we were debating the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1957. That this amendment is peculiarly timely at this time is pointed up by the 5-to-4 decision of the U.S. Supreme Court on April 6 in which our highest Court ruled that former Governor Barnett of Mississippi and former Lieutenant Governor Johnson, now Governor of Mississippi, do not have the right of jury trial when they are subjected to criminal contempt proceedings. In the majority decision, written by Mr. Justice Clark, it was very clearly set out that though the Court ruled in that hairline decision—5 to 4—that a defendant was not entitled to a jury trial in a criminal contempt proceeding, it was within the discretion and jurisdiction of the Congress to pass a statute which would dispense with the ruling that criminal contempt proceedings could be held without jury trial. The wording of that portion of the opinion by Mr. Justice Clark in that decision was as follows:

> It has always been the law of the land, both State and Federal, that the courts, except where specifically precluded by statute, have the power to proceed summarily in contempt matters.

I digress long enough to say that the Senator from Florida views those words as almost an invitation, if not a mandate, to Congress to take some action that will get the Court out of the disagreeable situation under which it has divided on this question 5 to 4, and under which, even in the Court's opinion, certain expressions appear, such as those decrying the tendency of the lower courts to impose much higher penalties for criminal contempt convictions than was the case theretofore.

It seems to me that we should regard this as almost a privileged matter, in which we should act at the end of proper debate upon the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and other Senators.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Alabama for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is not the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] the same amendment that the Senate adopted to the 1957 civil rights bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is the same as that offered at that time by our late distinguished friend from Wyoming, Senator O'Mahoney, who spoke with great persuasiveness and eloquence in support of the amendment and insisted that the Constitution required the adoption of such an amendment.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that our late friend Senator O'Mahoney was one of the ablest and most profound lawyers in the Senate?

Mr. HOLLAND. That was my opinion of him. I regarded him as a leader in the Congress in the field of knowledge of constitutional law and of questions in connection with the Constitution.

Mr. HILL. I had the same opinion of the late Senator from Wyoming. He was a great man. The late Senator from Wyoming and I had our pictures taken together shortly before he left the Senate. When he left the Senate, I inscribed on that picture, "To the last of the great giants." He had been in this body with William Borah, George Norris, Carter Glass, Alben Barkley, Pat Harrison, and others of the great men of his time; and he was one of the greatest.

Is it not true that the present President of the United States, who was at that time the distinguished majority leader, Lyndon B. Johnson, voted for this amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct; and he spoke for it persuasively. I think his speech has already been placed in the RECORD in the course of this debate.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that President Johnson's distinguished predecessor in the presidency, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, when he was a Senator from Massachusetts, also supported this amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct; and that fact has been placed in the RECORD. The fact that those two distinguished former Senators voted in that way is highly persuasive for doing what I have just said I believe is the mandate of the Supreme Court. I believe the Supreme Court has, in effect, issued a mandate for Congress to take statutory action to do away with the rule which, by a 5-to-4 decision, the Court says exists, permitting a trial without a jury in criminal contempt proceedings.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true also that the present majority leader of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], supported and voted for that amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. I so understand. I do not recall his speech on that amendment, but I have been told during this debate that he voted for the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Is it not also true that the amendment was adopted by the Senate by a substantial majority?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct; an overwhelming majority.

I thank my friend from Alabama for his constructive comments which, as usual, have illuminated the RECORD greatly.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Florida. When the sun is shining brightly, there is not much opportunity for anybody to add illumination. When the distinguished senior Senator from Florida is speaking, there is not much opportunity for anyone else to add illumination.

Mr. HOLLAND. We all know that the Chesterfieldian Senator from Alabama always speaks in this highly complimentary vein; but I appreciate it nonetheless. I thank him.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Florida knows that the Good Book tells us:

> Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.

Mr. HOLLAND. I remember that. I am glad the Senator brought the Bible into the discussion.

I have, on three occasions, spoken at some length on this bill. In my first two major speeches during the debate I made special reference to the fact that this bill deprives citizens of their right of trial by jury in criminal contempt proceedings.

On March 19, I discussed title IV—which deals with desegregation of the public schools.

I showed how dangerous would be the grant of unlimited power, under title IV, to the Attorney General to bring injunction suits at his sole discretion upon any finding of discrimination in school segregation cases which he personally saw fit to make, and thereafter to invoke criminal contempt proceedings without trial by jury.

I expressed my strong belief that what most Negro children of America want and need is better schools and not integrated schools. As my first witness, the great educator, Dr. James B. Conant, who was president of Harvard University, presented telling evidence on that point.

Also, I quoted definite statistics from the most authentic sources showing that the Negro student's and the Negro teacher's opportunity for education and professional advancement is greater in the segregated schools of the South than in the integrated schools of the rest of the Nation. Of that there can be no question when one looks at the facts, as, for example, the fact that all the fine presidents of the great colleges for the Negro race are presidents of segregated schools.

I warned the Senate on that occasion:

> The peril of destroying or diluting the rights of the constitutional guarantees to all citizens * * * is contained in the fourth title of the bill.

I sound that warning again today, Mr. President.

As the minority views of the House report clearly and conclusively show, title IV would deprive a defendant of many of the protections guaranteed every citizen by the Bill of Rights and particularly would deprive him of the right of trial by jury when he is charged with criminal contempt for disobeying writs of injunction or restraining orders in school desegregation suits brought by the Attorney General.

On April 6, I addressed myself to title VII—EEOC—Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—but in reality, to use the old title, the FEPC section of the bill.

I hope, and I believe, Mr. President, that I showed how this equally dangerous, or even more dangerous, section, whose parentage is so uncertain, no one seems to know from whence it came, is to the citizens of our beloved country.

I showed what grievous damage to our Constitution—to the very foundations of our democratic system—title VII, like title IV, would do by giving the arbitrary power to the Commission, rather than the Attorney General, to bring injunction suits without provision for jury trial for criminal contempt.

My point was buttressed, Mr. President, in a most timely and significant way. On that very day the Supreme Court, by a hairline 5 to 4 decision, ruled that former Governor Barnett of Mississippi and former Lieutenant Governor Johnson, who now is Governor of that fine State, did not have the right of jury trial when they were subjected to criminal contempt proceedings which came to a halt in the Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans when that court announced that it was evenly divided on that question, by a vote of 4 to 4. The Supreme Court on that very day made it completely clear that a jury trial would not be a matter of right for anyone facing a criminal contempt proceeding as a result of an action brought under either title IV or title VII of the pending bill.

I feel strongly about this matter, Mr. President. I have always believed that trial by jury is one of the most precious heritages the Founding Fathers handed down to us. I have treasured it as a part of the heart of that imperishable document, by which and under whose protective safeguards and inalienable rights we live—our Constitution. In connection with that I should like to include in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the following brief colloquy I had that day with the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated April 6, 1964, page 7010:

> Mr. HILL. Does the Senator agree that one of our most precious rights under our Anglo-Saxon system of justice is the right to trial by jury?
>
> Mr. HOLLAND. I thought so until the decision came down today. I was taught as a boy in law school and as a young lawyer practicing and appearing before all courts, from the lowest to the highest in the land, that that was one of the sacred rights, and that it came to us from law more ancient than ours. But apparently in the field of criminal contempt, a majority of the Supreme Court, five out of nine, thinks the matter is not of such substance that a jury should be called for.
>
> Mr. HILL. The truth is that it is a right that was fought for and won and goes back as far as Magna Carta, in 1215, and to the petition of rights and the Bill of Rights, and therefore permeates our whole Anglo-Saxon history.
>
> Mr. HOLLAND. It is one of the anchors of our Anglo-Saxon system of law. I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact, as shown by today's decision, that a bare majority, five out of nine members of the Supreme Court, could make this decision; whereas if a defendant is being tried by a jury, the unanimous verdict of all 12 is required to convict. There is a considerable difference between the right to have a bare majority of a court pass on one's case and the right to have a jury of one's peers pass on his case, because in order to convict, those peers must unanimously say, "This man has wilfully and criminally violated an order of the court, known to him and applicable to him, and which he has violated in an effort to knock out completely the orderly process of our laws."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. In such cases, under the various titles of the bill—and the bill has eleven titles—the Attorney General of the United States, whoever he might be, would really be the prosecuting officer, would he not?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is true.

Mr. HILL. Is it not also true that when Federal judges are appointed, the Attorney General, the head of the Department of Justice, has much to say about their appointment?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; I regret to state that that is a fact.

Mr. HILL. Is it not also true that the Attorney General, the head of the Department of Justice, also has much to say about the promotion of judges?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; I regret to say that that, too, is true.

Mr. HILL. On the other hand, 12 jurymen, 12 peers, selected from the population of the local district, would have no obligation to, or connection with, the Attorney General, who would be the prosecutor in such cases, would they?

Mr. HOLLAND. They would not. Their names would be drawn from the box in which the names of the total number of prospective jurors would have been placed; and the entire group of names would have been placed in that box and later drawn from it, under conditions of secrecy. Thereafter, in selecting the twelve members of the jury, both the plaintiff and the defendant would have the right to challenge or strike for reasons sufficient to them, including the reason of possible prejudice.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator from Florida agree that if the integrity of our judicial system is to be preserved, nothing is more important to it than preservation of the right of trial by jury?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. The entire history of mankind shows that to be true, does it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. All Anglo-Saxon history demonstrates that conclusively.

Mr. HILL. And even the history of earlier times does the same, does it not? Is not the history of all mankind replete with the tragic stories of those who suffered because of lack of the protection of our judicial system, including—and this is one of the most important—the right of trial by jury?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; all too often that was the case. It was because of such abuses that Magna Carta was wrung from a reluctant monarch; and that protection and the other protections under the Anglo-Saxon system of law came into being in order to protect more fully the rights of the individual citizen.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

I am sure the Senator from Florida recalls the masterly address by Jeremiah Black before the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of ex parte Milligan, after Milligan had been tried in Missouri, during the Civil War, by a drumhead court-martial. Jeremiah Black, a great lawyer, carried the case all the way to the Supreme Court; and while before the Supreme Court, he presented the history of these rights, and also presented a very clear statement of their meaning and their importance to individual citizens.

We say we are proud to be Americans; but, after all, what we really mean is that we are proud of the freedom and the liberty that we enjoy as American citizens, and also of the right of trial by jury, which is basic to the guarantee of justice and liberty to all our people. Is not that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct. The great knowledge of the Senator from Alabama of these matters makes me wish I had an opportunity to return to school and study under his tutelage. I thank him for his important contributions to the debate.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I read further from the debate from which I have been quoting:

> Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the jury of peers are chosen and selected within the judicial district in which the person lives? Are they not people who know him, know his standing, and know his general reputation in the community in which he lives?

Mr. HOLLAND. This is correct. If his reputation is good, it is fine for him to have such a jury summoned. If his reputation is bad, the jury will be summoned from the people of that very area, and who know more about what that bad reputation is.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

To say to the American businessman: "I shall tell you whom to hire, whom to fire, whom to promote, whom to demote;" to say to the great Labor Union of America: "I shall tell you how to manage your union, how to determine the seniority of your members, how to set the rules"; to say to the workers of America: "I shall tell you with whom you shall associate, with whom you must work at your workbench, with whom you must share your lunch hour"—is undemocratic, Mr. President, is unconstitutional, Mr. President, and is wrong. It must not happen in America or else we would become the very antithesis of democracy—a police state—and particularly so when authority would be given to the EEOC to proceed by injunction, coupled with later use of criminal contempt proceedings without jury trial. The Talmadge amendment would at least require the safeguard of jury trial in appropriate criminal contempt proceedings under this highly objectionable Title VII of the bill.

The most dangerous provision of the bill, of all those dealing with the power of the Attorney General to bring injunction suits, and thereafter to use criminal contempt proceedings without jury trial, is found in section 302 of title III of the bill, in the following words:

Whenever an action has been commenced in any court of the United States seeking relief from the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, the Attorney General for or in the name of the United States may intervene in such action. In such an action the United States shall be entitled to the same relief as if it had instituted the action.

The distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has done a great service during this debate by calling the attention of the Senate and the attention of the Nation to the fact that this inconspicuous portion of the bill accomplishes, in effect, what was embraced in the point III provisions of the 1957 civil rights legislation, which would have authorized the Attorney General to bring an injunction suit within his sole discretion in any matter which he felt involved a threat to or an invasion of civil rights, with the power, of course, to use criminal contempt proceedings, without jury trial thereafter. The Senate soundly turned down that proposal; and it has been since turned down by a majority of the Senate on several occasions, particularly by three different votes during consideration of the civil rights bill of 1960. Yet, it is now proposed in this bill, through this inconspicuous and almost hidden section which appears under title III, and is supposedly confined to the field covered by that title, "Desegregation of Public Facilities." Section 302 proposes to give to the Attorney General the full power to intervene in any action involving and defending civil rights brought by any citizen in any court of the United States. It would give to the Attorney General the right to obtain exactly the same relief as if he had instituted the action in the beginning, including, of course, the right to bring criminal contempt proceedings without trial by jury.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield again to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. In section 302, on page 13, the sentence beginning in line 9 is:

In such an action the United States shall be entitled to the same relief as if it had instituted the action.

That provision was included in order to insure that the defendant will not have his right of trial by jury, is it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; it was put there for that reason, and also to give the Attorney General any right which he might have had if he, himself, had instituted the proceeding.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. One of those rights is freedom from any questioning by the court or by anyone else as to why he decided to come into the case. It would be a right of intervention, without giving any court the right to question the discretion of the Attorney General.

Mr. President, that is too much power and authority to repose in any man. If he were a good man, I do not believe he would wish the power. If he were a bad man, he certainly should not have it. So far as I am concerned, I am not willing to give it to any Attorney General. My remarks have no reference to any present, former, or future Attorney General as a person, but refer to anyone holding that office.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. That was the strong feeling of the Senate in 1957 when it struck title III from the civil rights bill of that year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. Then in 1960 three separate efforts, one differing very little from the other, were made to put substantially the same provision in the bill of 1960. In every instance the Senate voted down such attempts.

Mr. President, how far from the sound and fundamental concepts of Anglo-Saxon justice do the starry-eyed advocates of this bill think they can go and still preserve an America with its constitutional guarantees of freedom?

It is interesting to note that even the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, the floor manager of this bill, in his eloquent declamation of March 30 recognized the sweeping nature of section 302 in the following words:

He [the Attorney General] would also be authorized to intervene in such suits brought by a private party as well as in any other suit brought by a private party based on the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.

A little later in his declamation the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] made the following statements:

The bill requires the Attorney General to state in his complaint that he has received a complaint and that in his judgment the persons who complained are unable to initiate or maintain appropriate legal proceedings. These statements by the Attorney General will not be subject to challenge either by the defendants or by the court. Under no circumstances will the Attorney General be required to reveal the names of the particular complainants. Of course, if the defendants deny that they discriminate, it would always be necessary for the Attorney General to prove discrimination to the satisfaction of the court.

In short, we are still relying on private litigation as the first line of action to make constitutional rights effective. The Attorney General may act only when he finds, in the particular case, that private litigants do not have and cannot obtain the resources necessary, or that they are likely to incur reprisals for their temerity in claiming their constitutional rights.

I note that the able Senator from Minnesota stretches the provision of title IV, which does provide, as he says, that "the Attorney General may act only where he finds in a particular case, that private litigants do not have and cannot obtain the resources necessary, or that they are likely to incur reprisals for their temerity in claiming their constitutional rights," so as to apply those same limitations to section 302. I respectfully call to the attention of the Senator from Minnesota and other Members of the Senate the fact that such limitations do not apply in any way to the provisions of section 302 under which the Attorney General, without any limitations whatever in his discretion, is given complete authority to intervene in any action which "has been commenced in any court of the United States seeking relief from the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, color, religion, or national origin." The authority of the Attorney General under section 302 is absolute and unlimited. He may intervene in any civil rights action brought by any private or public body other than the United States and as an intervenor in the name of the United States he shall be entitled to the same relief as if he had originally instituted the action. There could not be any greater grant of more unbridled power and when such grant is coupled with the additional power to bring criminal contempt proceedings without a jury trial, I have a deep conviction that such a grant goes far beyond what any law should provide if the constitutional rights of the citizens of our country are to be given any consideration by the Congress. No good man serving as Attorney General would want such sweeping power and no good or bad man should be allowed to have it.

I note with interest the additional statement by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] on page 6543 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 30, to the effect that a decision of the Attorney General to bring a suit or to intervene "will not be subject to challenge either by the defendants or by the courts." No stronger statement could be made to show that it is proposed to give the Attorney General complete and unlimited power to bring injunction suits followed, if he sees fit, by criminal contempt proceedings without jury trials.

"The emergence of a strong single Europe—a true superpower for which the resources are indeed available—could present Western unity with thorny problems unless tightly integrated in the Atlantic framework."

"These considerations do not suggest," according to the council statement, "that the United States should reverse its course and start opposing European unification. What they do suggest is that the United States cease to pressure its European allies toward any particular brand of unity and concentrate rather on exploring with them the fields, forms, and degrees of unity with us that would be mutually advantageous."

"The prime goal of future U.S. policy must be to capitalize on and to stimulate every shared interest that unites the free nations of the West and moves them forward toward one Atlantic community. A U.S. policy that made collaboration on an Atlantic scale its guiding standard should * * * be able to take the edge off any inward directed and exclusive 'Europeanism'."

In particular the council cites the following areas on which agreement is of basic importance: "(1) strategic policy, including control of nuclear weapons, (2) trade policy, including agricultural policy, and (3) financial policy, including the strengthening of the West's monetary system."

In pointing out that these objectives can be accomplished without elaborate new institutions, the paper concludes: "The immediate need * * * is * * * the will to use better what we already have. We need a new determination—shown by acts rather than words—to develop greater Atlantic strength and unity. The United States must now show this will and determination, stop the disintegration of NATO, resume the initiative shown by the Truman and Eisenhower administrations, and begin to lead again."

The members of the Critical Issues Council are: Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, chairman; Elliott V. Bell; Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, U.S. Navy, retired, Arthur F. Burns, Albert L. Cole, James H. Douglas, Marion B. Folsom, Thomas S. Gates, T. Keith Glennan, Oveta Culp Hobby, Walter H. Judd, Mary P. Lord, Clare Boothe Luce, Deane W. Malott, James P. Mitchell, Gen. Lauris Norstad, U.S. Air Force, retired, Don Paarlberg, C. Wrede Petersmeyer, Samuel R. Pierce, Jr., Charles S. Rhyne, Raymond J. Saulnier, Lewis L. Strauss, Walter N. Thayer, Henry C. Wallich.

CRITICAL ISSUES PAPER NO. 3

(By the Critical Issues Council, Washington, D.C.)

After the bitter experience of two world wars, followed immediately by the challenge of the cold war, the United States was compelled to make an historic decision: that it could no longer afford to stand aside or go it alone if it was determined to preserve its freedom and independence.

Allowing Eurasia and the adjoining islands to fall under hostile control would, in the end, make America's own position untenable. Thus, aggression against friendly and allied nations has come to be recognized as an attack against the United States. To deter such an attack—if necessary, to defeat it—the power of the United States had to be thrown into the balance.

The task of protecting the free world thus became a United States responsibility, and a United States commitment. The commitment endures. It is an inescapable obligation of leadership. But we cannot discharge our responsibility alone. In the world today we need the closest coordination with our allies in all matters of common concern, if we are to win the future.

I

NATO: THE CORNERSTONE OF WESTERN DEFENSE

The North Atlantic alliance is an unparalleled achievement of cooperation for common defense. It had its immediate origins in the crises of 1948–49—the Berlin blockade and the Communist takeover of Czechoslovakia—and the urgent needs of free world security. In meeting these needs, in containing the aggressive thrust of the Soviet Union, the alliance has been a notable success. But the basic requirement continues. NATO's very success has greatly enhanced its potential to cope with broader fields.

The preamble to the North Atlantic Treaty reaffirms the faith of a community now encompassing 15 free nations:

"In the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments.

"They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law.

"They seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area.

"They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security."

The alliance has provided both the sword and the shield in whose shelter the nations of Europe have been able to recover from wartime devastation, to preserve their freedom, and to enjoy levels of prosperity unprecedented in history.

For the United States, the alliance represents a genuine triumph of bipartisan foreign policy. Throughout a succession of national administrations, and with consistent congressional and popular support, this Nation has committed itself unreservedly to the interdependence of free-world security. Our willing and massive contributions of men and material have effectively underwritten this commitment.

1. Essential to U.S. security

The United States did not join the alliance just to save Europe from the imminent menace of communism. We returned to Europe, and we remain there today, because its defense is essential to our own—because the two are indivisible. A sense of interdependence and of community rapidly evolved into an alliance which today embodies the sum of its combined resources, whether military or economic or intellectual, and a potential for peaceful order and orderly growth matched nowhere else.

The alliance has succeeded: its immediate goals have been substantially accomplished. Under NATO, 15 free nations have been able to harmonize their sovereign interests into a common cause, build a powerful force-in-being, establish a supporting complex of bases and logistical networks, and take important steps toward development of a common strategy covering the use of nuclear and other weapons.

But this momentum is not now being maintained. Confidence, on both sides of the Atlantic, is being shaken. Dedication to the goals of allied strength and unity is giving way to a growing disunity and distrust. Seeds of disintegration are now undermining this bulwark of free-world security.

In so critical a situation, the primary burden falls upon the leader—to assess his own shortcomings, to reaffirm clear and consistent policy goals, and thus to take up his full responsibility. U.S. leadership appears fitful and inconsistent; it resorts too much to gadgetry rather than the establishment of sound and enduring relationships, built on a basis of mutual respect among sovereign equals.

Confidence within the alliance must now be restored—on both sides of the Atlantic. This requires that the United States must continue to bear major material burdens. We must put aside expediency and crude interallied "arm-twisting" and mobilize within the alliance all its latent resources of will and unity of purpose. If we are to guarantee our own security, there is no alternative. The costs, however great, are the price we must pay to preserve our future progress in freedom.

2. The continuing Soviet threat

The alliance is above all a pact of mutual assistance against a Soviet attack on the territory or armed forces of its member nations. Its foremost purpose is to deter, and if necessary to defeat, such an attack. And this must continue to be so, as long as the military threat from the East remains.

As a purely military pact NATO might not survive, should its members ever lose confidence in its ability to enhance their security against attack or come to believe that the threat from the East had ended. But the alliance extends beyond the military field: the treaty itself calls for cooperation in other fields, cooperation which is indispensable if only to assure the essential solidarity required for effective collective defense. NATO, the most vital of our transatlantic institutions, is thus the natural nucleus for an emerging pattern of Atlantic relationships and an evolving community of shared interests.

The military threat from the East is not ended. Thus, the leading question is: Does NATO as it stands adequately insure our security, the security of the United States as well as its Allies? If it does not, we—the United States and its Allies—must now make the necessary changes.

3. The means of deterrence

Deterrence of attack, against any part of the free world, is indivisible. As the threat is poised against all, so too must the burdens of an effective response be shared by all. Yet the particular situations differ greatly, in North America and in Europe, both as to specific vulnerabilities and the "mix" of forces that must be available to meet a varied range of aggressive acts. Without the projection of North American military might across the Atlantic, the exposed territory and eastern boundaries of the European allies would be in immediate jeopardy.

Even on grounds of sheer national self-interest, the heavy burdens placed on the United States in the defense of both North America and Europe are inescapable. If Communist power in the world is to be held in check—and for America to remain free—all free nations must be able to rely on the strength the United States is able and willing to commit to the commom security.

With world responsibilities of such vast scope, the United States must bear its share, perhaps what appears to be a disproportionate share, of the defense burden required if NATO is to reach its basic objective. The alternative would be to retreat to a Fortress America position. Such a position served U.S. interests, and served them well, only as long as other friendly nations were able to balance or defeat any hostile powers. Today, given the realities of international life, it would mean U.S. isolation and the alienation of like-minded peoples—until, when all others had succumbed, America would find itself facing a Communist-dominated world, superior in resources and in power.

4. The need for supplementary deterrents

But now, 15 years after NATO's establishment, its task of protecting the freedom and independence of the non-Communist nations of Europe—and of our friends and allies on other continents—has been rendered immensely more arduous. Two new factors have radically changed the context. First, the power of the leading Communist states has grown greatly since the early postwar period. More important still, the acquisition of long-range nuclear striking forces by the Soviet Union has raised questions as to the credibility and thus the deterrent effect of U.S. retaliatory threats to intervene with its

strategic forces—the West's most formidable military instrument—against any but massive attacks on oversea members of the Alliance.

Strategic nuclear forces are essential. But, however impressive in themselves, alone they are not sufficient. There is urgent need of supplementary deterrents—specifically, of very sizable forces deployed in Europe and on the oceans adjoining the European Continent, forces with a conventional capacity but supported by short- and medium-range nuclear weapons. Such forces must be on the spot if every kind of provocation, especially nuclear blackmail, is to be met with effective countermeasures. This requires that the threat of their use and, if deterrence should fail, the effectiveness of their use must be credible both to friend and foe.

So demanding is the military task now facing NATO that it must be able to count on all its members for whatever efforts are needed to attain the goals of the alliance. The allies of the United States made substantial commitments at a time when they were struggling to emerge from the devastation of the war. Yet, given their extraordinary economic recovery in recent years and the degree of internal stability they have attained, there remains a painful lag in the exertions of some of them. This fact stands in sharp contradiction to the interests at stake. On both sides of the Atlantic, it must be understood that a Communist conquest of even the smallest part of Europe would be a catastrophe for all.

5. The burden must be shared

This Nation must bear a share of responsibility for the failure of some European nations to meet the force requirements set by NATO. In part, the allies have been lulled into complacency by overreliance on the United States—on our support, our aid, and our deterrent. The words and actions of the United States which exaggerate some new era of "reconciliation" with the Soviet Union have helped foster a sense of "euphoria" and relaxation. The United States has failed to convince its allies that the military efforts demanded of them would add substantially to their security.

Europe sometimes voices a suspicion that any increase in European forces would merely signal the reduction of U.S. forces presently stationed there—forces the Europeans regard as the indispensable mainstay of their security. It is not so much that any specific number of U.S. divisions represents a "sacred" and inflexible commitment. But the overall need has been fixed after long interallied deliberation, and our basic commitment to the indivisible defense of Europe and the United States is indeed sacred. Unless and until these NATO force levels are filled by our allies, the burden falls upon the United States as the inescapable requirement of our own security.

An additional burden is that of a persistent imbalance in our international accounts, to which the costs of maintaining U.S. forces in Europe are a contributing factor. The defense of the dollar is in a very practical sense part of our grand strategy. A weak dollar would weaken the United States politically, and therefore militarily. The United States must seek out, therefore, all possible means to reduce the balance-of-payments cost of our forces abroad, without weakening our military or political posture. We must continue to press our allies, whose economic resources are rapidly rising, to accept a larger share of the burden of common defense. The greater the burden they will bear, the closer we will come to narrowing the payments gap—to the benefit, ultimately, of all the nations of the free world.

If it should be thought that the threat of U.S. troop withdrawals would act as a spur to needed European efforts, the likelihood is that, in the present psychological situation, it might lead to precisely the opposite result. It would tend either to arouse a sense of defeatism or else lend impetus to attempts—wasteful and militarily unpromising though they may be—to substitute independent strategic deterrents for the American nuclear umbrella. The mere hint of U.S. withdrawals, even if falsely interpreted as pointing toward future U.S. disengagement from the Continent, thus adds fuel to the doubts that are undercutting NATO's solidarity and deepens the crisis of confidence through which the alliance is now passing.

6. Control of NATO's nuclear capability

In the perfect alliance—which never has and never will exist—this problem would solve itself. That nation which commands all but a minute fraction of the alliance's aggregate nuclear resources would manage them in the common interest. It would decide when and where and how nuclear power would be used—and whether it would be used at all.

But even so honorable a nation as the United States cannot expect to be taken wholly on trust by other honorable nations in matters involving their very existence. Then, too, for many in Europe—and not just the French—some participation in the control of nuclear weapons has become a symbol of sovereignty.

In this sense, the nuclear question is but the tip of a vast iceberg consisting of unresolved problems of the political control of the totality of NATO's strategic resources. The question is even more one of relationships—the precise terms governing a partnership of sovereign nations, equal in pride and independence if not in direct ownership of major resources. Indeed, this very sense of independence among all the members of the alliance is no mark of failure; it is the inevitable consequence of NATO's profound success.

The practical question remains, however: By what further means shall we implement the formal understanding reached at the NATO heads-of-government meeting in December 1957, to establish nuclear stockpiles in Europe and to equip allied forces with delivery systems—but with the warheads in the custody of the United States, the donor nation. The means of mutual defense, both European and North American, were thus to be shared. While much was done in the years immediately following 1957 to carry out this proposal, the alliance must now decide how and by whom political and military control shall be exercised.

The concept of a NATO nuclear force under NATO command was projected as one possible solution, with the precise working arrangements left to interallied negotiation. Since 1960, this has been presented in the form of a multilateral force, the MLF. This proposal, originally conceived as a working concept for further consultation, has in recent years tended to be used more as a pressure tactic. But the essential disharmony concerning nuclear control remains; and the concept of MLF has, in fact, heightened it, rather than serving as a first step toward an eventual solution around which all the allies might compromise their legitimate differences.

We must now translate the concept of collective defense into a workable solution—into practical terms of how and by whom authority and control are to be exercised, and extended to cover all forces and all weapons, conventional and nuclear. In the last 3 years, there has been no real progress toward this goal. In fact, we have clearly retrogressed.

We cannot believe that either the ingenuity or the will is lacking to perfect workable arrangements in a way that satisfies the interests of all, including Germany and the other nonnuclear members of the alliance. The goal is plain: to make of NATO's nuclear capability the pillar of allied unity it should be, rather than the source of disintegration it has been allowed to become.

7. Toward greater unity

The disarray within NATO must be overcome. What is needed is the restoration of faith in the effectiveness of collective defense as the best road to national security. Such faith and mutual confidence are indispensable bases for solidarity in an age of nuclear weaponry with its unprecedented threat to national survival.

Solidarity can exist side by side with great differences in power. But it requires full respect for the sovereign interests of all. Our allies are demanding more than merely to be kept informed about decisions over which they have no control, more also than "consultation" in which their views carry weight only if they conform with U.S. preconceptions. What they want is real participation, a true share in the process by which decisions vital to all are reached. This is what they have every right to demand.

In turn, the United States can provide the effective leadership and forceful initiative that corresponds to its resources—and which its allies expect and applaud—only if it enjoys a high measure of freedom of action. Allied participation in planning, decisionmaking, and strategy must go hand in hand, therefore, with a clear recognition that the United States must be able to act, swiftly and decisively, in any emergency in which the strategic protection of the entire alliance is at stake. The ultimate decision on the use of nuclear weapons, to the effective, must be almost instantaneous. To be acceptable, it must be based upon close and meaningful consultation with our allies throughout the period leading toward that decision.

Confidence must be restored on both sides of the Atlantic. As in all matters of common concern within the alliance, the primary burden falls up the United States. As the leader, we must show wisdom in approaching all these critical problems—never falling back on the easy extremes of petulance or arrogance. We must show understanding to all the nations of the alliance—a patient recognition that no two have precisely the same background and history, the same interests or ambitions. We must show strength where and when strength is required—based always on conviction and principles, clear to friend and foe alike, and never on mere expediency.

The sum of these qualities of leadership will be a heightened sense of responsibility—to the Alliance, to ourselves, and to the cause of freedom.

II

THE UNITED STATES AND ITS INDIVIDUAL ALLIES

A Europe of multiple sovereignties has its apparent drawbacks, particularly when compared with some imagined federal European union patterned on the American model. But it must be accepted as a fact, and dealt with in a spirit of understanding and accommodation.

The United States must not play one European ally off against another—even though the temptation to do so may at times be great. Nothing could be more detrimental to the Alliance than an invidious competition among European nations for special favors from the United States or, worse still, for favored treatment by the Soviet Union. The U.S. strengthens its role of leadership if it convinces all of its allies that they can count on loyal U.S. support whenever their particular interests are consistent with the interests of the Alliance as a whole.

Attempts on the part of any member of the Alliance to gain special favors from the Soviet Union would necessarily lead to grave disunity. The United States can do much to prevent any such "race to Moscow" by setting an example of self-restraint in its own dealings with the Kremlin. While it would be unacceptable to the United States

if its allies assumed the right to veto any bilateral Soviet-American negotiations or accords, bilaterialism cannot be kept a monopoly of the superpowers. It will always tend to arouse a certain suspicion of special deals at the expense of others. In the interest of interallied confidence, the United States will be well advised, whenever the way is open for accords with the Kremlin that would be advantageous to the West, to make sure that its allies are given full and early insight into the negotiations.

1. The United States and Canada

Our relationship with Canada is probably closer than with any other nation. United States trade with Canada is larger than with the entire Common Market. The two governments are linked by numerous high-level joint boards and committees. Yet, we must take into account Canadian fears of domination, whether political, economic, or cultural, by her larger neighbor. The more we heed her voice in formulating policies on matters of common concern, the better off we both will be. Beginning in 1958, there have been frequent working meetings among cabinet officers of the two countries, bound together less by formal agendas than by an earnest desire to deepen the habits of consultation.

2. The United States and Britain

The special relationship with Britain assumes more importance in French eyes than it does to either Britain or the United States. It is not a matter of formal institutional arrangements, and two allies divided by common language do have their differences. Basically, the cordial relationship between the two countries derives from a deeply rooted similarity of values and approach which is shared by Canada and, to varying degrees, by our other allies. Differences arise when the two governments diverge in such matters as their estimate of the chances of accord with Moscow or in their attitude toward East-West trade.

In dealing with the United Kingdom, we must bear in mind its concern for close ties not only with the Common Market but also with other European countries, with the Commonwealth, and with ourselves. Far better than urging Britain to press for admission to the Common Market—and later, perhaps, to a European political union—would be to explore with her and with the other countries of Europe means of developing an economic association that would take more fully into account the interests of all free nations.

3. The United States and France

In the case of France, it is obvious that the relationship has deteriorated to a point that gravely endangers the alliance itself. This is the more disconcerting because France has agreed with the United States that the Alliance is indispensable for French security, at least for the forseeable future, and has taken the opportunity on several occasions to prove her firm alinement with the United States in resisting Soviet pressures and provocations.

Little is gained by stressing the real or alleged incompatibilities of French and American "grand designs." Instead, it is necessary to examine the practical steps that can be taken to give France and other countries that sense of independence without which De Gaulle claims there can be no genuine partnership.

Nobody can appreciate better than he what it took in the way of national authority, and of determination at the helm, to pull France back from the abyss of anarchy and interminable colonial warfare—and to do so without resorting to Fascist abuses of dictatorial power. Moreover, engaged in restoring French national self-confidence as a prerequisite of domestic stability, he opposes supranationality—which is what integration means to him—and rejects anything implying American or Anglo-Saxon special privileges.

There is a limit beyond which the independence of any member becomes incompatible with common allied action. But Franco-American amity is too precious, in terms of overriding Western interests, to be allowed to become the victim of dogmatic preconceptions or unsubstantiated mutual accusations.

4. The United States and Germany

Relations with Germany have been extraordinarily cordial since her defeat at the hands of the wartime Allies—so consistently cordial, in fact, and so valuable because of Germany's new-won power, wealth, and stability, that a mutually satisfactory German-American relationship should present no difficulty. Yet, such a view errs toward overoptimism even as the view of French hostility toward NATO and the United States errs in the opposite direction.

It is true that no group of influence in Germany today is cool or opposed to Western orientation. All parties are convinced of Germany's need for U.S. protection, preferably within the framework of NATO. The German military effort is becoming ever more substantial. Economically, Germany is doing enviably well.

Yet, when all is said, Germany remains a partitioned country, exposed to grave dangers in West Berlin, strung along the frontier of a Soviet empire both aggressive and superior in strength, and still suffering under the suspicion of neighbors both east and west of any German defense efforts that are reminiscent of her past nationalism and militarism.

Under these circumstances, what Germany needs least of all is to be courted by a United States in competition with France, nor made to bear responsibilities beyond what she feels to be her present capabilities. We must make it plain to the German people that their vital interests are America's vital interest, too, and will be firmly defended. Those interests are the freedom of West Berlin, free access to West Berlin, and the freedom of the people of the Eastern Zone, once they are rid of Communist oppression, to determine for themselves whether they wish to reunite with West Germany. In addition, the United States should help Germany to gain the confidence of her neighbors in the East, and become a magnet drawing them back into Europe instead of a source of apprehension that tightens the Soviet grip.

5. The United States and Italy

Relations with Italy have, on the whole, been excellent since the war. As a democratic country with a succession of governments firmly opposed to communism at home and abroad, she has contributed to the strength of both NATO and the Common Market. Internal difficulties in finding a stable majority to govern the country and in mastering the problems posed by a very large Communist vote persist, however, and make it particularly important that she be assured of sympathetic U.S. understanding and of a respected place in the councils of the West.

Preoccupation with the major Allies should not deflect attention from the many smaller European countries, some allied, some neutral, that exert a far from negligible influence on the course of European political and economic development and on U.S. foreign trade. The United States should take full advantage of the fact that sheer self-interest ranges most of these lesser countries on the side of those who, like the United States, are opposed to exclusive economic or political arrangements.

Moreover, their spiritual alinement with the West is a valuable contribution to the cause of Atlantic unity. Most of these countries have been notably successful in preserving internal stability, free institutions, and a prosperous economy. In an age of ideological warfare, these are assets which make up for the lack of military strength. The United States has much to gain from the reputation, a deserved one, of being a protector of the weak and a champion of freedom and prosperity for all.

III

EUROPEAN UNIFICATION

The unification of Europe, let us not forget, is a matter for Europeans to decide among themselves. U.S. interest is natural; but U.S. pressure, toward any particular form of unity will just as naturally be resented and, thus, strain the bonds of the Alliance as a whole.

Throughout the postwar era, successive American governments supported by congressional and public opinion have vigorously promoted European unification, especially favoring efforts pointed toward a federal or supranational political structure. The United States can take a measure of credit for the achievements of the dynamic European movement that set up the European Communities of the Six, the Common Market (EEC) foremost among them.

The question today is not whether the Six are reaping the full benefits they anticipated from such integration. It is, rather, whether the United States has a continuing interest in promoting further advances toward unification limited to European nations, or to some of them, and particularly toward European military and political integration. If it does, a further question arises concerning the extent and the form such integration should take. It can no longer be taken for granted that what is good for the narrow circle of countries seeking a powerful political merger will necessarily serve the purposes of those other allies with whom they are alined in the crucial task of collective Atlantic defense.

The chief original motives behind U.S. enthusiasm for European unity have lost their urgency, and much of their justification. A new European psychological unity, plus advanced weapons technology, have made intra-European wars all but unthinkable. Effective economic unity does not appear, if the Common Market is a fair standard, to depend on prior political integration. And whatever fears we had of the resurgence of Germany's militarism have been allayed by her membership in NATO and her reconciliation with France, the hereditary enemy. We must now reappraise our view of European unity—particularly if achieved along Federal or supranational lines—in terms of America's own interests. And foremost among them is its overriding interest in Western strength and solidarity, within the framework of the Atlantic world.

In the economic sphere, where integration has gone beyond mere speculation and blueprints, we are forewarned of some of the problems that might result from a tightly integrated protectionist Europe. Such an attitude poses dangers to other European nations, as well as to North America and the entire free world. While the United States has been prepared, in theory, to suffer sacrifices on the altar of European unity—a theory hardly confirmed by the harsh facts of the "chicken war"—it agreed to pay the price only in the expectation that economic integration would lead in turn to political integration. No such integration is presently in sight. Even if it were, its own compatibility with U.S. interests, and those of the alliance as a whole, can no longer be taken for granted.

The problem of European military integration also demands searching reappraisal. No one would question that more unification in such fields as standardization of weapons and forces, of logistical support, and the pooling of resources is desirable from the viewpoint of NATO. But U.S. support of a nuclear deterrent, other than NATO's, would

be hard to square with our objections to nuclear proliferation, and with our continuing search for arrangements by which all members of the alliance may share in the control of all weapons, both conventional and nuclear.

Despite continued and acknowledged U.S. influence, differences such as those now plaguing United States-French relations might well be reproduced on a still larger scale if a genuine integration of Western Europe along supranational lines were to take place. Such a political structure would have to be based on a surge of European nationalism and on strong leadership at the center. The emergence of a strong single Europe—a true superpower for which the resources are indeed available—could present Western unity with thorny problems unless integrated into the Atlantic framework.

1. A new standard: Atlantic unity

Greater unity in Europe is desirable, insofar as it strengthens the Atlantic Community; developments in Europe that weaken Atlantic unity are undesirable. This must be our guiding standard. For example, military unity of the whole or of a part of Europe, independent of NATO, would be clearly undesirable. Political unity, of even a part of Europe, must be carefully planned within a wider framework in order that it strengthen Atlantic unity. Even in the economic field, where regional arrangements can and do prove valuable, economic progress for all should be sought on the widest practical basis.

These considerations do not suggest that the United States should reverse its course and start opposing European unification. This is, in any event, a matter for Europeans to develop in their own way. What they do suggest is that the United States cease to pressure its European allies toward any particular brand of unity and concentrate rather on exploring with them the fields, forms, and degrees of unity with us that would be mutually advantageous.

A U.S. policy that made collaboration on an Atlantic scale its guiding standard should, by that token, be able to take the edge off any inward-directed and exclusive Europeanism. Such a policy would support the deep-seated and welcomed European desire for greater unity in a direction that would strengthen the transatlantic bonds on which the United States and Europe depend for their mutual security and their economic progress. It would assure Europe and the United States alike of success in the competition with their common Communist adversaries, and thus fulfill the rich promise of the alliance, in fields beyond the military and on a base that exploits the broadest possible community of interest.

IV

ATLANTIC UNITY

Today's challenges demand the greatest possible unity of freemen everywhere to meet problems with which no nation, alone, can now deal adequately. But we state it as a major premise that first priority must be put upon maximum unity in the Atlantic world, with respect to political, economic, and military matters alike.

This family of nations—the United States, Canada, and Western Europe, bound together by strong ties of common heritage and history—forms the core of free world unity. The prime goal of future U.S. policy must be to capitalize on and to stimulate every shared interest that unites the free nations of the West and moves them forward toward one Atlantic community.

Since 1945 emphasis on unity for Europe has enabled Americans to sound progressive and alive to the call of the times, without suggesting that the United States itself accept any new ties with others. Behind the enthusiasm for unity confined to Europe there lay both concern and overconfidence—concern that the United States would be pushed around if closely linked with Europe, and overconfidence stemming from the belief that we were so rich and powerful as not to need others. Both sentiments are now out of touch with reality.

The membership, extent, form, pace, and method of any purely European unity is something for Europeans to decide. Attempts by the United States to impose its preferences can only lead to reaction against outside meddling. The chief question for Americans is: how much unity of others with us is in our interest? And we must also ask ourselves: what are to be the respective roles of Europe, united or not, and of the nations of North America within this broader Atlantic world?

The United States is not exclusively an Atlantic nation and cannot become one without neglecting its interests in the Western Hemisphere, in the area of the Pacific, and in other parts of the world. The same holds true, though to a lesser extent at least for Britain and France.

This means that special transatlantic ties should not be exclusive and inward directed. They should give the countries involved a firmer base from which to operate, both against adversaries who need to be held in check, and toward friends—such as Japan, the developing countries, or the American Republics—who need access to and support from the advanced countries of the Atlantic area.

1. An "evolving" community

Rather than looking toward the construction of elaborate new "supranational" institutions, the United States must be ready to build upon the foundations of practical, workable interdependence. There is already evolving a free-world community of shared interest which compels us, day-by-day, to deal with urgent problems. In addition to NATO itself, its institutions include the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund, each with a different membership but with a common core of Atlantic nations.

The term "partnership"—which has been stressed since 1961 to indicate one of the chief characteristics of a workable Atlantic Community—is useful, if it is not made to suggest a partnership of equal powers, or one necessarily limited to two partners only. A partnership of two provides no adequate place for Canada or for those European nations—possibly including the United Kingdom—that may decide to stay out of some future United Europe. While it may be flattering to Europeans to hear American statesmen speak of an impending equal partnership, they know this must remain at best a remote goal.

What the Europeans want today—and have every right to want—is participation of their countries with an equal voice in the formulation of policies that are of vital concern to them, whether they bear on the Atlantic area or on other parts of the globe. This right is reciprocal: If our European partners are to be protected against surprise moves by the United States that could endanger their security, the United States must be consulted, in turn, before European action is taken that could adversely affect its interests.

2. A broader partnership

Harmonization of policy must extend beyond foreign policy to all matters of common concern. Three matters on which agreement is of basic importance are: (1) strategic policy, including the control of nuclear weapons; (2) trade policy, including agricultural policy as typified by the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations; and (3) financial policy, including the strengthening of the West's monetary system. These are all problems of great difficulty and complexity. Their solution depends on continuous and patient effort, strengthening the "habit of consultation," and the will to reach agreement in the common interest.

We must not shy away from experimenting with novel organizational devices if and where they can serve to symbolize and strengthen unity. The immediate need, however, is not for new or more elaborate institutions but rather the will to use better what we already have. We need a new determination—shown by acts rather than words—to develop greater Atlantic strength and unity. The United States must now show this will and determination, stop the disintegration of NATO, resume the initiative shown by the Truman and Eisenhower administrations, and begin again to lead.

President Eisenhower well stated the goal in his farewell message to the NATO Council:

"Together we must build a Community which will best safeguard the individual freedom and national values of our various peoples and at the same time provide effective means of dealing with problems with which none of us, alone, can now deal effectively."

A bold new initiative is necessary. Let us proclaim the goal of a true Atlantic Community adequately organized to meet the political, military and economic challenge of this era. Let us invite our allies to explore with us the best means of creating such a Community, beginning with a critical survey of existing institutions and the formulation of proposals for their reform and simplification, and such new institutions, as may be necessary. We have pushed too long for greater unity, for others. Now let us lead toward greater unity of others with us.

(NOTE.—Not every member of the Critical Issues Council, its task force, or Republican Citizen Committee necessarily subscribes in every detail to all the views expressed. The council endorses its papers as a substantial contribution to public awareness of current critical issues and to the presentation of positive solutions.)

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 22, 1964]

GOP PANEL'S WORD TO UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON.—A blue ribbon Republican panel called yesterday for bold U.S. leadership to reinvigorate the Atlantic alliance instead of its current policy which "appears fitful and inconsistent."

A harsh report on the U.S. role in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization came from the Critical Issues Council of the National Republican Citizens Committee.

At a news conference on the report, Gen. Lauris Norstad, former NATO commander, said the Atlantic allies were asking questions about the "consistency and obscurity" of U.S. policies.

ATTITUDE

General Norstad, who headed the task force that wrote the report, said the administration sometimes tried to meet problems by resorting to gadgetry, such as a plan for reorganization.

Asked how greater cooperation could be gained from France while President de Gaulle heads that country, he said there was the matter of attitude and sensitivity in the policy of the United States.

He said he disagreed with the French President on a number of issues, but that we can't blame all of our problems on De Gaulle. He added that General de Gaulle spoke for France and reflected European concern about American policies.

The GOP group, headed by Dr. Milton Eisenhower, brother of the former President, and including former NATO commander Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther (retired), said:

"The mere hint of U.S. withdrawals—even if falsely interpreted as pointing toward future U.S. disengagement from the (European) continent—adds fuel to the doubts

that are undercutting NATO's solidarity and deepens the 'crisis of confidence' through which the alliance is now passing."

The council, issuing its third critical issues paper, works in cooperation with the Republican National Committee, but its views do not reflect official GOP policy.

In issuing a report on "The Atlantic Alliance and U.S. Security," the panel indicated that additional U.S. troops and naval units armed with short- and medium-range nuclear weapons are urgently needed in Europe.

The extra forces could be ready for conventional warfare or used to offset Soviet nuclear blackmail, the council said. It contended that long-range nuclear missiles are unsuitable for meeting small-scale Communist aggression.

While other NATO members should be urged to do their share, the group said, the United States "must bear a share of responsibility for the failure of some European nations to meet NATO force requirements."

The Republicans charged that the Democratic administration had failed in the last 3 years to convince allies to assume a greater share of the burden to insure the security of all NATO members.

They urged that the United States concentrate on strengthening the Atlantic alliance for mutual security and let European nations work out continental unity.

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON—SPEECHWRITER

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, from time to time in recent weeks there has been speculation in the press about a supposed White House search for a master speechwriter. I suggest that the search need not go on. There is already a speechwriter in the White House—the President himself. The proof lies in the extemporaneous remarks delivered by the President at the White House reception for the American Society of Newspaper Editors. It seemed to me there shone in these remarks of the President the fire and clarity that marked the day-to-day utterances of our majority leader of old. The President who found it in his heart to say, in the rose garden: "These are the stakes: To make a world in which all of God's children can live, or to go into the dark" will find, I am certain, that his efforts to communicate with the American people, and with all people everywhere, will not be in vain.

Mr. President, with pride that it was in this Chamber, by the Members of this body, that the talent in the man who is now our President was most keenly appreciated, I ask that the extemporaneous remarks to which I have referred may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S SPEECH TO EDITORS AT WHITE HOUSE RECEPTION

Ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate your coming here today. The reason I wanted you in the rose garden is simply because if we had gone inside the White House Lady Bird would have insisted that I turn on all the lights.

I want you to know Lady Bird.

Mrs. JOHNSON. It is such a pleasure to welcome you here today, and I am so glad that Washington is turning its loveliest face to you. It is grand for us to have the opportunity to be with you. Thank you for coming.

The PRESIDENT. Now I would like for you to know my oldest daughter, Lynda Bird.

Miss LYNDA JOHNSON. He said I was on the record, but after coming after my parents, who always make such good speeches, I want to plead the fifth amendment because I am afraid anything I would say would incriminate me.

But we certainly are glad to have you here—we don't think we could have a better setting—people who write the stories about some of us who try to live the things you say about us. As I said before, it is good to have you here.

The PRESIDENT. Luci, my teenager, will be coming along a little later. She is being interviewed by a magazine at the moment. I want you to know her, too.

We are going in shortly to the White House, so you can pick up your candles in a box over there.

We had a preacher back home who dropped his notes just as he was leaving his church one time, and his dog jumped at them and tore them up. When the preacher went in the pulpit, he apologized to his congregation and said, "I am very sorry, today I have no sermon. I will just have to speak as the Lord directs. But I will try to do better next Sunday."

DELIVERED SPEECH AS LORD DIRECTED

I don't have a speech today. I just intend to do as George Reedy directed at the press conference this morning—to speak as the Lord directs. I thought I might talk to you about this job which fate has thrust upon me.

I am the President of the United States, the only President you will have, God willing, until January of next year. One of the hardest tasks that a President faces is to keep the time scale of his decisions always in mind and to try to be the President of all the people. He is not simply responsible to an immediate electorate, either. He knows over the long stretch of time how great can be the repercussions of all that he does or that he fails to do, and over that span of time the President always has to think of America as a continuing community.

He has to try to see how his decisions will affect not only today's citizens, but their children and their children's children unto the third and fourth generation. He has to try to peer into the future, and he has to prepare for that future.

If the policies he advocates lack this dimension of depth and this dimension of staying power, he may gain this or that advantage in the short term, but he can set the country on a false course and profit today at the expense of all the world tomorrow. So it is this solemn and this most difficult responsibility, and it is always hard to interpret confidently the future patterns of the world.

There are always critics around imploring the President to stick to the facts and not to go crystal gazing. Some of them tell me to try to keep my feet on the ground, if not my head in the sand.

But this is the point: The facts include today, the overwhelming ability in irresistible forces of change have been unleashed by modern science and technology, and the very facts dissolve and regroup as we look into them. To make no predictions is to be sure to be wrong. Whatever else is or is not that certain in our dynamic world, there is one thing that is very sure: Tomorrow will be drastically different from today. Yet it is in all of these tomorrows that we and our children and our children's children are going to be forced to live. We have to try to see that pattern; we have to try to prepare for it.

MUST IGNITE FIRE IN BREAST OF LAND

The President of this country, more than any other single man in the world, must grapple with the course of events and the directions of history. What he must try to do, try to do always, is to build for tomorrow in the immediacy of today, for if we can, the President, and the Congress, and you leaders of the communities throughout the Nation, will have made their mark in history. Somehow, we must ignite a fire in the breast of this land, a flaming spirit of adventure that soars beyond the ordinary and the contented, and really demands greatness from our society, and demands achievement in our Government.

We intend to seek justice because that is what the Nation needs. We intend to create hope because that is what the Nation needs. We intend to build opportunity because that is what the Nation deserves. We intend to pursue peace relentlessly because that is what the world demands.

These are the simple aims of our purpose. These are the forward thrust of our objective. But to start on this adventure, we must begin and we ought to begin today. Justice is a universal beginning for a great society. Justice is undone and untended in too many in our land.

Our Nation will live in tormented ease until the civil rights bill now being considered is written into the book of law. The question is no longer, "Shall it be passed?" The question is "When, when, when will it be passed?" We cannot deny to a group of our own people, our own American citizens, the essential elements of human dignity which a majority of our citizens claim for ourselves. Civil rights are not a luxury to be accorded to many. They are an obligation under our Constitution that is owed to all, for the bill before the Senate is only the validation of our moral, national commitment.

I want to repeat here today again, again, and again for the record what I said at Gettysburg last year: One hundred years ago Lincoln freed the Negro of his chains, but he did not free his country of its bigotry, for until education is blind to color, until employment is unaware of race, emancipation will be a proclamation, but it will not be a fact.

TRYING TO PRESERVE HUMANITY RESOURCE

We are trying to preserve our national resource of humanity, also. Some call it, and choose to refer to it, as a war on poverty. Well, it is a war, and poverty is the enemy. But the real objective is the preservation of our most precious asset—over 9 million American families at the bottom of the heap. It is not a program of giveaway. It is not a program of doles. It is a program that is concerned with skills and opportunities, with giving the tools for the job of growth, in making taxpayers out of tax eaters. We are investing in opportunity and giving them the skills to seize it.

For the first time in America's history, poverty is on the run and it is no longer inevitable and its elimination is no longer impossible, because it is right, we are fighting this war because it is wise, we are committed to winning it, and our strategy is to reach deep to the core and to the cause of the poverty. Having confronted it, then destroy it. In every aspect of this program, the cooperation of National, State and local governments is the passkey to action and the channelway for success. The Nation shall be the beneficiary, because by raising the average productivity of 11 million poverty stricken wage earners by only $1,000 a year, we would add $15 billion to the Nation's annual output.

Forty-nine percent—a hideously high figure—49 percent, one out of every two young men that are Americans who are examined for the draft, are found lacking physically, mentally, and morally. It is a senseless act of shameless neglect to ignore this intrusion on our satisfaction as a Nation.

ELDERLY CITIZENS NOT TO BE BARRED

But even as we try to invest our youth with the commitment of new opportunity, we are

equally determined that elderly citizens are not barred from dignity, are not vacant of hope. There must come from the Congress soon legislation for medical assistance for senior citizens. There is hardly a home in America today where a son, or a daughter, or a relative does not brood over the possible avalanche of medical expenses for their mothers and their fathers, or their uncles or their cousins, or their aunts. The dread of an impossible expense burden burns deep in the consciousness of practically every American home.

Is it a wild unreasonable proposal to ask that out of the average earnings of workers that are now more than $100 per week for over 70 million that they put $1 a month into social security, their employers do the same, making $2 a month? The Government contributes nothing. Is it asking too much for this bountiful country to prepare a law so that older folks can face illness when it inevitably comes and face it without the chill foreboding of an empty purse or an inadequate insurance policy? Under this plan, citizens know they did it for themselves without a Government handout. Because it is just, because it is right, because it is part of the good society to construct prudent programs, with vision, based on common sense and common decency, this bill is high on the agenda of our American purpose.

To build good Government, the first and most urgent need is good people. The pay bill soon to be debated in the Congress reaches into the very essence of urgency if this Government means to retain excellence and quality. On my desk tonight there are now dozens of resignations from some of the most brilliant and able men in the Government. They have run out their financial string. Each year they have gone into debt and each month now compounds their financial agony. They must quit to find higher incomes in private industry, and this Government suffers the harsh and irretrievable loss. To deny this pay bill is to invite mediocrity.

CAREER OFFICIALS DESERVE PAY RAISE

We cannot do the great things that this great Nation must do to develop a great society unless we, as a Nation, have the men to do them. Congressmen, Members of the House and the Senate, deserve twice what they get. Career officers, appointed officials, all deserve more money for jobs which too often demand long hours and ceaseless work. Don't make them steal or quit or go along borrowing when they are doing the job for you.

There is also in the Congress the legislation to adjust our immigration laws. The quota system is outworn. We want skilled people who can do jobs that need to be done, and we do want families reunited.

These are but a portion of our catalog of aspirations, for in the months and the years ahead, there will be new challenges and greater difficulties. Now we must attend to the duties that demand our attention. Right now, as you know, in the room across the hall, we are engaged in intensive collective bargaining sessions day and night in which we are trying to help railroad labor and railroad management solve their problems themselves in accordance with our free enterprise system.

A strike would cost us the loss of 7 million jobs in a very short time. A strike would cost us a downturn in our gross national product of 10 to 15 percent. A strike would cost us great dangers in health throughout the Nation. A strike would almost paralyze our entire system.

BARGAINING TEMPO TRIBUTE TO SYSTEM

The tempo of that bargaining that is taking place has stepped up considerably, and I believe this is a tribute to the free enterprise system. Sometimes I feel the free enterprise system is something like the weather—everybody likes to talk about it, and write about it, and we don't do enough about it. We have here in this case an opportunity and a responsibility to do something about it. That opportunity and that responsibility can be discharged, if we cooperate in helping the people on both sides, and not attempting to handcuff them by taking an extreme position which will provoke reactions that would break down the collective bargaining processes.

No group in all this Nation has a greater investment and responsibility than you, the leading editors of this Nation. The wounds of this Nation must be healed. The breaches in this Nation must be closed. And from this unity of this Nation must come the wisdom and the courage to reach beyond the commonplace.

The world is no longer the world that your fathers and mine once knew. Once it was dominated by the balance of power. Today, it is diffused and emergent. But though most of the world struggles fitfully to assert its own initiative, the people of the world look to this land for inspiration. Two-thirds of the teeming masses of humanity, most of them in their tender years under 40, are decreeing that they are not going to take it without food to sustain their body and a roof over their head.

And from our science and our technology, from our compassion and from our tolerance, from our unity and from our heritage, we stand uniquely on the threshold of a high adventure of leadership by example and by precept. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit," saith the Lord. From our Jewish and Christian heritage, we draw the image of the God of all mankind, who will judge his children not by their prayers and by their pretentions, but by their mercy to the poor and their understanding of the weak.

CANNOT CANCEL THAT STRAIN

We cannot cancel that strain and then claim to speak as a Christian society. To visit the widow and the fatherless in their affliction is still pure religion and undefiled. I tremble for this Nation. I tremble for our people if at the time of our greatest prosperity we turn our back on the moral obligations of our deepest faith. If the face we turn to this aspiring, laboring world is a face of indifference and contempt, it will rightly rise up and strike us down.

Believe me, God is not mocked. We reap as we sow. Our God is still a jealous God, jealous of his rightousness, jealous of his mercy, jealous for the last of the little ones who went unfed while the rich sat down to eat and rose up to play. And unless my administration profits the present and provides the foundation for a better life for all humanity, not just now but for generations to come, I shall have failed.

If there is judgment in history, it rests on us, according to our generosity or our disdain. These are the stakes, to make a world in which all of God's children can live or to go into the dark. For today under the shadows of atomic power it is not rhetoric but it is truth to say that we must either love each other or we must die.

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

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

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 163 Leg.]

Aiken	Case	Hart
Allott	Church	Hickenlooper
Bartlett	Cooper	Hill
Beall	Dirksen	Holland
Bennett	Dodd	Humphrey
Bible	Dominick	Inouye
Boggs	Ellender	Jackson
Burdick	Fong	Javits
Cannon	Gruening	Jordan, Idaho
Keating	Morse	Saltonstall
Kennedy	Morton	Scott
Kuchel	Moss	Simpson
Magnuson	Muskie	Smathers
Mansfield	Nelson	Smith
McCarthy	Neuberger	Sparkman
McGee	Pastore	Symington
McGovern	Pearson	Walters
McIntyre	Pell	Williams, N.J.
McNamara	Prouty	Williams, Del.
Metcalf	Proxmire	Young, Ohio
Miller	Ribicoff	
Monroney	Robertson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota with the understanding that I do not yield my right to the floor.

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

MRS. L.B.J.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the review of Ruth Montgomery's new book, "Mrs. L.B.J." This is a fine biography of Mrs. Johnson and it is, in fact, the first full length book which has been written about the First Lady. The review was written by Oveta Culp Hobby, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In her book Ruth Montgomery captures the grace and charm of Mrs. Johnson and presents her as a warm, thoughtful, and talented wife, mother, and now First Lady of the United States. I commend this book to the Members of the Senate.

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

CHATELAINE OF THE WHITE HOUSE

(A review by Oveta Culp Hobby)

"MRS. L.B.J."—BIOGRAPHY BY RUTH MONTGOMERY

Because of the suddenness of her entry into the White House, Mrs. Lyndon Baines Johnson has been the subject of an incredible number of newspaper and magazine articles within a short 4 months—so numerous, in fact, that at first it would seem superfluous to publish a book about her at this time.

But as this book proves, it is all the more necessary, because it is needed to offer an orderly sequence of the events of her life, and to provide a context into which the many interviews and anecdotes can be set.

Lady Bird Johnson is an unusual woman in any time, in any country. Few could have done so well and so warmly in the complex role she has been called upon to fill from the day of her marriage. Old Texas friends and close Washington friends know that and have deep respect and admiration for the woman they call Bird.

As a distinguished Washington correspondent who has known and frequently covered Mrs. Johnson during the last 20 years, Ruth Montgomery was splendidly qualified to write this first book—the first in this new era of White House history.

Because of their long and pleasant association, the author knows, for instance, how deliberately Mrs. Johnson has always held herself to a lifelong regimen of growth. And she is aware of how many old Washington friendships and associations are a part of the new White House existence. Mrs. Montgomery and Mrs. Johnson have shared the

Washington scene, which gives the author insight into her subject.

More remarkable is the author's grasp of Texas. She has seen and understood that though the President and his wife were born and reared in the same State, they came from backgrounds as diverse as though one had been born in Wyoming and the other Mississippi. She has caught the phrasing and the inflection of Mrs. Johnson, and her prose changes style and pace when she shifts from Mrs. Johnson as her subject to the President.

A slim volume, the book reflects many past interviews and experiences with the Johnson family as well as recent research among their family and friends. It includes stories and anecdotes not already familiar to the public, and it gives the familiar events in accurate and official version.

No one can write about Mrs. Johnson without giving way to a few adjectives—warm, thoughtful, gracious, efficient, serene. But as much as possible, the author uses facts and anecdotes to create her portrait.

The author indirectly suggests the link between the ante bellum plantation wife who managed an entire community of people and affairs as a routine part of her housekeeping, and the modern Mrs. Johnson who could expand and manage a ranch in Johnson City, a television network in Austin, a Senator or Vice President's house in Washington—and still be a gentle, soft-voiced, gracious woman to her husband, children, and friends.

More forthrightly, she says that Mrs. Johnson is "perhaps the most experienced chatelaine ever to become First Lady."

The book has all the swift readability of good journalism. Beginning slowly, almost gently, in a nostalgic account of Mrs. Johnson's childhood on the old country place outside Karnack, it picks up speed with the entrance of the tall, lean, compelling Lyndon Johnson; by midbook the reader is riding the self-propelled skyrocket that swept President and Mrs. Johnson to the Nation's highest post.

"Mrs. L.B.J." is a work of candid admiration. Those who know Mrs. Johnson personally, whether closely or casually, will find it valid and colorful.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, with the understanding that he does not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield with that understanding.

THE JOHNSON MAGIC SCORES AGAIN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week I noted how only one man could have secured a postponement of the threatened rail strike. That man was the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson. And he delivered.

Similarly, there was only one man who could have achieved a settlement of the dispute itself, the President of the United States. And he delivered.

Surely this rail settlement must stand as one of the most remarkable achievements in the field of labor-management relations in this generation. The entire Nation owes a great "thank you" to the President who assumed the leadership in reaching this solution and to the railroads and brotherhoods who bargained and negotiated in good faith until a solution was achieved. This is surely an outstanding testament to the basic soundness of our free enterprise system and to the viability of free collective bargaining. Congratulations are due to all participants.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the New York Times of April 23, 1964, commenting on the successful rail settlement be printed at this point in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that other editorials commenting on the President's activities in foreign aid, the balance of payments, the President's recent press conference, and civil disobedience be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 23, 1964]

SUCCESS ON THE RAILROADS

Thanks to President Johnson and his special mediators, the most frustrating industrial dispute in the Nation's history has ended on a note of success for labor, management, and the country. The railroad agreement announced at the White House last night did more than avert a costly strike; it kept alive public confidence in the capacity of employers and unions in this key industry to resolve their mutual problems through collective bargaining.

True, an accord made under intense Presidential pressure after 5 years of governmental involvement is something less than a total triumph for free decision-making. Yet it is precisely because the past record was so barren of any sign of capacity for forward movement through voluntary agreement that the pact looms as an enormous achievement for the President and the men whose ingenuity and persistence brought about a contract both sides were prepared to sign.

They hammered into the consciousness of carriers and unions alike a recognition that this was the Rubicon for collective bargaining in an industry whose troubles had already forced Congress to pass the first compulsory arbitration law in the Nation's peacetime history—the law to resolve the conflict over railroad "featherbedding."

The specific terms of last night's peace have not yet been officially announced. Plainly, the unions got a more advantageous deal than they would have if they had accepted the original recommendations of a Presidential panel 2 years ago. In that sense, they are the gainers from their unbroken record of negativism to all Federal settlement proposals. Yet both sides are bound to benefit, in the long haul, from the limited start made toward modernizing work rules and pay practices unchanged since the days of the Iron Horse.

They will benefit, too, from the acceptance of direct responsibility for establishing the standards that will prevail in their industry. For four decades both sides have become so accustomed to relying on the White House to make all the important decisions in their labor-management affairs that another failure would have brought insistent clamor for legislation to put them under permanent Government restriction. In a period of stress for democratic institutions, the proof the railroads and the unions have given of ability to compromise in the public interest represents a meaningful contribution to the defense of free decision-making. It is also a remarkable personal victory for the President in his first big strike test.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 23, 1964]

FIGHTING FOR FOREIGN AID

President Johnson has taken the offensive on his foreign aid program. In two separate speeches, he made the point that foreign aid is an "act of necessity" and went on to warn that he will continue to demand supplemental appropriations if Congress fails to provide the $3.4 billion he is requesting. The administration cut out all of the waste and pared all of the frills from the foreign aid package, the President insists, relieving Congress of the necessity of wielding its own economy ax.

Congressional opponents of foreign aid are unlikely to be impressed by these assurances. On the contrary, they will probably make a great show of finding something they can describe as unnecessary expenditure, and then proceed to cut into the bone. In an election year, those who can cut spending on foreign aid have the extra incentive of winning votes, an incentive that unfortunately does not apply to the program's defenders.

But Mr. Johnson says he will not bargain over the program. In taking a firm stand against further cuts, he is fighting for the very principle of foreign aid. For the issue is not whether one program or another deserves support—there will always be disputes over the relative merits of different projects—but whether the United States can afford the cost of foreign aid. On this score, the amount requested by the administration is truly the bare minimum.

When Mr. Johnson first announced his trimmed-down request for foreign aid, we argued that he could only get what he asked for by refusing to compromise. We welcome both the President's determination to rule out any haggling and his threat to keep coming back to Congress if it persists in carrying out false economies. This is the way to preserve the vital role that foreign aid can play.

[From the Washington Post]

A BETTER BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS POSITION

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

NEW YORK, April 19.—There is an intricate, but definite, relationship between these recent developments: (1) the fact that the interest rate on 91-day Treasury bills in last Monday's auction fell below the 3.5 percent Federal Reserve bank rate for the first time since last November, (2) the preliminary evidence of a sharp improvement in the international balance of payments in the first quarter and (3) the efforts that are now being made by the European Common Market countries to formulate a coordinated program to curb inflation pressures.

The current status and the outlook for these matters have a bearing on the outlook for business activity and investment policies. To discuss them intelligently, it is necessary to review briefly, the events of the past 8 months, beginning with the introduction of the administration's interest equalization tax proposal last summer.

In a discussion of this and other germane national policies last August, it was concluded in this space that: "The logic of the situation, therefore, suggests that the course has been set leading to improvement in the balance-of-payments situation."

Last October, Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon said: "The added incentives for use of capital in the United States (resulting from the tax reductions) will enhance the relative attractiveness of investment here for Americans and foreigners alike. The increased productivity associated with rising investment, together with greater incentives to develop and market new products and to apply more rapidly the fruits of our vast research capabilities, will reinforce the efforts we are making to increase our exports."

The writer emphasized at that time that the official statements of Government policy indicated that the encouragement of investment in the United States was one of the objectives. "It is significant that these policies do not rely on sharply rising Federal Government expenditures and/or persistent inflation as sources of economic growth."

In reporting from Amsterdam last November 25, it was noted that the prosperity in

Europe "contains serious elements of inflation that are now visibly threatening its continuation"—in contrast with relative price stability and a better control of costs in the United States. "I no longer have any doubt that the U.S. international payments deficit is well along the road to elimination—very possibly sooner than any anticipations that I have heard from Washington officials."

Against this background one can more easily understand why the European Common Market countries are now trying to design a coordinated program to curb inflation pressures. We can also find in it part of the explanation for the recent sharp improvement in the U.S. international balance-of-payments position. The recent softening of short-term interest rates in this country is, in part, one of the effects of this improvement.

It has been necessary that our national credit policies be influenced by the international balance-of-payments problem, in addition to the dictates of the domestic situation. The decline in the balance of payments reduces—at least temporarily—the possibility that credit might have to be tightened to cope with that specific problem.

Several valid arguments are being presented to discourage the acceptance of the first quarter improvement in our balance-of-payments figures at face value. It is premature to say that this problem has been solved. The first quarter statistics were helped by the abnormal shipments of grain to the Communist countries. There is also an abnormality in the low level of capital exports insofar as it is being caused by the proposed interest equalization tax.

Nevertheless, we should not overlook the fact that part of the improvement was the tangible result of well-designed policies. Our international trade balance probably has been helped by our relative price stability in contrast with continued inflation in Europe. The improved relative attraction of investment in the United States vis-a-vis Europe must be having a favorable influence on international capital flows. There has been a very distinct improvement in the confidence in the American dollar, which encourages cash balances to build up here instead of in Europe.

* * * * *

[From the Washington Post]

JOHNSON—AT STAGE CENTER

(By Douglas Kiker)

WASHINGTON.—It was a production that was kept on the straw-hat tryout circuit for a long time, but it opened to good notices when it finally was given its national premiere yesterday.

President Johnson, after meeting reporters in nearly every other conceivable place, held his first press conference yesterday in the State Department auditorium. Just as John F. Kennedy used to do.

"Ladies and gentlemen," he said, kicking it off, "I have come before you today for a regular scheduled, televised, notified-well-in-advance press conference. I did not drive myself over here. But I did have to cancel an informal meeting with some tourists at the [White House] gate."

It was the best attended Presidential press conference in history. There were 512 people there, many of them visiting firemen in Washington for the annual convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

In fact, their presence in town was the big reason why Mr. Johnson chose to hold his first weekday meeting with the press yesterday.

Mr. Kennedy's largest audience came on August 30, 1961, when 437 correspondents showed up to hear his comments on the newly constructed Berlin wall.

Juts about everybody conceded that John F. Kennedy's auditorium stage technique was flawless, and there was speculation that Mr. Johnson was hesitant to appear in contrast.

A REAL PRO

The thoroughness of the preparation for his debut made Richard Burton, rehearsing Hamlet up in Toronto, look like an amateur.

Mr. Johnson held a series of unannounced press conferences in his office, in his press secretary's office, in the Cabinet Room, in the White House East Room, in the White House movie theater, and in the front yard of his Texas ranchhouse before he decided he was ready to play the Palace.

The result was a polished performance yesterday that drew favorable comment from nearly everyone who saw him.

Why, he looked right smart up there, blue suit, blue striped tie, wearing his spectacles to read his opening statement, but then slipping them into his pocket later during the session.

That opening statement was crammed with statistics that glittered like stars in the Texas sky, and it was short, to the point, and quickly read.

He fielded some pretty tough questions, answering those he liked, and passing off those he wanted no part of.

He appeared sure and confident, in command of his job and his audience.

He stacked up pretty well—that was the common opinion here.

No more the caretaker President. It's the Johnson administration now—that was the impression he left.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 18, 1964]

CONTEMPT FOR LAW

Violence, lawlessness, and civil disobedience as forms of protest have been roundly and fittingly condemned by President Johnson, by the Democratic and Republican floor leaders of the civil rights cause in the Senate and by the most effective and trusted of the country's Negro leaders. Whether their warnings will be heeded by the restless mass of Negro citizens and by the reckless men striving to propel them into anarchy remains to be seen.

Civil disobedience—the kind of action called for by that irresponsible offshoot of the Congress of Racial Equality in Brooklyn, involving a wanton waste of the city's water supply and the projected disruption of traffic at the opening of the World's Fair—is a tactic which may have utility for majorities in rebellion against the oppressive rule of a minority. It can have no possible utility in a situation like that in America where a minority is striving for majority recognition of rights guaranteed by a Constitution.

It is one thing for people to breach laws which they believe to be unjust and unconstitutional for the purpose of testing their validity in court; but it is a quite different thing to violate reasonable and incontestably valid laws for the purpose of disrupting the normal and lawful life of a whole community. Attempts to inflict wanton and indiscriminate injury on a community cannot be tolerated by responsible governmental authorities. They must be resisted—by whatever degree of force may be required.

It is, nevertheless, incumbent on those who condemn such civil disobedience, to recognize its causation. It grows out of frustration and despair; it grows out of ignorance and a susceptibility to demagogy which are the consequences of segregation and other forms of racial discrimination and deprivation; and it grows out of a helpless fury at the interminable charade on Capitol Hill where another minority is pursuing an obstructionism of its own by its own peculiar brand of civil disobedience.

But none of this can in any degree condone or justify the folly of the Negro threats of violence and disorder. They constitute utter folly because through their invocation of counterforce they are inevitably doomed to defeat. And they constitute utter folly, too, because they reflect a contempt for law on the part of a minority which can enjoy its rights only under a rule of law.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I note by the heading on the Bipartisan Civil Rights Newsletter that today is the 38th day of debate on H.R. 7152, and the 21st day of the filibuster. The debate which has aroused the interest of the citizens of this country, though, has gone on for many thousands of days. In general, I am strongly in favor of debate. When it is directed to the issues and the substance of the matter being examined, it constitutes an important part of the legislative process. However, when the discussion is rambling, dilatory, and designed more to mislead than to educate, then I believe that the time has come to replace fiction with truth and opinion with fact.

As is clear, I am sure, to my distinguished colleagues, there has been much enlightening and extended discourse on constitutional law and the legislative procedure in this Chamber. But, despite the erudite explanations of each title of the civil rights bill, the misconceptions and distortions concerning this legislation are not easily overcome.

Debate on the civil rights bill is not limited to Members of this body. The news media of the country have done an admirable job of bringing to public attention the issues involved in this struggle for human rights. The information thus provided has been eagerly greeted by those who realize that a basic fact of good citizenship is keeping abreast of the issues facing the country.

Nevertheless, rumors and fantastic allegations against the civil rights bill, and those who support it, have been widely disseminated. Shadowy organizations with unrevealed sources of income have financed misleading newspaper advertisements and publications attacking this bill. While we in this Chamber engage in reasoned—if prolonged—debate, others less reasonable are engaged in a guerrilla war against civil rights where propaganda is the chief weapon and the use of half-truths and distortions, the instruments of deceit.

As the article entitled "Rights for Sale" which appeared in the Sunday Washington Post, April 19, 1964, so clearly details, no one really knows how much money is being spent, and by what organizations, to defeat this legislation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted into the RECORD at this point.

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

RIGHTS FOR SALE—MILLIONS GOING INTO LOBBYING

(By Robert E. Baker)

No one really knows how much money is being spent throughout the Nation to support and fight the civil rights bill now before the Senate. But it is safe to say that the total will run into the millions by the time the battle is over.

The biggest apparent single spender is the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms (CCFAF), the headquarters lobby for the attackers, which dealt out $192,000 in the first 3 months of this year.

"Oh, ours is a most modest operation," said John J. Synon, director of CCFAF. "Our spending is nothing compared to the other side."

But Marvin Caplan of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights disagrees: "I wish we had the money they've got." And Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., vice chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, said the procivil rights forces haven't spent enough money to "put in your eyes," that most of the work is voluntary.

ADS AND PAMPHLETS

The CCFAF launched its anticivil rights campaign last July and since has spent more than $325,000, most of it in hundreds of newspaper ads and more than a million pamphlets.

In its latest lobbying report filed with the House of Representatives, the CCFAF said it spent $85,000 for newspaper advertising in the first 3 months of this year and $72,000 for printed matter.

Its thrust was aimed at States where Negroes are few and other States where there are white racial minorities potentially opposed to the bill. One expenditure was $2,428 for ads in a Polish newspaper in Chicago.

Lobbies are required to list the source of contributions of $500 and more. The CCFAF's report for January, February, and March showed that it received $142,581.16 from the Mississippi State Sovereignty Commission, a State agency formed to preserve segregation. At one time it helped finance the White Citizens Councils.

But the commission contends that only $10,000 of its contributions was from State funds and that the rest was from private sources. Reporters in Jackson tried to track down the private sources but were told that the money was in the form of cashiers' checks and that the names of the contributors were not recorded.

Official State commissions in Florida and Alabama also have contributed a total of $13,000 to the CCFAF. The Plaquemines Parish (La.) Council, headed by political boss Leander Perez, who built a stockade in the swamps for arrested racial demonstrators, has appropriated $5,000 in taxpayers' money to the CCFAF.

But all this support of the CCFAF does not give the full picture of the money being spent against the civil rights bill.

The Jackson, Miss., Junior Chamber of Commerce has sent out pamphlets all over the country. In February, founder Robert Welch of the ultra-right-wing John Birch Society urged his units around the country to place newspaper ads opposing the bill under such names as "the Blanktown Committee To Preserve the American Republic," and to write the CCFAF for material.

One such ad popped up in Indiana under the sponsorship of "the Fort Wayne Committee To Preserve the American Republic."

Guessing how much money the pro-civil-rights forces are spending is an almost impossible task, primarily because of the diversification of the organizations involved.

The Leadership Conference on Civil Rights is not a registered lobby. It operates from a small office here with expenses since last summer running less than $50,000. But the success of the CCFAF in stirring opposition to the bill caused the conference to answer with a pamphlet, "Some Questions and Answers on the Civil Rights Bill." It has distributed 250,000 copies at a printing cost of $25,000.

The conference comprises 80-odd organizations ranging from labor unions to fraternal groups interested, at least in part, in civil rights progress. Few of the organizations are registered as lobbies; those that are by no means limit themselves to the civil rights bill.

The NAACP, for instance, lists its Washington bureau as a lobby. Big contributions in the last 3 months of 1963 included $6,000 from the Council for United Civil Rights Leadership and $2,000 from a Philadelphia fraternal club. But less than 2 percent of the NAACP's income is directed to lobbying for the civil rights bill.

CONVOCATION OF PREACHERS

Both the pro- and anti-civil-rights forces are trying to inspire letters to Senators from the grassroots. The Leadership Conference on Civil Rights is bringing in State delegations, one at a time, to talk to Senators. Churchmen also are beginning to make their presence felt in favor of the bill, which the CCFAF's Synnon is quick to acknowledge.

"The National Council of Churches is precluded from lobbying by its tax-exempt status," said Synon. "But it is lobbying all right."

The council, however, points out that one-fifth of 1 percent of its budget—$40,000—goes to its Commission on Religion and Race and that only a small portion of that sum can be charged directly to support of the civil rights bill.

Synon said also that the seven civil rights organizations of the Council for United Civil Rights Leadership in New York collected $800,000 in pledges last summer for the civil rights fight. But it turns out that half of that amount actually was pledged by foundations for the support of various programs ranging from voter education to job opportunities for Negroes and that a very small portion of the $800,000 has been spent in support of the civil rights bill.

Said a spokesman for the NAACP, one of the council organizations: "It may seem ironic, but the NAACP ended the year 1963 with $268,000 tied up in bail bonds, most of it in Mississippi, which has so far contributed $260,000 to the anti-civil-rights lobby."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It is no secret that one of the most effective weapons of political warfare is propaganda. For centuries, men have been stirred to action by an inflammatory word, a seditious pamphlet, or a provocative publication. Used as a means of arousing interest, enlightening individuals, and enlisting supporters, propaganda serves a useful and worthwhile function. That species of propaganda, however, which relies on distortion, misrepresentation of facts, and unfounded assertions must be rejected by all those who seek the truth.

Unfortunately, much that has been written against the civil rights bill is intended not to enlighten, but to confuse. Rather than appealing to logic, the propaganda published by those who oppose this legislation appeals to prejudice, since unfounded diatribes often arouse more opposition to a measure than reasoning. The logical and objective statements of fact made in rebuttal seldom dispel completely the fantasies implanted in men's minds by misleading propaganda. In a free society, the reason of men ought to govern their prejudices, but the sad truth is that such is not always the case. The Nation has witnessed recent examples of mob violence and outbursts of racial hatred which testify to the terrible chaos which results when reasoned discourse has been suspended.

In the course of this prolonged debate, several of my colleagues have commented upon the propaganda campaign being waged to defeat this civil rights legislation. Despite their efforts to unmask the vicious hate literature masquerading as reasoned analysis of the bill's provisions, a flood of anticivil rights propaganda—some of it patently false—continues to flow into the North, without having received the point-by-point refutation which might expose to everyone's view its deceptive and fallacious arguments.

However, it is not surprising that the opponents of civil rights have expended so much of their energy in an effort to convince the public that the provisions of the civil rights bill are antagonistic to the beliefs held by a majority of the American people. Lacking popular support, unsuccessful in its attempts to secure the votes necessary to defeat this legislation, the minority has tried to camouflage its weakness in its propaganda.

The American people are not so easily deceived. Neither are the Members of this body. The noise made by those who oppose civil rights legislation bears little relation to their numbers. The impressively large vote in favor of this bill by the House of Representatives makes it unquestionably clear that there is widespread bipartisan support for H.R. 7152. No amount of propaganda can conceal the fact that those in opposition to the bill are in the minority. This is obvious to those who support this bill, but it is a point that deserves to be stated again and again, so that there can be no doubt in anyone's mind that the overwhelming majority of citizens favor this legislation and wish to see it voted upon by the Senate.

A well-financed minority has purchased invidious advertisements in New York newspapers attacking the civil rights bill. The able and distinguished Senators from New York have demonstrated that those anticivil rights ads, paid for by the Mississippi State Legislature, do not represent the views of the vast majority of the voters of their State. I need not comment further on these advertisements because they have already been discussed by my colleagues and have received wide attention from the news media.

Less well known to the general public is the fact that other advertisements, similar in character, have appeared in small newspapers throughout the country. These ads attacking the civil rights bill were paid for by various local chapters of an organization calling itself the Committee To Preserve the American Republic. The ads ask the reader to write for more anticivil rights propaganda, and list two addresses. One address is the Washington headquarters of the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedom, located across the street from the Senate Office Building. The clandestine operations of this organization have already been discussed by other Members of this body. The other address to which readers are directed to write is American Opinion,

Belmont, Mass. American Opinion is the publication of the John Birch Society. What two organizations could better demonstrate that the extremist views of those who oppose civil rights are not shared by the large majority of American citizens?

These advertisements, all of them containing essentially the same copy, have appeared in the Birmingham, Ala., Independent, the Fort Wayne, Ind., Journal-Gazette, the Summit, Miss., Sun, the Angeles Mesa, Calif., News Advertiser, and, I am sorry to add, in two newspapers in New Jersey, the Red Bank Register, and the Burlington County Times. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this ad be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

(Ad appearing in Burlington County Times, Feb. 29, 1964)

EVERY VOTE FOR "THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963" IS A NAIL FOR THE COFFIN OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC

A recent president of the American Bar Association has solemnly declared: "The proposed extension of Federal executive and administrative control over business, industry, individual citizens and the States by the package of legislation called the Civil Rights Act of 1963 exceeds the sum total of all such extensions by all decisions of the Supreme Court and all acts of Congress from 1787 to June 19, 1963. When future generations look back through the eyes of history at this legislation they will recognize 10 percent of 'civil rights' and 90 percent extension of raw Federal power."

The results of this legislation would be enormous suffering by, and oppression of, both our white citizens and our Negro citizens alike; and such turmoil, rioting, bitterness and chaos as benefits only the Communists—or a Federal Government drunk with its drive for power. For a free copy of a brief analysis of this legislation by highest legal authority, write to Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedom, suite 520, 201 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. For a full understanding of the background, forces, and purposes behind this legislation, send $1 for the civil rights packet to American Opinion, Belmont, Mass.

In the meantime, the last bulwark against this act is the hard-pressed opposition within the U.S. Senate. If you oppose this Civil Rights Act of 1963, make your protest known, emphatically and immediately, by telegrams and letters, not only to your own Senators but to as many other Senators as you can. The address in every case is simply Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

This advertisement has been paid for as a public service by the Burlington County Committee To Preserve the American Republic, Post Office Box 105, Riverton, N.J.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield, without in any way jeopardizing his right to the floor or denying to him any of his parliamentary privileges under the rules of the Senate?

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have asked the Senator to yield because he is commenting upon advertisements that have been appearing throughout the Nation, advertisements which have been the subject of discussion in the Senate, and which I feel are grossly unfair, and have so stated.

I believe the Senator from New Jersey would be interested to know that during the time the advertisements first appeared, there was a deluge of mail highly critical of the civil rights bill, mail that reflected the distortions that were evident in the advertisements. But since that time, I assure the Senator from New Jersey, the entire picture has changed, so far as correspondence is concerned. In my office, where the mail was running about 2 or 3 to 1 against the civil rights bill a month ago, it is now running better than 3 to 1 in favor of the bill. I am pleased to note that much of the mail is coming from business leaders or people engaged in business, and from church people.

Today I received a visit from a number of clergymen of different denominations. Next Tuesday, April 28, in Washington, D.C., there will be a meeting at Georgetown University, at which the three great religious faiths of America—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—will be represented by their spokesmen. Those spokesmen will be members of the clergy. All of this tells me that some rethinking is taking place and that the time that has been used in the debate has not been to the advantage of the opponents but of the proponents.

I speak for others who have spoken to me of similar developments in their own offices. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who stepped out of the Chamber a moment ago, spoke to me of his experience with respect to correspondence from his State, as I have spoken of the experience with respect to my State. The whole picture has changed. People are speaking up for the civil rights bill. They understand its provisions, because the newspapers have been publishing excerpts and detailed discussions of those provisions.

I commend the Senator from New Jersey for his statement. I know he has been in the forefront of the battle for human rights and for the enactment of civil rights legislation; and he represents a great State in which the laws are designed to protect human rights and to assure equality of treatment.

I am confident that the pending bill does not contain any provision that is not already the laws in New Jersey. I have also said that about the laws of my own State; and in examining those of other States, we find that a majority of the States of the Union already have laws which are equal to or broader than or more encompassing than the provisions of the pending bill.

So I thank the Senator from New Jersey for his statement. It means a great deal to have him speak out, because he is a respected and recognized leader in the area of civil liberties and civil rights, and his word and his position on this subject are very convincing and very persuasive.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who is, in fact, the leader of the proponents in this debate, in which we are attempting to obtain Senate passage of the civil rights bill. I am sure that no one could discharge that responsibility more effectively or more fairly than he.

Later, I shall develop a comparison between the rights and opportunities provided by the laws of New Jersey and the rights and opportunities protected by the pending bill. The Senator from Minnesota is eminently correct: the laws of New Jersey are far more comprehensive, in every department of this subject, in protecting individual rights.

I also wish to commend the Senator from Minnesota for his references to recent expressions of opinions in the States. The advertisement, to which I referred, appeared in the Burlington County Times, in February. The mail I received was then more than 2 to 1 in favor of the civil rights bill; but since the debate has begun, we have found that there is a better understanding of what the bill will do. For example, for the period April 11 through April 17, I received from residents of New Jersey only 98 letters in opposition to the bill, whereas, in the same period of time, I received from New Jersey residents 363 letters in favor of the bill.

I have had a tabulation made in connection with my mail on the civil rights bill; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Incoming civil rights mail

	Out of State anti	Out of State pro	New Jersey anti	New Jersey pro
Mar. 20–27	216	6	114	198
Mar. 28 to Apr. 3	153	6	81	146
Apr. 4 to Apr. 10	107	7	80	277
Apr. 11–17	138	7	98	363
Apr. 18–24				

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I do not question the right of individuals to place the ads or the right of the newspapers to print them. But I do question the subterfuge which accompanies the conscious attempts by a few people to deceive the American public. Who paid for these ads? What is the role of the John Birch Society in the campaign being waged to defeat this bill? These questions are not likely to be answered, because those opposed to civil rights require the veil of secrecy in order to promote their aims. They shun the spotlight of publicity, because the fantasies and illusions they create appear more frightening when they are seen as grotesque and shadowy images. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a story appearing in the New York Times, on April 21, 1964, which shows the importance of secrecy to the anti-civil rights propagandists, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 1964]

BIRCH DRIVE SEEKS RIGHTS BILL DEATH—CAMPAIGN BY LETTER AND AD PUSHED—MEMBERS URGED TO TALK AGAINST MEASURE

(By Ben A. Franklin)

WASHINGTON, April 20.—The John Birch Society has called on its members to continue a "massive" letterwriting and advertising campaign against passage by the Senate of the civil rights bill. The campaign is re-

ported to have produced already "half a million messages to Washington."

In the March issue of the John Birch Society bulletin, official monthly magazine of the conservative group, Robert H. W. Welch, Jr., the society president, made his first appeal to members of local chapters. He urged them to organize "the most massive protest—by mail, telegram, by advertising, by the distribution of literature, by personal conversations, and in every practicable way—that we have ever undertaken with regard to any legislation."

Meanwhile, as the Senate entered the 35th day of debate on the civil rights bill, the minority leader, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, said that he would begin calling up his amendments to the fair employment section of the bill in midweek.

Mr. DIRKSEN said that the first amendment to be called up would be one of the less controversial of the 11 he will offer.

Tomorrow, Senator DIRKSEN will make known the text of the only amendment that would greatly weaken the fair enployment practices section. This concerns the procedure to be followed in pressing a complaint against job discrimination. At issue is the question of whether the Fair Employment Commission can file suit for the complainant, or whether the aggrieved must file on his own.

Both the March and April issues of the bulletin include the layout of a suggested three-column newspaper advertisement. The bulletin suggested that the ads be given "scrupulous proofreading (that) eliminates all typesetting chances of errors."

USE OF NAME SHUNNED

The bulletins also suggest that the ads should not carry a John Birch Society identification. In the sample format, the sponsoring group is "The Blanktown Committee To Preserve the American Republic, 1122 Main Street, Blanktown, Any State."

The suggested headline for the advertisement says:

"Every Vote for the Civil Rights Act of 1963 Is a Nail for the Coffin of the American Republic."

In the bulletin's April issue, Mr. Welch commented on the reaction to his March appeal to the membership by saying that "Washington is gasping at the results" of the letterwriting campaign.

"It is our guess," he went on "that our members are responsible for pouring more than a half a million messages into Washington during the last month and will pour in that many more before this fight is over."

The suggested text of the advertisement contends that "when future generations look back through the eyes of history at this legislation they will recognize 10 percent of 'civil rights' and 90 percent extension of raw Federal power."

The ad urges readers to help block the bill by writing "emphatically and immediately, by telegrams and letters, not only to your own Senators but to as many other Senators as you can."

If the bill passes, the ad went on, its consequences would include "turmoil, rioting, bitterness, and chaos as benefits only the Communists."

The ad also says that "a brief analysis of this legislation by highest legal authority" is available free of charge from the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms, Inc.

The committee is the most active and best financed registered lobby against the civil rights bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in addition to newspaper advertisements, anticivil rights letters, editorials, and other forms of propaganda manufactured in the South have been sent to citizens in my State to create an impression that there is widespread opposition to civil rights in New Jersey. In one case, which I regard as particularly shocking, someone decided that one of my constituents could not adequately express his views on the merits of this proposed legislation, and so took the novel—and strictly illegal—step of forging his signature to a communication expressing opposition to civil rights. Happily, my response to the card unmasked this deception. However, I doubt that this is the only instance of this disturbing invasion of privacy. My colleagues may well wish to ascertain, insofar as possible, how many of the letters they receive are truly sent by their constituents. Write in votes are one thing; write-in constituents are quite another.

There is some evidence that this insidious propaganda bombardment has had an effect on the opinion of some voters in New Jersey. Certainly this material may mislead and delude some portion of the electorate, even though there are presently much more effective civil rights regulations in my State than those proposed in this moderate bill.

As evidence of the confusion being created by segregationist propaganda, I point out that I have received a number of letters from individuals who object to provisions which are not even contained in this bill—and, in some cases, they oppose provisions which are specifically excluded by the bill—simply because they have been deceived by the propaganda. The following letter is typical of many I have received:

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: Our main objection to the question is the "busing." What sense does it make to force a white or colored pupil, from their neighborhood school, to a school 2 to 3 miles away * * * busing should be forbidden.

That letter was written to me, despite the fact that section 401(b) in title IV of H.R. 7152 specifically prohibits the busing of students across town, in order to achieve racial balance in the public schools. That provision clearly relates to busing, and legislatively prohibits busing in order to achieve racial balance in the public schools. Of course I wrote to that effect to my correspondent, and I hope a reasoned answer to him will clarify his misconception in regard to this area.

The influx of anticivil rights propaganda into my State has led some people to believe that the enactment of this proposed legislation would have some pernicious effect on their way of life. This assertion bears absolutely no relationship to the truth. The fact is that the laws presently on the statute books in New Jersey which bar discrimination in public accommodations, public facilities, education, and employment, are far more comprehensive in their guarantees of equal treatment than is any provision of this bill. The passage of civil rights legislation by Congress would add or detract nothing from the statutes already in effect in New Jersey. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that a tabulation comparing the provisions of H.R. 7152 with existing New Jersey statutes be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

COMPARISON OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL WITH NEW JERSEY LAW

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL	NEW JERSEY LAW
Title I—Voting	
No official shall apply different standards in qualifying people to vote in any Federal election. No official shall deny the right to vote to any individual because of immaterial errors or omissions in any step of the voting process. Section 101(2), page 2.	No discrimination practiced in any election.
No official shall give a literacy test without putting it in writing and retaining copies of the test for 22 months. Section 101 (a), page 3.	No literacy test required.
Establishes a rebuttable presumption that all persons who have completed the sixth grade are literate. Section 101(b), page 3.	
Requires expeditious handling of all voting cases and authorizes the Attorney General or the defendant to request a three-judge court to hear the case initially with direct appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. Section 101(d), page 4.	
Title II—Public Accommodations	
Prohibits discrimination in specific places of public accommodation whose operation affects interstate commerce or whose practices of discrimination are supported by State action. Covers hotels, motels, restaurants, cafeterias, lunch counters, gasoline stations, theaters, stadiums, and all facilities that are part of a covered establishment. Enforcible by civil action brought by Attorney General or persons discriminated against. Page 6.	Includes all of the establishments contained in the bill, but in addition, applies to places of safety or shelter, public conveyance, garage, public bathhouse, public boardwalk, skating rink, hospital, public library, retail stores, swimming pool, and billiard parlor.
Private clubs or establishments not open to the public are specifically exempted from coverage. Page 8.	No person shall publish any notice or advertisement to the effect that the public accommodations of any place are denied to any person on account of race, creed, color, or national origin.
	Civil suits may be brought and violators are liable to a fine of up to $500. In addition, violation constitutes a misdemeanor and is punishable by a fine of up to $500 or imprisonment of up to 90 days, or both.
	Private clubs are exempted.

Title III—Public Facilities

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL	NEW JERSEY LAW
Prohibits discrimination in public facilities owned, operated, or managed by the State or subdivision thereof.	Discrimination in all public facilites prohibited.
Authorizes Attorney General to institute or intervene in civil actions whenever he receives a complaint of discrimination.	Criminal penalties are identical to those for violation of public accommodations section above.
Authorizes the Attorney General to intervene in any case already filed by individuals seeking relief from the denial of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, or national origin.	

Title IV—Education

Directs Commissioner of Education to conduct a national survey as to the availability of equal educational facilities at all levels of public education.	Prohibits discrimination in all public schools, including academies, colleges, and universities.
Authorizes Commissioner of Education to give technical assistance to desegregating school districts that request help.	Prohibits discrimination because of race, religion, or color in private secondary and post-secondary schools.
Prohibits the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.	
Authorizes the Commissioner to set up special training institutes to teach school personnel how to deal with special educational problems occasioned by segregation.	
Authorizes Commissioner to make grants to school boards for in-service training or for employing desegregation experts.	
Authorizes Attorney General to initiate or intervene in school desegregation cases if he receives a complaint and the injured parties are unable to pursue their legal remedies.	Provides that a member of a school board who votes to exclude an individual from a public school on account of race, creed, color, or national origin, may be fined up to $250 or sentenced to 6 months in jail, or both.

Title V—Civil Rights Commission

Extends the life of the Commission 3 years and 4 months, and directs the Commission to serve as a national clearinghouse for civil rights information and to investigate general allegations of voting frauds not related to racial discrimination.	Permanent State agency, Division on Civil Rights, with full legal powers to prevent and eliminate discrimination within the State.

Title VI—Federally Assisted Programs

Directs all Federal agencies to require the elimination of discrimination under all aid programs and negates provisions of any Federal law that is contrary. Authorizes termination of aid to effectuate this directive, with the approval of the President and after 30 days following the filing of a report by the agency with the committee of the House and Senate having legislative jurisdiction over the agency.	All State public works contracts shall contain a nondiscrimination clause.
	A deduction of five dollars shall be made for each calendar day during which any employee is discriminated against, or intimidated.

Title VII—Fair Employment

Establishes an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to receive or to initiate complaints alleging discrimination in industries affecting interstate commerce.	Prohibits discriminatory practices in employment by any employer or labor organization with six or more employees or members.
Prohibits employers and labor unions with 25 or more employees or members from discriminating in their hiring and firing policies.	Upon complaint, administrative board may issue an order requiring compliance with law. Violation of board's order is a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of up to $500 or by imprisonment of up to 1 year in jail, or both.
Empowers Commission to eliminate discriminatory practices by conciliation and persuasion and to take the case to court if necessary. After a trial de novo, the court may order compliance.	

Title VIII—Voting Census

Directs the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a survey of registration and voting statistics by race, color, and national origin in such areas as may be designated by the Commission on Civil Rights.	Not applicable.

Title IX—Appeal Procedure

Provides for appeals from Federal court orders which send civil rights cases back to State courts.	Not applicable.

Title X—Community Relations Service

Establishes a Community Relations Service in the Department of Commerce to provide informal assistance to individuals or communities requiring help in resolving civil rights problems.	Conciliatory functions performed by Division of Civil Rights.

Title XI—Miscellaneous

Authorizes money to carry out the act.	Not applicable.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, fortunately, most citizens in my State are aware of these facts. And, having the facts at hand, they have not been fooled by the fictions of others. This is reflected in the mail I receive, which has consistently run more than 3 to 1 in favor of civil rights legislation. This is encouraging, and demonstrates the reliability of an informed and intelligent electorate. Nevertheless, the false accusations and rumors being spread about this bill should not be allowed to go unchallenged.

Frankly, I do not understand the basis for the objections to the bill. There has been no subversion of liberty in New Jersey as a result of our equal opportunity legislation. There has been no invasion of privacy or trampling of property rights because we have equal accommodations laws. There has been no disintegration of the democratic process because the voting regulations in New Jersey apply equally to all citizens. On the contrary, the foundations of democracy have been strengthened, the protection of property and personal rights has been guaranteed, and the two races have established a basis of mutual understanding. The debate on civil rights has been over for a long time in New Jersey. We faced the problems of discrimination, and attempted to settle them in a reasonable fashion.

These laws have not ushered in a utopia, but the experience of New Jersey and the experience of 29 other States with similar laws, provides some reasonable basis for rejecting the claims that chaos and calamity would result if this legislation were enacted. We should rather consider, in all soberness, our obligation to enact legislation that will serve the interest of all citizens, and return to the Negro population the rights which have been too long denied them.

A moment ago I mentioned the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedom, and the misconceptions which have resulted from that organization's propaganda activities. I would like to address myself specifically to the distortions and unfounded assertions contained in a pamphlet prepared and distributed by the coordinating committee entitled, "Unmasking the Civil Rights Bill." The pamphlet is a compilation of charges and allegations that the civil rights bill will destroy the freedoms, rights, and economic interests of various groups in America—bankers, farmers, the press, businesses, and labor unions. Of course, the bill will do none of these things, but some opponents apparently feel that this approach is more persuasive than a discussion of the merits of the proposed legislation. Perhaps the confusion created by this propaganda can best be removed by an examination of the charges made in this particular pamphlet.

POINT-BY-POINT EXAMINATION

Charge: The civil rights bill was railroaded through the House Judiciary Committee and has not received the careful consideration and thorough discussion it deserves.

Fact: That statement is erroneous. Senators see piled before me a visible ref-

utation of this ridiculous statement. In fact, as it was placed here on my desk there was a moment when I feared that the data would be visible, but the Presiding Officer would not be able to see me.

The pile would reach higher than I stand behind my desk. I can just about peer over and observe the distinguished Presiding Officer.

A subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee held 22 days of public hearings on civil rights bills between May 8, 1963 and August 2, 1963. During that time it heard 101 witnesses, including 2 Senators and 26 Congressmen. It received an additional 71 statements from interested parties. The hearings and statement run to some 2,649 pages of printed record. In addition to the public hearings, the subcommittee studied the bill for 17 days in executive session. The full Judiciary Committee considered the bill in executive session for 7 days. The House Rules Committee held 9 days of public hearings and took testimony from 39 witnesses, covering 518 pages of printed record. A subcommittee on the House Labor Committee heard 33 witnesses in 10 days of public hearings, covering 557 pages of the printed record on a bill to prevent discrimination in employment. Title VII of the present bill is in part based upon those hearings. The House of Representatives debated H.R. 7152, when the bill came to the House from the Rules Committee, from January 31, 1964 to February 10, 1964. Each title of the bill was debated separately and thoroughly. One hundred fifty-five amendments were submitted; 34 were adopted.

As for the bill's consideration by the Senate, the Commerce Committee held 22 days of hearings on S. 1732, a bill dealing with discrimination in public accommodations. It heard the testimony of 47 witnesses, took 81 additional statements, and compiled a printed record of over 1,500 pages. The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee held 7 days of hearings on S. 1937, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment, heard 55 witnesses, and compiled a written record of 578 pages.

The Senate Judiciary Committee held hearings for 11 days during July, August, and September of last year on bills identical to H.R. 7152. It heard testimony from 5 witnesses, took additional statements, and compiled a record of 483 printed pages. That committee also held hearings for 6 days in May and June on bills relating to the extension of the Commission on Civil Rights and compiled a record of 467 pages. It heard testimony from 29 witnesses and received 5 additional statements.

Thus, there was a total of 87 days of public hearings, 309 witnesses heard, and 161 statements filed. There are almost 7,000 pages of printed record discussing the provisions of the bill. So as not to add further to these statistics, I have not bothered to compile the number of speakers in the House who have addressed themselves to the bill. The RECORD of the House between the dates of January 31 and February 10 was filled entirely with statements concerning the bill. The RECORD of the Senate has been filled since March 6 almost totally with statements by both sides on this issue.

Mr. President, it took me about 5 minutes to read that impressive log of statistics of the full and complete committee discussion and floor debate on the proposed legislation. I do not know of any measure that has been more completely considered than the civil rights bill that is before the Senate.

For comparison, I ask unanimous consent that two tables showing the number of witnesses, the number of days of hearings, the number of statements and the number of pages of printed record which were compiled during consideration of the 1957 and the 1960 civil rights bills be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL, 1957

1. House Committee on Judiciary: February 4–26, 8 days of hearings, 108 witnesses, 20 statements, 1,299 pages of hearings.

2. House Committee on Rules: May 2–May 17, 9 days of hearings, 25 witnesses, 231 pages.

3. Senate Committee on Judiciary: February 14–March 5, 13 days of hearings (7 days discussed in committee), 68 witnesses, 12 statements, 930 pages.

Total: 57 days, 201 witnesses, 32 statements, 2,460 pages.

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL, 1960

1. House Judiciary: March 4–May 1, 17 days of public hearings, 95 witnesses, 14 statements, 960 pages.

2. Senate Judiciary: March 28–29, 2 days, 3 witnesses, 1 statement, 178 pages.

Total: 30 days, 18 witnesses, 15 statements, 1,138 pages.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. As is plain to see, there is no comparison between the extent of the examination given the bills then and that received by the legislation we are presently considering. In fact, we have expended more than twice as much time on this bill as we did on the other two measures combined.

PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

I now wish to speak of another charge which has been made in the committee's propaganda to which I have referred. The charge is about as follows:

It is contended that hotels, restaurants, and theaters would lose their right to serve whomever they choose; that they would have to deal with objectionable customers.

Fact: The bill does not require any establishment to serve unkempt, intoxicated, or disorderly persons, whatever their race, religion, or color. Title II of the bill merely requires that business establishments whose operations affect interstate commerce and which presume to serve the public, provide these services without distinction as to race.

The reaction to these provisions is surprising indeed. Not only do 30 States and the District of Columbia already have similar laws on their statute books, but there are precedents for such laws in the South. Southern opponents argue that to open places of public accommodation to Negroes would overturn the longstanding, immutable folkways of southern history.

A CLOSE LOOK AT SOUTHERN HISTORY

This assertion is contradicted by the fact that the policies of segregation are not immutable folkways which arose during the period of slavery, nor did segregation come into being during or immediately after the Reconstruction period.

I think this is important to point out. I do not believe that aspect of southern history has been brought out in the debate.

This misconception has had the effect of clothing segregation with the sectional pride that grew out of the period when the South emerged from the chaos and bitterness of the Reconstruction. In this manner many of the guardians of segregation have been able to defend their racial views with unusual zeal and clothe them with an appealing, but fictional historical validity.

As a matter of fact, however, at a time when the hardships of slavery and the bitterness of the Reconstruction formed a vivid memory for both races, the race policies in the South were far milder than they later became. There exists convincing historical evidence that the races lived in comparative harmony for almost two decades after the demise of the Reconstruction, and that the South showed little interest in promoting or accepting Jim Crow policies.

When, in 1879, Sir George Campbell, a Member of the British Parliament, scrutinized the South for racial tension, he commented, with some surprise, that Negroes shared public facilities and that—

> The humblest black rides with the proudest white on terms of perfect equality, and without the smallest symptom of malice or dislike on either side.

A writer in the Atlantic Monthly, who signed himself, "A South Carolinian," corroborated Sir George Campbell's observation:

> Negroes are freely admitted to the theater in Columbia and to other exhibitions, lectures, though the whites avoided sitting with them if the hall be not crowded. In Columbia they are also served at the bars, soda fountains, and ice cream saloons.

Thus, those who view the civil rights movement as a radical departure from the past are mistaken. In fact, the sit-ins and other demonstrations at lunch counters and theaters represent an attempt by the Negroes to reclaim lost rights.

In his study of Mississippi, Historian Vernon Warton noted that saloons served whites and Negroes at the same bar and that restaurants served dinner to both races in the same room.

Throughout the State, moreover, cemeteries held both whites and Negroes. Warton indicated, however, that in about 1890 Negroes began to be excluded from saloons, restaurants, parks, and cemeteries.

So there was a period running up to 1890, following the Reconstruction, in the South where the races lived together in these areas of public accommodations.

Unfortunately, the latter-day practice of segregation has been perpetuated rather than the more enlightened

customs which characterized earlier decades. Perhaps one of the most interesting bits of evidence of southern resistance to segregation can be seen in an editorial which appeared in 1897 in the Charleston News and Courier, the oldest newspaper in the South.

South Carolina seems to have been one of the most enlightened States in this regard. In opposing a plan for separation of the races on trains, the editorial said:

As we have got on fairly well for a third of a century, including the period of Reconstruction, without such a measure, we can probably get on as well hereafter without it, and certainly so extreme a measure should not be adopted without added and urgent cause.

The editor then called attention to what he considered the absurd consequences to which such a law might lead once the principle of Jim Crow was conceded:

If there must be Jim Crow cars on the railroads, there should be Jim Crow cars on the street railways. Also on all passenger boats. * * * If there are to be Jim Crow waiting saloons at all stations, and Jim Crow eating houses * * * there should be Jim Crow sections of the jury box, and separate Jim Crow dock and witness stands in every court. * * * And a Jim Crow Bible for colored witnesses to kiss. It would be advisable also to have a Jim Crow section in county auditors' and treasurers' offices for the accommodation of colored taxpayers. The two races are dreadfully mixed in these offices for weeks every year. There should be a Jim Crow department of making returns and paying for the privileges and blessings of citizenship. Perhaps the best plan would be, after all, to take the short cut to the general end * * * by establishing two or three Jim Crow counties at once, and turning them over to our colored citizens for their special and exclusive accommodation.

In reducing the proposed law to its absurd consequences, back in 1879, in Charleston, S.C., the editor doubtless believed that he had dealt the Jim Crow principle a telling blow. There was, however, another irony in his argument of which the author was unconscious. For what he intended to characterize as the absurd soon became a reality. Apart from the Jim Crow counties and the Jim Crow witness stand, all the other consequences suggested by the editor in derision were put into practice.

By the late 1890's the advocates of Jim Crow began to gain ascendancy in southern society. As late as 1900, the only Jim Crow law that had been adopted by a majority of the Southern States applied to passenger trains. South Carolina did not adopt this law until 1898, North Carolina in 1899, and Virginia in 1900.

Segregation tragically was extended to other areas; North Carolina and Virginia adopted a law requiring segregation on streetcars as late as 1901, Louisiana in 1902, Arkansas, South Carolina, and Tennessee in 1903, Mississippi and Maryland in 1904, and Florida in 1905.

A park law adopted by Georgia in 1905 appears to have been the first venture of a State legislature into segregated parks. Not until 1914 were circuses and tent shows segregated by law; this law required separate entrances, exits, ticket windows, and ticket sellers.

PUBLIC LAW 78—STRONG PRECEDENT FOR PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

I have gone into this matter at some length in order to clear away the prevailing misconception that segregation is as indigenous to the South as the magnolia blossom and the mint julep. But aside from the historical precedent and refutation that the equal accommodations provision of this bill would have disastrous results on an established way of life, there is other strong proof that no irreparable harm would result from this bill's passage. I refer to a law, already in effect, which extends the same guarantees provided by this bill to foreign nationals and Americans of foreign ancestry.

Mr. President (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair), paradoxically, many of the Senators who are most strenuously opposed to the public accommodations section of H.R. 7152 have voted 7 times in the last 12 years in favor of a public accommodations provision that is even more comprehensive than title II of this bill.

The public accommodations provision given such strong support for so long by the Congress is contained in Public Law 78, a law establishing a program to import Mexican farmworkers. This provision, known as article 8 of the 1951 migrant labor agreement, is an irrefutable precedent for title II of the pending civil rights bill. Article 8 has been enforced in numerous instances, and is still in effect today.

I wish to read part of the article, to crystallize the conclusions I am making:

ARTICLE 8—PROHIBITION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

Mexican workers shall not be assigned to work nor permitted to remain in localities in which Mexicans are discriminated against because of their nationality or ancestry. Within a reasonable time after the effective date of this agreement and from time to time thereafter, the Mexican Ministry for Foreign Relations will furnish the Secretary of Labor a listing of the communities in which it considers that discrimination against Mexicans exists. If there is concurrence by the Secretary of Labor that there is such discrimination in any such area, he will not issue, or where appropriate will withdraw, the authorization provided for in article 10.

If the Secretary of Labor does not concur, the appropriate Mexican Consul may request a statement signed by the chief executive officer or officers or the chief law enforcement officer of the community in which the Mexican workers are to be employed, pledging for the community that:

(a) No discriminatory acts will be perpetrated against Mexicans in that locality; and

(b) In the event that the Mexican Consul reports the existence of acts of discrimination against any Mexican because of ancestry or nationality, the local governmental officers who signed the statement will have such complaints promptly investigated and take such community and individual action as may be necessary to fulfill the community pledge.

The Mexican Government will permit employment in such areas if such pledges are furnished.

Under this provision, an agency of a foreign government, the Mexican Ministry for Foreign Relations, may impose severe economic sanctions against anyone who discriminates against Mexican citizens or Americans of Mexican ancestry. Furthermore, it can also take direct action against a local American community to prevent discrimination against American citizens.

These antidiscrimination provisions have been enforced many times. In Slaton, Tex., in the summer of 1960, for instance, the Labor Department investigated and found that discrimination against Mexicans was being practiced by restaurants, bowling alleys, and by the city officials who refused to desegregate certain public facilities. At that time, the matter was satisfactorily resolved without the necessity of removing the Mexican nationals under contract in the area.

In the summer of 1961, a formal complaint was made by the Mexican Government alleging that the Slaton City swimming pool was being operated on a "white only" basis, and that American schoolchildren of Mexican ancestry were being denied the use of that public facility. Negotiations with city officials were conducted in an effort to eliminate this discrimination. The Mexican Government requested the immediate removal of all Mexicans working in the Slaton area. Through negotiations with Slaton city officials, the situation was eventually resolved in 1962 when the city of Slaton opened its swimming pool to all members of the public.

This is but one instance: Similar nondiscrimination cases have involved restaurants, movie theaters, and barbershops. In fact, a significant number of Texas counties have been declared ineligible for braceros by the Mexican Government.

On the basis of these facts, it would appear that article 8 of Public Law 78 goes far beyond the public accommodation proposals in the civil rights legislation. Unlike the public accommodations provision of the civil rights bill, which only prohibits discrimination by businesses that affect interstate commerce, Public Law 78 prohibits discrimination regardless of whether interstate commerce is involved.

Yet, many of those who now contend that the public accommodations provisions of the civil rights bill will destroy the property rights of businessmen have expressly affirmed the more stringent nondiscrimination provisions of Public Law 78 for more than 12 years. The workability of equal accommodations laws is well demonstrated by these and other examples where the discrimination barriers in the South have been torn down.

If the public accommodations section of H.R. 7152 is unconstitutional, it would seem clear that the nondiscrimination provisions of Public Law 78 are equally unconstitutional. For under both provisions, businessmen would not be allowed to discriminate against a minority without being subject to governmental

sanctions—a cutoff of the labor supply or civil suits.

It is simply poor logic to argue that it is unconstitutional to deny public accommodations to a Negro citizen, but that it is constitutional to provide public accommodations to Mexicans. The constitutionality of a public accommodations law cannot turn on the severity of the governmental sanction or on the ancestry or the color of the customer. Yet, that seems to be the argument advanced by those opposed to civil rights legislation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator know that under the Bracero Act the only thing involved is whether braceros will be allowed to go to that particular community, and that there is no penalty of any sort assessed against the merchant or the community that does not treat Mexicans fairly? The only question is the question of availability of help under the Bracero Act. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is correct, but I am surprised at the Senator's expression, "The only thing involved." The Senator well knows, coming from one of the greatest agricultural States, that the whole economic life of the growers of fruits and vegetables depends on the supply of labor. In the past, in certain areas, growers have told us that they would fail and go out of business unless they could have the bracero labor supplied under Public Law 78. True, it is "the only thing involved," but it is a very important thing. An available supply of labor is critical when harvest comes along.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield further for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida for a further question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator know that under the pending bill the penalty which would be imposed for discrimination as to color would go much further following the bringing of an injunction suit, and following the trial for criminal contempt proceedings, without a jury sitting at the trial, and the possibility of grave punishment that exists, whereas no such thing is involved in the bracero legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, under the bill before us, if it becomes law, an individual who discriminates can insure that he stays in business by opening his doors to the public. The effect of the Public Law 78 provision against discrimination can be far more harsh than title II because the sanctions under Public Law 78 affect an entire community. A grower having no discriminatory intent, or carrying out no discriminatory act, could be denied needed Mexican workers merely because someone else—another grower or merchant—decided to discriminate against Mexican-Americans. Yet the nondiscriminator could do nothing about it. As an individual, he would be more severely affected and imposed upon by the antidiscrimination sanction than the individual restaurateur, who discriminated, would be. In the pending bill, it is not what is done next door or downtown that justifies a penalty; it is what a man does himself. Under the civil rights bill the businessman controls his own business destiny. That is not so under Public Law 78.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the restaurateur felt that the admission of persons of the other color would destroy his business, and he refused to conform, would not he be subject to an injunction and to a criminal contempt proceeding without a jury trial; whereas no such procedure would lie against a merchant, or even a community, which discriminated insofar as braceros were concerned?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. In the one case a grower who is in one of these communities may lose his labor supply. Under the pending bill the restaurateur can have his establishment locked up. Either way, we have a governmental sanction being imposed. I find it easier for an individual to control his destiny under the bill than under the other situation.

Of course in terms of business, there is the fear of losing business. Up our way it is good business to have the accommodations open to all orderly persons. One does not turn away a cash customer because he happens to have a different colored skin. His money will buy the same amount of corned beef as the money of anyone else will buy.

Mr. HOLLAND. I see no comparison whatever between the two situations, because under the Bracero case there is no penalty to be visited upon the individual who has a free right to decide whichever way he wishes to go. The Government cannot bring a suit against him, as it would be possible for the Commission to do under the provisions of the pending bill. There is no possibility of punishment by criminal contempt without a jury trial. It seems to me that the two situations are not at all alike. There is certainly no penalty of any kind that the Government threatens to visit against the individual who refuses to conform.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There is another difference between the two provisions. Under the proposed civil rights legislation before the Senate, the American Government brings the action to enjoin a violation in the public accommodations section. Under article 8 of the Public Law 78 agreement, however, the Mexican Government can put an American grower out of business. So far as the triggering authority is concerned, I would rather have it home based. I would not want to put any grower in an area where he must absolutely rely on Mexican labor, and where the Mexican Government could put him out of business for the discriminatory act of a third person.

Mr. HOLLAND. Has not the Senator admitted that several counties in Texas, which do not qualify for braceros, have continued to live and prosper without knuckling under to that provision?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I cannot speak about the prosperity. Both Senators from Texas have stepped out of the Chamber temporarily. Perhaps we could inquire of them. Once in a while, when it serves the advantage of certain parts of the debate, we find that there are areas of Texas that are very hard hit, and not as prosperous as other areas. There may be a ready supply of labor. Perhaps it is labor of Mexican ancestry but of American citizenship, which is close by. Of course there does not have to be any agreement under such a situation, because there is a local supply, and there need not be any import of labor from Mexico. Perhaps all this is becoming academic, because Public Law 78 is in its phaseout period—its last year—and will not be renewed.

In order to relieve any anxiety on the part of growers, particularly in California—I know that people in California are major users of the braceros—I am working on a program which would bring order where growers think there might be chaos, the program would operate through the U.S. Employment Services and would match workers with jobs. It would set up a system allocating the supply of loan to the job demand.

The Senator from Florida and I have discussed this situation. We have cooperated in many programs. Some of the benefits are already being provided in the States. I refer to services like those provided under the Health Migrant Act—Public Law 87-692. I see our employment service stabilization bill—S. 527—as offering the same kind of hope to agricultural communities.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has conceded, has he not, that he is trying to take the braceros away from the growers and is not visiting any destruction on them?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. On the braceros?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; on the growers. His effort is to take all braceros away, is it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes; and replace the braceros with qualified American farm workers.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is no destruction in connection with the braceros?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. No, when we have the mechanics such as S. 527 which would bring qualified farmworkers to Texas or California, where they are needed. There is a gap that we are trying to fill.

I am happy to have had this exchange with the Senator from Florida. I hope that we may soon be able to get on to other important matters before the 89th Congress convenes.

I should like to deal with one other charge that is being made:

Charge: Banks could not operate under the bill without undue hardship because the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Veterans' Administration would all cease their dealing with the bank if either the bank or one of its depositors were guilty of discrimination.

That is the wildest charge of them all.

Fact: The provision in the bill forbidding discrimination in programs receiving Federal financial assistance is limited to Federal grants, loans and contracts; it expressly excludes insurance or guaranty contracts. Thus, the charge is refuted. The bill does not affect the Veterans' Administration guarantee program; it does not affect the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; it does not affect the Federal Housing Administration insurance program. As to programs which are affected by the bill, only the distributor of Federal funds could be penalized, never the ultimate recipient.

CUTOFF OF FEDERAL FUNDS

Charge: The bill places arbitrary power in the hands of Federal bureaucrats who can cut off all Federal assistance to State agencies and programs which practice discrimination.

Fact: Far from granting arbitrary power to any branch of the Federal Government, title VI of H.R. 7152 represents an attempt to prevent States which receive Federal funds from using those funds arbitrarily by discriminating against Negroes who would otherwise benefit from State and Federal programs. The cutoff of Federal assistance to State agencies is a last resort, and can be employed only after attempts to secure voluntary compliance with the law have failed. Moreover, the President must give his consent to the agency's proposal to end its assistance to a State, and even then, the aid is not halted until 30 days after a complete report has been filed by the agency with the House and Senate committees having legislative jurisdiction over the agency's activities. With these procedural safeguards written indelibly into the bill, it is difficult to understand how the opposition to this legislation can claim that the Federal Government is exercising arbitrary power when actually what it is attempting to do is to secure compliance with the constitutional guarantees provided for all citizens.

Senators who complain about the arbitrary cutoff of funds should know that more Federal funds are being held up because of this filibuster than are ever likely to be cut off by any Federal agency. It is the conscious obstruction by a few which is preventing the Senate from conducting its business in a normal and orderly manner. Appropriation bills cannot be passed. Other important pieces of legislation cannot even be considered, because the pending unfinished business cannot be brought to a vote.

Public works projects and manpower development and training programs, to name only two examples, have come to a halt across the country because the funds to finance these programs have been exhausted, and no new funds can be authorized. Many unemployed workers who could return to work, if these programs were functioning, remain idle. The plans for accelerated public works projects that would help to revitalize highly depressed areas in New Jersey are not even being reviewed because there is no prospect that funds to finance them will be available in the foreseeable future.

Thousands of workers, unemployed because of the rapid advances of technology and automation, eager to be retrained for new skills, cannot receive that instruction because of the action of a few Members of this body. It is ironic that those who oppose the civil rights bill, and who, by their use of the filibuster, are actually cutting off funds for needed programs, come from those States which would benefit most from these programs.

Charge: Under the bill, veterans' benefits, pensions, unemployment compensation, and social security benefits to individuals may be cut off when individuals engage in racial discrimination.

Fact: Social security benefits are paid directly by the United States to the ultimate beneficiary. The United States does not discriminate in paying social security benefits. For like reasons, title VI will not affect veterans' compensation and pensions, civil service retirement, railroad retirement, and similar programs involving direct payments from the United States to the beneficiary.

Unemployment compensation is administered by State agencies, some of which receive Federal aid. Under the bill, a State agency administering an unemployment compensation program which participates in the Federal unemployment trust fund would be prohibited from denying payments to otherwise eligible beneficiaries because they are Negroes. It is difficult if not impossible, to see how anyone could legitimately object to that.

Another charge that has been made and used by propagandists—these charges have saturated northern New Jersey and have warped the opinion of those who do not know the real facts about the proposed legislation—is that Federal personnel will dictate decisions of homeowners and realtors concerning the building, occupancy, renting, leasing, and sales of homes.

Fact: The principal sources of Federal assistance to private homeowners and realtors are the FHA and VA insurance and guarantee programs—both of which are specifically exempted from coverage in this bill. It is as straight, clear, and simple, as that.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Charge: The bill impairs freedom of speech and of the press because it prohibits editorial opposition to desegregation.

Fact: Nothing in the bill prohibits opposition to desegregation or criticism of it. In its original form, the bill would have prohibited inciting, aiding, or abetting violations of the act—a type of provision that is found in many statutes, and which has nothing to do with criticism or opposition to a law, but only to the manner in which that opposition is demonstrated—that provision was eliminated by amendment by the House of Representatives.

Certain opponents of this bill have also contended that its passage would lead to the restriction of free speech and freedom of the press, which are guaranteed by the first amendment. Fears are expressed that persons and newspapers who urge the maintenance of segregation would be subject to fine and imprisonment. Nothing, of course, could be farther from the truth. It should be clear that the Civil Rights Act and other Federal legislation is subject to the commands of the first amendment. No word in H.R. 7152 even suggests that freedom of speech or of the press will be curbed, and no such word could stand the test of constitutionality if it were there.

Instead of raising such false fears, it would perhaps be well for certain opponents of the civil rights bill to recognize where the true threat to freedom of expression lies. For the November 6, 1963, edition of the Washington Post reports that television stations in Atlanta and Shreveport refused to carry a CBS network program because certain actors in the program expressed opinions concerning racial segregation which were at variance with opinions held by some persons in the South. Such action is hardly the best way to promote freedom of expression.

A far more serious threat to first amendment freedoms has taken the form of actions for libel which have been instituted by public officials of certain Southern States against newspapers and persons who have expressed opinions in opposition to segregation. The New York Times of April 4, 1964, reports that at least 17 such libel actions seeking damages totaling $288 million are now pending in Southern States. The use of the law of libel to obtain unjustified and inflated damages from biased and inflamed jurors is a perversion of the law and a serious threat to freedom of expression. The U.S. Supreme Court recently reversed a judgment of an Alabama court which had awarded $500,000 to an official of Montgomery, Ala., for alleged damages suffered by an advertisement which appeared in the New York Times. In his concurring opinion in this case, Justice Goldberg stated:

> The opinion of the Court conclusively demonstrates the chilling effect of the Alabama libel law on first-amendment freedom in the area of race relations.

Before the opponents of this bill argue that H.R. 7152 violates the first amendment, they would do well to put their own house in order and stop using the law of libel to silence opinion that is crit-

ical of the practices of racial segregation.

Charge: Boards of trustees of schools would be denied the right to handle students and teaching staffs in any way they chose.

Fact: Public schools are, of course, forbidden to discriminate under the Constitution. These schools are built by the tax money of all; they must be equally available to all. They are not the private preserve of local boards of trustees; they belong to all the people. Unfortunately, many of those who see the bill as an invasion of liberty actually want license to take unconstitutional action. The bill would not grant them that license. Nor should it do so. All of us should begin to realize that when we speak of a gulf between the races we are referring for the most part to an economic gulf. An economic gulf which can best be bridged by education. Let us stop fighting about the color of the child who sits next to our son and daughter and begin discussing how we can work together to improve the quality of all our schools.

VOTING

Charge: The bill takes away the rights of States to determine qualifications of voters.

Fact: Under the bill the States will continue to determine the qualifications of voters. The bill has no effect on this established right. It simply requires that the same standards for determining qualifications be used for Negroes as are being used for white applicants. It would prohibit, as it should, the practices of some local officials who regularly turn down all Negroes, including teachers and college graduates, because of "illiteracy," while granting the vote to white persons who can neither read nor write.

Hopefully, it will also eliminate blatant cases of discrimination, such as the one involving the blind Negro woman who was assisted in filling out her voting registration form by a polling official, and then was disqualified for "failing to fill out the voting form properly."

Injustice of that kind would be dealt with by the bill.

The Constitution prohibits such practices, and this bill will make certain that this constitutional prohibition against double standards is obeyed.

However, I should like to point out what I consider to be a serious omission in this bill—an omission which can be corrected by an amendment which I intend to offer at the appropriate time. I refer to the fact that the bill, while acting wisely to correct the above cited violations of voting rights in Federal elections, does nothing about State and local elections. I believe that the same prescriptions now made to apply to the election of Federal officials should apply to the election of State and local officials. The Negro in the South seldom gets to see his President or his Senator, and I may add, neither does the voter in the North; and if this debate does not soon terminate, this fact may well prove unfortunate for some of us.

However, the Negro in the South does get to see his sheriff and his local judges and other officials of the county or those in the city hall quite often. These are the people he is interested in helping elect and I intend to offer an amendment which will give him a fair chance to register and then do as his conscience may direct.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

Mr. President, it is also charged that employers, including farmers, will have to hire employees according to race to establish racial balance in every job classification; and it is said that quotas will be imposed, forcing businessmen to hire incompetent and unqualified personnel.

Now I turn to the fact: For some reason, the fact that there is nothing whatever in the bill which provides for racial balance or quotas in employment has not been understood by those opposed to civil rights legislation. They persist in opposing a provision which is not only not contained in the bill, but is specifically excluded from it. Those opposed to H.R. 7152 should realize that to hire a Negro solely because he is a Negro is racial discrimination, just as much as a "white only" employment policy. Both forms of discrimination are prohibited by title VII of this bill. The language of that title simply states that race is not a qualification for employment. Every man must be judged according to his ability. In that respect, all men are to have an equal opportunity to be considered for a particular job. Some people charge that H.R. 7152 favors the Negro, at the expense of the white majority. But how can the language of equality favor one race or one religion over another? Equality can have only one meaning, and that meaning is self-evident to reasonable men. Those who say that equality means favoritism do violence to commonsense.

Let me quote some arguments, which I am sure Senators will find familiar, being used against H.R. 7152. These quotations are not taken from the pamphlet distributed by the Coordinating Committee, although they might very well have been. Rather, they are excerpts from a legal brief submitted by counsel for Jones & Laughlin Co., in the N.L.R.B. against Jones & Laughlin case, decided by the Supreme Court in 1937. The brief reads, in part:

> The petitioner's order constituted an unlawful interference with the right of the respondent to manage its own business * * * the question of retaining or discharging an employee involves delicate consideration of discretion which the law is loathe to attempt to weigh. The facts of the present case show the dangers of bureaucratic interference. * * * This is clearly an interference with the normal right of the respondent to manage its own business, because it is a dictatorial usurpation of the respondent's discretion to determine the capabilities of its employees.

As everyone is aware, that fallacious argument was rejected by the Supreme Court; but today it is being repeated virtually word for word against the civil rights bill. Yet, in the more than 25 years since that Supreme Court decision, there has been no effort to repeal the National Labor Relations Act because it threatens the individual's right to manage his own business. Today, no one would say that the National Labor Relations Board has taken over the management of businesses. Neither has it sought to determine the capabilities of employees. Rather, it has accomplished its initial goal, the facilitating of orderly collective bargaining. Likewise, title VII of the bill has only one purpose—the elimination of racial and religious discrimination in employment.

Finally, let me attempt to put to rest the wholly spurious argument that H.R. 7152 would establish compulsory employment quotas, by pointing out certain relevant facts which should demonstrate the baseless nature of this objection to the bill. The Supreme Court has ruled, in numerous cases, that racial discrimination in the selection of juries is unconstitutional. In case after case, where it has been demonstrated that Negroes have been systematically excluded from serving on juries, the Supreme Court has declared such practice a violation of constitutional procedure. No individual may be prevented from serving on a jury on account of his race. But this does not mean that every jury must contain a Negro. The Court's decision does not establish quotas for juries. Neither does the Court demand that prospective Negro jurors be given preferential treatment over prospective white jurors when a panel is chosen. In fact, the Supreme Court has flatly rejected the notion that there must be racial quotas for juries. In *Akins* v. *Texas*, 325 U.S. 398 (1945), the Court ruled that there need not be any direct correlation between the number of Negroes on a particular jury and the number of Negroes in the community.

What is true in the case of juries is also true in the area of employment. H.R. 7152 does not require that every employer with more than 25 employees hire a Negro or a certain percentage of Negroes. It is possible that although a particular jury or a particular business will contain no Negroes, no charge of discrimination will be made. But businesses, like juries, may not systematically exclude Negroes, when the only ground for exclusion is the color of a man's skin.

So I think the experience with juries is on all fours with what will be the situation in the case of employment. In practice, I know this is true in New Jersey, which I am so proud to represent. No quotas are applied there.

There is an absolute absence of discrimination for anyone; and there is an absolute prohibition against discrimination against anyone.

Charge: The bill vests almost unlimited authority in the President and his appointees and is a vicious interference with private and State rights.

Fact: Authority granted to Federal officers is carefully limited in every section of the bill and thorough judicial review is provided for. The bill specifically provides for the use of State remedies where possible—title II, section 204(c). It emphasizes the use of consultation and mediation—sections 204

(d), 602, 707(a), 1002—and the dissemination of information—sections 403–405, 504. It seeks not to subvert, but rather to uphold the liberties of all American citizens.

And, if State laws, commissions, and means of enforcement are already operating effectively within the State, the Federal authorities will defer to them. Personally I would prefer to see each State take the necessary actions to protect the freedom and dignity of its citizens; however, the constitutional rights of citizens cannot be indefinitely suspended because a State refuses to act.

Charge: The bill is unconstitutional and contrary to the spirit of the Bill of Rights.

Fact: On the contrary, the civil rights bill is designed to guarantee and protect constitutional rights. For too long the rights of Negroes have been denied and abridged. The testimony and findings in hundreds of court cases demonstrate beyond the shadow of a doubt that Negroes are being deprived of their right of free access to Government facilities in violation of the 14th amendment; their right to freedom of speech and petition in violation of the 1st amendment; their right to the equal protection of the laws, to due process of law, and even to the security of their persons and that of their families.

H.R. 7152 would provide a remedy against these abuses; it would rectify some of these injustices; it would restore the balance in favor of observance of the Constitution where observance is now sadly lacking. And it would accomplish these goals without infringing upon the constitutional rights of any citizen.

The supporters of this bill have contributed to the debate so that the American people will have a clearer understanding of what this legislation means and why it must be adopted. In undertaking to provide a free exchange of views, the Senate has admirably fulfilled its responsibility to inform and educate the citizenry concerning the great problems facing the Nation. However, the Senate has not fulfilled its primary responsibility as a legislative body; namely, to take action so that those problems may be resolved. The civil rights bill must be brought to a vote. Only then can the issue which now divides us be decided.

But now the Senate stands immobile, unable to fulfill its responsibility. Meanwhile, there is growing restlessness in the country. Some of it is well-directed and inspiring, like the prayer vigil now going on here in Washington. Some of it is ill-advised and embarrassing and dangerous, like the stall-in at the World's Fair.

We must give our Negro citizens the privileges which have been so long denied them. We must grant them full and equal citizenship. We must enact this bill, not because we are forced to do so, not because of sectional concern, but because, in the words of our late President, John F. Kennedy, "It is right."

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I intend to seek the floor in my own right in a moment, but before the Senator from New Jersey yields the floor, I wish to say that I had an opportunity to hear the entire address that he has delivered in the Senate this afternoon. I wish to express my own personal appreciation for the research, study, and time that the Senator from New Jersey has obviously given to the subject. He has made it possible for many of us to come to a better understanding and a better appreciation of the issues that are at stake.

During the years that I have had the privilege of knowing the Senator from New Jersey, going back to the time when he was a Member of the House of Representatives, I have known of no person in public life who has demonstrated a greater and more consistent concern for the entire range of human rights. The same broad humanitarian philosophy that has made him a leader in working for better standards for American labor, and for our rural citizens, and for a higher quality of life for our people in the cities has also helped to explain the great interest he has taken in this all-important area of human rights. I wished to commend the Senator before he yielded the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to my good friend the Senator from South Dakota.

I yield the floor.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, at a later stage in the debate on the civil rights bill I hope to outline briefly my own views on the important issues that are raised in the bill.

THE URGENT NEED FOR CONVERSION PLANNING

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the attention of the Senate on another subject which in some ways is related to some of the issues in the civil rights debate. Last Monday in a speech before the Associated Press in New York, President Johnson announced a 40-percent cutback in the production of enriched uranium, which is the material from which nuclear warheads are constructed. At the same time Premier Khrushchev announced a parallel cutback in Russian nuclear production. On the following day Prime Minister Douglas-Home pledged Britain's support and cooperation in the reduction of nuclear materials production.

The reaction, so far as I know, in practically all countries, both here in the United States and overseas, was enthusiastic. Most commentators have recognized that the cutback would not in any way affect the balance of power between the great nations, nor would it interfere in the least with the enormously destructive power either of the Soviet Union or the United States.

President Johnson made that point quite clear in his speech.

Nevertheless, there is genuine cause for satisfaction in the announcement of these reductions. We all know that it is not weapons, but the will to use them, that cause wars. The awesome power of nuclear weapons may give the great powers pause, but the terror of weapons has never yet prevented a war. As long as fear and mistrust exists between nations, the danger of war will be ever present. The coordinated announcement of cutbacks in the production of nuclear materials, while not significant in military terms, was an important step toward reducing the tensions that pervade our world, raising the hope that international conflicts may more easily be resolved without resort to force.

However much we welcome the chance to reduce our production of the weapons of war, we must recognize that such a cutback is not without attendant difficulties. Many people in this Nation, indeed, whole communities, are dependent on the production of enriched uranium for their livelihood.

The recent reduction, plus earlier announced reductions in nuclear materials production, have directly affected over 400 jobs in Portsmouth, Ohio; Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Paducah, Ky. In addition, the reductions mean a cutback in the need for privately supplied electrical power amounting to over $30 million, thereby affecting employment in that industry. There is no doubt that this loss of employment will inevitably spread out through the adjacent communities, compounding the problem.

The threat of economic distress hangs over many other areas of this country heavily engaged in defense production. In a democratic nation such as ours there is always the danger that the legitimate concern of the people of such areas may influence decisions that ought not be the subject of economic pressures.

In other words, our level of defense spending ought not to be geared to economic pressures. It ought to be geared to providing the needs of our military defense, and for no other purpose.

Since 1950 this Nation has spent over half of its entire budget each year in preparation for war. Many voices, including that of President Eisenhower, warned of the dangers of a military-industrial complex that was easy to build but very difficult to dismantle. It was Karl Marx who predicted that capitalist countries would have to spend more and more on the production of arms in order to prevent economic collapse, and that this would propel the world inevitably toward war. In this, as in so many of his theories, Marx was wrong. There is nothing inevitable about the production of arms in America. The dangers of our world require that we be militarily strong, and we are strong. But there is neither need nor excuse for saddling our taxpayers with the cost of construction of superfluous weapons that add little if anything to our military strength.

President Johnson was clear on this point when he told his New York audience on Monday:

> We must not operate a WPA nuclear project just to provide employment when our needs have been met.

In our determination to prevent waste in our military program, and to avoid provocations that increase world tension, however, we must not abandon those of our people who have become dependent on military programs for their income and for their livelihood.

Through its defense programs, the Federal Government has brought entire communities into a dependency from which they cannot escape, in my judgment, without assistance. Where will they get that assistance when the inevitable shifts and cutbacks take place?

Secretary McNamara has been clear about the role of the Department of Defense. In an appearance before the House Armed Services Committee in January of this year, Mr. McNamara said:

> The Defense Department cannot and should not assume responsibility for creating a level of demand adequate to keep the economy healthy and growing. Nor should it, in developing its programs, depart from the strictest standards of military need and operating efficiency in order to aid an economically distressed company or community.

Mr. President, I think that statement is unassailable. I cannot see how anyone could quarrel with the Department of Defense in considering that it is its responsibility to provide for the military defense of the country at the lowest possible cost, and without regard to considerations of providing jobs, or doing the various other things to stimulate the economy which are not within the proper role of the Defense Department. We would be in a sorry state if our Defense Department were subjected to the pressures of economic need in carrying out its mission to defend our Nation.

To meet the Government's responsibility to those communities that have become dependent on defense contracts and installations—and they have done a good job in meeting the country's defense needs—I introduced a bill on October 31 of last year to create a National Economic Conversion Commission. It would be the task of this Commission to develop proposals to lessen the impact of a defense cutback, such as the one announced last Monday by President Johnson, and to work with local and State leaders, to work with defense contractors in developing alternative production plans so that employment and income can be maintained. The bill, now before the Commerce Committee, has 12 cosponsors in the Senate, the latest one being the Senator from Maryland, who asked that his name be added to the bill yesterday. Twenty-two Members of the House have since introduced identical bills in that body. The President has created a special executive department committee, known as the Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament, to coordinate executive department conversion planning.

The proposed legislation has the support of the Republicans and Democrats alike. This is a bipartisan problem. We are proposing a bipartisan solution.

Mr. President, considerable interest has been shown by Congress and by the President. Moreover, the public, and some sections of the press have also been concerned about the problem that I am discussing. I have received literally thousands of letters from people in every single State in the Union since the introduction of this legislation last fall, supporting the concept of a Conversion Commission. I have received literally hundreds of copies of letters which have been sent to the President of the United States and to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Commerce Committee. Many of these letters are from people who have been affected by the loss of jobs because of the reduction in defense spending, or people who fear the loss of their jobs because of proposed reduction in military spending.

There have been numerous articles in the press. I ask unanimous consent that two articles that appeared in the New York Times last week, one of which contains a useful table showing the importance of defense-space business to 34 large contractors, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as being representative of many others.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 12, 1964]

ECONOMISTS SEE AN END TO ARMS INDUSTRY BOOM

(By Will Lissner)

The bottom isn't falling out of the defense business, at least not yet, but the growth is, economists who have been studying the effect of recent cutbacks on the arms contractors report. This is forcing the country and the defense industry to think about the economics of a transition from an economy sparked by a munitions boom to one projected forward and upward by a newly strengthened civilian economy.

The small group of economists who have been preparing for the transition laugh at the industry leaders who as one put it, "approach the wailing wall, rend their garments, don sackcloths and ashes and recite from the Book of Lamentations."

These economists have been reporting recently on their studies in a variety of places, to the Senate Subcommittee on Manpower, before the Electronics Industries Association in Washington last month, in a symposium in the current issue of the bulletin of the Atomic Scientists and in several economic reviews.

THREAT TO PROSPERITY SEEN

In these reports they emphasize that adjustment to a peace that is breaking out ever so gradually is no light matter: It could threaten the country's prosperity. But the economists emphasize that it need not and, indeed, could underpin it.

John Silard of the United Automobile Workers legal staff, who was special consultant for the Senate Labor Committee on Defense Industry Conversion, points out that "today we are on the threshold of a serious national confrontation."

"Soon," Mr. Silard says, "we will be ready for a new policy of technological advance, which will facilitate the return to a peacetime pattern of national economic life."

Dr. Murray L. Weidenbaum, senior economist of the Stanford Research Institute and formerly with the Budget Bureau and the Boeing Co., recently completed for the Defense Department a study of defense conversion potentials.

He has tried to make clear to the defense industry the size and nature of the transition problem. The industry's nervous system suffered telling shocks from the nuclear test ban agreement, the decline in the next year's budget, the sharp reduction in new funding for strategic forces, impending closure of defense installations and indications of more cutbacks to come.

This, Dr. Weidenbaum emphasizes, is not a disarmament or even arms-control type of situation. Speculation is general that the defense budget may possibly decline as much as $5 billion over the next 5 years. He pointed out:

"Were this five-by-five situation to come about, it would mean no more than a 10 percent reduction from the current level, or a return by 1970 to the 1962 level of defense spending.

"Now, 1962 was by no means a depressed situation. In fact it was significantly higher than the post-Korean plateau in defense spending that characterized the Eisenhower administration."

DECLINE IS PREDICTED

Dr. Weidenbaum estimates that, taking future peaks and valleys into account and using dollars of constant value, the military budget will decline by several billion dollars in the next few years.

Then, he figures, it will begin a relatively slow increase so that between now and 1975 the military budget will rise at the average annual rate of 1 percent. This contrasts with a likely increase in total output of goods and services during that period of 3½ percent a year.

Thus the defense market outlook is for maintenance of a high level of defense demand in an area of the economy that is no longer a major growth area but rather one characterized by continued instability and fluctuation.

Archibald S. Alexander, assistant director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, who has responsibility for his agency's economic program, believes there are three broad alternative courses for future defense spending.

ALTERNATIVES ARE GIVEN

First, if no substantial disarmament agreements are reached but the weapons inventory becomes fairly complete and no crises require calling up additional men, the prospect is for a gradual decrease in defense spending.

This cut would be small in terms of actual dollars but larger in terms of percentage of total output, Mr. Alexander says. Offsetting steps needed, he holds, would be those that are needed today when companies and employees involved in shifts are hard hit, except that the blow would fall within a contracting industry.

The second alternative, Mr. Alexander says, is a substantial decrease under step-by-step disarmament. Dr. Weidenbaum estimates that the total net reduction in U.S. security expenditures under this alternative would be about $40 billion over a 12-year period.

This, Dr. Weidenbaum points out, would involve a decline of roughly $6 billion a year in the crucial introductory 3-year period of maximum impact. Then it would drop more gradually to the $20 billion annual level by 1975.

A net reduction of defense expenditures of $6 billion a year is about 1 percent of the total annual output of goods and services. It would be a far smaller percentage of total output than was represented by the defense cuts after World War II and after the Korean

war, Dr. Weidenbaum points out. The defense cut of post-World War II was 30 percent of total output; the post-Korean defense cut was 3 percent of it.

But this could cause a serious slowdown, he warns, and, if not offset, might well generate a total decline of several times that amount in the national economy.

Mr. Alexander's third alternative is a total decrease, which he points out could only occur if much of our defense industry was obliterated in a major war—which he hopes is unlikely.

Dr. Weidenbaum takes as a more realistic version the type of post-World War II disarmament to a level under $10 billion, but finds even this unlikely.

Barring new freezes in the cold war, the prospect is for the release of an important amount of resources and men from the military to the civilian economy.

OPPORTUNITY IS HAILED

Michael Michaelis, of Arthur D. Little, Inc., chairman of a U.S. Chamber of Commerce committee on research and development, who was formerly Executive Secretary of the White House Panel on Civilian Technology, argues that this is opportunity rather than threat.

The ability of corporations now oriented to defense to combine a great diversity of scientific and technical skills for massive assaults on large-scale problems, he finds, "may turn out to be a social innovation of even greater consequence, in the long run" than the technological revolution that made it possible.

"This," he concludes, "may be the spillover from military to civilian needs that is of greatest national and social consequence if we make up our minds to use it."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 13, 1964]

DEFENSE INDUSTRY FINDS CONVERSION CHALLENGING TASK—ECONOMISTS SAY SHIFT OFFERS OPPORTUNITY FOR SPURRING LONGRUN U.S. GROWTH

(By Will Lissner)

Helping the defense industry turn its swords into plowshares is a task of major proportions, according to a group of economists who have been studying the problem for government and business.

But the conversion of defense industry resources to peacetime pursuits, as fulfillment of national security needs and the international political situation permits offers the country a "tremendous opportunity" to bolster longrun economic growth and progress, the investigators report.

The group of economists includes Archibald S. Alexander, who is in charge of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency's economic programs; Richard Nelson of the Rand Corp., a specialist in research and development analysis, and Dr. Murray L. Weidenbaum, senior economist of the Stanford Research Institute.

Their findings are set forth in a report entitled "Defense Conversion Potentials," which has been submitted to the Defense Department by Dr. Weidenbaum.

The economists say that conversion is a large problem for several reasons.

NEW SHIFT IN PROCUREMENT

For one thing, a new shift has been developing in defense business.

During the midfifties, defense procurement shifted from the automotive and ordnance type of equipment produced largely in the upper Middle West to aerospace and electronic systems on which east and west coast companies have concentrated.

But in the last 6 years the major aerospace companies, taken as a whole, have received a declining share of prime defense contracts. A rising share is being allocated to research and development and production facilities along the gulf coast.

The bulk of the work will continue to be performed at existing industrial complexes, notably in California and the New England-Middle Atlantic region, Dr. Weidenbaum believes, but these facilities cannot reasonably expect to increase their share of defense contracts.

This, he thinks, may be why a prospective downturn, or even a plateau, in overall defense spending causes such consternation among these companies.

The problem of adjusting to a gradual or substantial decline in military demand is concentrated in a few industries—ordnance, aircraft, ship construction, and electronics—the bulk of whose sales are to the Government.

This problem is compounded because these four industries cluster in a few regions, notably the west coast, where they represent a major part of the industrial base of these areas.

Defense employment is 10 percent or more of the manufacturing employment of 15 States, according to data of the Bureau of Employment Security of the U.S. Department of Labor. These are the States:

Kansas, 30.26 percent; California, 29.59; Washington, 29.07; New Mexico, 23.80; Connecticut, 22.15; Arizona, 20.58; Utah, 20.35; Colorado, 17.80; Florida, 17.19; Maryland, 15.86; Massachusetts, 13.22; Texas, 12.65; Nebraska, 11.98; Missouri, 10.81; and New Jersey, 10.79.

SAN DIEGO CITED

The concentration is far greater in certain metropolitan areas, such as San Diego, with 81.8 percent of total manufacturing employment in missiles and aircraft; Wichita, Kans., 71.7 percent, and Seattle, 52.6 percent. The figure for the Los Angeles area is 26.9 percent.

Moreover, this employment is almost wholly in facilities built for the production of specialized defense equipment. Currently about 90 percent of defense production consists of such specialized equipment.

Dr. Weidenbaum, in studying conversion potentials for the Defense Department, found that relatively few of the workers or the facilities had ever been engaged in the production of civilian goods.

Moreover, the large, specialized defense companies had sought to diversify—turning out, for example, canoes, computers, and coffins—but had not been successful except in a very few cases.

LOSSES ON JETLINERS

The only attempt at diversification of a major sort was in production of transport aircraft for the commercial airlines, the large jetliners. But the profit performance on the large jet programs has been extremely poor and the losses incurred have both depleted venture capital and reduced enthusiasm for attempts to diversify, Dr. Weidenbaum reports.

This is to be expected he says. The companies lack commercial marketing capability because they needed none. They cannot produce large volumes at low cost because they are equipped to design efficiently small numbers of large-scale systems of great technical complexity. They just cannot make plowshares and pruning hooks.

Defense industry executives said, however, that there were fields these companies could enter if demand and financing were organized.

DISCUSSION URGED

They mentioned large-scale construction, mining of undersea minerals, sea farming, space travel, integration of transportation systems, revitalization of the merchant marine, improved communications and weather forecasting, nuclear electronic power, conversion of salt water to fresh, traffic control systems, air and water pollution control, urban development and program of technical assistance to developing countries.

Mr. Alexander, the disarmament agency official, has emphasized that the country must start discussing programs for an orderly transition of defense industry to civilian work.

What is needed, he says, are coordinated Federal, State, and local programs involving participation by business and labor in policymaking, planning, and action.

Dr. Weidenbaum has suggested some lines along which such programs might be developed.

TAX REBATE SUGGESTED

The Federal Government might award defense contractors nondefense research and development contracts. It might establish new requirements for nondefense systems so that the large defense contractors' sophisticated technology could be employed in them.

The Defense Department might treat commercial product planning or the development of a commercial marketing capability as allowable costs on military contracts. Retraining of employees might also be made an allowable cost.

To help nondefense industries that lag in research and development work, the Government might arrange the transfer of research resources from defense companies to these industries.

A tax rebate might be given for commercial research and development by defense contractors. This would be similar to the recently enacted tax credit for investment in production equipment.

Joint industry-Government financing of certain types of commercial research and development might be arranged, along the lines of the Interior Department's mineral exploration program. Under this, the Government pays up to half the cost of exploration and is reimbursed out of the proceeds.

Other possibilities are long-term loans and loan guarantees for certain types of commercial research and development, comparable to existing housing, small business and similar programs; leasing of Government-owned plant and equipment on favorable terms for work in behalf of industries with little engineering activity, and technical assistance on civilian applications of military research.

Michael Michaelis of the engineering concern, Arthur D. Little, Inc., one of the economists who have been studying the problem, says that the defense industry's development of the capability of creating highly advanced systems "has endowed us, as a Nation, with new military powers, and with a sense of power."

"To apply this capability to our civilian economy," he believes, "requires a deliberate and conscious national and corporate effort."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 13, 1964]

DEFENSE-SPACE BUSINESS

Following is a table summarizing research by Dr. Murray L. Weidenbaum of Stanford Research Institute estimating the importance of defense-space business to 34 large contractors. Partly because of the nature of the business, involving classified programs, the estimates are approximate. Defense-space orders may exceed company sales when payment is negotiated later, after delivery, and the amount does not appear in the year's sales figure. In some cases the ratio of defense-space orders to total sales may not be an accurate indicator of arms program involvement because, for example, military orders may be filled from civilian production.

Importance of defense-space orders to 35 major contractors, fiscal year 1962

Company	Defense contracts (1)	NASA contracts (2)	Total (1)+(2) (3)	Company sales [1] (4)	Ratio of defense-space orders to total sales (3)÷(4) (5)
	Millions	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Percent*
75 to 100 percent:					
Republic Aviation	$332.8	$6.9	$339.7	$295.8	100.00
McDonnell Aircraft	310.9	68.5	379.4	390.7	97.11
Grumman Aircraft Engineering	303.6	24.6	328.2	357.1	91.91
Lockheed Aircraft	1,419.5	5.0	1,424.5	1,753.1	81.27
Avco	323.3	1.4	324.7	414.3	78.37
North American Aviation	1,032.5	199.1	1,231.6	1,633.7	75.39
Hughes Aircraft	234.2	9.2	243.4	[2]	[3]
50 to 74 percent:					
Collins Radio	150.1	3.7	153.8	207.8	74.01
Thiokol Chemcial	178.3	.8	179.1	255.8	70.02
Raytheon	406.6	----------	406.6	580.7	70.02
Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock	185.0	----------	185.0	267.3	69.21
Martin Marietta	802.7	1.8	804.5	1,195.3	67.31
Boeing	1,132.8	15.6	1,148.4	1,768.5	64.94
General Dynamics	1,196.6	27.9	1,224.5	1,898.4	64.50
Curtiss-Wright	144.6	----------	144.6	228.7	63.23
United Aircraft	662.7	34.1	696.8	1,162.1	59.96
Douglas Aircraft	365.6	68.4	434.0	749.9	57.87
25 to 49 percent:					
American Machine & Foundry	187.3	----------	187.3	415.4	45.09
General Tire & Rubber	366.1	66.4	432.5	959.8	45.06
Northrop	152.5	1.3	153.8	347.5	44.26
Hercules Powder	181.6	----------	181.6	454.8	39.93
Sperry Rand	465.6	2.2	467.8	1,182.6	39.56
Bendix	285.9	19.4	305.3	788.1	38.74
FMC	160.4	----------	160.4	506.5	31.67
Pan American World Airways	146.7	----------	146.7	503.9	29.11
0 to 24 percent:					
International Telephone & Telegraph	243.6	2.2	245.8	995.5	24.69
General Electric	975.9	23.0	998.9	4,792.7	20.84
Radio Corp. of America	339.6	20.2	359.8	1,742.7	20.65
Westinghouse Electric	246.0	3.4	249.4	1,954.5	12.76
International Business Machines	155.5	12.6	168.1	1,925.2	8.73
American Telephone & Telegraph	467.7	10.8	478.5	11,742.4	4.07
Ford Motor	269.1	----------	269.1	8,089.6	3.33
General Motors	449.0	1.4	450.4	14,640.2	3.08
Standard Oil (New Jersey)	180.1	----------	180.1	9,537.3	1.89

[1] Net sales for fiscal year ending during 1962.
[2] Not available.
[3] Estimated from other sources to be in excess of 75 percent.

NOTE.—In some cases, it appears that the ratio of defense-space orders to total sales in fiscal year 1962 is not an accurate indicator of the actual ratio of military-space sales to total sales.

Source: M. L. Weidenbaum, Stanford Research Institute.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the cutback in the rate of arms spending, which until recently was widely thought to depend on the rather remote possibility of a firm disarmament agreement with the Soviet Union, has already taken place in the absence of any enforceable disarmament agreement.

Representative CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, explained this development to the House of Representatives earlier this year during presentation of the scaled-down Defense budget for next year. Mr. VINSON said:

> We are reaching a point in several areas, principally missiles, where we are coming up pretty close to our total needs. And we simply do not need to buy as many of the items as we did before.

Mr. President, I think that Representative VINSON has made a point that has not been fully appreciated, that in the absence of any kind of formal agreement on disarmament, we can anticipate substantial reductions in military spending for the simple reason that we have met all of our reasonable needs in a good many areas of the defense budget.

There comes a point after awhile when one can pile missiles no higher, when one can find no room for any more nuclear weapons systems. When that time comes, there will also come the recognition that we must reduce our allocation of the defense budget, even in the absence of any kind of agreement on disarmament.

Mr. President (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair), on August 2 of last year, I suggested in a speech in this Chamber that, as far as strategic nuclear weapons are concerned, we had a stockpile sufficient to destroy the Soviet Union several times over. President Kennedy made the statement as early as June 12 of last year, prior to the test ban treaty debate, that both the Soviet Union and the United States could destroy the world several times over.

I questioned the need for the continuance of the present rate of defense expenditure. I said to the Senate at that time:

> I think we need to take another careful look at our enormous arms budget, asking ourselves: What part of this budget represents additions to an already surplus overkill capacity? What alternative uses can be made of surplus military funds for strengthening the economic and political foundations of our society?

Since then, defense expenditures have been significantly reduced, primarily in the area of strategic weapons systems. President Johnson's proposed budget for fiscal year 1965 contains $1 billion less for the Department of Defense, and $3 billion less in new obligational authority for our military program.

Writing in the April issue of Foreign Affairs, former Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric, raised the possibility of a 25-percent cut in defense spending by the end of this decade. That would figure out to approximately $12½ to $13 billion, a 25-percent proportion of our present military budget expenditure.

What would such a cutback mean to our defense-dependent communities? At my request, the Department of Defense prepared a list of major military procurement programs not funded beyond fiscal year 1963, and those that will not be funded beyond fiscal year 1964, together with the affected major suppliers and their location. I ask unanimous consent to have this list printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MAJOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS NOT FUNDED AFTER FISCAL YEAR 1963 [1]

F–105 aircraft, major suppliers: Republic Aviation Corp., Farmingdale, N.Y.; United Aircraft Corp. (Pratt & Whitney Division), East Hartford, Conn.; Collins Radio Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa; North American Aviation, Inc. (Autonetics Division), Downey, Calif.; General Electric Co., Burlington, Vt.; General Electric Co., Johnson City, N.Y.; Laboratory for Electronics, Boston, Mass.

Falcon (GAR 2B/11) missiles, major suppliers: Hughes Aircraft Co., Tucson, Ariz.; Thiokol Chemical Corp., Elkton, Md.; the Eagle-Picher Co., Joplin, Mo.

Dyna-Soar (R. & D.), major suppliers; the Boeing Co. (Aerospace Division), Seattle, Wash.; RCA, Camden, N.J.; Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., St. Petersburg, Fla.

OH–13/23 helicopter, major suppliers: Hiller Aircraft Corp., Palo Alto, Calif.; Bell Helicopter Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Indiana Gear Works, Indianapolis, Ind., Parsons Corp., Traverse City, Mich.; United Aircraft Corp. (Ham-Stand Division), Windsor Locks, Conn.

OV–1 aircraft, major suppliers: Grumman Aircraft & Engineering Co., Bethpage, L.I., N.Y.; Bendix Corp., Eatontown, N.J.; Chandler Evans Corp., West Hartford, Conn.; Collins Radio Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Motorola, Inc., Scottsdale, Ariz.; Ryan Aeronautical Co. (Electronics Division), San Diego, Calif.; Sperry Rand Corp., Phoenix, Ariz.; United Aircraft Corp. (Haminton Standard Division), Windsor Locks, Conn.

A4E aircraft, major suppliers: Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc., Long Beach, Calif.; United Aircraft Corp. (Pratt & Whitney Division), East Hartford, Conn.; Bendix Corp., Teterboro, N.J.; Lear-Siegler, Inc., Grand Rapids, Mich.; Ryan Aeronautical Co. (Electronics Division), San Diego, Calif.; AiResearch Corp. (Garrett), Phoenix, Ariz.; Melpar, Inc., Falls Church, Va.; Kollsman Instrument, Elmhurst, L.I., N.Y.; United Aircraft (Ham-Stand), Windsor Locks, Conn.; Genisco, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.

RA–5C aircraft, major suppliers: North American, Columbus, Ohio; Solar Aircraft, San Diego, Calif.; Collins Radio Corp., Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Bendix Corp., South Bend, Ind.; North American (Autonetics Division), Downey, Calif.; General Dynamics (Electronics Division), San Diego, Calif.; Garrett Corp. (AiResearch Division), Los Angeles, Calif.; General Electric Co., West Lynn, Mass.; General Precision, Inc. (Kearfott Division), Little Falls, N.J.; Westinghouse Electric Corp., Glen Burnie, Md.

KC/RC–135 aircraft, major suppliers: The Boeing Co. (Transport Division), Renton,

[1] Maintenance and modification programs may continue to be funded after fiscal year 1963.

Wash.; United Aircraft Corp. (Pratt & Whitney Division), East Hartford, Conn.; Northrop Corp. (Norair Division), Hawthorne, Calif.; Rohr Aircraft Corp., Riverside, Calif.; Ryan Aeronautical Co., San Diego, Calif; Twin Industries, Inc., Buffalo, N.Y.

Hawk missile, major suppliers: Raytheon Co., Lexington and Andover, Mass.; Raytheon Co., Bristol, Tenn.; Aerojet-General Corp., Sacramento, Calif.; Intercontinental Manufacturing Co., Garland, Tex.; Northrop Corp. (Nortronics Division), Anaheim, Calif.; RCA, Camden, N.J.; Bendix Corp., Teterboro, N.J.; Goodyear Aircraft, Inc.; Akron, Ohio; FMC Corp., San Jose, Calif.

Nike-Hercules missile, major suppliers: Western Electric Co., New York and North Carolina; Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc., Charlotte, N.C.; Intercontinental Manufacturing Co., Garland, Tex.; Thiokol Chemical Corp.; Marshall, Tex.; Hercules Powder Co., Radford, Va.; General Electric Co., Syracuse, N.Y.; Continental Can Co., Inc., Chicago, Ill.; Aerojet-General Corp., Azusa, Calif.; Elgin National Watch Co., Lincoln, Nebr.; FMC Corp., Lakeland, Fla.; Consolidated Welding & Engineering Co., Chicago, Ill.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the impact of these cutbacks is already being felt in many parts of the Nation. Prof. Seymour Melman of Columbia University has prepared a list of recent and pending layoffs in 19 major defense firms in six States. I ask unanimous consent to have this list printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Recent and pending layoffs in 19 major defense firms

(NOTE.—These data were assembled from managements, trade unions, and employees of the firms.)

New York metropolitan region:	
Arma Division:	
1963 to date layoff of production workers	690
1963 to date layoff of engineers and technicians	825
1963 to date layoff of clerical and administrative workers	200
Sperry Gyroscope:	
1963 to date layoff of production workers	1,000
1963 to date layoff of engineers and technicians	550
1963 to date layoff of clerical and administrative workers	200
Reeves Instrument	360
Republic Aviation:	
1963 to date layoff of workers	3,700
Scheduled layoff (few engineers involved)	6,000
Ford Instrument: 1963 to date layoff of production workers	430
New Jersey:	
RCA (Camden and Morristown):	
1963 to date layoff of production and maintenance	3,700
1963 to date layoff of engineers	800
1963 to date layoff of technicians	450
ITT:	
1963 to date layoff of production and maintenance	300
1963 to date layoff of engineers and technicians	280
1963 to date layoff of salaried employees	220
Bendix Aviation (Teterborough)	500
Bendix Aviation (Red Bank):	
1963 to date layoff of production and maintenance	400
1963 to date layoff of white-collar workers	400
Bendix Aviation (Homedale): 1963 to date layoff	100

Recent and pending layoffs in 19 major defense firms—Continued

New Jersey—Continued	
Curtiss-Wright (Teterborough):	
1963 to date layoff of production and maintenance	2,000
1963 to date layoff of salaried personnel	400
ITT (data and information systems): 1963 to date layoff (mostly professional staff)	500
General Precision:	
1963 to date layoff of engineers	60
1963 to date layoff of production workers	170
Impending layoff of production workers	180
Massachusetts:	
Avco (Lawrence, Lowell, and Wilmington): 1963 to date layoff of engineers and scientists (projected layoff now pending 2,500)	270
Mitre: 1964 layoff	150
Raytheon: 1963 to date layoff	8,000
California:	
Aerojet (Sacramento):	
1963 to date layoff	2,000
Pending layoff	3,000
Aerojet (Azusa):	
1963 to date layoff	800
Pending layoff	1,200
Douglas (projected layoff now pending 3,750)	------
Lockheed:	
1963 to date layoff of engineers and scientists	1,100
Pending layoff (not including 700 to be transferred to Sunnyvale)	1,500
Systems Development Corp.: pending layoff	1,000
Colorado: Martin (Denver): As of Mar. 8 layoff of employees	2,800
Washington: Boeing: 1963 to date layoff of employees (continued reduction in employment through 1964)	14,600
Total	67,085

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in addition to the mounting problems in areas losing defense contracts, many communities partly or heavily dependent on a nearby military installation face the loss of that installation in the near future.

At a recent briefing that was unclassified, Secretary McNamara reminded Senators that no community should regard any military installation as anything other than a temporary installation. I believe that if Senators would stop to reflect on that statement, they can reach no other conclusion. Many of the shutdowns have already been announced. Inevitably, more will follow in the very near future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of military installations scheduled to be closed in fiscal year 1964 or in the first half of fiscal year 1965.

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

MILITARY INSTALLATIONS WITH ANNOUNCED CLOSING DATES IN FISCAL YEAR 1964, OR IN THE FIRST HALF OF FISCAL YEAR 1965

ALABAMA

Theodore Army Terminal, Mobile, June 30, 1964.

ARIZONA

Radar site, Winslow, August 30, 1963.
Radar site, Yuma, August 30, 1963.

ARKANSAS

Radar site, Walnut Ridge, August 30, 1963.

CALIFORNIA

Air Force Plant No. 16, Downey, October 26, 1963.
Air Force Plant No. 76, Bakersfield, March 30, 1964.
SAGE Center, Marysville, August 30, 1963.
Benicia Arsenal, Benicia, August 30, 1963.
Fort Mason piers, San Diego, July 12, 1963.
Mira Loma Air Force Station, Ontario, December 31, 1964.
Marine Corps supply forwarding annex, San Francisco, July 1, 1964.
Naval Air Station, Oakland, July 1, 1963.
Naval repair facility, San Diego, December 21, 1964.
Naval Oceanographic Office, San Francisco, January 31, 1964.
Nike site 33, San Francisco, June 30, 1964.
Pasadena Area Support Facility, Pasadena, December 31, 1964.
Overseas Supply Agency, San Francisco, July 1, 1964.
Santa Rosa Island A.C. & W., Station, Santa Barbara, July 1, 1963.

CONNECTICUT

New London dock, New London, November 7, 1963.
Nike site HA–25, Hartford, September 9, 1963.

FLORIDA

Fort Village Lanham Housing, Key West, August 30, 1963.

GEORGIA

Naval Forms and Publications Supply Office, Bryon, September 30, 1964.

ILLINOIS

Nike site C–44, Chicago, September 23, 1963.
Nike site C–54, Chicago, August 1, 1963.
Naval Oceanographic Office, Chicago, October 31, 1963.

INDIANA

Air Force Plant 30, Indianapolis, September 30, 1964.

IOWA

Ottumwa Tracking Station, Ottumwa, March 31, 1964.

KENTUCKY

Camp Breckenridge, Union County, June 30, 1964.
Louisville Army Depot, Louisville, July 1, 1963.

LOUISIANA

Camp Leroy Johnson, New Orleans, June 30, 1964.
England Air Force Base radar site, Baton Rouge, August 30, 1963.
Gap filler site, Lake Charles, August 30, 1963.
Gap filler site, Weeks Island, August 30, 1963.
Overseas Supply Agency, New Orleans, July 1, 1964.
Naval Oceanographic Office, New Orleans, January 31, 1964.

MAINE

Deblois Weapons Range, Columbia Falls, April 30, 1964.

MARYLAND

Naval Oceanographic Office, Baltimore, January 31, 1964.
Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant, (DOD 148) Strawberry Point, October 31, 1963.

MASSACHUSETTS

"E" Street Annex, Boston, June 30, 1964.
Mifflin Estate, Nahant, January 3, 1964.
Naval Oceanographic Office, Boston, October 31, 1964.
Nike site B–38, July 1, 1963.

MICHIGAN

Camp Lucas, Sault Ste. Marie, June 30, 1964.

SAGE Direction Center, Sault Ste. Marie, December 31, 1963.
Nike site D–17, Algonac, December 3, 1963.
Nike site D–54–55, Detroit, August 1, 1963.
Nike site D–86, Franklin, November 1, 1963.

MINNESOTA

Radar site, Grand Rapids, January 7, 1964.

MISSOURI

Fort Crowder, Neosho, June 30, 1964.
St. Louis Ordnance Plant, St. Louis, June 30, 1964.

NEVADA

Lanham Act housing site, Hawthorne, December 1, 1963.

NEW JERSEY

Camp Kilmer, Edison, June 30, 1964.
Nike Site PH–32, Burlington, July 5, 1963.

NEW MEXICO

Radar site, Las Cruces, August 30, 1963.
Radar site, Roswell, August 30, 1963.

NEW YORK

Army Building, 39 Whitehall Street, New York, June 30, 1964.
SAGE Direction Center, Syracuse, August 30, 1963.
Mitchel Field Sewage Facilities, New York, April 30, 1963.
Naval Oceanographic Office, New York, January 31, 1964.
Building No. 2, Jay Street Annex, Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, July 1, 1964.
Niagara Falls Chemical Plant, Niagara Falls, October 10, 1963.
Nike site NY–23, Nassau County, September 12, 1963.
Overseas Supply Agency, Brooklyn, July 1, 1964.

NORTH CAROLINA

Naval Air Facility Weeksville, Elizabeth City, December 31, 1964.
Radar site, Cherry Point, August 30, 1963.

NORTH DAKOTA

SAGE Direction Center, Grand Forks, December 31, 1963.
SAGE Direction Center, Minot, August 30, 1963.

OHIO

Brookfield Air Force Station, Brookfield, November 1, 1963.
Lordstown Military Reservation, Lordstown, September 15, 1963.
Naval Reserve Training Center, Cleveland, August 1, 1963.
Rossford Ordnance Depot, Toledo, July 1, 1963.

OKLAHOMA

The 32d Air Division, Oklahoma City, December 31, 1963.

OREGON

Naval Air Landing Field, Tilamook, July 31, 1963.

PENNSYLVANIA

Lukens Steel Plant, DOD 337, Coatesville, December 15, 1963.
Naval Home wharf, Philadelphia, March 31, 1964.
Naval Reserve Training Center, Erie, October 22, 1963.
Naval Reserve Training Center, Harrisburg, June 1, 1964.

RHODE ISLAND

Nike site PR–69, Providence (Coventry), September 9, 1963.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Nike site E–01, E–20, E–40, E–70, Ellsworth, September 12, 1963.

TEXAS

Camp Gary, San Marcos, December 31, 1964.
Radar site, Eagle Pass, August 30, 1963.
Gap filler site, Carrizo Springs, August 30, 1963.
Gap filler site, Comstock, August 30, 1963.
Gap filler site, Delmita, August 30, 1963.
Gap filler site, El Paso, August 30, 1963.
Gap filler site, Palacios, August 30, 1963.
Gap filler site, Laredo, August 30, 1963.
Gap filler site, McCamey, August 30, 1963.
Gap filler site, Riviera, August 30, 1963.
Naval Oceanographic Office, Galveston, October 31, 1963.
Panatex Ordnance Plant, Amarillo, December 6, 1963.
Radar site, Pyote, August 30, 1963.
Radar site, Ozona, August 30, 1963.
Radar site, Rockport, August 30, 1963.

VERMONT

Radar site, Lyndonville, August 30, 1963.

WASHINGTON

Radar site, Fort Lawton, Seattle, August 30, 1963.
Ammunition Storage Annex, Spokane, October 10, 1963.
Sage Direction Center, Spokane, September 30, 1963.
Mount Rainier Ordnance Depot, Tacoma, July 1, 1963.
Naval Oceanographic Office, Seattle, October 31, 1963.
ADC Unit, Spokane, September 30, 1963.
Naval Harbor Defense Unit, Port Townsend, January 16, 1964.

ALASKA

Radar site, Bethel, October 31, 1963.
Radar site, Middleton Island, October 31, 1963.
Radar site, Ohlston Mountain, October 31, 1963.
Eight DEW line sites, April 30, 1964.

HAWAII

Bombing Range, Bonham Air Force Base, March 31, 1964.
Fort Ruger Theater Parcel, June 30, 1964.
Sand Island Harbor Control Post, April 30, 1964.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, we tend to discuss the conversion problem as though it were far off in the future.

The New York Times made an excellent survey last summer of 25 of the largest military contractors in the country. They found that a high percentage of those companies had done little or no thinking, little or no planning, for the time when defense contracts may be reduced, canceled, or will have expired.

It is true that certain private industries that are under contract to the Federal Government have done considerable thinking and planning in this field, but they are the exception rather than the rule. We tend to think about this as a problem that is far off in the future, when the fact is that the problem is on top of us now. It is a very real problem to a great many people in various parts of the Nation.

The facts and figures I have just placed in the RECORD—and I hope they will be studied, because they show that arms reduction is a challenge to us—urgently call for a solution.

I have asked for hearings to be held on my conversion bill, and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has promised them at the earliest opportunity.

We all know something about the legislative situation before the Senate at the present time which makes it difficult for us to open up hearings on a new subject of this kind right now; but I urge all Senators to consider this proposed legislation carefully, and to investigate the situation within their own States.

I should like to say a word about the relationship of my proposed legislation to the President's Committee which has been created by Executive action. I personally welcomed the creation of the President's Committee as an indication of the concern of the White House with this problem, and the determination of the President to meet the situation before it has a major impact on our economy. At the same time, I believe that the Congress should demonstrate its own interest in protecting those communities affected by defense cutbacks. There is no need for a multiplicity of Government agencies in this area. There is need for a single capable agency, adequately staffed and financed, with a well-defined responsibility for planning the conversion of plants and communities from a defense economy to a civilian economy. I should expect that the Commission created by S. 2274 would either supplant the President's Committee, or would upgrade that Committee and turn it into a conversion commission with legislative authority and appropriated funds. In either event, the passage of S. 2274 would give us an agency adequate to the task and charged with reporting back to Congress within a year with specific plans for dealing with the plans to which I have referred. The bill would also bring the talents and resources of local and State governments—and defense contractors—to bear on the problem of conversion.

Mr. President, I hope that with the renewed interest in the problem generated by the President's recently announced cutbacks in uranium production, together with more awareness on the part of Congress and the public, we can take swift action to prevent serious economic difficulties from following in the wake of what should be a hopeful opportunity for our country; that is, the reduction of the arms burden.

We have reached the point in our development where it is possible to relieve ourselves of a portion of the heavy burden of armaments and to do so with no loss whatsoever to our military strength. We must not let this long-sought opportunity bring economic misery to many of our people and many areas of our Nation.

With the proper planning, the economic risks of defense cutbacks can be overcome. We can no more shirk our responsibility to protect the people and the communities who built our defenses than we can neglect our responsibility to maintain our national strength.

Mr. President, in an editorial in yesterday's Washington Post, the importance of planning for conversion was underscored.

Only intelligent forward planning will prevent the blessing of disarmament from being transformed to an economic nightmare—

The Post said. We must heed that warning before events overtake us.

I ask unanimous consent that the Post editorial, which I inserted in the RECORD yesterday, be again printed at this point of my remarks, in order to preserve the continuity of my statement.

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

SWORDS INTO PLOWSHARES

President Johnson's decision to curtail sharply the production of uranium and plutonium and the announcement by the Russians that they will move in the same direction are most welcome contributions to the relaxation of world tensions. But as the threat of nuclear annihilation recedes, new economic problems are created. And while they do not pose issue of life and death, their solution, which falls well within the boundaries of our knowledge and experience, is essential to a healthy American economy.

Although national defense absorbs nearly 10 percent of our gross national product, there is scandalously little knowledge about how many jobs are involved or exactly how changes in the level and composition of defense expenditures affects the level of employment. But when individual programs are "phased out" or when the overall level of defense expenditures declines, unemployment rises sharply in areas where defense production activities are concentrated.

There is no accurate measure of the number of persons idled by defense cutbacks or the number likely to lose their jobs when defense expenditures decline $1.3 billion in fiscal 1965. But it is obvious that the problem will grow more acute as the possibilities of a genuine detente are enhanced. Former Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell L. Gilpatric writes in the April issue of Foreign Affairs that a further improvement of relations with the Soviet Union could lead to the elimination of strategic bombers and a 25-percent reduction in the defense budget by 1970.

In the event of a sharp reduction of defense outlays, a way should be found for the orderly conversion of defense industries to civilian use. A massive conversion was easily effected after the Second World War, but the path was then cleared, as it would not be now, by a huge backlog of unsatisfied consumers' demands and an equally huge pool of liquid savings.

Without the pressure of consumer demand, there are no obvious or simple formulas for converting the military airframe industry or firms engaged in producing electronic equipment. The affected companies, many of whose managements have grown lethargic as a result of dealing with one sure customer, must find civilian products and open civilian product markets.

Last December President Johnson appointed a Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament. But that body has no staff, no budget, and, as yet, precious little information about the dimensions of a problem which is likely to grow more acute. An organizational framework is required, and it would be most swiftly provided by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN's bill (S. 2274) to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission. Only intelligent forward planning will prevent the blessing of disarmament from being transformed to an economic nightmare.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I wish to make one further general observation about the subject I have discussed; namely, the prospect of further reductions in arms spending, by expressing my own faith in the capacity of the American people and the American economy to absorb these reductions while our economy continues to move forward.

There is a wide range of unmet public and private needs to which we might devote new resources and manpower when they are found to be in excess of our defense needs.

The Senator from Connecticut, who was in the Chamber a moment ago, is now holding hearings on the problem of the pollution of air and the pollution of water, subjects which are of great interest to many of our citizens. They are problems which we ought to tackle with at least as much urgency as we have brought to bear on military programs.

There is also the problem of modernizing our railroad industry. We are all happy about the settlement of the threatened strike last night. However, this is only the beginning of many steps that should be taken to bring about a healthier and more wholesome railroad industry.

There is also the problem of mass transportation in the cities. That has been neglected. There are also the problems of weather control and weather modification.

There are unmet needs in the field of education and in the field of health, as well as in the field of urban and rural development. There are many areas to which we could turn our attention and our resources and some of our manpower once they become excess to our needs in the field of military defense.

Mr. President, if we seize these opportunities in the private sector and in the public sector, we shall find that any reduction in arms spending can open the way for new and hopeful opportunities for the American people.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KEATING obtained the floor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Delaware without losing my right to the floor.

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

FORGERIES ON TAX RETURNS IN ROBERT BAKER CASE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in March of this year Mr. Hauft, an accountant, made the charge that his name as it appeared on Mr. Baker's individual and partnership tax returns for 1961 was a forgery.

This information was submitted to the Internal Revenue Service. I have received a letter from the Internal Revenue Service dated April 23, 1964, in which the Commissioner of Internal Revenue confirms this charge. I quote:

> It has been established that Mr. Baker signed Mr. Hauft's name as the preparer of both the 1961 individual and partnership returns. This fact will be further considered as it relates to Mr. Baker's tax affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter dated April 23, 1964, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, D.C., April 23, 1964.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further reference to your letter of March 19, 1964, requesting information concerning the income tax affairs of Robert G. Baker. We advised you in our letter of March 26 that an investigation was underway by our Inspection Service of the allegation that tax returns may have ben substituted in the files of the Internal Revenue Service.

The investigation of this matter has now been completed. No evidence was found to substantiate the allegation that the Baker returns had been substituted in the Service's files. The investigation conducted by our Inspection Service, which included analysis of the questioned documents by the Federal Bureau of Investigation laboratory, shows that the returns are those originally received and processed.

It has also been established that Mr. Baker signed Mr. Hauft's name as the preparer of both the 1961 individual and partnership returns. This fact will be further considered as it relates to Mr. Baker's tax affairs.

I have forwarded a letter to Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, giving the full details of the investigation.

In addition to the return filing information given you in our letter of March 26, we can also advise you that income tax returns were filed by Robert G. and Dorothy C. Baker for the years 1953 through 1956. The returns for 1955 and 1956 were timely filed. The returns for the years 1953 and 1954 have been destroyed under the Service's destruction program, approved by the Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. Accordingly, we are unable to say with any certainly when the returns were submitted. However, there is nothing in our records to indicate these returns were not filed timely.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

MORTIMER M. CAPLIN,
Commissioner.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the letter further points out that these forgeries took place prior to the time the returns were filed. It is significant that the Commissioner specifically charges that Mr. Baker himself was the one who had forged Mr. Hauft's name as the preparer of the returns.

As evidence that forging the name of an accountant on a tax return is a violation of the law, I read a letter dated March 25, 1964, addressed to me and signed by Mr. Colin F. Stam, chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. It reads as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION,
Washington, March 25, 1964.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in response to your inquiry regarding the penalty provisions applicable in a situation where a tax return has been filed with a forged signature of a preparer of the return.

Under the Internal Revenue Code, such an offense may be prosecuted under section 7206(1) or under section 7207. Section 7206(1) provides:

"Any person who—

"(1) Declaration under penalties of perjury.—Willfully makes and subscribes any return, statement, or other document, which contains or is verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, and which he does not believe to be true and correct as to every material matter; or".

* * * * *

"shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both, together with the costs of prosecution."

Section 7207 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to fraudulent returns, statements, or other documents provides:

"Any person who willfully delivers or discloses to the Secretary or his delegate any list, return, account, statement, or other document, known by him to be fraudulent or to be false as to any material matter, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both. Any person required pursuant to section 6047 (b) or (c) to furnish any information to the Secretary or any other person who willfully furnishes to the Secretary or such other person any information known by him to be fraudulent or to be false as to any material matter shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

Such an offense may also be prosecuted under section 1001 of the Criminal Code of the United States (title 18, United States Code), which provides:

"SEC. 1001. STATEMENTS OR ENTRIES GENERALLY.—Whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact, or makes any false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or representations, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or entry, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

Sincerely yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

Mr. President, this letter clearly outlines the penalties for any person who forges the name of the preparer of a tax return.

I respectfully suggest that this is one instance in which the Department of Justice can begin taking action.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

FORGED CIVIL RIGHTS PETITIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, from time to time, during the debate on the pending measure, I have commented on the extent and contents of mail I have received on the subject from the State of New York. During the last 2 weeks however, a pattern seems to be developing in connection with printed petitions against the civil rights bill, which may be of interest to my colleagues.

About a month ago, I began to receive a number of single sheet petitions condemning the bill and urging me to vote against it. The petitions are printed on a sheet a little larger than a letter size paper. About one-third of the face of the petition contains printed matter stating that the bill would interfere with the right of homeowners to sell and lease their property; that if the bill were passed the Federal Government would supervise schools and homes and interfere with the personal liberties of individuals. Perhaps the most puzzling statement is the one alleging that the bill would bring about Federal control of an individual's right to build and occupy his home.

These charges, of course, are complete distortions of the actual contents of the bill. While the statement contains no mention of the source of these misrepresentations, or, for that matter, the source of funds which were used to have the petition printed and distributed, the allegations are of the character which appear so often in the publications of the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms. Only this month, the Mississippi State Senate appropriated an additional $50,000 for the use of this organization, so we know that they do have sufficient funds available for such a project.

As the signed petitions continued to come in, I marveled at the number of people who had been misled into believing these distortions. Each signer promptly received a letter from me explaining that the charges made in the petition were untrue and that I fully intended to support the bill. Then the return letters started to come in. Not all of the return letters, of course, were as I shall outline, but some of them, in all fairness, it should be said, expressed regret that they had been misinformed and were glad to receive my letter setting them straight. However, most of them did not reply to my letter, nor was any reply required.

The first letter I received was from a Roman Catholic clergyman, an official of the Brooklyn diocese. He said:

> It is important to me to advise you that I have not communicated with you at any time regarding civil rights legislation. * * * For a long time, it has seemed to me that dishonesty might occur in the matter of representations made to our lawmakers. It is most distressing to find that such is the case and that my name has been used.

Since then, I have received a number of other letters from constituents who have expressed both surprise and indignation that their signatures have been forged. A man in Elmhurst wrote:

> I am in favor of civil rights and whatever communication you received bearing my name was unauthorized.

Another simply sent my letter back with his own note:

> I never sent you a message. I approve of civil rights legislation.

A father in Forest Hills stated:

> I have not and will not sign any petition against civil rights. Further, I have never given permission to anyone to use my name, or my 11-year-old daughter's name—

Which, by the way, also appeared on the petition.

I have spoken on this subject this afternoon in order to advise the Senate to beware. Someone is using anti-civil-rights money to buy telephone books and mailing lists, and many of those earnest protests may represent only the wishes of those who would defeat the bill.

SPEECH OF JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER 3D, AT SPELMAN COLLEGE, ATLANTA, GA.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in a speech dedicating a new Fine Arts Building at Spelman College, Atlanta, Ga., on April 12, John D. Rockefeller 3d, noted that progress is being made in the vital areas of overcoming barriers, creating job opportunities, and providing educational and training programs that will allow the Negro and other minority Americans to achieve their full potential.

Mr. Rockefeller maintained that this progress creates responsibility for all concerned. Each American, he said, has the responsibility of practicing those precepts which will give equal opportunity to all Americans; the young Negro in turn has the responsibility of taking full advantage of his opportunities.

With great insight, Mr. Rockefeller said that the outcome of the civil rights struggle is crucial to the future of our country. "In its successful resolution there is, for each of us," he said, "an important role to play." Each of us in the Senate has his role to play and each knows full well what that role should be.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Rockefeller's speech be printed in full in the RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, often the argument is made by opponents of the civil rights bill, as it has been to all civil rights proposals in the past, that what is sought to be achieved by these measures—racial justice—cannot be obtained by law, but only by changes in human hearts. The answer is clear enough: no one contends that law is the simple, all-sufficing answer, but it is the basic, necessary first step in the direction of justice, which must be aided by wise and firm enforcement and continuous efforts at human communication and understanding.

The recent address delivered by Mr. John D. Rockefeller 3d, to which my colleague has referred, most eloquently stressed these fundamental points. I am most pleased to join my colleague in requesting that the address be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE TEXT OF A TALK BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER 3D AT THE DEDICATION OF THE JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER, JR., FINE ARTS BUILDING, SPELMAN COLLEGE, APRIL 12, 1964

I am very happy to visit Spelman College again. My family has been associated for five generations with the college as well as with the ideals of education that it serves. We are proud of the relationship and we applaud the leadership of President Read and President Manley in establishing Spelman as one of the fine institutions of education in Atlanta, and in the entire South.

Spelman always had a special meaning for my grandfather who spoke here at the ceremonies naming it just 80 years ago yesterday. The college, as you know, is named for my great-grandparents whose home was a station on the underground railroad.

It is gratifying to me that I should have the opportunity to represent my family here today, and to join with you in dedicating this Fine Arts Building to the memory of my father. His interest in Spelman as well as the United Negro College Fund is well known. But especially in our minds today was his interest in the arts to which this building is dedicated. It is most fitting that it bear his name, for art and beauty were meaningful factors in his life and he attached great importance to the place of the arts in the lives of people generally.

My hope—and I know it would be my father's hope—is that you will use this building as another means of gaining the fuller, richer life which the arts make available to us. I trust that each of you, and the future students of Spelman, will carry the knowledge and appreciation of art and culture gained here back to your families and communities.

I have wondered whether my talk today should be on the importance of the fine arts to your life and mine. But instead I have chosen a subject that is, I believe, even more important. That is the challenge of new opportunities for you and many other young people in schools and colleges across the country.

During the past 2 or 3 years, an exciting and significant social change has transformed the possibilities for the minorities of America. We are at the point of a changing tide where it is crucial that we understand these new opportunities and the responsibilities that go with them. Unless we see this new situation clearly, and act upon it with vigor, we may become lost in an undertow of violence and grief.

How America treats its minorities—and especially its Negro population—is first of all a moral question. Yet we should not ignore the far-reaching economic effects of the current struggle for equal opportunity. We should also be aware that what helps the Negro helps other minorities in all parts of America: The immigrant in New York, the migrant in the Southwest, the miner in Appalachia. And on the world scene, only a totally free America, meeting the ideals, rights, and aspirations of all, regardless of race, can maintain ideological leadership. As President Johnson stated a year ago: "Unless we are willing to yield up our destiny of greatness among the civilizations of history, Americans—white and Negro together—must be about the business of resolving the challenge which confronts us now."

Against this background, I would first like to discuss with you the three interrelated factors that, as I see it, dominate the civil rights question today: Simply expressed, they are barriers, jobs, and education.

II

As to barriers, it is clear that more and more are falling—in housing, employment, government, and education—in virtually every area of our national life. There is broad and growing understanding that, as President Kennedy put it, race has no place in American life or law.

I realize that to many of us the progress seems limited and slow—only the first steps on a long journey. In any event, it is a long-awaited beginning—a beginning that makes inevitable the day when every American will enjoy an equal freedom.

As Roy Wilkins has said, we are seeing "an awakening of the American conscience to the urgency of the civil rights issue." The barriers that remain, stand not only in the South; they stand in the North as well—the problem is not a sectional one, but a national one. It is no longer the Negro's problem; it is the problem of every American.

The Negro protest, militant and determined, is not just a struggle against a wrong. Rather, it is a struggle for a right. Its real roots are in the spirit—and the letter—of our democratic heritage. It seeks not an empty symbol nor a mere emblem of status. It seeks instead what is real and basic to the Negro and to every American: His personal dignity, his education, his job, his home.

The all-important civil rights bill is now being considered in our Senate. The attention of the Nation is focused upon the debate. While we look forward to its early passage, we must remember that the removal of legal barriers is only a first step. The laws are still to be enforced. Then, while they are being enforced and even after, still other barriers stand—these more difficult to break down. These are the hidden barriers. No law, no enforcement, no protest can erase these, for they exist hidden in the minds and hearts of people, of Negroes and whites alike. These are the intensely personal barriers of attitude, of how one man regards another, of how well or how little one man likes another. Subtle, ingrown, tangled, the sum of all our experiences, these hidden barriers cannot be removed, they can only be overcome.

They shall be overcome as whites and Negroes come more and more in contact with one another in their workaday lives, as a person of a color or a background different from ours becomes our neighbor and our coworker. Misunderstandings will be myriad since the wide gulf caused by centuries of enforced separation and indifference will take time to bridge. There will be setbacks, but there will be victories as well, each lowering a hidden barrier, each bringing nearer the day of equal freedom for all.

III

The second factor I would discuss is jobs. Here a dramatic and encouraging development has occurred across the American scene. Jobs for qualified Negroes are opening at a rate that those close to the situation would not have believed possible just a year ago.

Today, if a young man or woman has ability and initiative and is willing to give himself wholeheartedly to his work, he will find in many companies today that there is no position from which he will be barred because of race. Also, in these companies he has opportunity to rise to the higher positions, provided he has the abilities to meet the intensive competition. Such a statement would have been unthinkable only months ago.

Lately, I have discussed job opportunities with the heads of several national corporations. I am greatly impressed and gratified by their approach to this rapidly moving situation. They cited the strides their companies are making in hiring Negroes and moving them along into ever higher positions of responsibility and proficiency. This is not a record of isolated instances, but solid, hopeful evidence of the infusion of the Negro into the mainstream of American business. Yet, there is an irony that must temper optimism: The jobs are opening faster than Negroes can be found or prepared to fill them. Automation is crowding out the unskilled, calling for higher and higher levels of training and education.

At the same time, forces within industry and Government are at work to help disadvantaged minorities take advantage of the opportunities now coming within their reach. Some 150 leading companies are enrolled in the plans for progress under the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity in an imaginative and increasingly successful program to provide training and to open jobs for Negroes. The National Skills Bank, started last year by the Urban League, is helping to match individuals to jobs. In New York, an organization known as Harlem Youth Opportunities is developing a special attack on the problems there, and similar programs are beginning in other cities.

Yet a man must be responsible for his own qualifications. The help of others is often important—especially now—but in the last analysis if a man is to measure up, he must stand on his own two feet. Austin Walden, Atlanta's new judge, put it this way: "I have little concern about the difficulty of breaking down the remaining barriers in the pathway of Negro youth, but I am greatly concerned that youth prepare to take full advantage of the opportunities now opening before them. Henceforth, the young Negro will increasingly have to compete with the youth of the world. It will no longer suffice to be the best Negro. He will have to be the best man, period."

IV

So we have barriers going down and jobs opening up. The young American Negro faces unprecedented opportunities and, at the same time, the unprecedented challenge to prepare himself for them. Thus, we have the third factor in the civil rights struggle: education.

In the American dream, education has always been the watchword, the talisman, the open sesame to opportunity. Education is what our Founding Fathers so revered, what Lincoln gained by firelight, what, throughout our history, the sacrifices of one generation have earned for the next. As the leaders of the civil rights movement recognize, education is the key to the future of the American Negro as it is for all of us.

Yet, many have told me, education is the word that the young Negro of 1964 does not want to hear. He is impatient, they say. Talk of education he equates with further delay. Education to him means back to the books, wait a while—and he does not want to wait.

Every man of conscience will be sympathetic with his impatience. Yet can we speak of the opportunities which are opening and ignore what must be done to bring them within reach? Ralph McGill made this observation: "Because of the long isolation of the Negro from American life, a cultural and educational lag exists which would make it difficult for many Negroes—especially those in the rural South and those who had gone from it, untaught and unskilled to the industrial cities of the East and West—to take advantage of the rights attained."

James B. Conant has noted this cultural isolation in communities all over America. Children from these areas, he points out, are disadvantaged by isolation before their education begins; they are behind from the start, and the lag only lengthens as the pupil advances. The consequences are all too familiar. They appear especially in the adolescent years as increasing thousands of discouraged Negroes drop out of high school. They are young veterans socially crippled from the wounds of poverty and discrimination, caught tragically in the vicious circle of lack of training, lack of job, lack of hope.

That this lag be recognized and eliminated is of central importance to the Negro, to all the minorities of America, and to America itself. Every day it is allowed to exist, our Nation is wasting valuable human resources. Its correction, in the last analysis, is a matter not only of conscience but of commonsense.

It must be a foremost task of our time to equip American education with a catchup capacity that will permit our disadvantaged minorities an equal chance with all Americans to meet their basic needs and to realize their full potential. If this effort is to be really effective we must, as Dr. Conant has suggested, begin at the beginning. We must concentrate a massive effort on the beginning grades including kindergarten.

For leadership in this catchup effort we look to our educators, to the teachers and administrators, and to the citizens on our school boards. With each, we must rely on

his skill, but we must depend, to at least an equal degree, upon his heart, upon how much he truly cares about the welfare of the children.

The importance of "caring" cannot be overemphasized. I will always remember what a friend told me about a visit he made to several South American countries during the thirties. In many humble homes, alongside a revered religious symbol, he often saw a picture of Franklin D. Roosevelt. My friend one day asked a farmer why he gave the picture such a place of honor. The farmer said, "Because President Roosevelt is our friend. Because he cares about us and our problems."

Even as we begin this massive catchup effort within our schools, the urgency of the situation requires other, more immediate steps. I have in mind a proliferation of locally based projects designed to seek out promising disadvantaged boys and girls to give them the extra help they need to be admitted to high schools and colleges. There is a widening awareness of the extent of the problem and the urgency of the steps needed for its solution. Many encouraging beginnings are already underway. For example, universities and colleges such as Dartmouth, Princeton, and Oberlin are involved in such programs, as are Hotchkiss and Loomis Schools on the preparatory level. Still another promising technique to enrich our educational system is the increasing exchange between Negro and non-Negro colleges, the so-called sister-to-sister program, where, for instance, Tuskegee and Michigan are exchanging professors and students in many departments.

More, much more, needs to be done. We must look beyond our school systems if progress is to be rapid enough. Industry, labor, government, foundations, and individual citizens all have a role to play. It is essential that new and increased efforts, by both public and private agencies, be forthcoming. The objective is clear: to equip American society with the capacity to bring the new opportunities within the reach of the disadvantaged.

From this brief review of the current situation in relation to barriers, jobs, and education, it seems clear that important progress is being made—progress in the steady lowering of legal barriers, in the significant increase in job opportunities, in the growing attention to educational needs and training programs.

To me the winds of change coursing across our land carry a message of hope for the young Negro, for all Americans. This progress I see is not founded on a passive wish, but upon the realities of our day, upon the surging evidence of a turning tide.

The thought I would leave with you today is that the tide of progress, which brings us hope, also brings us responsibility. I cannot emphasize too strongly this element of responsibility. Certainly it is a collective responsibility facing our communities, our States and our National Government, but even more important, it is an individual responsibility facing each and every one of us.

As individual citizens in a democracy, our responsibility is direct and personal. In our way of life, change comes not on order from the top but by the accumulated actions of citizens working as individuals or groups across the Nation. These may be the separate actions of a town council, a church board, the president of a company, the mayor of a city, or the governors of a club. They may be the actions of a personnel officer, a union delegate, a restaurant owner, a landlord, or the driver of a bus.

When the citizens of a Nation are alert and progressive, a country moves ahead, when they are not, it moves backward; it cannot stand still. It is easy for citizens in a democracy to brush aside their responsibility on the grounds that the problems are too great or complex, the end results beyond their competence. We must remember, however, that it is what we do as parents, as voters, as workers in civic or social organizations, as holders of public office that will in the last analysis give equal opportunity to all Americans. America, we must remember, is no more than the sum of ourselves.

The individual responsibility which we are discussing applies to you young people with special impact and meaning. It has twofold implications. First, there is the responsibility to equip yourself to take full advantage of the new opportunities opening to you.

By raising your sights and reorienting your thinking, you can look ahead to a future of exciting promise. You can look beyond the older, long-open professions such as teaching. You can see the way clear to new careers in business, science, technology, and the arts, to mention but a few.

Competition will be stiff; you will be severely challenged to meet it. Many say the Negro has an "attitude deficiency"; he lacks competitive spirit, he lacks a sense of personal responsibility. The retort is that he has only lately been allowed to enter the competition, and has never had much to be responsible for. To the disadvantaged, discrimination is both a handicap and an alibi. However, it must be recognized that when the handicap goes, so does the alibi.

Your success in preparing for and meeting these new opportunities will inspire other young people in your community to similar efforts to advance themselves. And I would say to you without reservation that you can also be an example, an inspiration to the youth of all America, both Negro and white. The extent of your own success will depend very considerably upon your motivation, upon your will to win. It will also depend upon recognition that we get out of life only what we put in, and what we put in is determined largely by how well we are prepared.

Second, there is your broader responsibility to your community and to the Nation. You, and many other students like you, have been in the forefront of the Negro protest that is rewriting our laws and changing the economic and political patterns of American life. You have made protest a positive force. Now fast-changing circumstances summon you to progress beyond protest, to capitalize upon what protest has bought, to make safe and secure what is so newly won.

I do not suggest that there is no longer need for protest. I wish this were true, but laws are yet to be enforced, uncounted barriers are still to be removed. The civil rights movement undoubtedly will continue until we achieve the equal freedom that simple dignity demands. I trust, with a fervent faith, that this movement will always be distinguished by forbearance, by nonviolence, and by a deserved respect for wise leadership. The individual actions of you young people and your adherence to responsible leadership will determine to a large extent the ultimate success of the movement, and whether it will escape the tragedy of violence.

There is no question that the outcome of the civil rights struggle is crucial to the future of our country and hence to every American. In its successful resolution there is for each of us, as I have tried to indicate, an important role to play, and for you young people the responsibility is special. Yours must now be the role of the statesman who succeeds the revolutionary, of the settler who comes after the pioneer. There is in history a time for each, and to each posterity owes an equal debt. This is your great challenge * * * this is your great opportunity.

TWO SIDES OF MIDEAST ISSUES: FACT VERSUS FANATICISM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the American people have recently heard charges that our Government is taking a one-sided view of Middle East problems and that we are not fully aware of what is described as "the terrible tragedy of Palestine." We are told that we must reappraise our policies toward the Middle East and make more of an effort to see both sides of the issues.

Mr. President, I wish briefly to explore these charges. What is the terrible tragedy of Palestine—as the Arabs insist upon saying—which has been such a bar to peace in the Middle East? What are both sides of the Arab-Israeli dispute? What are Arab objectives for the future?

When Arab leaders talk of tragedy in Palestine, they are referring first of all to the Arab refugees, living in the Gaza strip and in Jordan. These refugees, so Arab leaders would have us believe, were driven from their homes by heartless Zionists and have lived in poverty and despair ever since. If this Arab view were in fact the true story, one might be more sympathetic to the publicly expressed concern of Arab leaders.

But the facts are quite different. In 1947, the United Nations approved the partition of Palestine. The Israelis, long ready for statehood and independence, accepted the U.N. resolution. The Arab states declared war and attacked the new state of Israel. The Jewish citizens of Israel, with their backs to the sea, stood fast to defend their state. The Arabs in Israel territory turned to their leaders for guidance and received very bad advice. They were told by the ex-Grand Mufti of Jerusalem and his aids to leave their homes to await the anticipated victorious arrival of the Arab armies. They were assured that within weeks they would be back to divide up the spoils of victory.

When the Arab armies were defeated these Palestinian Arabs found themselves homeless, but in Arab territory. If the Arab states had then accepted the reality of Israel's existence, many of the Arab refugees might have returned to their former homes. But, from the beginning, the Arab states refused to negotiate and make peace. Obviously, Israel could not afford to take a fifth column of disloyal and belligerent Arabs. They received shelter instead in U.N. camps along the borders of Israel and almost immediately became pawns in the bitter Arab struggle to dislodge and discredit the new State of Israel.

As individuals, these refugees at once received American sympathy and help in generous measure. Primarily the victims of jealous Arab leaders and their own fright and uncertainty, the refugees were fed and cared for by the U.N., and the United States paid most of the charges.

Now, 16 years later, the situation has changed. First, more than half of the increasing number of refugees are under 15; therefore, they were not by birth Palestinians and have no memory of life in the former British mandate.

Second, for 15 years, the Arab refugees have heard, through the idle days and desert nights, the voice of Arab imperialism and hatred for Israel. They have been told again and again over radio Cairo that Israel must be destroyed. The country that, under different circumstances might have become

their homeland—as it did become the homeland of those Arabs who ignored the Grand Mufti and remained in Israel—instead became the object of their burning hatred.

Third, for political reasons, the Arab nations have chosen to exaggerate the hardship of these people by refusing to resettle them in Arab countries, and by holding out to them the illusion of ultimate return and repatriation in Israel. Although there is ample space in many Arab lands—outside of Egypt—the Arab States have refused to offer their countrymen and coreligionists a home. To Israel and to other nations which have opened their doors to destitute refugees, this heartlessness is difficult to comprehend. Yet the Arab States prefer to use these refugees, men, women, and children, as political pawns and to insist upon their repatriation in Israel rather than to make them welcome in Arab lands.

Mr. President, to my mind that is the greatest tragedy of Palestine, and it is a tragedy that could so easily have been averted had the Arab leaders themselves shown any genuine concern for their unfortunate people who fled from Israel in 1947.

(At this point the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF) resumed the chair.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have discussed and am discussing at length the refugee problem, not because it is the real source of the conflict, but because it is the result. It is the outward symbol, continually cited by the Arabs to explain their intransigence against Israel.

The real issue, as King Hussein stated on "Meet the Press," is the existence of Zionism, that is, the historic and cherished ideal of the Jewish people to achieve a national homeland. I need not dwell upon the origins of Zionism. It was the dream of the Jewish people through centuries of discrimination and persecution. It became a practical goal of revered leaders, like Herzl and Chaim Weizmann. It became an imperative of the international conscience in the aftermath of Hitler's demoniac horrors. In a world of nationalism, it was as logical for Jewish nationalism to achieve its objective as it was for Arab nationalism.

The strength of Israel today is not alone the strength of its fortifications or the number of its soldiers. It is the strength of an idea, the restoration of a people, the renaissance of a civilization. There is no real conflict between Arab nationalism and Jewish nationalism, between the 13 Arab States with their 3 million square miles and Israel with its 8,000 square miles. Yet Arab leaders resent Israel, because an independent Jewish State in the Middle East is in direct opposition to their ambition for a pan-Arab empire extending from Africa to Asia, from the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean.

Now it should be clear that while Arabs talk of a united empire, they face serious practical difficulties in achieving it. There is no such reality as one Arab nation. There are separate Arab States, with the result that leaders are jealous of one another's prerogatives. There are differences of religion, of status, of nationality. They are sharply divided between the rich, oil-possessing states and the have-nots, like Egypt, with the largest population and the least resources. The only thing they seem to have in common is hatred for Israel. Only here can the Arab States seem to find real agreement and unity. Therefore, Arab resentment of Israel and Arab jealousy of Israel's progress have been deliberately exaggerated to promote and serve the shibboleth of Arab unity, until today hardly an Arab in the whole area is untouched by this contamination of hatred. Like Hitler's policies in Europe, Arab revanchism becomes a vicious circle. Israel is a territorial obstacle to the Arab monopoly of the Middle East; hatred of Israel therefore becomes a rallying point for frustrated imperialists; and ultimately, because it is the only point on which all Arabs can rally, hostility to Israel becomes an end in itself.

Any rational observer can see that Israel is no real threat to Egypt or Jordan, or Lebanon or Syria, as Arabs pretend. Israel's water diversion program does not deprive the Arab States of a resource which they were using or maintaining themselves, as has been charged. Israel is not responsible for Nasser's excessive military expenditures which are squandered to prop up a puppet regime in Yemen, as has been charged.

On the contrary, as one reviews closely events in the Mideast today, it is clear that Israel is concentrating its effort on constructive domestic development, while maintaining a defense-oriented military establishment, dictated by the continuing Arab siege.

Yet the Arabs refuse to sit down with the Israelis and settle any one of the specific issues in dispute—the refugee issue, or the boundary question, or the Jordan River diversion. Israel has consistently declared its readiness to take up these issues individually.

King Hussein made the point that the Arab nations do not categorically refuse to sit down with Israel. They only, as he put it, insist that Israel must first implement United Nations resolutions on the Mideast problems, as a precondition to negotiations. We hear that statement again and again.

Manifestly, such a statement is untenable, because it was the Arabs who went to war to nullify these resolutions in the first place. If all the United Nations resolutions had been implemented by both sides, the conflict would never have occurred. Moreover, 16 years have passed since Palestine became Israel. The face of the Middle East is changed, and no settlement can be made on the basis of ancient resolutions that do not reflect today's realities.

It is totally unrealistic for the Arab States to demand repatriation of Arab refugees, when the Arab States will not negotiate a peace settlement. Resettlement in Arab lands, with compensation, is the only realistic possibility for the great majority of the Arab refugees today. Acceptance of the boundaries existing today, with perhaps minor modifications, is also necessary. Use of the precious waters of the Jordan and other Middle East rivers can and should be negotiated with due regard to the rights of all riparian states. The water plan devised by President Eisenhower's emissary, the late Eric Johnston, was acceptable to the engineering experts of both Israel and Jordan. It is still the only logical and sensible plan; and, in truth, it is consistent with the water projects which both Israel and Jordan are now constructing.

The sincere way to negotiate a peace settlement is to sit together and talk, without preconditions. Any leader who would insist upon preconditions to the opening of talks is not honestly trying to resolve the issues between Israel and the Arab States; he is trying to block consideration of them and to make meaningful negotiations impossible.

So when the people of the United States are told that we should look clearly at the situation in the Mideast, at what the Arabs insist upon calling "the tragedy of Palestine," we ought indeed to take a good look. When we are told to look at both sides of the story, we should look at both sides.

What we see is very revealing. On the one side, we see Israel, a progressive nation, a haven for refugees the world over, deeply absorbed in economic development and growth within its own boundaries, a state practical enough to want good relations with its neighbors, but realistic enough to guard its own security.

On the other side, we see a band of frustrated Arab imperialists, in continual disagreement with themselves and the rest of the world, governments wasting the sustenance of their citizens for guns and rockets, wasting the days and years of fellow Moslem refugees for a political slogan at the United Nations, fanatics obsessed with the passion to exterminate those who do not conform to their singleminded dream of empire.

Mr. President, the people of the United States welcome leaders of foreign nations friendly to the United States. We listen with attention and interest to their words. But we cannot always agree with their arguments; and when we disagree, we can—and should—speak out.

King Hussein of Jordan has indeed given the American people a new insight into the Middle Eastern situation, but it is a picture that can only arouse deep concern and anxiety in this country. We once regarded him as a conciliatory Arab leader. We once hoped that he might inherit the wisdom of his grandfather Abdullah, who wanted an Arab-Israel peace. Altogether, since 1957, we have given King Hussein $461 million, in aid, mostly grants, including about $30 million in military aid. We have paid more than $150 million to provide for Arab refugees in Jordan, yet in Moscow on April 11, King Hussein's Ambassador reportedly declared in an interview:

> I will say frankly that today we believe that the U.S.S.R. can help us more than any other country.

Now King Hussein appears as the spokesman of an Arab alliance determined not to compromise, but to obstruct,

not to help others but to promote suffering, not to create, but to destroy.

What we can learn from this visit is twofold: First, that we, the United States, must reject fanaticism of any kind and look at the Mideast problem with open eyes and clear heads. We cannot allow ourselves to be browbeaten by Arab threats or wooed by Arab promises. We must recognize and emphasize again and again the fact of Israel's existence; the fact that hatemongering and military preparations by the Arab States are a definite threat to the peace of the Middle East and therefore to our own foreign policy objectives. We must understand that Arab diplomacy speaks with different voices in different lands. It is soft and persuasive in Washington, strong and nationalistic at the U.N., but bitter and belligerent in the Middle East. We must not be confused or misled by it.

I wish it were possible for all Senators to read from time to time the emanations that come out over Radio Cairo about the United States and its leaders. We must not be confused or misled by the change in pace which we find in Arab diplomacy.

Second, we must recognize the reality of the threat expressed by the Arab leaders since the Arab summit conference of January 1964. The Arabs mean what they say and they are acquiring the means, the missiles, jets and bombers to give effect to their threats. Time is not necessarily on the side of Israel or of peace if fanatic Arab nationalism is organized under a unified Arab military command, and if Arab leaders are fully armed, and attempt a deliberate wooing of world opinion for their deceptive arguments.

The United States cannot stand idly by while Arab forces seek new strength for future assaults on Israel. Our Government, preferably the President himself, should speak out and make unmistakably clear that the United States will not permit such an assault, now or at any time, and that the United States is committed to resist aggression, that the United States is determined to strengthen those who are threatened, and that above all, we want an Arab-Israel peace as soon as possible.

The need to begin negotiations, or even to begin negotiations about negotiations, grows more pressing with each day. The influence of the United States must be brought fully to bear on this question, and the Arab States must be made to understand that continued U.S. friendship and assistance is dependent upon a new attitude, an acceptance of compromise, and a willingness to talk with Israel's leaders about conflicts which could spark a serious military conflagration in the Middle East.

The situation that is rapidly developing there deserves the most careful attention. It is a grave threat to world peace. It is potentially one of the most, if not the most, explosive areas in the world, and if an explosion were ever to take place, the United States would face a world crisis of monumental proportions. We must use our best efforts today to avert such a crisis tomorrow.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida.

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

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

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 164 Leg.]

Aiken	Hill	Morse
Allott	Holland	Mundt
Anderson	Humphrey	Muskie
Bartlett	Inouye	Nelson
Beall	Jackson	Neuberger
Bennett	Jordan, Idaho	Pastore
Boggs	Keating	Pearson
Cannon	Kuchel	Pell
Case	Long, La.	Prouty
Church	Magnuson	Ribicoff
Curtis	Mansfield	Saltonstall
Dirksen	McGee	Scott
Dodd	McGovern	Smith
Dominick	McIntyre	Sparkman
Fong	Metcalf	Symington
Gruening	Miller	Williams, N.J.
Hart	Monroney	Young, Ohio

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. HOLLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a brief statement, with the usual understanding?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

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

PORTUGAL MOVES TOWARD GREATER DEMOCRATIZATION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, for some years the United Nations has been expressing criticisms of Portugal complaining that in its relationships with its colonial areas is retarding the development and growth of educational and democratic processes which will eventually prepare these regions for complete, stable, and secure independence should that be their desire. These processes in underdeveloped countries are usually much slower than desired and too frequently new countries fail to improve conditions for their citizens or to operate democratic procedures appropriately because they are "put on their own" before they are duly prepared for self-government and independence.

At times the United States has been engaged in the doubtful practice of trying to control from afar through support of abortive United Nations resolutions the relationship between Portugal and Angola. Since the Portuguese are old and honored friends of the United States and have been of great assistance in our defense effort, it is therefore gratifying to note that recent developments indicate that there is important new evidence. That the processes of democratizations are at work in Angola and in Mozambique.

Since this change has not been widely publicized in the American press and since the criticisms of earlier Portuguese policy were banner headlined, I ask unanimous consent that in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks there appear the text of a press release dated April 15, issued by the Portuguese Embassy in Washington and headlined, "Legislative Elections in Angola and Mozambique."

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

LEGISLATIVE ELECTIONS IN ANGOLA AND MOZAMBIQUE

The results of the legislative elections recently completed in the oversea Provinces of Angola and Mozambique were as follows:

ANGOLA

Legislative council: 34 representatives were elected to the legislative council, of which: 15 were elected by direct suffrage, 3 by the workers' organizations, 3 by the corporate organizations, 3 by the rural "Regedorias" (rural councils), 4 by administrative bodies of the Province, 3 by the religious and cultural organizations, and 3 by economic associations. Total, 34.

Percentage of eligible voters (direct suffrage) who went to the polls: 84.9 percent.

Economic and Social Council: 16 representatives were elected to the economic and social council of the Province, as follows: 4 elected by the administrative bodies of the Province, 4 elected by the workers' organizations, 4 elected by the economic associations, and 4 elected by the religious and cultural organizations. Total, 16.

MOZAMBIQUE

Legislative council: 27 representatives were elected to the legislative council, of which: 9 were elected by direct suffrage (the percentage of eligible voters who went to the polls was 87.19 percent); 3 representatives were elected by each of the following groups: Workers' organizations, corporate organizations, religious and cultural organizations, rural "regedorias," administrative bodies, and economic associations.

Although the majority of the representatives elected are natives of Mozambique, one of them was born in Angola.

Economic and social council: 16 representatives were elected to the Economic and Social Council, 11 of them being natives of Mozambique. These elections are not by direct suffrage, but rather by the organizations representing the economic and social interests of the voters. Thus, four representatives were elected by each one of the following groups: Workers' organizations, economic organizations, administrative bodies, and religious and social organizations.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, while the elections reported in this release are different in nature and character from the type of representative elections we are accustomed to in the United States, they do mark real progress toward self-determination and self-rule by the people involved.

In the highly significant business of making freedom function for the people generally instead of for only a few politicians or rulers at the head of a newly created nation, the educational processes of "learning to do by doing" have great and enduring values. This is what it appears is now taking place in Angola and in Mozambique. I join many other Americans in wishing the best for the continued development of these procedures and congratulate the Government of Portugal on the progress which is being made. May it continue without interruption by violence from within and without interference from without which will destroy its chances for success.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, since it is my custom to give notice to my colleagues in the Senate as to my intention, I wish to state to Senators who are present that, speaking for myself and my distinguished captain, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], there is no intention to ask for a live quorum at the end of my speech.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, that statement is based on the understanding that the Senate will recess at about 8:30 until tomorrow morning. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The acting majority leader has advised me that he would like to have the Senate recess at 8:30 this evening until tomorrow. My statement is in compliance with that understanding.

Mr. President, the pending business is the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and other Senators, which would, if adopted, provide that in most proceedings for criminal contempt in Federal courts, the defendant shall be entitled to a trial before a jury conforming as nearly as may be to the proceedings in other criminal cases. The carefully drawn amendment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia provides that trial by jury shall not apply to criminal contempts committed in the presence of the court or so near thereto as to interfere directly with the administration of justice nor to the misbehavior, misconduct, or disobedience of any officer of the court nor shall it be construed to deprive courts of their power in civil contempt proceedings to secure compliance with or to prevent obstruction of their orders as distinguished from punishment for criminal contempt.

This amendment is most timely and it brings up substantially the same issue as was passed upon favorably by a large majority of the Senate in 1957 when we were debating the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1957. That this amendment is peculiarly timely at this time is pointed up by the 5-to-4 decision of the U.S. Supreme Court on April 6 in which our highest Court ruled that former Governor Barnett of Mississippi and former Lieutenant Governor Johnson, now Governor of Mississippi, do not have the right of jury trial when they are subjected to criminal contempt proceedings. In the majority decision, written by Mr. Justice Clark, it was very clearly set out that though the Court ruled in that hairline decision—5 to 4—that a defendant was not entitled to a jury trial in a criminal contempt proceeding, it was within the discretion and jurisdiction of the Congress to pass a statute which would dispense with the ruling that criminal contempt proceedings could be held without jury trial. The wording of that portion of the opinion by Mr. Justice Clark in that decision was as follows:

> It has always been the law of the land, both State and Federal, that the courts, except where specifically precluded by statute, have the power to proceed summarily in contempt matters.

I digress long enough to say that the Senator from Florida views those words as almost an invitation, if not a mandate, to Congress to take some action that will get the Court out of the disagreeable situation under which it has divided on this question 5 to 4, and under which, even in the Court's opinion, certain expressions appear, such as those decrying the tendency of the lower courts to impose much higher penalties for criminal contempt convictions than was the case theretofore.

It seems to me that we should regard this as almost a privileged matter, in which we should act at the end of proper debate upon the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and other Senators.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Alabama for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is not the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] the same amendment that the Senate adopted to the 1957 civil rights bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is the same as that offered at that time by our late distinguished friend from Wyoming, Senator O'Mahoney, who spoke with great persuasiveness and eloquence in support of the amendment and insisted that the Constitution required the adoption of such an amendment.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that our late friend Senator O'Mahoney was one of the ablest and most profound lawyers in the Senate?

Mr. HOLLAND. That was my opinion of him. I regarded him as a leader in the Congress in the field of knowledge of constitutional law and of questions in connection with the Constitution.

Mr. HILL. I had the same opinion of the late Senator from Wyoming. He was a great man. The late Senator from Wyoming and I had our pictures taken together shortly before he left the Senate. When he left the Senate, I inscribed on that picture, "To the last of the great giants." He had been in this body with William Borah, George Norris, Carter Glass, Alben Barkley, Pat Harrison, and others of the great men of his time; and he was one of the greatest.

Is it not true that the present President of the United States, who was at that time the distinguished majority leader, Lyndon B. Johnson, voted for this amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct; and he spoke for it persuasively. I think his speech has already been placed in the RECORD in the course of this debate.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that President Johnson's distinguished predecessor in the presidency, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, when he was a Senator from Massachusetts, also supported this amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct; and that fact has been placed in the RECORD. The fact that those two distinguished former Senators voted in that way is highly persuasive for doing what I have just said I believe is the mandate of the Supreme Court. I believe the Supreme Court has, in effect, issued a mandate for Congress to take statutory action to do away with the rule which, by a 5-to-4 decision, the Court says exists, permitting a trial without a jury in criminal contempt proceedings.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true also that the present majority leader of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], supported and voted for that amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. I so understand. I do not recall his speech on that amendment, but I have been told during this debate that he voted for the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Is it not also true that the amendment was adopted by the Senate by a substantial majority?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct; an overwhelming majority.

I thank my friend from Alabama for his constructive comments which, as usual, have illuminated the RECORD greatly.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Florida. When the sun is shining brightly, there is not much opportunity for anybody to add illumination. When the distinguished senior Senator from Florida is speaking, there is not much opportunity for anyone else to add illumination.

Mr. HOLLAND. We all know that the Chesterfieldian Senator from Alabama always speaks in this highly complimentary vein; but I appreciate it nonetheless. I thank him.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Florida knows that the Good Book tells us:

> Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.

Mr. HOLLAND. I remember that. I am glad the Senator brought the Bible into the discussion.

I have, on three occasions, spoken at some length on this bill. In my first two major speeches during the debate I made special reference to the fact that this bill deprives citizens of their right of trial by jury in criminal contempt proceedings.

On March 19, I discussed title IV—which deals with desegregation of the public schools.

I showed how dangerous would be the grant of unlimited power, under title IV, to the Attorney General to bring injunction suits at his sole discretion upon any finding of discrimination in school segregation cases which he personally saw fit to make, and thereafter to invoke criminal contempt proceedings without trial by jury.

I expressed my strong belief that what most Negro children of America want and need is better schools and not integrated schools. As my first witness, the great educator, Dr. James B. Conant, who was president of Harvard University, presented telling evidence on that point.

Also, I quoted definite statistics from the most authentic sources showing that the Negro student's and the Negro teacher's opportunity for education and professional advancement is greater in the segregated schools of the South than in the integrated schools of the rest of the Nation. Of that there can be no question when one looks at the facts, as, for example, the fact that all the fine presidents of the great colleges for the Negro race are presidents of segregated schools.

I warned the Senate on that occasion:

The peril of destroying or diluting the rights of the constitutional guarantees to all citizens * * * is contained in the fourth title of the bill.

I sound that warning again today, Mr. President.

As the minority views of the House report clearly and conclusively show, title IV would deprive a defendant of many of the protections guaranteed every citizen by the Bill of Rights and particularly would deprive him of the right of trial by jury when he is charged with criminal contempt for disobeying writs of injunction or restraining orders in school desegregation suits brought by the Attorney General.

On April 6, I addressed myself to title VII—EEOC—Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—but in reality, to use the old title, the FEPC section of the bill.

I hope, and I believe, Mr. President, that I showed how this equally dangerous, or even more dangerous, section, whose parentage is so uncertain, no one seems to know from whence it came, is to the citizens of our beloved country.

I showed what grievous damage to our Constitution—to the very foundations of our democratic system—title VII, like title IV, would do by giving the arbitrary power to the Commission, rather than the Attorney General, to bring injunction suits without provision for jury trial for criminal contempt.

My point was buttressed, Mr. President, in a most timely and significant way. On that very day the Supreme Court, by a hairline 5 to 4 decision, ruled that former Governor Barnett of Mississippi and former Lieutenant Governor Johnson, who now is Governor of that fine State, did not have the right of jury trial when they were subjected to criminal contempt proceedings which came to a halt in the Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans when that court announced that it was evenly divided on that question, by a vote of 4 to 4. The Supreme Court on that very day made it completely clear that a jury trial would not be a matter of right for anyone facing a criminal contempt proceeding as a result of an action brought under either title IV or title VII of the pending bill.

I feel strongly about this matter, Mr. President. I have always believed that trial by jury is one of the most precious heritages the Founding Fathers handed down to us. I have treasured it as a part of the heart of that imperishable document, by which and under whose protective safeguards and inalienable rights we live—our Constitution. In connection with that I should like to include in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the following brief colloquy I had that day with the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated April 6, 1964, page 7010:

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator agree that one of our most precious rights under our Anglo-Saxon system of justice is the right to trial by jury?

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought so until the decision came down today. I was taught as a boy in law school and as a young lawyer practicing and appearing before all courts, from the lowest to the highest in the land, that that was one of the sacred rights, and that it came to us from law more ancient than ours. But apparently in the field of criminal contempt, a majority of the Supreme Court, five out of nine, thinks the matter is not of such substance that a jury should be called for.

Mr. HILL. The truth is that it is a right that was fought for and won and goes back as far as Magna Carta, in 1215, and to the petition of rights and the Bill of Rights, and therefore permeates our whole Anglo-Saxon history.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is one of the anchors of our Anglo-Saxon system of law. I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact, as shown by today's decision, that a bare majority, five out of nine members of the Supreme Court, could make this decision; whereas if a defendant is being tried by a jury, the unanimous verdict of all 12 is required to convict. There is a considerable difference between the right to have a bare majority of a court pass on one's case and the right to have a jury of one's peers pass on his case, because in order to convict, those peers must unanimously say, "This man has wilfully and criminally violated an order of the court, known to him and applicable to him, and which he has violated in an effort to knock out completely the orderly process of our laws."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. In such cases, under the various titles of the bill—and the bill has eleven titles—the Attorney General of the United States, whoever he might be, would really be the prosecuting officer, would he not?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is true.

Mr. HILL. Is it not also true that when Federal judges are appointed, the Attorney General, the head of the Department of Justice, has much to say about their appointment?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; I regret to state that that is a fact.

Mr. HILL. Is it not also true that the Attorney General, the head of the Department of Justice, also has much to say about the promotion of judges?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; I regret to say that that, too, is true.

Mr. HILL. On the other hand, 12 jurymen, 12 peers, selected from the population of the local district, would have no obligation to, or connection with, the Attorney General, who would be the prosecutor in such cases, would they?

Mr. HOLLAND. They would not. Their names would be drawn from the box in which the names of the total number of prospective jurors would have been placed; and the entire group of names would have been placed in that box and later drawn from it, under conditions of secrecy. Thereafter, in selecting the twelve members of the jury, both the plaintiff and the defendant would have the right to challenge or strike for reasons sufficient to them, including the reason of possible prejudice.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator from Florida agree that if the integrity of our judicial system is to be preserved, nothing is more important to it than preservation of the right of trial by jury?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. The entire history of mankind shows that to be true, does it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. All Anglo-Saxon history demonstrates that conclusively.

Mr. HILL. And even the history of earlier times does the same, does it not? Is not the history of all mankind replete with the tragic stories of those who suffered because of lack of the protection of our judicial system, including—and this is one of the most important—the right of trial by jury?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; all too often that was the case. It was because of such abuses that Magna Carta was wrung from a reluctant monarch; and that protection and the other protections under the Anglo-Saxon system of law came into being in order to protect more fully the rights of the individual citizen.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

I am sure the Senator from Florida recalls the masterly address by Jeremiah Black before the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of ex parte Milligan, after Milligan had been tried in Missouri, during the Civil War, by a drumhead court-martial. Jeremiah Black, a great lawyer, carried the case all the way to the Supreme Court; and while before the Supreme Court, he presented the history of these rights, and also presented a very clear statement of their meaning and their importance to individual citizens.

We say we are proud to be Americans; but, after all, what we really mean is that we are proud of the freedom and the liberty that we enjoy as American citizens, and also of the right of trial by jury, which is basic to the guarantee of justice and liberty to all our people. Is not that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct. The great knowledge of the Senator from Alabama of these matters makes me wish I had an opportunity to return to school and study under his tutelage. I thank him for his important contributions to the debate.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I read further from the debate from which I have been quoting:

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the jury of peers are chosen and selected within the judicial district in which the person lives? Are they not people who know him, know his standing, and know his general reputation in the community in which he lives?

Mr. HOLLAND. This is correct. If his reputation is good, it is fine for him to have such a jury summoned. If his reputation is bad, the jury will be summoned from the people of that very area, and who know more about what that bad reputation is.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

To say to the American businessman: "I shall tell you whom to hire, whom to fire, whom to promote, whom to demote;" to say to the great Labor Union of America: "I shall tell you how to manage your union, how to determine the seniority of your members, how to set the rules"; to say to the workers of America: "I shall tell you with whom you shall associate, with whom you must work at your workbench, with whom you must share your lunch hour"—is undemocratic, Mr. President, is unconstitutional, Mr. President, and is wrong. It must not happen in America or else we would become the very antithesis of democracy—a police state—and particularly so when authority would be given to the EEOC to proceed by injunction, coupled with later use of criminal contempt proceedings without jury trial. The Talmadge amendment would at least require the safeguard of jury trial in appropriate criminal contempt proceedings under this highly objectionable Title VII of the bill.

The most dangerous provision of the bill, of all those dealing with the power of the Attorney General to bring injunction suits, and thereafter to use criminal contempt proceedings without jury trial, is found in section 302 of title III of the bill, in the following words:

> Whenever an action has been commenced in any court of the United States seeking relief from the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, the Attorney General for or in the name of the United States may intervene in such action. In such an action the United States shall be entitled to the same relief as if it had instituted the action.

The distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has done a great service during this debate by calling the attention of the Senate and the attention of the Nation to the fact that this inconspicuous portion of the bill accomplishes, in effect, what was embraced in the point III provisions of the 1957 civil rights legislation, which would have authorized the Attorney General to bring an injunction suit within his sole discretion in any matter which he felt involved a threat to or an invasion of civil rights, with the power, of course, to use criminal contempt proceedings, without jury trial thereafter. The Senate soundly turned down that proposal; and it has been since turned down by a majority of the Senate on several occasions, particularly by three different votes during consideration of the civil rights bill of 1960. Yet, it is now proposed in this bill, through this inconspicuous and almost hidden section which appears under title III, and is supposedly confined to the field covered by that title, "Desegregation of Public Facilities." Section 302 proposes to give to the Attorney General the full power to intervene in any action involving and defending civil rights brought by any citizen in any court of the United States. It would give to the Attorney General the right to obtain exactly the same relief as if he had instituted the action in the beginning, including, of course, the right to bring criminal contempt proceedings without trial by jury.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield again to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. In section 302, on page 13, the sentence beginning in line 9 is:

> In such an action the United States shall be entitled to the same relief as if it had instituted the action.

That provision was included in order to insure that the defendant will not have his right of trial by jury, is it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; it was put there for that reason, and also to give the Attorney General any right which he might have had if he, himself, had instituted the proceeding.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. One of those rights is freedom from any questioning by the court or by anyone else as to why he decided to come into the case. It would be a right of intervention, without giving any court the right to question the discretion of the Attorney General.

Mr. President, that is too much power and authority to repose in any man. If he were a good man, I do not believe he would wish the power. If he were a bad man, he certainly should not have it. So far as I am concerned, I am not willing to give it to any Attorney General. My remarks have no reference to any present, former, or future Attorney General as a person, but refer to anyone holding that office.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. That was the strong feeling of the Senate in 1957 when it struck title III from the civil rights bill of that year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. Then in 1960 three separate efforts, one differing very little from the other, were made to put substantially the same provision in the bill of 1960. In every instance the Senate voted down such attempts.

Mr. President, how far from the sound and fundamental concepts of Anglo-Saxon justice do the starry-eyed advocates of this bill think they can go and still preserve an America with its constitutional guarantees of freedom?

It is interesting to note that even the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, the floor manager of this bill, in his eloquent declamation of March 30 recognized the sweeping nature of section 302 in the following words:

> He [the Attorney General] would also be authorized to intervene in such suits brought by a private party as well as in any other suit brought by a private party based on the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.

A little later in his declamation the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] made the following statements:

> The bill requires the Attorney General to state in his complaint that he has received a complaint and that in his judgment the persons who complained are unable to initiate or maintain appropriate legal proceedings. These statements by the Attorney General will not be subject to challenge either by the defendants or by the court. Under no circumstances will the Attorney General be required to reveal the names of the particular complainants. Of course, if the defendants deny that they discriminate, it would always be necessary for the Attorney General to prove discrimination to the satisfaction of the court.
>
> In short, we are still relying on private litigation as the first line of action to make constitutional rights effective. The Attorney General may act only when he finds, in the particular case, that private litigants do not have and cannot obtain the resources necessary, or that they are likely to incur reprisals for their temerity in claiming their constitutional rights.

I note that the able Senator from Minnesota stretches the provision of title IV, which does provide, as he says, that "the Attorney General may act only where he finds in a particular case, that private litigants do not have and cannot obtain the resources necessary, or that they are likely to incur reprisals for their temerity in claiming their constitutional rights," so as to apply those same limitations to section 302. I respectfully call to the attention of the Senator from Minnesota and other Members of the Senate the fact that such limitations do not apply in any way to the provisions of section 302 under which the Attorney General, without any limitations whatever in his discretion, is given complete authority to intervene in any action which "has been commenced in any court of the United States seeking relief from the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, color, religion, or national origin." The authority of the Attorney General under section 302 is absolute and unlimited. He may intervene in any civil rights action brought by any private or public body other than the United States and as an intervenor in the name of the United States he shall be entitled to the same relief as if he had originally instituted the action. There could not be any greater grant of more unbridled power and when such grant is coupled with the additional power to bring criminal contempt proceedings without a jury trial, I have a deep conviction that such a grant goes far beyond what any law should provide if the constitutional rights of the citizens of our country are to be given any consideration by the Congress. No good man serving as Attorney General would want such sweeping power and no good or bad man should be allowed to have it.

I note with interest the additional statement by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] on page 6543 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 30, to the effect that a decision of the Attorney General to bring a suit or to intervene "will not be subject to challenge either by the defendants or by the courts." No stronger statement could be made to show that it is proposed to give the Attorney General complete and unlimited power to bring injunction suits followed, if he sees fit, by criminal contempt proceedings without jury trials.

I regret exceedingly that I was not allowed to bring out these points during the able declamation of the Senator from Minnesota, but he precluded my doing so by stating in the beginning:

At the conclusion of my remarks I shall be more than happy to attempt to answer questions or to engage in debate and discussion. I believe it is very important for a full understanding of this measure, but during my presentation I shall not yield.

Unfortunately, the declamation of the able Senator lasted so long and was followed immediately without a quorum call by a similar declamation made by the able senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] that no practical opportunity was given for any colloquies whatever with reference to the positions taken by the able Senator from Minnesota in his presentation of what he characterizes as the "affirmative case for the bill before the Senate."

I do not wish to weary the Senate with repetition of what I have said previously on this bill, but I do wish to read this opening paragraph of my remarks on April 13. It sums up just what my feelings, my convictions and my fears for my country are, should this iniquitous piece of handiwork become law.

I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 13, page 7736:

Mr. President, I feel so strongly that the coercive and compulsive methods embraced in the pending bill are completely inappropriate for the solution of the racial problem which it is supposed to solve, that I must discuss in some detail that important aspect of the situation; namely, the coercive and compulsive methods embraced in the bill, and the complete inappropriateness of the suggested solution of the problems. For coercion, whether by legislation, litigation, economic pressure, or raw force can never solve a problem like this—coercion only makes the problem more difficult.

I pointed out how the inflamed passions of susceptible people, spurred to violence by reckless, militant organizers who set themselves up as their leaders, are exploding in anger, frustration, and fear across the country; how naked threats of "ballots or bullets," "the bloodiest year yet," and "the hot summer" are inflaming emotions and unleasing forces which, if not contained by cool heads, soon may embroil whole communities, entire regions of the Nation and broad areas in internal strife.

I mentioned the terrible things that are happening in Cleveland, where bitter hatred, heated to the breaking point by demagogs has resulted in the death of one man; where a frenzied zealot has sounded "a call to arms" to Negroes to arm themselves with shotguns and rifles and combat fatigues and helmets; where full-scale rioting, which could swiftly become mob violence and lead to mob rule or martial law, has occurred. The able Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], for whose courage all of us must have great admiration, expressed his concern, and not only that, took his stand in respect to that incident, despite the threat of dire political consequences. I salute the Senator from Ohio.

I also mentioned, and wish to mention again, the outrageous thing which CORE—the Brooklyn chapter of CORE—proposed to wreak in New York City, the greatest center of population in our country. They proposed to wreak damage not only upon New York City, but also upon the Nation, and, for that matter the free world, by creating a tremendous traffic jam with gasless jalopies, brokendown automobiles, and flat tires on the highways leading to the great New York World's Fair—the current showplace of America and the showplace of the free world—which opened yesterday. Next, Brooklyn CORE proposed to waste the great metropolis' water supply by leaving open all water spigots and mains, and bringing on inconvenience, health hazards, and the danger of fire.

What monstrous performances, Mr. President, to propose in the name of civil rights, in the very shadow of the Statue of Liberty which beckons all the people of the world to come to America, the land of the free, the land of peace, and of good will. What must the people of the rest of our great country, the friendly peoples of the world—and, Mr. President, those of the Communist countries who are not our friends—think of America? I feel sure this news was received with sorrow by our friends and with great glee by our enemies.

Yes, I know that the national CORE suspended the Brooklyn CORE. I further am aware that the all-out traffic jam has not occurred yet, and that the water supply has not yet been sabotaged, but that is not the point. The tragic fact is that in free America such things could even be planned and publicized by irresponsible leaders, which, of course, they are. The further tragic point is that these irrational people were serious in their intentions—they intended to do these things—and may still intend to do them.

I feel that at this point in my remarks there should be preserved in the RECORD for all who may read it now, or later, the story as told by the newspapers of what happened in New York yesterday at the opening of the World's Fair which was honored by the attendance of our President to make the speech of dedication. I find the report of the disgraceful happenings of yesterday in all of the papers of today. I wish to include in the RECORD at this time the longest and most factual of the several articles in the New York Times and also the most detailed of the articles in the Washington Post, both papers being dated today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles from the New York Times and the Washington Post under date of April 23, 1964, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FAIR OPENS, RIGHTS STALL-IN FAILS; PROTESTERS DROWN OUT JOHNSON; 265 ARRESTED IN DEMONSTRATIONS—RAIN SOAKS CROWD—SIT-INS MAR FESTIVITIES AT SOME PAVILIONS—ATTENDANCE CUT

(By Homer Bigart)

The New York World's Fair was opened by President Johnson on schedule yesterday, despite the double obstacle of foul weather and civil disobedience.

Massive demonstrations threatened by civil rights groups outside and inside the fair failed to materialize. A few hundred Negro and white activists did, however, distract and disturb the crowds during the colorful premier of the great exposition.

It rained most of the morning, and it was cloudy and chilly the rest of the day. The grim, November-like weather, combined with the fear that integration activists might block access to the fair, undoubtedly kept thousands away. By 4 o'clock the attendance was only 69,582, of which fewer than 47,000 represented paid admissions.

Wide publication of a threat to pull emergency cords on subway trains apparently had alarmed many. Yet there was only one serious attempt to stop a train.

TRAFFIC FLOWS SMOOTHLY

Similarly the forecast of a paralyzing stall-in evaporated; traffic moved smoothly.

At evening 265 persons had been arrested outside and inside the fairgrounds.

Among those arrested were leaders of the demonstration. James Farmer, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality, and Bayard Rustin, organizer of last summer's march on Washington, were taken into custody as the police dispersed a sit-in at the New York State pavilion.

The militant integrationists were unable to disrupt the opening ceremonies, of which the climax was the President's speech to 10,000 rain-soaked spectators in Singer Bowl. Entrance to the bowl was by invitation only.

But later the President was assailed by rude shouts from pickets and sit-ins when he dedicated the Federal pavilion.

Groups of demonstrators sat in clumps of freshly planted shrubbery at either side of the pavilion. The President spoke from under the shelter of the huge structure, which resembles a giant ice cream sandwich balanced on a small pyramid.

SHOUTS OF FREEDOM NOW

Another group of teenager militants marched in a circle 100 yards away, surrounded by the police. They brandished placards, and their shouts of "Freedom now" sometimes drowned out the strong voice of the President.

"We do not try to mask our national problems," said the President. "We do not try to disguise our imperfections or cover up our failures. No other nation in history has done so much to correct its flaws."

The President's forecast of "a world in which all men are equal" drew loud derisive laughter from the pickets.

As soon as the President had left, police wagons drove up, and the sit-ins were flushed from the shrubbery. They had to be dragged into the wagons.

The opening-day crowd tried to ignore the pickets, but they seemed to be all over the fair. The gathering of two or more pickets served as a magnet, attracting scores of policemen, reporters and photographers. The milling knots disrupted the visitors' appreciation of the 646-acre fair, which seemed surprisingly beautiful even in the rain.

Bearded and untidy, the seats of their pants muddied from sitting on the soggy ground, the pickets repelled and fascinated the fairgoers.

Some foreigners were embarrassed. A Pakistani woman, swathed in a purple and gold sari, paused to watch the pickets, then murmured to her escort, who replied in English: "I think we should move on. I do not like to look at this."

The fair was a glittering mirror of national opulence; yet the pickets and the sit-ins and the lie-ins were a somber reminder of an aggrieved minority.

The demonstrations, Mr. Farmer explained before his arrest, "were to point up the contrast between the glittering world of fantasy and the real world of brutality, bigotry and poverty."

Other sit-ins blocking stairways at the New York State pavilion were jumped on

and stepped on by visitors before they were dragged away by the police.

A woman led her 6-year-old daughter through the sit-ins and then scolded her for not following instructions.

"When I say step on them, step on them," the mother told her child.

The Southern States' pavilions were special targets for demonstrators.

On entering the fair, Mr. Farmer had gone directly to the Louisiana pavilion. He was carrying a three-foot electric cattle prod along with a sign saying that the instrument was used on Negroes in Louisiana. But since the pavilion was far from completed and unable to open, picketing there soon broke up.

At the Florida pavilion, a white youth climbed to the top of the building and perched on a 50-foot pillar. About 40 other demonstrators, who said they were from Florida, alternately marched or lay down to bar the entrance. They sang "We shall not be moved."

The Illinois pavilion was forced to close—but for other reasons. "Mr. Lincoln," an animated mechanical effigy of the Great Emancipator, failed to move and talk. "Electronics difficulties" were blamed.

This fair had something for everybody. Besides the rather eerie Lincoln effigy, which could simulate a flesh-warm handshake when the electronics were right, there were a host of other audio-animated figures, including caveman and dinosaurs; about 150 pavilions, some shaped like giant eggs; and in the amusement area, rides that provided hair-raising thrills.

AGLOW WITH COLOR

As night fell, the pavilions and fountains were bathed in colored lights. The Pool of Industry erupted with fireworks and rainbow-hued fountains. The most brilliant lights probed the heavens from the tower of the U.S. electric power and light companies. The 12 searchlights adding up to 12 billion candlepower, concentrated in a single beam that was supposed to be visible as far off as Washington.

The gates of this billion-dollar festival, which commemorates the 300th anniversary of New York, opened at 9 a.m. An attendance of at least 250,000 had been forecast. But the weather was cruel.

"It's April Again" insisted the music from 150 loudspeakers scattered about the grounds, but the air was as raw as late autumn. And it was raining.

Nevertheless, the grounds were picturesque. The copious rains of recent weeks had helped the newly planted grass. The trees were budding, and some areas were bright with forsythia and azalea.

The ceremonies opened with a parade starting at 9:25. It sloshed, with bands playing bravely, through avenues that were almost deserted. Only five persons stood on the reviewing stand with Maj. Gen. William E. Potter, U.S. Army, retired, who took the salute as executive vice president of the fair.

There were governors and beauty queens in the parade; bagpipers from three nations, a steel band, a Chinese drum and bugle corps; African drums, an Israeli accordionist with folk dancers and Spaniards with guitars. Even the pickets had trouble keeping their feet still when a military band played "Dixie" and a Stephen Foster medley.

The international section included Moorish women who lifted their robes as they stepped over puddles; geisha girls twirling parasols; hula dancers shivering in overcoats on a Hawaiian float. Further on, riding in a red convertible, was Miss Louisiana in a sopping, sequined, strapless gown; Montana cowboys in yellow slickers led by Gov. Tim M. Babcock; the University of Pennsylvania's 201-member band, with Miss Susan Scranton, daughter of Gov. William Warren Scranton bearing the "U."

There were other cheering sights: a German beerwagon drawn by four big, fat, brown horses, and a host of Walt Disney characters.

PUDDLES AT BOWL

Inside Singer Bowl invited guests waited in underpasses, unwilling to sit in the rain until the officials arrived. There was something wrong with the drainage; great sections of the paved stadium floor, on which temporary seats were arranged were under an inch or two of water.

Finally it stopped raining, and shortly after 11 a.m. the official ceremonies began with an invocation by Cardinal Spellman.

All the speakers paid tribute to Robert Moses, the builder and president of the fair.

Former President Harry S. Truman said he wished Mr. Moses were a native of Missouri.

"There's only one Moses," Mr. Truman said lightly, "and that's not the one mentioned in the Bible."

TRUMAN CHARMS CROWD

The former President, who was accompanied by Mrs. Truman, their daughter, Margaret, and her husband, Clifton Daniel, made a gently humorous speech that charmed the spectators and made them forget the rain.

Mr. Truman said he had tried to get the United Nations headquarters in Missouri, "but I didn't have a Chinaman's chance."

The former President received a standing ovation.

Other speakers included Governor Rockefeller, who said "the fabulous Bob Moses has done it again." Mr. Rockefeller also put in a laudatory word for the New York State Exhibit at the fair and for upstate scenery.

Then, after a fanfare and "Hail to the Chief," the President arrived, heavily guarded.

Mr. Johnson made no allusion to the presence of civil rights demonstrators at the fair. But he predicted that the United States would soon be a nation "in which no man is handicapped by the color of his skin or the nature of his belief," a nation "in which no man need be poor."

MIDTOWN TEMPO NORMAL ON THE FAIR'S FIRST DAY

The opening of the World's Fair yesterday did little to alter the day-to-day rhythm of life in New York.

There was no great crush on the subways or the sidewalks. Taxicabs, despite the rain, were generally available. The crowds in the department stores were about average, and tables were easy to get in most midtown restaurants.

Only the hotels seemed to be doing extraordinary business. The Waldorf-Astoria, the Astor, the New York Hilton, and the Plaza, among others, reported all their rooms taken for last night and tonight.

PEACE CALLED POSSIBLE

A chill breeze stirred the sodden flags outside, but the President spoke without a topcoat and warmed the audience with predictions of peace and plenty. He insisted: "Peace is not only possible in our generation, but I predict it is coming much nearer."

The President drew laughter by referring to the fair as "the promised land of Mr. Moses."

Earlier Mayor Wagner had predicted that more than 70 million persons would visit the fair before it closes in autumn, 1965—a record for any exposition.

"Today we may well be marking the end of one era and the beginning of another," the mayor said.

Messages from former Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower and Herbert Hoover were read.

Present under the blue and orange canopy on the speakers' dias were 9 State Governors; 23 Ambassadors; 11 Members of Congress; the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai E. Stevenson; the United Nations Under Secretary for Special Political Affairs, Ralph Bunche; Marquesa Carmen Villaverde, daughter of Spain's Generalissimo Francisco Franco, and Mrs. Indira Gandhi, daughter of India's Prime Minister Jawaharjal Nehru.

CHANTING DEMONSTRATORS

From Singer Bowl, the President went to dedicate the Federal pavilion. He spoke against a background of chanting demonstrators who never ceased marching during his speech.

The marchers lifted three youths to their shoulders, and the youths waved placards that the President could see: "A World's Fair Is a Luxury, but a Fair World Is a Necessity" and "See New York's Worse Fair—Segregated Schools for Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and Rats."

The theme of the fair is "Peace Through Understanding." Many of the pavilions euphorically projected a future of peace and prosperity.

Several exhibits were not ready, and some pavilions remained closed. Others opened with partly completed displays.

"America is never accomplished," said an Archibald MacLeish quotation on an interior wall of the Federal pavilion. "America is always still to be built." This applied also to the $17 million pavilion itself. The Hall of Presidents will not open until July 4.

SHOUTS MAR JOHNSON'S TALK AT PAVILION

(By Richard J. H. Johnston)

Twenty-three chanting civil rights demonstrators all but drowned out President Johnson's second speech at the World's Fair yesterday.

The words of the President, as he dedicated the Federal pavilion, were unintelligible to about half of the 400 persons who had gathered at the entrance to the building, a vast open area that is under the building itself.

President Johnson stopped at the Federal pavilion moments after he left the Singer Bowl, where he had spoken at the dedication of the fair itself.

The demonstrators, a group of white and Negro, male and female youths from the Congress of Racial Equality, had taken up positions on the outer rim of a moat that fronts the structure. Silently they held aloft plastic and oilcloth banners painted in red, reading, "Freedom Now" and "Jim Crow Must Go."

When the band had finished playing "Hail to the Chief," Luther H. Hodges, the Secretary of the Interior, stepped to the podium to introduce Mr. Johnson.

The pickets began rhythmic chants of "Freedom Now" and "Jim Crow Must Go."

CHANTS GROW LOUDER

Mr. Hodges hesitated, looking to his left at the spot where the shouting was coming from. He seemed to realize that it was not going to stop and continued his brief introduction.

As the President stepped to the microphones, the chanting swelled in volume. With a glance toward the demonstrators, Mr. Johnson spoke with measured words, ignoring the shouts.

Visitors standing in front of the President tried to shush the noise and began demanding that the police "do something * * * take them out of here."

A New York City police official shouted to a captain and a sergeant, ordering them to "get them away from there." But the two officers hesitated until several patrolmen began to force the demonstrators from their place on the lagoon rim.

One by one the demonstrators sank limply to the rain-soaked turf, still shouting. The police began dragging them away, but before any could be removed, Mr. Johnson had finished his short address. He stood through

a chorus of "The Star-Spangled Banner" played by the band, turned his back and strode across the building's esplanade to his waiting car 100 yards away. He was unsmiling until he reached the car, where he posed, waving and smiling, for photographers.

DRAGGED AWAY BY POLICE

The demonstrators continued to shout through the anthem. Three of them rose to their feet, the rest lay in huddled groups.

As the police began dragging them toward patrol wagons that had drawn up, one demonstrator clutched at a newly planted shrub. It came loose and the demonstrator dragged it along with him.

While the President was talking, Jay Rutherford, New York protocol chief for the State Department, stood wringing his hands in anguish as the chanting continued.

"This is dreadful, dreadful," he said.

Nearby was a small group of foreign dignitaries who watched and heard the disturbance in disbelief.

A Secret Service man, looking grim, said, "We can't protect him from this public insult."

Former Gov. W. Averell Harriman, who is now Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, arrived at the scene just as the President began to speak. He became so agitated over the disturbance that he forgot to take his hat off until the final bars of the national anthem were being played.

"This is certainly disgraceful," he muttered.

OTHER PLANS GO SMOOTHLY

Except for this incident, the President's visit made under the most thorough security arrangements ever for the protection of a President in peacetime, went off without a hitch.

At the end of a 7-minute flight in a Marine Corps helicopter from Kennedy International Airport, the President stepped to the landing pad atop the Port Authority Building at noon.

He rode an elevator 120 feet to the ground and stepped into a closed limousine. Twenty-five New York City motorcycle policemen escorted the 20-car motorcade over the eighth-of-a-mile route within the grounds to the Singer Bowl, where he made the fair opening-day dedicatory speech.

About 3,000 spectators saw him pass from behind barriers 30 feet away on either side of the route. World's Fair and city policemen, detectives and Secret Service men stood almost shoulder to shoulder along the route.

The Presidential car was driven into the bowl through a truck ramp. The President got out at the foot of the steps of the speakers' platform.

From the bowl he went by car, a distance of 300 yards, to the Federal Pavilion.

He returned to the heliport by the same route over which he had arrived, and his helicopter rose from the pad at 1 p.m. He returned to Washington in his Air Force jet from Kennedy Airport.

JOHNSON OPENS FAIR AMID RIGHTS DIN; STALL-IN PLANS FAIL—PRESIDENT IGNORES CHANTERS, TALKS ON PEACE, EQUALITY

(By Edward T. Folliard)

NEW YORK, April 22.—President Johnson looked straight ahead today, refusing to be distracted or rattled, when civil rights demonstrators sprawled on the ground near him at the New York World's Fair and chanted "Freedom now" and "Jim Crow must go."

The Chief Executive had opened the fair earlier with this heartening statement:

"I prophesy peace is not only possible in our generation—I predict it is coming much earlier."

He recalled how much had happened since New York's World Fair of 1939, and said that if his prophecy of peace is fulfilled people will see a vastly different America by the time of the next fair.

ENVISIONS THE FUTURE

"They will see an America in which no man must be poor," he said.

"They will see an America in which no man is handicapped by the color of his skin or the nature of his belief—and no man will be discriminated against because of the church he attends or the country of his ancestors."

It seemed to make no difference to the demonstrators—members of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE)—that Mr. Johnson is a champion of civil rights.

They gathered in front of the U.S. pavilion, which he was to dedicate by cutting a red-white-and-blue ribbon. They were for the most part young, white and Negro, some of them with beatnik beards.

FLOP DOWN NEAR PRESIDENT

When police began to disperse the demonstrators, those on the President's left flopped to the ground among some Andromeda shrubs. They chanted "Freedom now" and "Jim Crow must go" while Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges and Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York were speaking, and they kept up the clamor when Mr. Johnson took over the microphones.

"With God's help and His blessing," said the President in his peroration, "we will move forward to a world in which all men are equal, in which all people are free, in which all of us can live in peace."

"Freedom now," chorused the demonstrators. "Jim Crow must go."

Mr. Johnson never turned his head to look at them, although they were about 50 feet away. He did, however, raise his voice so that he could be heard above the hullabaloo.

The U.S. Marine Band played the Star Spangled Banner, and the President and others came to attention—all except the CORE demonstrators. They remained in the mud behind the shrubs, and kept up their chanting.

One of the big stories of the day concerning the fair had to do with something that did not happen. This was the expected "stall-in," a plan by the suspended Brooklyn chapter of CORE to put 2,000 cars on the highways leading to the fair and stall them by having them run out of gasoline.

Had the highways been blocked by such a scheme, it would have made no difference to President Johnson in his travels. After flying to the John F. Kennedy International Airport, he went by helicopter to the fairgrounds in Flushing Meadow.

From the heliport on the grounds, the Chief Executive drove to the Singer Bowl for the grand opening. A heavy rain had been falling, the flags were drenched, and about a third of the bowl seats were empty when he arrived.

Former President Harry S. Truman and Mrs. Truman were already in the stand, having come in an admiral's barge. The Missouri warrior had made a speech, and so had Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Mrs. Indira Ghandi, the daughter of Indian Prime Minister Nehru, and Robert Moses, president of the fair.

Mr. Johnson, accomplished by Mayor Wagner and Secretary of Commerce Hodges, left the Singer Bowl after the opening ceremony and went to the U.S. pavilion.

What he had to say in dedicating the big glass and stone pavilion seemed especially appropriate in view of the demonstration put on by the CORE demonstrators.

Mr. Johnson said:

"We do not try to mask our national problems, whatever they may be, under a cloak of censorship or under a cloak of secrecy. We do not try to disguise our imperfections or to cover up our failures. Rather, we freely admit them, and we bend our energy and our toil to correct them.

"I know of no other great power in the history of the world which so freely admitted fault and felt under such a great moral duty to correct those faults.

"This is because we realize that real progress comes through a constant process of criticism and reexamination; that those who censure the old provide the foundation upon which the new can be built.

"Free and unhindered criticism of men, of ideas, and of institutions is the vital nourishment of all freedom. Thus we have chosen as our theme the challenge to greatness."

The President flew back to Washington after the ceremony at the pavilion.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 23, 1964]

JOHNSON OPENS FAIR AMID RIGHTS DIN—STALL-IN PLANS FAIL—294 ARE ARRESTED IN SERIES OF WILD DEMONSTRATIONS

NEW YORK, April 22.—Police and civil rights demonstrators clashed today in a series of scuffles, some of them bloody, but the stall-in that was intended to paralyze the opening of the New York World's Fair fizzled.

The threatened king-size traffic jam never developed. Police said traffic on the five major expressways feeding into the 646-acre fairgrounds was "light to moderate."

Nevertheless it was a stormy beginning for the fair designed to advance "Peace Through Understanding." There was picketing inside and outside the fair. Disturbances and scattered violence occurred constantly.

A total of 294 demonstrators were arrested. Among them were James Farmer, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality; Bayard Rustin, a director of the March on Washington, and Author Michael Harrington, whose book "The Other America." sparked interest in the attack on poverty.

Several leaders of the insurgent CORE chapters that fostered the plan to deliberately stall autos also were arrested.

ACCUSED AS DISORDERLY

A spokesman at the neighborhood Elmhurst police station said that the charges were mostly disorderly conduct and resisting arrest.

Four Queens Criminal Court judges were on duty handling the cases as fast as possible. Bail was set from $500 to $2,500 each. In the past, civil rights demonstrators were usually released for a hearing.

Demonstrators, mostly young Negroes and whites, gathered in front of the U.S. Pavilion and chanted "Freedom Now" and "Jim Crow Must Go" as President Johnson spoke at the dedication. They chanted as other dignitaries made speeches, almost drowning out many of them.

The most serious incident occurred early in the day in Queens when about 20 demonstrators tried to stall a subway train en route to the fair.

The train came to a jarring halt when someone, presumably a demonstrator, pulled an emergency cord.

Two demonstrators threw themselves in front of the train. They lay near the electrified third rail on ties wet from a drizzling rain. Others lay down inside the train and kept the doors from closing.

Police with night sticks moved in. They yanked 17 men and 3 women off the train and tracks, some with blood streaming from head and face wounds. Three policemen were injured.

"Just like Birmingham, just like Birmingham," the demonstrators chanted as they were marched off to jail.

(In Washington, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, said on the floor of the Senate that Federal agencies should investigate the stall-in and the treatment of demonstrators.)

Police also fought with demonstrators outside the main entrance to the fair at about the time the President arrived.

A singing, chanting crowd in front of the entrance suddenly stopped and headed for a subway. Then they abruptly turned around, joined hands, and charged the fair entrance.

Police rushed to the gates to stop them. Shoving and pushing broke out. One of the demonstrators was arrested and manacled. The others screamed and shouted in protest.

But on the parkways, where trouble was supposed to develop, traffic was moving smoothly.

The runaway CORE groups apparently put few cars on the road in the protest that they said was designed to call attention to slum conditions, a lack of progress in school integration, discrimination in employment, and alleged police brutality.

Several cars ran out of gas, a couple developed motor trouble, and at least one car stalled with two flat tires. But as fast as the demonstrators stalled their automobiles, police pulled them out of the way with tow trucks, dump trucks, and even bulldozers.

But, either because of the steady rain that fell all morning, or because of fear of being delayed by a jam, many motorists who ordinarily use the roads or who might have planned to drive to the fair stayed away. One police official remarked that traffic was lighter than on a normal weekday.

After nightfall, when the fair became a dazzling galaxy of lights, attendance slowly mounted to a total of 87,039 by 9:30 p.m.—far below the expected 250,000 to 500,000.

Isiah Brunson, chairman of the Brooklyn CORE, which originated the stall-in idea, said it achieved its objective—causing the city financial pain by keeping cars off the roads.

Inside the fair there were incidents as demonstrations were held by national CORE in an attempt to overshadow the stall-in.

The more than 1,000 demonstrators, half of them white, never got very far. They were effectively contained by about 5,000 city and private policemen.

MANY PICKET GROUPS

Most of them gathered at 9:30 a.m. at the Unisphere, the steel globe that is the symbol of the fair. After marching around it, they broke into smaller groups and picketed individual exhibits.

Farmer and most of the other leaders went to the New York pavilion. They picketed for a while and then linked arms and sat down in front of the entrances.

Police asked the demonstrators to move. They refused. Some visitors stepped over them to get inside, and one, perhaps inadvertently, stepped down hard on Rustin's thigh on his way in.

When another request to move was ignored, the sit-ins were placed under arrest. Some walked to police vans. Farmer elected to be carried.

TROUBLE AT POSITIONS

One demonstrator tried to climb atop the huge plastic orange crowning the Florida exhibit tower while Gov. Farris Bryant was present.

He was pulled down, but he kicked a detective in the face. The kicker was arrested while other pickets shouted at the Governor, "Governor Bryant must go." Bryant ignored them.

The pickets also singled out the pavilions of the Schaefer Brewery Co and Ford Motor Co. for demonstrations, forcing the latter to close for a while.

There were minor demonstrations at the Maryland, New York State, Mississippi, Louisiana, Illinois, New England, Missouri and General Motors pavilions.

Farmer picketed outside the Louisiana exhibit and carried a cattle prod, a battery-powered pole that produces an electric shock and has been used against civil rights demonstrators in that State.

The crowds in many cases ignored the demonstrators and walked right over them. Some kicked and shoved their way through.

SOME FAIRGOERS ANGRY

At the New York State pavilion, angry fairgoers kicked and jumped on the pickets blocking stairways. A bespectacled man jumped several steps from the bottom and landed with both feet in a knot of demonstrators.

Intermittently, visitors got into angry conversation with individual CORE members and their sympathizers both in and outside the fair. Alert police moved in fast to break up the arguments before blows were exchanged. Some pickets heckled police.

The last of the CORE pickets left the grounds about 9 p.m., although most had pulled out in the afternoon.

National CORE issued a statement saying the demonstrations were "classic" and "successful" and that there would be more of them.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it is, I am sure, humiliating to most New Yorkers, who, like other Americans, have high respect for our President, to note that the shrieking and singing demonstrators drowned out the voice of the President as he sought to bring the high prestige of the Presidency to the fair to honor its formal dedication. I am not surprised to note that President Johnson showed no concern, no frustration, and no anger and went ahead to complete his speeches on both of the occasions when he was so rudely treated. One of my good friends in Florida called me today to tell me that he was listening yesterday over either radio or television and that he was astounded to note the disgraceful way in which the President, as the honor guest of the occasion, was mistreated by the demonstrators. Both of the news articles which I have placed in the RECORD, that is, from the New York Times and the Washington Post—clearly report these disgraceful exhibitions.

Before I read from this article, Mr. President, I should like to comment that our distinguished friend, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], apparently has made two completely different speeches on this subject today. I take it for granted, knowing his sincerity, that after he made the first one on the floor, which occurred during a colloquy with the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], he, too, must have read the newspapers, because the two statements are so vastly different in their content.

I note that in the colloquy earlier in the day between the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from New York, according to the UPI, included the statement:

"This was a proud day for New York," JAVITS said. "There was a little discord but not too much."

The New York Senator urged the Southern States to follow New York's example and added the city would welcome investigators from the Civil Rights Commission.

It was a proud day, so he said on the floor of the Senate; and I am sure he meant just that.

I note this afternoon in a UPI dispatch, that our distinguished friend, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], makes a completely different statement. It reads:

JAVITS acknowledged today that he apologized privately to President Johnson for the actions of shouting demonstrators at the World's Fair.

JAVITS said he considered the shouts during Johnson's speech yesterday opening the New York fair an act of "disrespect to the President."

The comments came during an exchange on the Senate floor with Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee.

That exchange, as I understand, came later in the day. Apparently our friend the senior Senator from New York had seen some of the items which I have just placed in the RECORD. For example, one of the items from the New York Times—and it is quite lengthy—is by a very distinguished reporter, Mr. Homer Bigart. I shall not attempt to read it in full, because it is much too long, and it is already in the RECORD. But I think it is necessary to read some of the paragraphs from it in order to give a clearer understanding of what was reported in the New York Times by this distinguished reporter.

The first of these statements is this:

At evening, 265 persons had been arrested outside and inside the fairgrounds.

Further:

But later the President was assailed by rude shouts from pickets and sit-ins when he dedicated the Federal pavilion.

The article further states:

The President's forecast of "a world in which all men are equal" drew loud derisive laughter from the pickets.

Another paragraph reads:

As soon as the President had left, police wagons drove up, and the sit-ins were flushed from the shrubbery. They had to be dragged into the wagons.

Two later paragraphs read:

Bearded and untidy, the seats of their pants muddied from sitting on the soggy ground, the pickets repelled and fascinated the fairgoers.

Some foreigners were embarrassed. A Pakistani woman swathed in a purple and gold sari, paused to watch the pickets, then murmured to her escort, who replied in English: "I think we should move on. I do not like to look at this."

The article further states:

The fair was a glittering mirror of national opulence, yet the pickets and the sit-ins and the lie-ins were a somber reminder of an aggrieved minority.

The demonstrations, Mr. Farmer explained before his arrest, "were to point up the contrast between the glittering world of fantasy and the real world of brutality, bigotry, and poverty."

Still later—and I shall have more to say about this later:

At the Florida pavilion, a white youth climbed to the top of the building and perched on a 50-foot pillar. About 40 other demonstrators, who said they were from Florida, alternately marched or lay down to bar the entrance. They sang, "We Shall Not Be Moved."

Mr. President, there is much more of the same. It is too bad that such an oc-

casion met with that kind of response from people of the great metropolis of New York. It was not stopped, either by the police of New York or the fair police, though it is stated in another article that there were 5,000 of such police there in order to stop that kind of demonstration.

There is one more paragraph in the item which I was reading, Mr. President. I read that into the RECORD at this time:

CHANTING DEMONSTRATORS

From Singer Bowl, the President went to dedicate the Federal pavilion. He spoke against a background of chanting demonstrators who never ceased marching during his speech.

The marchers lifted three youths to their shoulders, and the youths waved placards that the President could see: "A World's Fair Is a Luxury, But a Fair World Is a Necessity," and "See New York's Worse Fair—Segregated Schools for Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and Rats."

The second article from that same edition of the New York Times is by Richard J. H. Johnson, whom I do not happen to know, but it is under his byline.

I have already placed that in the RECORD, but I quote certain paragraphs from it because I believe they point up the extravagant, highly disagreeable, and highly disgraceful nature of what occurred in New York at the World's Fair yesterday.

The first paragraph reads as follows:

Twenty-three chanting civil rights demonstrators all but drowned out President Johnson's second speech at the World's Fair yesterday.

The second quotation is:

When the band had finished playing "Hail, to the Chief," Luther H. Hodges, the Secretary of the Interior—

Of course, that should be Secretary of Commerce—

stepped to the podium to introduce Mr. Johnson.

The pickets began rhythmic chants of "Freedom Now" and "Jim Crow Must Go."

CHANTS GROW LOUDER

Mr. Hodges hesitated, looking to his left at the spot where the shouting was coming from. He seemed to realize that it was not going to stop and continued his brief introduction.

As the President stepped to the microphone, the chanting swelled in volume. With a glance toward the demonstrators, Mr. Johnson spoke with measured words, ignoring the shouts.

Visitors standing in front of the President tried to shush the noise and began demanding that the police "do something—take them out of here."

A New York City police official shouted to a captain and a sergeant, ordering them to "get them away from there." But the two officers hesitated until several patrolmen began to force the demonstrators from their place on the lagoon rim.

One by one the demonstrators sank limply to the rainsoaked turf, still shouting. The police began dragging them away, but before any could be removed, Mr. Johnson had finished his short address. He stood through a chorus of "The Star-Spangled Banner" played by the band.

That was during the singing of "The Star-Spangled Banner" at the end of the President's remarks. "The Star-Spangled Banner" was sung by a wonderful chorus.

Continuing the quotation:

The demonstrators continued to shout through the anthem. Three of them rose to their feet, the rest lay in huddled groups.

Mr. President, what shall we say of the type of Americanism represented by callow youths who use this kind of method of showing in the presence of thousands their disrespect for their President, their disrespect for their national anthem, and their disrespect for all the standards of decency as was shown in the demonstration yesterday?

Another paragraph reads:

While the President was talking, Jay Rutherford, New York protocol chief for the State Department, stood wringing his hands in anguish as the chanting continued.

"This is dreadful, dreadful," he said.

Nearby was a small group of foreign dignitaries who watched and heard the disturbance in disbelief.

A Secret Service man, looking grim, said, "We can't protect him from this public insult."

Mr. President, what are we coming to, when 5,000 police are required to maintain order, in addition to the Secret Service and all the other secret protective paraphernalia in the area, and when a group of hoodlums of this kind can bring this kind of discredit and disgrace upon the great city of New York, in which they are a minority, and upon our country in the presence of countless foreigners? There are numerous foreign exhibits at the fair.

Another article tells of the parade in which people from many foreign nations participated in native costumes to show their appreciation of the New York World's Fair.

What kind of conduct are we coming to? Is there any such thing left as reasonably good manners? Is there any such thing left as patriotism? Is there any such thing left as respect for our highest dignitary, the President of the United States, and for a fair which has drawn the attention of the whole free world on this great and glittering and really glorious occasion, the opening of the World's Fair, for which Congress appropriated $17 million so that an appropriate exhibit might be constructed there to represent the United States of America?

What are we coming to when we allow these things to get so out of hand as to force the President of the United States grimly to attempt to speak against a background of shouts and insults of that kind, and then to leave grimly, as the article states, with no smiles until he got into his car and was gone at the end of an occasion which should have been an occasion for pleasure and rejoicing by him and by all the assembled thousands of people.

It all comes from the most false kind of leadership. It comes from a disturbed people who apparently understand little of what their country stands for. It comes from those who have little understanding of the great investment which the city of New York and the State of New York have made in the fair, and of the enormous amount of good will which would come to their own State and to their own city, if only they would cooperate reasonably with those who have made possible this great asset of the free world.

Not only the United States, not only many States in the Nation, not only the great manufacturing enterprises from one end of the Nation to the other are exhibiting there, but many nations throughout the free world are also exhibiting.

I am placing these things in the RECORD because I hope that there are people throughout the country—and there are some who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—who will read and understand what a terrible debacle a thing of this sort really is, and how deeply it drags the prestige of our country down into the mud and mire to have this kind of conduct made evident on such an occasion.

I have already placed in the RECORD the articles published in the Washington Post this morning. I believe it might be well to read into the RECORD a few of the paragraphs from the second one because it was written by one of the most distinguished reporters in our Nation, Edward Folliard, who apparently was present in person, because it appears over his byline.

This was the theme of the Chief Executive:

I prophesy peace is not only possible in our generation—I predict it is coming much earlier.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Can the Senator recall recently when any President of the United States, who was not engaged in making a political speech but was on a mission of good will and affection in the tradition of American respect for a great city of our country, has ever been treated with such indignity?

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot, except for the tragic assassination of our beloved late President Kennedy, which went even further than that, because it came apparently from only one diseased mind. The misconduct in the present instance came from group psychology, which I find hard to understand, and from leadership which was far wider than one person, from a group whose minds are apparently afflicted with the idea that their country means nothing to them, that it is quite within their province and their idea of liberty that they should put on such a disgraceful exhibition as this one proved to be at the New York World's Fair opening and dedication yesterday.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that there have been Presidents who have been subject to severe criticism. For example, I was worried that some extremists might be discourteous to President Kennedy when he visited the city of New Orleans, because after all there were some people in the area who had been vitriolic in their criticism of the President; but when the President came to New Orleans everyone treated him courteously; and anyone who may have had unkind thoughts toward the

President, if he could not be polite in treating the President, stayed away and did not go to the celebrations.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is courtesy of the kind we should find in every community of the Nation. It has been shown in my own State. Florida did not vote for the Kennedy-Johnson ticket. Unfortunately, we lost by 47,000 votes, which was close, because over a million and a half votes were cast. But when the late President Kennedy came to Florida a few days before his untimely death, he was received with great joy and acclaim, both in the city of Tampa and in the city of Miami, with literally hundreds of thousands of people out on the streets to do him honor.

When President Johnson only recently came to the celebration in connection with the groundbreaking ceremonies of the Cross Florida barge canal in north Florida, where many people are highly conservative and do not agree with the President's philosophy, and who hold to the conservative philosophy that generally pervades the South, everyone came out to do honor to the President and his lovely wife and his two daughters. Thousands of people stood in the rain to do honor to a man who had come to do them honor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not a fact that a great many Americans who do dishonor to and indicate contempt for the man who occupies the office of the President of the United States are indicating contempt toward the great country which he represents?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is completely right. I appreciate his bringing this matter to our attention. There is contempt. There is no doubt about it. There is no sense of fealty on the part of citizens who would do a thing like that. It is unfortunate that we should have in our country such leaders of youth, because these incidents involved youths, as my further reading from this article will show.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not generally true that for every right possessed by a citizen there is also a responsibility and a duty?

Mr. HOLLAND. There is a responsibility and duty, as was called to our attention so clearly by the late President Kennedy at his inauguration. That is something that every citizen owes to his country. The Government, on the other hand, in the very nature of things, will not do a great many things for a great many people because they do not need them.

However, the fealty and the honorable devotion and dedication to the service of one's country shown by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, when he served on the beachheads of Italy—and I know something about his service there—is something which in time of peace should glow in the lives of all young Americans.

We have come to a sad day when this kind of thing can happen. Those who are pushing the civil rights bill and those who are demonstrating in support of the bill are playing with fire. They are doing it deliberately, and thus are sacrificing most of the precious patriotic ideals of our country.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield further.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to ask the Senator what his opinion is about this situation. When we look at those who would deny a white citizen so much as the right to be tried before a jury, or the right of his neighbor to have a trial by jury, does the Senator believe that there is anywhere a community where the responsible white citizens would subject a President—even though the President were advocating that they be governed, for example, by the contempt powers of the Federal court—to such an indignity?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; I am sure the Negro citizens in the Senator's State and in mine would join in acclaiming the President's coming to our States. I have seen that happen in recent days. They have joined and would join in doing honor to our President. I cannot understand the degraded standards of certain people. Even less do I understand the leaders of the people who knowingly are bringing these things to pass.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield further.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I suggest to the Senator that the colored citizens of his State and of my State would conduct themselves with credit. They would not reflect the kind of leadership that James Farmer and others like him provide for certain misguided people. I suggest further that there is a minority of that race which can be stirred up to conduct itself in the backward fashion of Africa—or in the most backward fashion that people have considered as the backward fashion of Africa of 30 years ago, as exemplified by certain leaders.

Those are the kind of people who have political power in this country today.

Mr. HOLLAND. Unfortunately, they have much power. I read the next sentence in the article from news dispatches published on the front page of this morning's Washington Post:

> Nevertheless, it was a stormy beginning for the fair designed to advance "Peace through Understanding." There was picketing inside and outside the fair: Disturbances and scattered violence occurred constantly. A total of 294 demonstrators were arrested. Among them were James Farmer, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What was James Farmer doing there?

Mr. HOLLAND. He was picketing.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is not this the James Farmer who suspended the chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality which was calling the strike?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; he suspended the chapter which was trying to stage the stall-in—not S-t-a-l-i-n, but s-t-a-l-l-i-n.

As I understand, he joined wholeheartedly in the picketing, not only of the President, but of the various pavilions also.

I read the following from the news article published on the front page of today's Washington Post.

> A total of 294 demonstrators were arrested. Among them were James Farmer, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality; Bayard Rustin, a director of the march on Washington, and Author Michael Harrington, whose book "The Other America," sparked interest in the attack on poverty.
>
> Several leaders of the insurgent CORE chapters that fostered the plan to deliberately stall autos also were arrested.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Did not James Farmer and his organization, CORE, declare themselves as being against this demonstration?

Mr. HOLLAND. Against the stall-in on the highway. However, I believe that at the same time they announced that they would participate in the demonstrations within the fair. That is my recollection of his announcement.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. James Farmer was against blocking the entrances to the World's Fair, but he was in favor of subjecting the President to the type of indignity that the President suffered. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. He was expelled. He was dragged, kicking, from the scene. I should like to read another paragraph.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I trust that James Farmer was not subjected to the type of bone crushing police brutality that other Negro demonstrators were subjected to.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is one picture of a demonstrator bleeding from his face and with blood on his clothes. Another picture shows a policeman striking a demonstrator on the head. This demonstrator was trying to hold up an interurban train or an elevated train by standing in the door and refusing to let the door close. The picture is here, if the Senator wishes to see it. The picture was published in one of the New York newspapers. I believe it is in the Daily News. It shows a police officer striking a young demonstrator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the picture to which the Senator makes reference the picture showing two Negro policemen beating a Negro demonstrator, with one of the policemen holding the demonstrator and the other policeman hitting the demonstrator over the head with a heavy blow from his night stick?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is one of the pictures. But not that to which I have just referred. Another one shows even greater application of brute force and beatings. I believe that the picture to which the Senator refers was published in the Washington Evening Star of yesterday.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am not sure that is the picture I had in mind.

Mr. HOLLAND. Another picture shows one of the demonstrators who has been struck on the head, with his head bleeding from several wounds. The Senator will notice blood streaming down his face and all over the demonstrator's trousers. Another picture shows a policeman striking a man with a raised club. Has the Senator seen this?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The picture I have in mind appeared in the New York Times and was somewhat clearer. There appeared to be blood flowing down a demonstrator's face at the same time that a policeman's billy club was being landed on his head.

Mr. HOLLAND. There are so many, I will not begin to say how many there are. A picture to which I referred earlier shows police officers beating a young man who is holding the train door open. The caption reads: "Policeman Yanks Picket from Train at Jackson Heights." There are probably 20 from various newspapers. Apparently the photographers were at different places and saw different actions.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I invite the attention of the Senator to a picture which shows a policeman beating a Negro. Has the Senator ever seen such vivid evidence of extreme inhumanity to man as those two policemen are administering to a Negro demonstrator, who apparently is pleading for his life?

Mr. HOLLAND. This is a very brutal scene. It is a picture of a demonstrator holding both hands above his head. He has fallen down. One Negro policeman is holding him from the back, and another one is at his side, striking him with his nightstick.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator from Florida believe that such inhumane beating could be visited upon American citizens, and that the mayor and the chief of police of that city had told the police to go ahead and crack the skulls of the demonstrators with no regard for their lives?

Mr. HOLLAND. That might have occurred; but not knowing whether it occurred, thinking very well of the mayor of New York, and realizing the size of New York—it has a good many more people than Florida, which has a population of just under 6 million—I would hesitate to say that the mayor himself knew anything about this.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator recall the publicity that occurred when a man had his trousers torn by a police dog in Birmingham?

Mr. HOLLAND. I recall that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator recall the pictures showing how that occurred?

Mr. HOLLAND. I recall seeing the pictures. Later the USIA distributed the pictures all over the world.

The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] suggested today that if there were any fairness at all, the pictures of what took place yesterday might well be shown all over the world. Personally, I hope they will not be. I think it would be just as wrong to show them as it was wrong to show pictures of the isolated case in Birmingham. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana will agree with me.

After all, we are all one great country. We stand or fall together. My feeling is that we are being very foolish when we allow this kind of thing to happen and are even more foolish when we publicize such pitiful happenings by distributing pictures of them all over the world. I hope we shall get away from this kind of action. I am completely out of patience with it. It seems to me we are sacrificing our country upon the altar of personal feelings, when such activities can be so strongly encouraged, even by people in high places.

I am sure that there must be people of decency in New York. There must be many humane and generally good people, who will not permit such excesses as we saw through the pictures of what took place yesterday and as we learned, through radio and television, transpired not only on the fair grounds, but also in New York City.

One of the articles states that there are two instances in which it was necessary to assist demonstrators off the rapid transit trains which they had stopped. One picture shows that action. The article states that the demonstrators stopped a train, and that a man got down on the tracks in front of the train and came very near to being electrocuted, because apparently he did not know he was almost on the third rail.

So much has been written about what transpired that I cannot hope to read it all. But I have placed most of the articles in the RECORD, where those who want to read, those who are not blind, can realize how far things have gone, how far we are allowing this activity to go, and how greatly this disorder, this disturbance, which has resulted largely from the introduction of this bill, is affecting our country. It is a terrible thing.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Did the Senator notice that the Birmingham incident with respect to the police department was a situation in which the police merely wanted a demonstrator to move back, but the demonstrator had his cameraman with him and insisted on walking into the dog, so that he could show all over America and all over the world a picture of how he was being bitten by a dog—obviously a put-up job; while, on the other hand, the brutality that occurred in New York City was not a put-up job? Is it not obvious that the man whose head was being cracked in was pleading for mercy? He did not come with a cameraman and plead for mercy. He was pleading his cause. Is not that fairly clear from the picture?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is fairly clear from the picture. Yet I still think we should not publicize these acts; we should try to correct them.

Both the Senator from Louisiana and I have been rather moderate in our approach to this matter. Throughout the years of the pendency of the poll tax amendment to the Constitution, he and I were joint authors of the amendment. I am very proud of that. I suspect that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana was subjected to greater pressure and criticism in his State than I was in my State, but he stayed with me from beginning to end, and we finally saw that amendment go into the Constitution.

I read in the newspapers the other day—I hope the Senator from Louisiana did, too, because it gave me a good feeling—a statement by the secretary of the State of Texas that more than 100,000 voters had qualified to participate in the elections to Federal office this year—elections for President, Vice President, presidential electors, Senators, and Representatives. Those people had not paid their poll tax and would not have been qualified to vote under the Texas poll tax law.

We are getting somewhere by taking moderate means of approach, but we are not getting anywhere when we take drastic methods of approach.

I hope that Senators who, I fear, are thinking about votes rather than the results of this will wake up in time to realize that such a drastic bill as this is destructive of the rights of all people, black or white, rights which they should be allowed under the Constitution. I hope Senators will wake up in time to change course. That is the real purpose of this extended debate.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his contribution to the discussion.

I continue to quote from the article by Mr. Folliard, at the time he was being annoyed by demonstrators at the pavilion:

> Mr. Johnson never turned his head to look at them, although they were about 50 feet away. He did, however, raise his voice so that he could be heard above the hullabaloo.
>
> The U.S. Marine Band played "The Star-Spangled Banner," and the President and others came to attention—all except the CORE demonstrators. They remained in the mud behind the shrubs, and kept up their chanting.

What a dismal picture that is. It is sad to think of its having occurred in our Nation's greatest city when it was most on parade, at the opening of the great World's Fair.

I have before me another article. I shall not place it in the RECORD, because I do not want to burden the RECORD. It relates to the Maryland exhibit at the World's Fair. The writer tells how the exhibit was picketed, and states that the Governor of Maryland, J. Millard Tawes, a fine gentleman, canceled his trip to the fair because of the threats of demonstrations and stall-ins. I shall read one paragraph:

> However, Gov. J. Millard Tawes canceled a trip to the opening because of threatened stall-in.

It is all so much dismal stuff. I could read five times this amount into the RECORD, but I prefer not to do so. I want the people of our country and elsewhere to realize that in that great city, which should be one of the centers of our civilization, one of the leaders in the things that are worth while, there are fine people who, through the promotion of the World's Fair, are attempting to do just that. They have done a fine job, and we have helped them.

I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], who is now occupying the chair as Acting President pro tempore, and other Senators have all helped in trying to make certain that the United States was well represented at the fair by having an exhibit. To have the whole event so nearly destroyed, so completely frustrated by the actions of a few irresponsible, unprincipled people who are led by even more irresponsible and less principled leaders, is too bad. I hope that we shall learn in time that we cannot afford to have this kind of activity in our country.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Can the Senator see any basic distinction between what the Congress of Racial Equality was doing in New York City and what it has been doing in other cities of the South, and even in other parts of the country?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. The Senator from Florida, as he will say in the latter part of his talk, if he can get around to it, has been picketed almost every time he has gone to Florida in the course of his current campaign. Not one insult has been hurled at him. He has been picketed by CORE on every occasion, sometimes, too, by NAACP, and sometimes by student groups. The picketing has been done respectfully and decently. There has been no interference with our program. We have put over every point of right of assembly, right of petition, right to state their complaints, in a way that neither I nor anyone else could complain of.

I am sorry they feel that way about me; but I do not find in their conduct anything about which I can complain; and I have seen similar situations in the cases of the picketing of others. For example, the other day, Assistant Secretary of the Army Ignatius went to the University of Florida, in connection with an ROTC occasion of some kind. A very large crowd assembled there, and he was picketed by a group of pacifists. There are some pacifists in our State; but their picketing was done in an orderly manner, and in good form, and those who did the picketing were clean and decently dressed, and were well behaved. So far as I am concerned, if they are able in that way to get rid of their frustration and to "work off a little steam" by that process, I have no objection. It seems to be a sort of fad for some people to picket. If that is a way in which they can satisfy their feelings and can "work off some steam," I have no objection.

My aide has handed me two tearsheets which have just come from the Associated Press news ticker. I have not read them; but I shall read them now to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, because I am sure my aide would not have handed them to me if they did not have some sound application to what we are discussing.

The first one reads as follows:

Moscow.—Tass carried a 200-word item about the opening of the New York World's Fair in its international service today, calling it "a mixture of carnival and fair."

The Soviet news agency devoted nearly half of the story to civil rights demonstrations. It said those arrested for trying to stop subway trains "were all covered with blood when brought to the station."

One of the men shown in the newspaper photograph which I showed to the Senator from Louisiana was arrested during the stopping of the subway trains.

I read further from the Associated Press news ticker item from Moscow.

It noted there was chanting during President Johnson's speech and that more than 200 were arrested, then added: "One of the demands of the demonstrators was that the police should stop its brutal treatment of Negroes."

Mr. President, the brutality was mostly on the side of the demonstrators, although certainly there was some on the part of the police—judging from the newspaper photographs.

The other tearsheet from the Associated Press news ticker reads as follows:

WASHINGTON.—The Justice Department indicated today it will look into complaints that police mishandled civil rights demonstrators in New York yesterday. It said it makes a routine check of all such complaints.

A number of demonstrators were arrested yesterday in connection with the opening of the New York World's Fair. Some of those taken into custody at a Queens subway station had bloody heads and faces.

Senator RUSSELL reading news reports of the incidents to the Senate yesterday, demanded that Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and the civil rights Commission investigate reports that police had beaten the demonstrators.

He renewed his demand today, challenging the Government and supporters of civil rights legislation to publicize "the blood flowing on the sidewalks of New York yesterday" with the same zeal applied to alleged southern offenses.

Mr. President, all these things join with the material we have previously been discussing, to make the sorry picture a little more complete, and to make completely clear that the distress which was pictured on the face of the Pakistani woman, in the photograph published in connection with one of the dispatches, and that shown on the face of the foreign dignitaries who were with the President, and who could not understand that situation, have been turned into glee in Moscow, when the Government officials there heard that such disturbances were occurring and that such treatment had been accorded our beloved President. It is unthinkable, Mr. President.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield briefly to me, to permit me to make a statement, if it is understood that in yielding to me for that purpose, he will not prejudice his right to the floor or any of his other rights?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, Mr. President; with that understanding, I ask unanimous consent to yield for that purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have asked permission to make a brief statement, rather than to propound an interrogatory, because I believe that a statement will better enable me to cover the point I have in mind.

A short time ago I discussed what happened in the little city of Plaquemine—which should not be confused with the Parish of Plaquemines, which is located about 100 miles away from the city of Plaquemine.

In the peaceful little city of Plaquemine, a tolerant, kindly city, Mr. James Farmer, of the Congress of Racial Equality, who went there, stirred a lot of fine, understanding, lovable people into demonstrations of hatred and unrest; and in that connection there were all sorts of violations of law, including demands that businessmen hire Negroes to work as cashiers in their places of business, even though the Negroes referred to had had no such experience; and there were also demands that if such Negroes were not hired to work as cashiers in those places of business, Negroes would picket such business establishments—contrary to the ordinance of that city, which prescribes that picketing may be done only by groups of not more than two persons. There was also a great deal of hurling of bricks and brickbats and broken bottles at automobiles, and similar violations of law and disturbances of the peace. There were countless violations and all sorts of disturbances. All of them were stirred up by the same persons. There were also many threats of personal harm to the residents of the city; and there were violations of the right of working people to enjoy peace and rest at night, when they were in their homes, and when it was time for them to sleep. In short, there were all sorts of unlawful disturbances and violations of law and order, including a great deal of chanting, singing, and screaming at late hours of the night, well after midnight; and countless other minor violations.

Mr. HOLLAND. But they were not directed against the President of the United States.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is true. However, the point I make is that there is no real distinction between the two situations. Both involve clear violations of the law. In the one case, there were violations of law and disturbances of the peace, by various means, including the throwing of bricks and large stones at people's automobiles, the blocking of traffic, the creation of turmoil, and action which resulted in keeping working folks awake at night—all sorts and kinds of noise and disturbances. All the activity of that sort involved clear violations of law, and all such violations of law justified the methods the police used to break up the demonstrations and to send the people to their homes.

But that situation was described by James Farmer and by others of his group as "police brutality."

I suggest to the Senator from Florida that although the magnitude becomes greater when such persons undertake to humiliate the President of the United States in the eyes of the rest of the world, and although it is unthinkable that anyone would do such things, yet I believe it is fairly clear that the principle is the same in both cases—namely, that such activities clearly involve violations of laws and violations of the rights of citizens.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Louisiana is correct; and such developments are a sad commentary on the situation which has obtained in so many parts—almost everywhere—of our country.

On the other hand, I doubt that even one dozen of the people of his great State would attempt to embarrass or humiliate the President of the United States—as was done yesterday in New York.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, I doubt that any of the people of my State would do such a thing—unless it might be done by someone whom I would not think a good American. It is possible that someone of that sort might attempt to do such a thing.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator from Louisiana is correct.

So it is clear that it is with false leadership, selfish leadership, and un-American leadership that we must have our greatest concern.

Mr. President, I have assembled a number of other clippings, which I was ready to use in presenting these matters to the Senate. However, time is passing; and I promised the majority whip that I would be in a position to have the Senate take a recess at about 8:30 p.m. That is the understanding of the Acting President pro tempore, is it not?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. So I shall not further burden the RECORD with many more news articles, although I have quite a number ready to use.

Likewise, Mr. President, I feel that I should and must include in the RECORD the story of the insulting treatment which was given to Florida's distinguished Governor yesterday at the Florida Pavilion. The State of Florida has spent a good many hundreds of thousands of dollars in providing a pavilion and an exhibit which we think are not only a useful credit to our own State, but also a contribution to the entire fair. We responded in this way to the invitation extended to us by the officials of the New York World's Fair. We feel that we are the guests at that fair, of the city of New York, and of the State of New York. We know perfectly well that the officials of both the city and the State not only refuse to countenance such happenings as those that occurred yesterday at the Florida Pavilion to our Governor, the Honorable Farris Bryant, but we are also sure that the governing officials of both the city and State are ashamed of the conduct of some of their citizens on that occasion. Mr. President, I prefer not to relate this matter in my own words, but, instead, to quote the report from the New York Herald Tribune of today, April 23, appearing in the column of Jimmy Breslin, whom I do not know. The article reads as follows:

AT FLORIDA'S PAVILION

The muddy shoes did not move. They were shoved further out to make it harder for anybody to walk over them. And these kids sitting on the walk with their backs against the glass doors stiffened and locked arms when they saw Farris Bryant, the Governor, coming toward them at the entrance to the Florida exhibit at the World's Fair yesterday.

Bryant was in a black hat and light brown topcoat and was walking first. Behind him were these big guys in cowboy hats and green uniforms and black shiny holsters with .45's in them. They were Florida State Troopers.

The entrance had six glass doors which open outward. There were 20 kids, all of them white, sitting in the entrance-way with their backs against the glass doors and their muddy shoes sticking out.

I am glad that the article has made it clear that all 20 people were white, because it shows clearly that the responsibility for all the disturbance created by James Farmer and all the others does not rest solely upon members of the colored race.

I continue to read from the article:

Bryant picked the last door on the left side and walked up to it. He stopped when he hit the muddy shoes. They did not move for him.

"Would you mind moving aside?" he said to the kid sitting against the door.

Mark Epstein, 16, and a student at Elizabeth Irwin High School in Greenwich Village, looked up at the Governor of Florida through thick glasses and he said nothing. The muddy shoes did not move.

A BEATING IS AVERTED

The Governor stepped back, and now the green uniforms moved around him and came in on top of these kids. One trooper stepped on Epstein and grabbed the door handle and pulled the door to him. Epstein tried to push against the door, but then another Florida trooper got his hands on the door and now it moved and Epstein slid with it. Then one of the troopers reached down and put a big hand on Epstein's black hair. The kid's head jerked up and the trooper started walking with his hands at his side, dragging this kid along the ground by his hair.

"You're not in Florida, gentlemen," a colored kid standing on the side started yelling, "You're not in Florida, gentlemen."

The trooper dropped his hand to Epstein's jacket collar. He took a handful of it and started walking again. The front of Epstein's shirt cut into his throat and now he didn't know what was happening to him and he was badly frightened. So were the others. They were trying to hold their ground, but the sharp creases in the troopers' green pants disappeared as their knees jammed into the kids. The muddy shoes moved a little.

Now the troopers had an aisle cleared and the Governor walked through it and into the building and so did the people behind him. The troopers followed immediately. The one who had Epstein by the collar dropped him and left him on the ground. The kid was coughing because he hadn't been able to breathe.

Then a huge trooper, this one in a gray uniform, stepped out to hold the door.

"Don't I know you from some place," the colored kid on the side yelled at him. "Aren't you the man who bought my police dog?"

"Lay that club on his haid," a man told the trooper.

A PICKET IS MOVED

And now everything was going to happen. The trooper looked straight at the colored kid with narrowed eyes. Inside the pavilion, a man came running to the glass doors with his fists clenched and a bad look in his eyes and he was trying to push through and if he had made it there would have been hell. But Billy Vessels put an arm in front of the guy and Vessels was not going to let the guy get past his arm.

I am sure that the Senator from Louisiana remembers Billy Vessels. He was a great football player with the University of Oklahoma. As I remember, he was an All-American football player.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I remember him.

Mr. HOLLAND. I continue to read from the article:

Vessels once played football for Oklahoma about as well as anybody ever played college football and yesterday at the World's Fair he saved a lot of kids a bad beating.

It was over then. The place was quiet. The only sound was Mark Epstein, 16, coughing to get his wind back. The whole thing had seemed unreal. And now everything else seemed unreal. You felt like you were in a strange place.

Off to the left, up on top of the hill, were apartment buildings. Familiar buildings, too. And right behind them is Queens Boulevard. Pepe and Johnny Maguire have a bar there. And up the other way, behind Shea Stadium, is LaGuardia Field. And the el up there, crossing the parkway, that one goes to Sunnyside. They have a fight club in Sunnyside. Hell, you know the whole area. You feel at home in it. But yesterday it was different. It was a strange place filled with things that have never gone on before. You never else seemed unreal. You felt you were in a strange place.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask the Senator if he does not find it somewhat frightening to think that people who would promote and be responsible for that kind of indignity to a President, the Governor of a State, and people in general, have such political power that many people in politics fear to do anything that would offend them.

Mr. HOLLAND. Unfortunately, that is the case. I am still reading from the article by the reporter Jimmy Breslin, whom I do not know:

This is no knock at the trooper. He had to clear a way for the Governor of his State and this kid was trying to stop him. The guy had to do something. But it was bewildering to see it done here in this place where you always felt at home.

"I can't go down to Florida," Epstein said, "so this is the closest I can come to demonstrating against Florida. Right here at the fair."

Mr. President, that statement speaks rather large in itself. Twenty white boys—Epstein and nineteen others whose names we do not have—tried to prevent the Governor of our State from attending the dedication of a pavilion, which was paid for by the taxpayers of Florida, and built in response to an invitation extended by the officials of New York City and New York State. They tried to prevent the Governor from entering his own State pavilion and from performing the dedication ceremonies there.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Did the thought ever occur to the Senator that some of the white beatniks are paid to do that sort of thing?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have heard of it, but I prefer to think that it is the fault of leadership, and that bad precept is responsible. We have heard that Farmer himself was pulled into a police wagon and went to jail. Two other leaders, whose names I read from one

of the articles a while ago, were involved. How can we blame youngsters who are 16, 20, and 21 years of age for feeling that they are being properly led when experienced men, with quite a knowledge of the world, stoop to doing the type of things that they are doing, particularly in misleading the youth of our Nation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Was the passageway which Mr. James Farmer was seeking to block the same passageway that the President would have had to use in order to ascend the platform and address the people of America at the opening of the New York World's Fair?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not able to answer that question. The news articles do not specifically define what passageway it was. But it was one of the passageways in the various areas that were being picketed. Not only was the Florida pavilion picketed, but there was quite an article about the picketing of a beer company's exhibit and the picketing of the Ford exhibit, which was forced to close. I am sorry that the Ford exhibit closed. The Florida exhibit did not close, and will not be forced to close by that kind of demonstration.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would it not be a fair statement to say that those people complain about rights that they imagine they should have at the expense of others, and have demonstrated how much utter contempt they have for the rights of the citizens?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is true. That is one of the things we must do. We must find some way to reach those people and show them what false philosophy they follow, what false ideas they have, how they are completely violating all decency, and all the lawful rights of the others, and treading on the Constitution, and doing it in the name of civil rights.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would it not be fair to paraphrase the Scriptures in a way and say that those people worship false gods?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am afraid they do. Does the Senator mean the leaders, or the followers?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Both the leaders and the followers.

Mr. HOLLAND. The leaders would be responsible for the leadership. The ones who follow the leaders worship them. If that is what the Senator means, I presume that is true.

Mr. President, I have been picketed several times in my own State during these last few weeks by CORE, NAACP, and others, both white and colored, but always quietly and respectfully. I would be astounded to receive such treatment as that meted out in New York, even though I am a citizen and an official of Florida, and not of some other State, from any group of picketers in Florida. They have certainly demonstrated much more peacefully and with much better manners than those displayed yesterday by this young group of picketers at the Florida pavilion at the World's Fair who tried to exclude the Governor of Florida from the pavilion which he had come to dedicate and which was paid for by the citizens of Florida. I could not for a moment believe that any group of picketers in my State—whether white or black—could treat a visiting Governor from another State in the disgraceful way that these New York picketers treated Governor Bryant yesterday. I hope that with such conduct prevailing and disclosed by the New York press the officials and the people of New York will themselves come to the conclusion that they must use a stronger hand and enforce more decent conduct on the part of those who seek to exercise their right of assembly and freedom of speech by picketing. I shall not dwell longer on this disagreeable matter, Mr. President, other than to include in the RECORD a thoughtful column by Mr. David Lawrence from the Evening Star of yesterday, April 22, entitled "High Court's Law of the Land." The subtitle reads "Stall-in and Sit-in Reflect Confusion in United States on Limits on Demonstrations."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In view of the prejudice that the press, the television, and radio seem to demonstrate against the South in general, what does the Senator think would have happened if the people of our States had treated the President with such indignity in a planned organization and showed the President the type of discourtesy and disrespect that was accorded the President on yesterday?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shudder to think how extreme the statements would have been in the Northern press of the Nation. I think there would have been very extreme statements in the press in Florida and in Louisiana, too. I do not think we would have tolerated that kind of mistreatment to a visiting dignitary. We do not have that kind of disrespect for those in high office. I am sure we would find nothing of that kind in either the State of Louisiana or the State of Florida.

Mr. Lawrence cites certain decisions of the Supreme Court which he says have encouraged the extreme tactics now being exhorted to by picketers. I read two paragraphs from Mr. Lawrence, as follows:

> Demonstrators thus have been encouraged to block entrances and collect crowds that disrupt traffic—if only to gain notoriety or publicity for their cause. The right of any citizen to drive his automobile and stall it on a public highway is regarded by some Negro leaders as comparable to the court-approved right of sit-in demonstrators to block entrances to buildings.
>
> Strictly speaking, the police should be able to arrest persons either for a breach of the peace or for performing acts which threaten a breach of the peace. But the Supreme Court has declared otherwise, and the supporters of the stall-in idea have every right to invoke the existing Supreme Court decisions in defense of their demonstrations in New York City. It is true that the New York State court issued an order enjoining the stall-in demonstration. The mere existence of an injunction, however, is not sacred in the eyes of the Supreme Court if the person who violates it claims his objective is to obtain constitutional rights. This is an extreme interpretation, but the Supreme Court has made it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was my pleasure to see the article by Mr. Lawrence. That article, like many others by Mr. Lawrence, convinces me that he is one of the true intellectual giants of this country. Mr. Lawrence's article, like many of his articles, very clearly states that violence must be controlled, whether it is in the South or in the North.

Mr. HOLLAND. And whether it is committed by demonstrators, or by ordinary criminals. That is really the point of his remarks.

Mr. Lawrence makes it very clear that "now ordinarily individuals would not take these chances, but they have been supported by recent Supreme Court decisions and by the voices of approval which have been raised in many quarters to the idea of demonstrations."

I think that is along the lines I have stated. It seems to be a hobby. It seems to be a fad. Demonstrations seem to be a smart thing. No matter what they do—or how they do them—they are right.

Mr. President, I hope that the people of our country—both those in official positions and the members of the public generally—will regard yesterday's demonstrations as a storm signal which may not be neglected, but will call the whole country back from the present dangerous trend under which demonstrations are becoming more and more unruly and are violating more and more the rights of innocent persons. Unless there is a betterment of the situation, we may well expect much greater showing of resentment from the general public than has been shown to date.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Has the Senator any reason to believe that passing this bill, which in the opinion of many was generated by and had its beginning with the Birmingham demonstrations, would take this type of thing off of the street and into the courts?

Mr. HOLLAND. No. That is the big misconception. Enacting a law, handing down a decree, issuing a mandate, sending down an army, exerting economic pressure—none of those things heals wounds which occur because people do not like each other, and for some reason do not want to associate.

The good that has been accomplished—and many things have been done—have come about by means of using a friendly approach to see what is tolerable to the two races. Nothing is going to solve this problem until we find out what is tolerable. Not everything in this bill will be found to be tolerable by the two races. I have heard from Negro teachers, and I have heard from Negro merchants who do not want this bill—for obvious reasons, which the Senator knows. The public has been most patient, but there is an end to patience and I express the

strong hope that we may see an end to the extreme types of demonstrations which have now become commonplace.

In the effort to discover what is showing up today on the ticker tape which is just outside the Senator Chamber as to the disorders that are taking place in various parts of our country and which indicate the utter disrespect of law and order which is prevailing in too many places, I went out to the AP ticker, Mr. President, a couple of hours ago and picked up four or five items which indicate something of the widespread troubles which we are having as a result of the extremely reckless leadership in these demonstration movements. I quote several of these ticker items into my remarks at this time as a part thereof. Surely it must be apparent to anyone who is not blind and will not refuse to see that these so-called demonstrations are doing great harm to the country and holding up a false image of our country to all the world. You will note in the item from the New York Times which I inserted a few minutes ago, the fearful comments of the Pakistani lady when she ran into the demonstrations at the World's Fair yesterday. We do not want the whole world to think we are a Nation of hoodlums and lawless rioters.

In closing, I read into the RECORD several comments which I think will show that this problem has become nationwide, and is growing more dangerous every day. These comments come from the tickertape and cover a period of perhaps a couple of hours. They were taken off the ticker before I began my speech.

The first item which I quote is from Chicago:

CHICAGO.—A civil rights group said today it would picket a $100-a-plate Democratic fund-raising dinner tonight at which President Johnson will be the main speaker.

Rose Jennings, of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, said the demonstration would "urge more rapid action on the civil rights bill" and protest the "inadequate" food budget of the city's relief recipients.

Mrs. Jennings said she did not know how many pickets would participate in the demonstration.

When told that Johnson said he felt sorry for the demonstrators who interrupted his speech at the opening of the world's fair yesterday, Mrs. Jennings replied: "It's nice to know a man does have some compassion."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Can the Senator tell me why those people would picket a Democratic Party fundraising dinner in the North? Have not the Democrats of the North in general been strong in support of anything that could be labeled civil rights?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

There is an item from Providence, R.I.:

PROVIDENCE, R.I.—A sit-in by backers of legislation to bar discrimination in housing neared the 48-hour mark at the Rhode Island statehouse in Providence today.

Lawmakers generally ignored the demonstrators, who sat in spectators chairs on both sides of the house chamber.

Extra State police and deputy sheriffs were on duty, but no incidents were reported.

The number of demonstrators swelled to more than 100 at times during the night.

Several participants said they had maintained a fast since the start of the sit-in Tuesday afternoon.

Leaders said the demonstration would continue at least into tomorrow.

Two Providence youths again pitched a pup tent on the statehouse lawn and spent the night there in what they described as a demonstration of the ability of Negroes and white persons to live together harmoniously.

One youth was a Negro, the other white.

More than half of the demonstrators inside the capitol were white persons.

The question of a ban on housing discrimination has been before the Rhode Island Legislature for 7 years. Such bills passed the senate twice, but did not come out of committee in the house until this year, when a watered-down measure backed by leaders of the Democratic majority was killed by a margin of almost 2 to 1.

The city of Providence, where most of the State's Negroes live, is now seeking authorization to enact a housing discrimination ordinance of its own.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Much as I dislike to see this sort of thing happening, I say to the Senator from Florida that this is a matter of one's chickens coming home to roost. This all started when President Kennedy "bent a knee" to the Birmingham demonstration. After that there have been all kinds of demonstrations in this country.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is a great deal of truth to that, but we must pool the thinking of the people of this country and find out how we can solve the problem. The avalanche is moving, and we must stop it. That is the reason why I am placing these disagreeable things in the RECORD.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Can the Senator tell me whether there is anything in the civil rights bill that would would solve the Rhode Island problem and call off that particular demonstration?

Mr. HOLLAND. No, there is not. The Senator knows that perfectly well. Many of these demonstrations are aimed at intangible, idealistic goals, which have no reference at all to the pending civil rights legislation. They grow out of this same misleading movement which so frequently erupts into violence.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is there anything in the civil rights bill which would have helped the problem at the World's Fair?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; and the funny part about that is—if one can say "funny," because it is really tragic—that the State of New York has on the statute books all the drastic legislation which is in this bill, and it is not solving the problem. New York has an FEPC act; it has an open housing act—which is not in this bill at all—it has abolished segregated schooling. It has integrated schools. It has everything that is in this bill that the moderates in the Senate complain about, and they have not been found to be solutions.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator that his colleague, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], placed in the RECORD the other day statistics from the Department of Labor showing the percentage of Negro unemployment in the various States. The State of New York with its longstanding FEPC law headed the list—or nearly so—with about 18 percent, if I remember correctly, of Negroes who were unemployed; whereas in the South, where, of course, there are no FEPC laws, there is not one State which has a percentage of unemployment that is one-third that of the State of New York.

Perhaps it is only frustration on the part of those people. They have tried all the legal remedies and they have not worked, so they do not know what will work. They are merely "kicking out" against conditions which they do not understand.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator recall when Attorney General Robert Kennedy first came to talk to a group of southern Senators, and told us what he had in mind in the nature of a civil rights bill? He undertook to sell us on the idea of wanting to take these disputes off the streets and put them in the courts?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I suggest to the Senator that if this is not correct, the very States which are pressing this type of legislation already have all these laws, and they are the ones having the trouble nowadays.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. He has stated it better than I have. That is what I was trying to say. The States which have such laws on their books have found out how futile it is for them to have enacted them.

Early today the ticker carried a story from Chester, Pa.

CHESTER, PA.—All public schools in this city were closed today and 216 persons in jail following the resumption of civil rights demonstrations.

School officials yesterday announced the closing of the city's 18 public schools, "pending the return to normal conditions," because of what they termed an explosive situation and fear for the safety of 11,000 pupils in this industrial city.

Civil rights demonstrators have staged rallies and protest marches in this city of about 63,000 almost every day in the last month. They are protesting alleged de facto school segregation, a charge denied by the eight-member school board, which includes one Negro.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What city did the Senator say that was?

Mr. HOLLAND. Chester, Pa. Pennsylvania has an FEPC law, and also integrated schools.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator know of anything in the pending civil rights bill which would help the situation in Chester, Pa.?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not a thing but they have the fever.

The last item is tragic. I regret to have to put this in the RECORD but I believe I should do so, to show what is going on. It is one of the many which I hurriedly took off the ticker in a period of 3 or 4 minutes, 2 hours or more ago. It comes from St. Louis:

STABBING

ST. LOUIS.—James Reedy, 22-year-old student at St. Louis University, was stabbed to death just before midnight when he and a classmate were accosted by a gang of about 15 Negroes, police reported.

Reedy was found on a sidewalk across the street from the John J. Cochran Veterans' Hospital, in an integrated residential area (at 900 North Grand).

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Was that boy white or colored?

Mr. HOLLAND. He was white. The ones who killed him were Negroes, according to the article, and there is no indication there was any provocation of any kind.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What is there in this bill that would help with that situation?

Mr. HOLLAND. Nothing. The article states that even the housing area in which the murder occurred was an integrated housing area.

This was a dreadful thing.

Probably that is the reason why Negro and white youths were in such close juxtaposition, which may have contributed something to the trouble. I do not know.

But they were not living in the normal state of separation of the races which the Senator and I know is to be preferred. It is even preferred in the great cities of the North. That is why there is de facto school segregation, because in schools in the communities where the children are colored, the children there are also colored, and when the community is Puerto Rican, they are Puerto Rican, and when the community is white, they are white. The Senator knows perfectly well that the old adage, "Birds of a feather flock together," applies in this instance.

The other day I placed in the RECORD a vital and stimulating article published in the New York Times showing the three great subdivisions—one in New York, one in Connecticut, and one in New Jersey—in three different States which had started deliberately to develop integrated housing areas with quotas for each race.

Soon they became what the Negroes who remained there called Negro ghettos, because the white people moved out and the colored people moved in.

It is too bad that these qualities of character seem to be imbedded so deeply in both whites and colored people.

We witness accounts of it both as to schools and as to housing every day. We know about the situation in Seattle, Tacoma, and Berkeley, and how the people turned down by a huge majority proposed open housing regulations and in Kansas City barely failed to do so.

All of us must understand there are a great many things that can be done by law, but we cannot change the nature of people.

When we try to change the nature of people, without their having an opportunity to decide for themselves what parts of the change they can tolerate, we are making a hopeless mistake—a dangerous mistake—and we are making ourselves look just about as foolish as intelligent human beings can look.

Unless there are some further questions, I yield the floor.

THE EDUCATED WOMAN

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], has recently written an article on the changing role of women in society, and particularly the influence of education in that change.

In the article the Senator examines the consequences of an ever-increasing number of college educated women on the labor market and offers some recommendations to insure that the social and intellectual contributions of these women will not be wasted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in the Intercollegiate Association of Women Student's magazine be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

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

THE EDUCATED WOMAN

(By MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, U.S. Senator)

Rows of numbers concerning foreign aid and surplus commodities don't haunt the leaders in Government nearly as much as that lone number followed by a percentage sign which tells of continuing unemployment. Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz reports that nearly 6 percent of Americans are unemployed. If that is a disturbing figure to the President and Members of Congress, imagine what it means to be one of those 4 million who need a job and must suffer mental and physical anguish because there is no work.

But the able Secretary has also noted that the preponderance of the unemployed are to be found in the ranks of the uneducated.

A decade back speakers on the campuses of women's colleges were apt to ponder at length over the value of a college degree, and it was a time when many coeds thought of getting married, of rearing beautiful children, cooking wonderful goulash, and entertaining the boss on short notice, but in an atmosphere of glistening crystal and romantic candlelight.

Today's college woman knows that she can do both—have a degree, perfect her skills as a breadwinner, and still have a home and children.

In fact, it is assumed that most girls graduating from college this June will be going into the labor market.

Because of the increasing numbers of women with jobs, President Kennedy appointed a Commission of educators, businessmen, professional people, labor leaders, and politicians, like me, to study possible areas of discrimination against women who work. This Commission, after 2 years of investigation, will make its report to the President this October. The report will have a direct bearing on your own welfare as a professional woman or one of the women with special talents in the army of white-collar workers.

The report will deal with civil and political liberties, your role in the social security system, the kind of tax deductions you may claim, and your right to equal pay.

Women are traditionally trained to be nurses, teachers, and social workers. Needs for these skills are exceeding supply and a call is out for the educated women in America to come back into the labor market and give us the benefit of their training. However, the number of college-trained women has tripled in the last 30 years and yet the number of college graduates in the labor force has declined.

I have found it of interest to explore the reason behind this statistic. As a member of the President's Commission on the Status of Women I have had an opportunity to explore the social security laws and the tax laws affecting women, and I think I have found the answer. Many of these women are also housewives and mothers. In order to pursue their professions they must hire household help or child care assistance or pay nursery school tuition. Since there is a minimum of tax deduction, they may question the worthwhileness of leaving home and going back into the world of business.

A change in this unfair tax provision will be included in the recommendations to the President from the Commission.

The modern professional woman is not only poorly represented in the thousands of new space age jobs involving science and mathematics, but is also losing ground in some of her longtime strongholds. Elementary schools and social work are attracting increasing numbers of men who are profiting from the better salaries and favorable tenure laws that teachers have won over the years of organization and appeals to legislatures.

Dr. Mary Bunting, president of Radcliffe College, is one of my colleagues on the Status of Women Commission. She attributes the decline of professional women to the cultural force that tells a woman that it is unladylike to use her mind. The commission has also taken note that although there are plenty of women on college faculties, they are all instructors or assistant professors. One such assistant commented, "They make you a full professor the day before you retire."

Many of you attend college for other reasons than job training. There is great emphasis for both men and women to attend college not only for the sake of an education, but also for its social and economic status.

And what if marriage is your goal. Most women want to marry a man with a college education, and realize that to get him they will need a college education themselves.

For the college woman who doesn't need to work to fulfill financial or creative needs, there is a desirable career as a volunteer in community service, in politics, in art.

Whatever it is, the educated woman of today can find in herself an individual of social worth who has her very important role to play in giving intellectual leadership to her family and society.

A NEW DIXIE COLONEL—THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR FUNDAMENTAL AMERICAN FREEDOMS, INC.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the April 12 issue of the Norfolk, Va., Virginian-Pilot and Washington Post carried an excellent, carefully documented article on the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms, Inc., and its director, John J. Synon.

The Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms, Inc., is re-

sponsible for much of the misinformation that has been spread throughout Montana and other States concerning the civil rights bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article which appeared in the Washington Post, written by Luther J. Carter, Washington correspondent of the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot, be printed in the body of the RECORD. Mr. Carter is a former recipient of an American political science congressional fellowship and in that capacity served with skill and ability in my office for several months. I can vouch for his thorough and patient research.

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 12, 1964]

A NEW DIXIE COLONEL

(By Luther J. Carter)

A heavy fist clenching a "$100 Billion Blackjack" shook threateningly at newspaper readers in scores of cities outside the South last month, and many may have felt the sense of alarm this menacing full-page advertisement was meant to produce.

The ad, sponsored by the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms, Inc., a group created last July to lobby against the civil rights bill, was the brainchild of John J. Synon, 54, a public relations man.

"I wrote every word of it," says Synon, the Coordinating Committee's director.

The advertisement was checked for "legal exactitude" by John C. Satterfield, the Mississippi lawyer and former American Bar Association president who, along with Synon, leads the lobbying effort.

But it was Synon, who chose the "blackjack" image in an attempt to turn opinion against the bill's fund cutoff provision, and the rest of it as well.

The "blackjack" in the ad refers to the Federal budget. Synon and his committee contend that by withholding funds Federal administrators could crack down on any federally assisted local activities which they fancifully conceived to be discriminatory. Supporters of the bill regard this as the grossest of distortions.

Who is this newly commissioned colonel in the Dixie forces? What are his qualifications to speak against the civil rights bill?

Synon, 6-feet-3½, angular, talkative, was born in Norfolk, the son of a lawyer and real estate developer. He attended Blackstone Military Academy in Southside, Va.

Caught by the depression, he never attended college, but began a string of newspaper and other jobs which, interrupted by a 2-year stint in the Air Corps that ended in a disability discharge, eventually took him to California.

Since World War II Synon has performed in a wide assortment of roles: A public relations man with a taste for rightwing politics who helped Goodwin J. Knight campaign in 1950 for reelection as Lieutenant Governor of California; a secretary to the Governor after Knight succeeded Earl Warren; a Knight appointee on the State industrial accident commission.

He was the apparent author of an article in a rightwing journal attacking Knight as a betrayer of the conservative cause; a losing candidate for Congress who championed right-to-work legislation; a lobbyist for whisky by the drink before the Virginia Legislature; and before taking up the fight against the civil rights bill, a lobbyist in Washington for Portuguese business firms in Angola whose names became embroiled in a congressional investigation last spring of foreign lobbies.

Synon, the anticivil rights bill lobbyist, sees that job as one of arousing opposition to the bill in congressional constituencies and letting Congressmen feel the pressure—rather than actually buttonholing Members.

He is paid $500 a week, plus expenses which have been running as much as $1,600 a quarter. He told an interviewer, "I'm a top-flight man and they don't come cheap."

Synon can thank the Mississippi Sovereignty Commission for most of his salary, although the commission insists that as the chief financial provider for Fundamental American Freedoms, Inc., it has looked much more to private donors across the country than to the State's taxpayers.

The vice chairman of Fundamental American Freedoms, Inc., James J. Kilpatrick, editor of the Richmond News Leader, encouraged Synon to become the lobbying group's director.

"He is our senior reviewer of nonfiction for the News Leader's book page," says Kilpatrick. "I certainly have a lot of confidence in him."

On the strategy of the campaign, Synon said, "There's nothing I need to do in Virginia, and there's nothing I can do in New York. So we are concentrating on those States where we have reason to believe the Senators are intellectually honest and subject to facts rather than pressure."

"We would approach (through advertising and direct-mail campaigns) those Senators whose States contain few Negroes. Let's say, in the Dakotas—they've got more Indians out there than they have Negroes. The Senators can afford to be statesmen."

In his view, no Senator is more important to the ultimate outcome of the civil rights fight than the Republican minority leader, EVERETT M. DIRKSEN of Illinois.

Synon explained the conflicting pressures that work upon DIRKSEN: "This bill isn't going to create any new jobs. Who is going to lose his job if you're going to force the employment of Negroes? This answer is simple. He [the Negro] is going to take the job where he is more nearly competitive. The surprising thing is what amounts to a sellout by the labor unions toward their membership.

"The bill will utterly destroy union seniority. DIRKSEN comes in this because he has hundreds of thousands of Hungarians, Polish, Italians, and Irish who are going to be the first fall-guys in Operation Black Bootstrap."

DIRKSEN, he said, is feeling pressures from two sides, from Negroes and from the white working class.

"The question is—which is his softer side? Just where is his soft underbelly?" he said. "Senator DIRKSEN will do the right thing according to his lights. The question is, what are his lights? But I have a great deal of confidence in the minority leader."

This confidence may have been shaken last week when DIRKSEN spelled out his ideas on the civil rights bill's fair employment section, saying that the modifications he proposes would "broaden" and improve the act and would not gut it.

It's the constitutional issue, and nothing else, which has led to the lobbying effort, Synon said.

"We are not interested in the racial aspects of this thing at all," he said. "I have pretty much of a detached view of it."

Church lobbying for civil rights legislation is a potent force for the bill in the Midwestern and Rocky Mountain areas where his group is concentrating, Synon said. But, "These people are not engaged in the saving of souls. They are engaged in an ideological war just as is the John Birch Society and the Communist Party. * * * They are lobbyists.

"Senators are wise to pressure groups and they evaluate them accordingly."

Synon came to the attention of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when it made an extensive inquiry into foreign lobbies. The New York public relations firm of Selvage and Lee, Inc., figured importantly in the investigation, and Synon was on a $5,000 a year retainer by that company.

(Synon's first connection with Selvage and Lee was as a lobbyist for liquor legislation at the 1962 session of the Virginia General Assembly.)

In October 1962, three articles deploring the "racist" attitude of Negro leaders in Africa and the United States appeared in the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier under Synon's byline. He was identified as a public relations man who has made a "close study of African affairs."

The Foreign Agents Registration Act required that Synon inform the newspaper of his association with Selvage and Lee, and that the firm represented Portuguese oversea companies in Africa. According to Thomas R. Waring, the paper's editor, the News and Courier knew of these connections. The articles were published without compensation to Synon.

"The press has been full of anti-Portuguese material, all of it written by people who are on somebody's payroll," Waring said. "We saw no reason to refuse readable copy that we liked because the author happened to be on the payroll of Portugal."

The articles bitterly critical of the Kennedy administration, accused it of hypocrisy and a cynical pursuit of Negro votes.

Another fleeting speciman of rightwing-literature appeared in the November 16, 1957, issue of the publication Human Events. Some people attributed it to Synon, although it appeared under the psuedonym "J. Sutter Mill," and Synon won't say whether he wrote it or not. Entitled the "Death of a Salesman," the piece attack Goodwin Knight cuttingly and contemptuously.

"It was far too nasty and far too wrong," says Knight. "He (Synon) bragged to everybody in the (San Francisco) Press Club that he wrote it."

It said in strong language that the Governor was neither "left" nor "right" but the "quintessence of expediency."

"I would not give him (Knight) the satisfaction of knowing that I did not write it," Synon said.

Knight said "he was very bitter against me personally, because I couldn't endorse him when he ran for Congress (in 1958)."

The story of Synon's career in California from the time he met Knight in 1949 until he took a job back East with the Americans for Constitutional Action in 1959 is filled with contradictions.

Synon says he was working as a public relations man for an oil association and became Knight's northern California campaign manager. He says Knight passed him over and selected Robert G. Alderman as his personal secretary when he became Governor. Synon joined the Governor's office in 1953. Later Alderman was fired. Synon says he then took charge of Knight's office. Knight said that Synon was "I think, assistant press secretary."

Synon received $7,356 a year to start and was receiving $12,000 a year when he left about 12 months later. Knight says he appointed Synon to the Industrial Accident Commission after others in his office said they couldn't work with Synon. Synon says he wanted out because he didn't like Knight's actions.

His new job paid $11,000 a year to start. His pay increased to $15,750 a year before he resigned in late 1959.

On the commission, Knight says he heard from other commissioners that Synon "was not industrious and not a good commissioner."

Synon points out he went on the commission in 1955 to fill an unexpired term and

Knight named him to a full 4-year term in 1956—an appointment confirmed by the State Senate.

Synon resigned about a year after Democratic Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown took office.

On January 3, 1957, an investigating committee of the California Assembly called Synon and Alderman to testify about the passing out of "free ride" insurance brokerage fees to politically friendly brokers, even though they might perform no services whatever with respect to State insurance contracts. Alderman testified—in contradiction to Knight's assertions—that the Governor once intervened to sugegst four brokers for the list of fee recipients, the Sacramento Union reported.

Synon was quoted by the San Francisco Chronicle as saying that he never had discussed insurance brokers with Knight, and had "absolutely no recollection" of signing any memoranda telling the Finance Director that the Governor wanted certain brokers placed on the favored list. The memoranda, with his signature, were then produced.

Assemblyman Jesse M. Unruh of Los Angeles, now Speaker of the Assembly, suggested that Synon had "set up a deal" for a friend to undercut another broker's renewal bid for insurance on the San Francisco Harbor contract. Synon denied any wrongdoing, and said that the new policy had resulted in a $13,000 premium savings.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, pursuant to the order entered on Friday, April 17, 1964, I move that the Senate take a recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order entered on Friday, April 17, 1964, until tomorrow, Friday, April 24, 1964, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 23 (legislative day of March 30), 1964:

Commission on Civil Rights

Eugene C. Patterson, of Georgia, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights, vice Robert G. Storey, resigned.

In the Air Force

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be second lieutenants

Adams, Duane A., xxxxxxxxx.
Allbee, Thomas D., xxxxxxxxx.
Anderson, William J., xxxxxxxxx.
Arslan, Charles R., xxxxxxxxx.
Ashy, Joseph W., xxxxxxxxx.
Balcom, Keith W., xxxxxxxxx.
Baschnagel, William R., xxxxxxxxx.
Bass, Thomas L., xxxxxxxxx.
Betts, Carlton L., xxxxxxxxx.
Bjornstad, Eugene N., xxxxxxxxx.
Bock, Charles M., xxxxxxxxx.
Borinski, George E., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Boswell, William H., xxxxxxxxx.
Bower, Larry E., xxxxxxxxx.
Bradbury, Rufus S., xxxxxxxxx.
Bragaw, Robert A., xxxxxxxxx.
Brennan, John E., xxxxxxxxx.
Bridges, John D., xxxxxxxxx.
Bromiley, William R., xxxxxxxxx.
Brook, Harley J., xxxxxxxxx.
Brooks, Donald A., xxxxxxxxx.
Brooks, William I., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Brown, Samuel, xxxxxxxxx.
Brudno, Edward A., xxxxxxxxx.
Buecker, William H., xxxxxxxxx.
Buley, Joseph R., xxxxxxxxx.
Calvez, Clifton A., xxxxxxxxx.
Carr, Richard J., xxxxxxxxx.
Carstensen, John R., xxxxxxxxx.
Casey, David R., xxxxxxxxx.
Catenacci, John R., xxxxxxxxx.
Chandler, George E., xxxxxxxxx.
Clark, John G., xxxxxxxxx.
Clark, Robert C., xxxxxxxxx.
Cobb, Jerry R., xxxxxxxxx.
Cole, Gordon E., xxxxxxxxx.
Colligan, John J., xxxxxxxxx.
Combs, Richard R., xxxxxxxxx.
Condit, James C., xxxxxxxxx.
Cranos, Roger L., xxxxxxxxx.
Crooks, Thadis W., xxxxxxxxx.
Curtis, Carl R., xxxxxxxxx.
Curtis, John E., xxxxxxxxx.
Cutright, Robert C., xxxxxxxxx.
Danforth, George S., III, xxxxxxxxx.
Davis, Clarence L., xxxxxxxxx.
Decker, John A. Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Delaney, Joseph F., xxxxxxxxx.
Delaveaga, Richard A., xxxxxxxxx.
Denby, Donald J., xxxxxxxxx.
Densmore, Joel Y., xxxxxxxxx.
Dipaolo, Salvator M., xxxxxxxxx.
Distaso, Jack R., xxxxxxxxx.
Dixon, James W., xxxxxxxxx.
Dodgen, Donald L., xxxxxxxxx.
Dodson, William H., xxxxxxxxx.
Doublier, Rene M., xxxxxxxxx.
Duston, Arthur G., IV, xxxxxxxxx.
Dutton, John A., xxxxxxxxx.
Eathorne, Frank G., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Edmunds, Rance S., xxxxxxxxx.
Elliott, John R., xxxxxxxxx.
Elliott, Leland R., xxxxxxxxx.
Elrod, Bryant D., xxxxxxxxx.
Engstrom, Wayne A., xxxxxxxxx.
Epting, James L., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Erickson, Alan W., xxxxxxxxx.
Eynon, Alfred C., xxxxxxxxx.
Fanelli, Matthew J., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Ferm, Rodney E., xxxxxxxxx.
Finn, Ronald S., xxxxxxxxx.
Fish, Rufus T., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Fletcher, Larry N., xxxxxxxxx.
Flowers, Arthur D., xxxxxxxxx.
Fox, Edward H., xxxxxxxxx.
Frampton, Gene D., xxxxxxxxx.
Friedl, Robert S., xxxxxxxxx.
Gabrielson, Richard A., xxxxxxxxx.
Garner, Thomas L., xxxxxxxxx.
Gassmann, Joseph, xxxxxxxxx.
Geldbach, Arthur R., xxxxxxxxx.
Gemelli, Glenn G., xxxxxxxxx.
Gilbert, Thomas M., xxxxxxxxx.
Gilmour, Niles D., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Glynn, Lawrence J., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Grady, Sanders W., xxxxxxxxx.
Graham, William G., xxxxxxxxx.
Green, Theron B., xxxxxxxxx.
Greene, Howard B., xxxxxxxxx.
Greenstine, Robert B., xxxxxxxxx.
Griffin, Kirby G., xxxxxxxxx.
Gross, Larry R., xxxxxxxxx.
Grosskopf, George K., xxxxxxxxx.
Guy, Alden R., xxxxxxxxx.
Hall, William M., xxxxxxxxx.
Hammond, Marvin H., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Hardin, Thomas S., xxxxxxxxx.
Harlan, Robert H., II, xxxxxxxxx.
Harmon, Jerry H., xxxxxxxxx.
Harms, Frederick G., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Harrington, Fred A., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Harris, Kent K., xxxxxxxxx.
Harris, Leaman D., xxxxxxxxx.
Hartman, Willard S., xxxxxxxxx.
Hinkle, Richard E., xxxxxxxxx.
Hockenberry, Everett D., Jr., xxxx
Hoke, Russell M., xxxxxxxxx.
Holland, Dewey G., xxxxxxxxx.
Hooks, Kenneth R., xxxxxxxxx.
Howard, Joseph C., xxxxxxxxx.
Jacobs, Michael F., xxxxxxxxx.
Jacobus, Kenneth H., xxxxxxxxx.
Jander, Thomas R., xxxxxxxxx.
Jansen, Carl A., xxxxxxxxx.
Jedlicka, Richard A., xxxxxxxxx.
Jefferson, Jack J., xxxxxxxxx.
Jennings, Paul C., xxxxxxxxx.
Jensen, Fred C., xxxxxxxxx.
Jevcak, Joseph J., xxxxxxxxx.
Jewett, Calvin F., xxxxxxxxx.
Johanningsmeier, Donald, xxxxxxxxx.
Johnson, Gene H., xxxxxxxxx.
Johnson, Ralph K., xxxxxxxxx.
Johnson, Ralph T., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Johnson, Thomas P., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Jones, Jerry P., xxxxxxxxx.
Jonke, Frank J., xxxxxxxxx.
Kerkman, Dennis J., xxxxxxxxx.
Kirschman, Richard H., xxxxxxxxx.
Kohlmann, Dennis, xxxxxxxxx.
Kolb, Harry U., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Korte, Edward M., xxxxxxxxx.
Krach, Thomas H., xxxxxxxxx.
Lape, Gary D., xxxxxxxxx.
Larson, Rodney M., xxxxxxxxx.
Layton, Daniel E., xxxxxxxxx.
Lee, Gregory A., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Lockhart, Johnny G., xxxxxxxxx.
Love, Roy R., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Lucas, James H., xxxxxxxxx.
Lunsford, Jack H., xxxxxxxxx.
Lutsky, Alan L., xxxxxxxxx.
Madden, Dennis P., xxxxxxxxx.
Mangum, David H., xxxxxxxxx.
Marquis, James D., xxxxxxxxx.
McCarthy, William R., xxxxxxxxx.
McChristian, Jerome M., xxxxxxxxx.
McDonald, Donald G., xxxxxxxxx.
McKean, Robert E., xxxxxxxxx.
McKenna, George W., xxxxxxxxx.
McLaughlin, Robert G., xxxxxxxxx.
McLaurin, William T., xxxxxxxxx.
McMasters, John H., xxxxxxxxx.
McVean, Duncan E., xxxxxxxxx.
Merrell, Robert H., xxxxxxxxx.
Meyers, George J., III, xxxxxxxxx.
Misiorowski, Ronald L., xxxxxxxxx.
Morrison, Roger A., xxxxxxxxx.
Muldowney, Francis W., III, xxxxxxxxx.
Narbut, Leon A., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Nelson, Marshall D., xxxxxxxxx.
Nichols, Kenneth E., xxxxxxxxx.
Obermeyer, Ronald W., xxxxxxxxx.
O'Connor, John M., xxxxxxxxx.
Oliva, Anthony J., xxxxxxxxx.
Oliver, Alfred, xxxxxxxxx.
Oliver, George M., xxxxxxxxx.
Pack, Richard L., xxxxxxxxx.
Panton, David W., xxxxxxxxx.
Payne, John B., III, xxxxxxxxx.
Phillips, Maxey J., xxxxxxxxx.
Pignone, Francis X., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Placko, Jerry S., xxxxxxxxx.
Plummer, Ernest L., xxxxxxxxx.
Pokorny, Otto T., xxxxxxxxx.
Pollak, James E., xxxxxxxxx.
Proctor, William A., xxxxxxxxx.
Quinn, John A., xxxxxxxxx.
Racine, Joseph F., xxxxxxxxx.
Rampy, Johnny M., xxxxxxxxx.
Randolph, Donald D., xxxxxxxxx.
Rappold, Robert A., xxxxxxxxx.
Reagan, Norman W., xxxxxxxxx.
Rice, Arthur W., III, xxxxxxxxx.
Ricker, Leo F., xxxxxxxxx.
Riddle, George E., xxxxxxxxx.
Rieger, Louis J., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Riley, Chester H., xxxxxxxxx.
Risch, Gregory M., xxxxxxxxx.
Rodda, Michael K., xxxxxxxxx.
Rodgers, James A., xxxxxxxxx.
Rush, Hughey A., III, xxxxxxxxx.
Schaefer, Weldon E., xxxxxxxxx.
Schibler, Mark C., xxxxxxxxx.
Schmidt, Walter K., xxxxxxxxx.
Sculley, Jay R., xxxxxxxxx.
Seagraves, Harold O., xxxxxxxxx.
Seale, Stephen W., xxxxxxxxx.
Sealy, William F., xxxxxxxxx.
Shogren, Stanley P., xxxxxxxxx.
Sidebottom, Harold W., xxxxxxxxx.
Smith, Douglas B., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Smith, George C., xxxxxxxxx.
Smith, Gregory H., xxxxxxxxx.

Smith, James L. C., xxxxxxxxx.
Sorensen, Donald N., xxxxxxxxx.
Spanberger, Lloyd R., xxxxxxxxx.
Speckmann, Elwood W., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Spradlin, Don M., xxxxxxxxx.
Stager, Dale W., xxxxxxxxx.
Stuart, Warren C., xxxxxxxxx.
Sweet, John H., xxxxxxxxx.
Taff, Ralph G., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Talbot, Grady E., xxxxxxxxx.
Thomasson, David E., xxxxxxxxx.
Thompson, Donald L., xxxxxxxxx.
Tillman, Joe A., xxxxxxxxx.
Troutman, William W., xxxxxxxxx.
Trykoski, Michael A., xxxxxxxxx.
Tschirhart, Leslie H., xxxxxxxxx.
Wadkins, Donald L., xxxxxxxxx.
Wagstaff, Frank E., xxxxxxxxx.
Wallace, Larry W., xxxxxxxxx.
Walls, Douglas D., xxxxxxxxx.
Wardlaw, Thomas T., xxxxxxxxx.
Welch, Guy F., xxxxxxxxx.
Welde, Francis J., xxxxxxxxx.
Wells, Peter C., xxxxxxxxx.
Wennerstrom, Arthur J., xxxxxxxxx.
Werner, James K., xxxxxxxxx.
Whalen, Francis J., xxxxxxxxx.
White, Robert E., xxxxxxxxx.
White, Ronald L., xxxxxxxxx.
Willis, Richard P., xxxxxxxxx.
Wilson, Joseph A., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Wilson, Ronald L., xxxxxxxxx.
Wirsching, James H., xxxxxxxxx.
Yeager, Kurt E., xxxx.
Yeargain, Gary P., xxxx.
Zimmerman, Larry L., xxxxxxxxx.
Zipps, Robert H., xxxxxxxxx.

The following distinguished military graduates of the Air Force Precommission Schools for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, under provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be second lieutenants

Ackerman, Emanuel, xxxxxxxxx.
Akin, Robert L., xxxxxxxxx.
Albritton, Edward C., xxxxxxxxx.
Alford, William R., xxxxxxxxx.
Allen, William H., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Allis, Richard A., xxxxxxxxx.
Almeda, Charles E., xxxxxxxxx.
Alverson, Richard V., xxxxxxxxx.
Anderson, William A., xxxxxxxxx.
Anger, Terry G., xxxxxxxxx.
Armitage, Thomas C., xxxxxxxxx.
Arthurs, Dale D., xxxxxxxxx.
Arvik, Jon H., xxxxxxxxx.
Ayer, Frederick L., xxxxxxxxx.
Bailey, James P., xxxxxxxxx.
Baird, James, xxxxxxxxx.
Ballard, Malcolm J., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Barbieri, William A., xxxxxxxxx.
Bart, Siegfried G., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Bayer, Robert E., xxxxxxxxx.
Beasley, Dennis C., xxxxxxxxx.
Benjamin, Warren E., xxxxxxxxx.
Benson, Verne H., xxxxxxxxx.
Bernard, Harold W., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Bernhart, Michael H., xxxxxxxxx.
Biltz, James E., xxxxxxxxx.
Birch, George E., xxxxxxxxx.
Bischoff, John W., xxxxxxxxx.
Blackmon, Jerry M., xxxxxxxxx.
Bolen, Todd, xxxxxxxxx.
Borchert, Frederick C., xxxxxxxxx.
Borner, Frank D., xxxxxxxxx.
Boucher, Paul A., xxxxxxxxx.
Bowen, Robert E., xxxxxxxxx.
Bradberry, Brian L., xxxxxxxxx.
Brandt, Paul L., III, xxxxxxxxx.
Branscum, Harold W., xxxxxxxxx.
Brinson, Edwin L., xxxxxxxxx.
Browne, Cletus C., xxxxxxxxx.
Burckel, William P., xxxxxxxxx.
Burdick, David R., xxxxxxxxx.
Burhans, William A., xxxxxxxxx.
Burk, William J., xxxxxxxxx.
Bush, Richard L., xxxx.
Bush, Ronald J., xxxxxxxxx.
Bussey, Louis R., xxxxxxxxx.
Calabrese, John R., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Campbell, Timothy L., xxxxxxxxx.
Carson, Gerald G., xxxxxxxxx.
Carter, Richard L., xxxxxxxxx.
Cason, Thomas O., xxxxxxxxx.
Charbonnier, Robert D., xxxxxxxxx.
Chmielewski, Michael R., xxxxxxxxx.
Christie, Harry W., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Clarke, Charles E., xxxxxxxxx.
Clem, Michael C., xxxxxxxxx.
Coffas, James, xxxxxxxxx.
Coffey, James A., xxxxxxxxx.
Cohn, Marcus T., xxxxxxxxx.
Colapietro, Robert L., xxxxxxxxx.
Colasanti, Leonard M., xxxxxxxxx.
Coogler, Monroe A., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Cook, William A., xxxxxxxxx.
Coons, David J., xxxxxxxxx.
Cooper, Robert N., xxxxxxxxx.
Cox, James D., xxxxxxxxx.
Cox, Stephen E., xxxxxxxxx.
Crabb, James H., xxxxxxxxx.
Croft, Robert L., xxxxxxxxx.
Crow, Wesley B., xxxxxxxxx.
Culp, Eugene R., xxxxxxxxx.
Cyphers, Hubert J., xxxxxxxxx.
Daggett, Jesse B., II, xxxxxxxxx.
Davis, Donny R., xxxxxxxxx.
Davis, William H., xxxxxxxxx.
DeBolt, Richard A., xxxxxxxxx.
Deere, Monte M., xxxxxxxxx.
DeMuth, Ronald N., xxxxxxxxx.
Dice, Eugene E., xxxxxxxxx.
Dierker, Ronald J., xxxxxxxxx.
Douglass, John W., xxxxxxxxx.
Duarte, Fred, xxxxxxxxx.
Dudac, Thomas W., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Dugdale, Richard K., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Edwards, Carlton W., xxxxxxxxx.
Elder, Richard W., xxxxxxxxx.
Ellis, William G., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Ellrodt, Bernard F., xxxxxxxxx.
Evans, William H., xxxxxxxxx.
Fallon, Thomas A., xxxxxxxxx.
Finigan, Thomas R., xxxxxxxxx.
Ford, Roger E., xxxxxxxxx.
Fowler, Arnold K., xxxxxxxxx.
Fox, Michael J., xxxxxxxxx.
Frank, Richard E., xxxxxxxxx.
Frankhauser, Walter A., xxxxxxxxx.
Frazier, Keith V., xxxxxxxxx.
Fresh, Donald W., xxxxxxxxx.
Frucci, Norman R., xxxxxxxxx.
Fulton, William C., xxxxxxxxx.
Futch, Thurman C., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Gaasch, Roland C., xxxxxxxxx.
Gamble, Don M., xxxxxxxxx.
Garrett, Norris A., xxxxxxxxx.
Gasperich, Frank J., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Gelbhar, Johnny R., xxxxxxxxx.
Gemelos, Elias N., xxxxxxxxx.
George, S. W., xxxxxxxxx.
Giles, Harry G., xxxxxxxxx.
Girvin, Richard J., xxxxxxxxx.
Goar, Larry J., xxxxxxxxx.
Godfrey, Curtis L., xxxxxxxxx.
Goosen, Clarence D., xxxxxxxxx.
Grace, James W., xxxxxxxxx.
Grant, James F., xxxxxxxxx.
Grassman, Jon M., xxxxxxxxx.
Greenley, Jon A., xxxxxxxxx.
Gregory, Eugene R., xxxxxxxxx.
Griswold, Guy D., xxxxxxxxx.
Grossberg, Herbert I., xxxxxxxxx.
Grote, Jeffrey E., xxxxxxxxx.
Groth, Dennis D., xxxxxxxxx.
Guerra, Philip, Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Guerra, Raul J., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Habiger, Eugene E., xxxxxxxxx.
Hackett, Robert H., xxxxxxxxx.
Hagen, James J., xxxxxxxxx.
Hall, Billy L., xxxxxxxxx.
Hamblin, David R., xxxxxxxxx.
Hansen, Gordon L., xxxxxxxxx.
Hanson, Melvin A., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Harris, John R., xxxxxxxxx.
Harrison, John H., xxxxxxxxx.
Hawkins, Houston T., xxxxxxxxx.
Heier, Joseph F., xxxxxxxxx.
Henry, Louis M., xxxxxxxxx.
Herbst, Darell J., xxxxxxxxx.
Herman, William J., xxxxxxxxx.
Hill, Thomas L., xxxxxxxxx.
Hirschy, Victor L., xxxxxxxxx.
Hoksch, Orville J., Jr., xxxx.
Horihan, Charles R., xxxxxxxxx.
Hornbeek, Larry R., xxxxxxxxx.
Hubbard, Hershell R., xxxxxxxxx.
Hudson, Robert W., xxxxxxxxx.
Hughes, John W., xxxxxxxxx.
Hurst, Jackson F., xxxxxxxxx.
Hussong, Daniel E., xxxxxxxxx.
Hutson, John M., xxxxxxxxx.
Istock, Paul H., xxxxxxxxx.
Jacobs, Dale L., xxxxxxxxx.
James, Walter D., xxxxxxxxx.
Jared, Julius D., xxxxxxxxx.
Jelks, Edwin B., III, xxxxxxxxx.
Jensen, Jerald N., xxxxxxxxx.
Johannisson, Eric E., xxxxxxxxx.
Johnston, James U. L., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Jolie, Jacques, xxxxxxxxx.
Jones, Clyde D., xxxxxxxxx.
Jones, Dale G., xxxxxxxxx.
Jordan, Lawrence W., xxxxxxxxx.
Judd, Thayne H., xxxxxxxxx.
Katayama, Daniel H., xxxxxxxxx.
Keating, Joseph M., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Keck, Henry E., xxxxxxxxx.
Keeler, Joseph F., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Keller, Loren W., xxxxxxxxx.
Kempin, Paul D., xxxxxxxxx.
Kirkham, John N., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Kirkpatrick, Haskell M., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Klein, Robert A., xxxxxxxxx.
Klein, Robert J., xxxxxxxxx.
Knopf, Kenneth D., xxxxxxxxx.
Kobler, Arthur L., xxxxxxxxx.
Koskinen, Michael F., xxxxxxxxx.
Kramer, David K., xxxxxxxxx.
Kramer, John W., xxxxxxxxx.
Kressin, Paul E., xxxxxxxxx.
Landes, Jack T., xxxxxxxxx.
Langley, Stanley R., xxxxxxxxx.
Lanning, Russell M., xxxxxxxxx.
Larsen, Thomas L., xxxxxxxxx.
Lee, Joseph C. H., xxxxxxxxx.
Ligon, Joe L., xxxxxxxxx.
Lipscomb, William O., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Lomas, Richard M., xxxxxxxxx.
Looney, Larry N., xxxxxxxxx.
Lorance, David R., xxxxxxxxx.
Lowther, Jack L., xxxxxxxxx.
Manning, Richard P., xxxxxxxxx.
Marshall, Clark E., xxxxxxxxx.
Maslona, Paul M., xxxxxxxxx.
Mauk, Samuel C., xxxxxxxxx.
McCarthy, Michael W., xxxxxxxxx.
McCarthy, Robert J., xxxxxxxxx.
McGehee, Robert L., xxxxxxxxx.
McKinney, James R., xxxxxxxxx.
Meacham, Arthur R., III, xxxxxxxxx.
Michna, Robert J., xxxxxxxxx.
Mihata, Walter H., xxxxxxxxx.
Milacek, Alan D., xxxxxxxxx.
Miller, David M., xxxxxxxxx.
Miller, John A., xxxxxxxxx.
Miller, Melvin E., xxxxxxxxx.
Miller, Roger A., xxxxxxxxx.
Minarcine, Robert A., xxxxxxxxx.
Mong, Dayton J., xxxxxxxxx.
Montequin, James J., xxxxxxxxx.
Morgan, Kenneth A., xxxxxxxxx.
Morris, Jon P., xxxxxxxxx.
Morrow, James K., xxxxxxxxx.
Mosby, Warren A., xxxxxxxxx.
Murphy, Robert G., Jr., xxxxxxxxx.
Myers, Gus E., xxxxxxxxx.
Nanney, John P., III, xxxxxxxxx.
Nelson, Harry A., xxxxxxxxx.
Norwood, James R., xxxxxxxxx.
O'Donoghue, Denis D., xxxxxxxxx.
Olson, Paul M., xxxxxxxxx.
Panneton, Robert J., xxxxxxxxx.
Parker, Robert W., xxxxxxxxx.
Partrich, William C., xxxxxxxxx.
Pearson, Donald J., xxxxxxxxx.
Pearson, Frank R., xxxxxxxxx.
Peters, James F., xxxxxxxxx.
Peterson, James W., xxxxxxxxx.
Poole, William M., xxxxxxxxx.

Poppink, Gerald N., XXXXXXXXX.
Ragan, Tillman J., XXXXXXXXX.
Rapson, Robert L., XXXXXXXXX.
Rebollo, Claudio, XXXXXXXXX.
Reed, Charles H., XXXXXXXXX.
Reimer, John C., XXXXXXXXX.
Richardson, Hugh W., XXXXXXXXX.
Richardson, John M., XXXXXXXXX.
Ridings, Virgil P., Jr., XXXXXXXXX.
Riza, Jan C., XXXXXXXXX.
Roberts, Jimmy P., XXXXXXXXX.
Rothenberger, Dale L., XXXXXXXXX.
Rouse, George D., XXXXXXXXX.
Salisbury, Charles H., Jr., XXXXXXXXX.
Sanders, Dale J., XXXXXXXXX.
Sandison, Edwin W., IV., XXXXXXXXX.
Saxton, Gerald F., XXXXXXXXX.
Schnicker, Donald L., XXXXXXXXX.
Sears, Robert J., XXXXXXXXX.
Seibert, Ruebin R., XXXXXXXXX.
Seitz, Thomas B., XXXXXXXXX.
Seknicka, John E., XXXXXXXXX.
Shiplov, Jerimiah J., XXXXXXXXX.
Shoemaker, Anthony A., XXXXXXXXX.
Silverman, John L., XXXXXXXXX.
Sirois, Joseph G., XXXXXXXXX.
Smith, Garwin B., XXXXXXXXX.
Squazzo, Emil M., XXXXXXXXX.
Stevenson, Garland E., XXXXXXXXX.
Stewart, Michael R., XXXXXXXXX.
Stinson, Edgar S., XXXXXXXXX.
Stokes, Dan M., XXXXXXXXX.
Strehlow, Virgil G., XXXXXXXXX.
Sullivan, Thomas J., XXXXXXXXX.
Supik, Donald F., XXXXXXXXX.
Svoboda, Adrian L., XXXXXXXXX.
Tafoya, Alberto F., XXXXXXXXX.
Tannian, Frances C., XXXXXXXXX.
Tash, Neal E., XXXXXXXXX.
Tatman, David I., XXXXXXXXX.
Taylor, Henry L., III., XXXXXXXXX.
Trusty, Monty J., XXXXXXXXX.
Tucker, James H., XXXXXXXXX.
Vogel, John M., XXXXXXXXX.
Walker, Harold C., XXXXXXXXX.
Warren, Max E., XXXXXXXXX.
Waterman, Charles R., XXXXXXXXX.
Webster, Joseph B., III, XXXXXXXXX.
Weigand, Louis G., III, XXXXXXXXX.
Wessel, James R., XXXXXXXXX.
Weyler, Kenneth L., XXXXXXXXX.
White, James S., XXXXXXXXX.
Whittier, Charles E., XXXXXXXXX.
Wickham, Frederick O., Jr., XXXXXXXXX.
Wilkins, Kermit D., XXXXXXXXX.
Willems, Gary B., XXXXXXXXX.
Williams, Jonathan, D., XXXXXXXXX.
Wilson, Jack G., XXXXXXXXX.
Wilson, John H., XXXXXXXXX.
Wilson, Robert E., XXXXXXXXX.
Wolf, Gary K., XXXXXXXXX.
Woodson, Murphy A., XXXXXXXXX.
Wright, Alfred A., XXXXXXXXX.
Wright, David K., XXXXXXXXX.
Wright, Franklin E., XXXXXXXXX.
Wright, John D., XXXXXXXXX.
Young, Jimmie D., XXXXXXXXX.
Young, Michael A., XXXXXXXXX.
Young, Robert A., XXXXXXXXX.
Younger, Jey E., III, XXXXXXXXX.
Zimmer, Peter B., XXXXXXXXX.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 23 (legislative day of March 30), 1964:

POSTMASTER

I withdraw the nomination sent to the Senate on April 2, 1964, of Gavin R. Argue to be postmaster at Apalachin, in the State of New York.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Polish Constitution of 1791: A Contribution to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 3, marks the 153d anniversary of the 3d of May Polish Constitution, from which I should like to quote:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

These words express the close ties of Polish liberalism with the ideals of our own American Republic. Seven million people of Polish descent live in the United States and, therefore, their May 3 commemoration, sponsored by the Polish-American Congress, is also our commemoration.

The Polish Constitution is one of many contributions of the Polish people to Western civilization. May 12 marks the 600th anniversary of the founding of the Jagiellonian University of Krakow, the only institution of higher learning in Poland with a continuous history. Among the university's alumni is Nicholas Copernicus, regarded by historians as the first major figure in the scientific revolution—a revolution which is still going forward. Of special interest to Americans is the large academy of medicine, now separated from the university, where a children's hospital and research center is being built, partly with U.S. grants.

Poland is now ruled by a Communist government, and I noted with dismay the increased persecution of the Catholic Church of Poland last summer. All Americans hope for the release of Poland from oppressive restriction of liberty. The commemoration of the 3d of May Polish Constitution is, therefore, an important day in our American common life.

Armenian Martyrs Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of April 24, 1915, a shocking and evil event befell the Armenians in Turkey. More than 1,000 Armenians, good and honorable persons from all walks of life, were arrested and imprisoned by the Turkish Government. From the moment of their arrest they were held incommunicado. A few days later they were deported under heavy guard and then they were brutally executed. The arrest and execution of these Armenians proved to be the beginning of the end of Armenian communities in Turkey. The extermination of the Armenians and their communities was carried out so effectively, so ruthlessly, that by the end of that year all Armenians had been uprooted from their homes. Some were massacred; some were starved to death; the lucky ones—only a few hundred thousand of them—were able to escape to neighboring Persia and Russian Caucasus. When the First World War came to an end, historic Armenian towns, the villages in which Armenians had lived from time immemorial, were dead towns and deserted villages. More than 1 million Armenians had lost their lives in this almost unprecedented human carnage, and those who had survived were on the verge of starvation. Such was the cruel and crushing legacy of World War I to the Armenian people.

Since that fateful April 24, Armenians everywhere observe the anniversary of that sad event as a national day of mourning, and pray for the blessed memory of the victims of Turkish genocide. On the observance of the 49th anniversary of that sad event, I join the Armenian people in their prayers.

Armenian Martyrs Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, April 24 is recognized as the commemoration of a most horrible event in history, the beginning of 2 years of extermination of the peaceful Armenian people in 1915.

Armenia was once a thriving nation of 1,250,000 people, located between the Black Sea, the Euphrates River, Russia, and Iran. It encompassed the regions of Anatolia, Cilicia, and part of the Caucasus. The Armenian people were Christians, the first ancient nation to adopt Christianity, and by 1915 they were prosperous, well educated, and highly civilized. Armenian cities were clean and well governed. Every village had a school, and nearly every large town had a college. Armenians were closely allied with Western Europe and the United States and proud of their Christian heritage. Truly, in former days, Armenia was a progressive outpost in the Middle East, setting standards and showing the way to advanced civilization for the whole region.

But in 1915 Armenia was unfortunately a subject state of the Ottoman Empire. Moslems were scattered throughout the Armenian population. The Moslems generally, as latecomers, were poorer than the Armenians, uneducated, unskilled, and envious of their Armenian neighbors. This situation provided the fuel for genocide by the archaic, repressive government in Constantinople. Like the great crusades in reverse Moslems from the north swept into Armenia to eradicate an alien religion and its followers.

The massacre started on April 24, 1915, with the arrest of thousands of leading Armenians who might be able to lead a resistance. Then a carefully planned extermination was carried out, working downward through the populace even to the smallest village, until practically every Armenian in the Ottoman Empire was destroyed.

The men were seized and summarily executed. The young women were sold into brothels and harems. The children by thousands were given to Muslims to be converted. Thousands of old men and women and children were forced to walk without adequate food or clothing many miles, sometimes for 5 or 6 months without rest until they all died from exhaustion. In this terrible massacre 800,000 Armenians died, and 250,000 fled into Russia. In 2 years Armenia ceased to exist, and the Armenian homeland became a vacuum to be slowly filled by Muslims. Today a decimated Armenian nation survives as a captive republic of the U.S.S.R. The proud, progressive Armenia of 1914 is no more.

This is the saddening event which is commemorated today, appropriately called Armenian Martyrs Day. In remembering it we pay respect to a great nation of long-suffering people, to all Armenians. Mankind dealt unfairly and cruelly with them. Our remembrance of it may help remind all of us never again to permit such a thing.

A Success in the Foreign Aid Program—The Public Health Center at Gondar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the kingdom of Ethiopia is a very poor nation, 57 percent of those 20 million people manage to eke out a meager living from agriculture. Since the gross national product is estimated at only $800 million, the per capita income is comparatively low, less than $75 a year. Because of its low standard of living, communicable and other diseases are rampant and it is estimated that 600,000 Ethiopians are received annually at the country's hospitals and clinics. To treat these patients, there are only 200 physicians, the majority of whom have practices in Addis Ababa.

The Ethiopian Government realized that the first step toward combating these contagious diseases, of typhus, malaria, and dysentery, would be to train specialized personnel. Therefore, there was established at Gondar in October 1954 the Haile Selassie Public Health College and Training Center. The purpose of the center is to train first-rate public health workers who adapt themselves to meet the needs of rural Ethiopia. These public health personnel become community health officers, nurses, and sanitarians of preventive medicine rather than practicing physicians and bedside nurses. Graduates from the center will attempt to eradicate malaria by spraying swamps, will attempt to do away with typhus by purifying contaminated water supplies.

The U.S. Government, through the Agency for International Development, closely supports this center at Gondar in cooperation with the Ethiopian Government and the World Health Organization. We provide a director, generally some one on loan from the U.S. Public Health Service, and technicians, five at the present time, who serve as faculty instructors. Laboratory equipment and medical supplies, too, are an integral part of the U.S. program. The Ethiopian Government, in addition to providing the buildings, pay for the salaries of personnel at the center. U.S. assistance is scheduled to end in 1970, when the center becomes self-supporting.

Graduates of the training program now total 225, who are staffing some 60 rural service centers in villages throughout the country. Although received with suspicion at first by the rural population, the health officers were slowly incorporated into the village social life when the people saw for themselves the proof of the good wook of these dedicated personnel. The success of the program has been measured by the enthusiastic support which the graduates now receive from the villagers, by the decline of the communicable diseases, and by the number of young people who volunteer for public health service.

Senator John G. Townsend, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in mourning the death of former Senator John G. Townsend, Jr., of Delaware.

He was one of my closet friends in Congress. We often referred to him as the chicken king of the United States, and the strawberry king, because of his leadership in these fields of agriculture in his home State.

John Townsend was a devoted Republican. He was a devoted American. He rendered great service to his country. All who knew him will miss him greatly.

A Tribute to Voit Gilmore, America's First Director of the U.S. Travel Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, Voit Gilmore, our country's first Director of the U.S. Travel Service, on April 6 announced his resignation in order to return to his native State to resume his private and public responsibilities.

With him go the best wishes of his many friends in Congress and his colleagues in Government. We note with pleasure that he intends to continue his distinguished record of public service by running as candidate for the North Carolina State Senate. Although qualified by experience and ability to fill posts of higher responsibility, Mr. Gilmore with characteristic modesty seeks an elective post that will put him close to the people of his area.

It has been 2½ years since the President asked Voit Gilmore to organize and direct our Government's program to increase international understanding and good will, as well as to bring needed dollars to the United States by attracting tourists to our shores. USTS is now vigorously promoting travel to the United States in 42 foreign countries.

The results have been both impressive and gratifying. As was noted by Senator MAGNUSON, able chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee and an author of the Travel Service legislation, Voit Gilmore had nine USTS offices open and running on five continents in less time than it takes many new Government agencies to recruit a staff and acquire its furniture.

Government redtape for arriving travelers was slashed. A new attitude of friendliness to strangers improved the worldwide image of America as the hospitable land it is. Mr. Gilmore developed "Americans-at-Home," the USTS plan which has led some two dozen U.S. communities to establish hospitality programs to let international visitors meet Americans and see American homes.

In just 2 years—between 1961 and 1963—oversea travel to the United States increased an amazing 42 percent, contrasted with a previous average annual increase of only 8.5 percent. The 1963 total was 735,000 visitors from overseas, a volume which pumped some $400 million into the American economy. Our distinguished Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Luther H. Hodges, has termed USTS "one of the best investments by the U.S. taxpayer in the last decade."

U.S. industry has cooperated closely with USTS and has applauded its accomplishments. The "Visit U.S.A." effort has been an outstanding example of Government-industry cooperation to bolster the American economy. In recognition of this, Mr. Gilmore received the American Motor Hotel Association's distinguished service award for 1961–62,

he was given industry's Mr. Travel Award in 1963 and also last year he received Hospitality magazine's coveted silver plate award for his contribution to the travel industry.

Of course there were problems connected with getting so ambitious and so unprecedented a program launched on a global basis. Never before has our Government engaged in a promotional effort of this sort. It has been pioneer work. Many were skeptical of the program and were quick with criticism. The obvious results have turned such doubts to praise.

It has been my pleasure to support the U.S. Travel Service from its legislative beginnings until the present, when its year of greatest accomplishment is in prospect. I share the feeling of my chairman, Hon. OREN HARRIS, who heads the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, who has termed USTS one of the greatest opportunities for international peace and commerce yet created by Congress.

Voit Gilmore, the guiding spirit of USTS from its beginning, is due the thanks and admiration of a grateful nation. He flew almost a million miles to get the Travel Service underway. He gave the directorship the utmost of his talent and unbounded energy.

He departs with the satisfaction that his "child" is well begun, well on the way to being one of America's most effective programs to improve world peace and aid our national economy.

Congratulations and Godspeed to Voit Gilmore, a distinguished American. May his days of service be long and fruitful.

Armenian Martyrs Day, April 24

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Armenians in Turkey have had their miseries and misfortunes. They had lived under the autocratic tyranny of the Turks for centuries, and had endured all sorts of hardships. Since late 19th century they were being massacred by the tens of thousands and nothing seemed to avert more massacres. All these tragic events had become part of their national history. But their real national tragedy, one that practically wiped out all traces of Armenian communities in the Ottoman Empire, began on the fateful April 24, 1915.

On that day, and during the night of April 23, all prominent Armenians in Constantinople and in other towns, persons active and well known in all phases of communal activity, were arrested and imprisoned, held incommunicado and then under their guard-executioners deported to various parts of the country. Their unenviable lot was sad enough to plunge the whole Armenian community of the country into national mourning, but the lot that was in store for some 2 million Armenians in Turkey was no different. In the course of the next 6 months all of them were uprooted from their native homes. Many hundreds of thousands lost their lives in carefully organized wholesale massacres. Hundreds of thousands more lost their lives by famine and under indescribable hardships. Though some 500,000 managed to escape death by finding refuge in neighboring lands, in Persia, Russia, and in some parts of Europe, the majority of the Armenians simply ceased to exist by the end of 1915. Thus in the course of less than a year the industrious and relatively prosperous Armenian community, with its centuries-old eventful history, was no more.

Such was the legacy of the tragic events which began on that black April 24 of 1915. Today in commemorating the 49th anniversary of that tragedy, Armenians everywhere, even those in the Soviet Armenian Socialist Republic, bless the memory of the victims of that tragedy perpetrated by the Turkish Government in 1915.

Genocide is a crime against humanity. Those who are guilty of such crime must know that as the spirit of the brotherhood of man grows, all mankind will rise against crimes against their brothers.

Armenian Martyrs Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, April 24 each year marks a sad day in the history of the Armenian people. It was on that day in 1915 when some 2 to 3 million Armenians—the whole Armenian population in Turkey—were slaughtered or deported. This tragic event is observed annually by Armenians in the United States and in other countries as Martyrs Day.

On this day, people of Armenian descent and all freedom-loving people, pay their respects to those martyrs who nearly a half century ago were innocent victims of a cruel and despotic regime which sought to further its dreams of conquest by undertaking wholesale massacres of a peaceful people. This was certainly an act of genocide—the murder of a whole people, a tragedy that shocked all mankind.

Beginning on that infamous day in 1915, all prominent Armenians in Turkey were arrested and later deported to various parts of that country—only to be executed there. Among them were clergymen, intellectuals, well-known merchants, artisans and others—in all about a thousand persons representing all classes of the Armenian community in Turkey. But they were only the first group of victims of a well-organized genocide plan to destroy this minority people in Turkey.

Others followed within a matter of weeks. It soon became evident to all Armenians in Turkey that they were doomed to death and destruction, and that they were faced with a tragedy of national proportions—a tragedy which was unheard of until that day in the annals of civilization. In a period of less than 6 months the Turkish Government decimated the Armenians within its borders by massacres, deportation, famine, and other means. Only a small segment of the Armenian community succeeded in escaping.

In the United States today we have several hundred thousand people of Armenian extraction. They are loyal and devoted citizens, intelligent, hard-working, deeply religious, and a great asset to our country. To all of them and to their kinsmen in other countries, I wish to extend my deep sympathy on this day and to join with them in paying tribute to the memory of the Armenian martyrs of 1915. Only by keeping their memory alive and retelling the tragic events of that genocide, can we hope to prevent such acts in the future.

Imports of Foreign Beef

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DOWDY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the cattle industry of the United States is now facing a grave crisis in its history. Foreign imports of beef are endangering this industry's very existence.

In my newsletter of April 24, I discuss this problem with my constitutents. I insert this newsletter at this point:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN REPORTS

(By JOHN DOWDY, Seventh District of Texas)

The question of meat imports from Australia and New Zealand continues to press upon our domestic cattle producers; it is particularly pressing upon our own cattlemen of the Seventh Congressional District. The domestic livestock industry of the United States has suffered serious economic difficulties in recent months because of the rapidly increasing amount of meat that is being imported.

This situation has been brought about in the last few years because Congress, over my protest, surrendered to the Executive the power to control foreign commerce, which was given to the Congress in the U.S. Constitution.

When that bill was passed, it gave to the Executive the authority to reduce tariffs which Congress had provided for imports. The tariff on meat was subsequently cut in half, with indication that it may be even further reduced. I am firmly of the opinion that we should first give consideration to the interests of our own producers and our own industries.

In the interest of our cattle producers, I have introduced H.R. 10817, which will impose limitations on imports of meat into the United States.

Meat imports are now 10 times what they were 4 or 5 years ago. It is true, and I am pleased that it is so, that meat imports from Australia have declined substantially during the first 3 months of 1964, from what it was last year, and this decline should be quite beneficial to the domestic livestock industry

of the United States, which has been suffering in recent months, not only from the imports, but from the drought.

However, we should make it completely clear that this reduction in meat imports from Australia is not based on any negotiation or any voluntary agreement. There is nothing to prevent a reverse of the present imports position at any time, with a spurt in the amount imported. American livestock producers still desperately need legislation to set reasonable limits on beef imports, and I am supporting this proposal.

It is my hope that Congress will give this matter top priority, in order that we may prevent further serious economic damage to this large and important U.S. industry. If the cattle industry is seriously injured, the entire economy of the United States will suffer along with it.

Administration Rejects Proposal for Expenditure Policy Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, 1964, the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee wrote to President Johnson suggesting that a bipartisan Presidential Advisory Commission on Federal Expenditure Policy be established with the purpose of making an objective study in this area. I inserted a copy of that letter to President Johnson in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 20, 1964, pages 610–611.

In a letter of April 11, Secretary Dillon has rejected the suggestion of the Joint Economic Committee minority. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Secretary Dillon's letter, as well as my reply to him, be included in the RECORD for the information of those who wish to follow this discussion to its conclusion.

The letters follow:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: The President has asked me to reply to the letter of January 10, 1964, from the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee. Your concern over expenditure policy is entirely appropriate, and we appreciate the constructive and thoughtful approach which has gone into your recommendation for a special advisory commission to review Federal activities and expenditures.

The President's firm position on the importance of expenditure control along with tax reduction in stimulating the sound growth of our economy is, of course, now well known. His determination to eliminate waste and efficiency through a continual review by the executive branch of the usefulness of existing programs and the establishment of priorities among needed and desirable new programs was unambiguously set forth in his first budget. I am sure you agree that the progress we are making toward a balanced budget, as a result of his strict economy measures and the exhaustive screening of existing programs, was an important factor in the early enactment this year of the tax reduction legislation.

It is, of course, a basic and necessary part of the President's duty under the Budget and Accounting Act to propose in each budget the amounts which, in his judgment, are necessary for the support of the Government. The Congress has a similar responsibility when it is considering the President's budget recommendations.

Expenditure policy is, in fact, program policy. It encompasses practically the entire range of matters with which the executive branch and the Congress deal, including national security and domestic economic and social policy. Under our form of government these responsibilities rest with elected officials, the President and the Members of the Congress. Theirs is the basic responsibility for formulating and deciding matters which relate to the nature, size, and relative priority of Government programs and outlays. It would seem unrealistic and unwise to assign to a bipartisan commission a task so broad that it encompasses virtually the whole of the agenda of government.

To be sure, expertise on a more specialized basis—dealing wtih specific programs or with matters of organization and procedures—can and has in the past been of value both to the President and the Congress. Expert knowledge has also been useful in obtaining greater economy and efficiency in selected operations. The President and his operating officials have called in the past for such advice as circumstances warrant, and will continue to do so in the future.

In the final analysis, however, I believe the greatest progress can be made toward your objectives if we concentrate on improving program and management appraisals and reviews within the existing framework—both legislative and executive—rather than through a large temporary commission with broad and far-ranging terms of reference.

Certainly the Joint Economic Committee can, as in the past, contribute to such efforts. I can assure you that the President and each of his agency officials intend to press ahead to improve on the accomplishments we have made to date in careful determinations of priorities, in ever greater attention to efficiency, and in the elimination of any and all unnecessary expenditures.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 22, 1964.

Hon. C. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary, U.S. Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for your letter of April 11, 1964, replying to a letter of January 10, 1964, sent to the President by the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee and suggesting the establishment of a Presidential Advisory Commission on Federal Expenditure Policy.

I regret that the administration has rejected the idea of an objective and bipartisan review of expenditure policy by a Commission of experts outside of the Government. However, I do agree with you that efforts in this area should move forward by improvements of the existing legislative and executive framework.

In the light of the difficulties in altering established patterns of thought and procedure within Government, however, the Joint Economic Committee minority felt that the recommendations of a blue-ribbon Commission would help to stimulate needed action within the existing framework.

You may be certain that I will continue to press for improvements in the existing expenditure policy machinery. I would, of course, welcome the full support of the administration in those efforts since the chances of making meaningful improvements without administration backing are slight.

Since the January 10 letter to the President was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I intend to place your reply as well as this letter in the RECORD so that those who are interested may follow the discussion to its conclusion.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Statement Before the House Judiciary Committee by Representative Roudebush

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, this week the House Judiciary Committee opened long-awaited hearings on the question of a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary prayer and Bible reading in American public schools.

The debate actually goes much deeper than that. What is involved is whether or not the great religious heritage of this Nation shall continue to be observed in our public functions and public institutions.

It has been my privilege to support a constitutional amendment to repair the great damage caused by the Supreme Court decision, and this week I was among the Members of the House of Representatives to offer testimony in support of such action.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the text of my statement to the House Judiciary Committee in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

Perhaps no issue in recent years has so aroused the American people as the Supreme Court outlawing of voluntary prayer and Bible reading in our public schools.

It is no overstatement to categorize this action as shaking the very moral and religious foundation of this Nation.

On June 18, 1963, the day following the second of the Supreme Court decisions banning the religious observances, I introduced my legislation—House Joint Resolution 487, to amend the Constitution to permit nonsectarian prayer in public schools on a voluntary basis.

It is my understanding that since that time a total of 144 resolutions in 35 different forms have been introduced before Congress—all designed to retain religious observances in our public life.

I was also one of the 164 Members of the House who signed a petition to discharge House Joint Resolution 693, a proposed constitutional amendment similar to my own legislation making prayer and Bible reading permissible.

The very seriousness of the situation, and the fact that we do need a constitutional amendment is evidenced by the very circumstance that brings us to these hearings today. It seems incredible in a nation such as ours, which has achieved its stature and impact in history as a free civilization, that we are meeting here today to consider if legislation is needed to permit Americans to pray and read the Bible in public institutions.

Since the very origin of this Nation, our basic laws contained in the Constitution, our great Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights have been based upon public faith and recognition of God.

It is not the design or intent of my legislation, or that of any other Member, to enforce, impose, or regulate religion in any manner whatsoever in our public schools.

Our Constitution clearly demands that there be a separation of church and state, but it was never intended to separate God and state.

And, by the same token, it is discrimination and restraint of the most odious nature to require that the vast majority of our public school students refrain from any prayers or Bible reading because it may offend a tiny minority of the students.

My request for a constitutional amendment arises from a simple prayer which said little more than "God bless my parents, my teacher, and my country."

No child was required to recite this prayer. No child even had to stay in the room during the ceremony if he didn't choose to.

The Supreme Court decided that the use of this simple, nondenominational prayer on a permissive basis was a violation of the Constitution.

I respectfully submit, in my opinion, the Supreme Court was wrong.

If the Court was right one of the first things it should have done was to abolish its own prayers.

If the Court was right the Declaration of Independence might have to be rewritten to strike out references to the Supreme Being.

If the Court was right the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the mint might have to reissue all coin and currency without "In God We Trust."

If the Court was right we shall have to revise the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, and remove the words "under God."

And, of course, the Court's ruling raises a question about the rules of the House and Senate which provide that each session shall open with a prayer.

None of these analogies are farfetched. Quite the contrary. In fact, it was reported by Associated Press on April 7 that the same woman who instituted one of the school prayer cases has petitioned the Baltimore School Board to strike the words "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance.

In California, suit has been instituted to remove "In God We Trust" from our coinage.

If these cases follow the legal path of previous cases, we can presume that they will someday reach the Supreme Court. In view of the past rulings, there can be little doubt as to the ultimate outcome.

Conceivably this tiny minority of citizens who are opposed for whatever reasons to any public recognition of a God, could effectively attack all of the references to God that I have mentioned and thereby succeed in removing such from any governmental function. I would say today that this very probably will happen over a period of time unless appropriate action is taken by the Congress.

History has recorded the decline and fall of many civilizations who have forsaken their religious heritages and beliefs. Judging from the volume of opposition to this move to take God out of American public life, it is my sincere belief that the American people are not willing to see our bedrock foundation of religious principles rent asunder by a hairsplitting Supreme Court.

We could go on citing endless examples to illustrate the absurdity of the Supreme Court's decision in the school prayer case, but this is hardly necessary.

There has been general and widespread confusion and disobedience, which is tantamount to nullification of this particular decision.

But the decision should not be allowed to rest there. Our school superintendents, our teachers, our principals, and our students should not be forced to technically break the law in their daily observances.

There should be a legal nullification and the process of obtaining such can be set in motion through approval by the Congress of my House Joint Resolution 487, or similar measures introduced in the House.

Support of such legislation has become formal policy of the Republican minority in the House, and I wish to strongly associate myself with the resolution adopted in February by the House Republican Policy Committee.

This resolution reads: *"Resolved,* That the House Republican Policy Committee go on record in support of a constitutional amendment declaring the right of individuals to participate or to refrain from participation in prayer and Bible reading in public institutions throughout the United States and the right of the Government of the United States to make reference to God Almighty in public governmental affairs."

Mr. Chairman, one of the most obvious differences in our American system compared to that of the Soviets, is our national belief in God, and the tolerance for all faiths and religions.

This difference should be emphasized and strengthened, rather than weakened and abandoned in favor of the godless Communist ideology.

It is true, many of our youngsters receive adequate spiritual and religious education in church, Sunday school, and the home. Many do not, and it has been said unless the Bible is used in public schools many millions of children will never know the Ten Commandments.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the approval by this committee of a constitutional amendment to keep God in our public life, and the report of such an amendment to the House of Representatives for a vote by all Members.

Thank you.

The 1964 National 4–H Club Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this morning I joined with other members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation in welcoming our State's delegates to the magnificent conference of the 4–H Clubs. It was an inspiring sight to witness. Delegates from across the Nation and from every State, accompanied by their leaders, were welcomed by Members of the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate. The purpose of this annual conference is to provide an opportunity for a select group of older 4–H Club members to learn more about our democratic Government and citizenship in action, as well as to develop a greater appreciation of our American heritage and to better understand their own roles as responsible citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the four young delegates who represent the Commonwealth of Massachusetts at this great conference. They are Sandra Kupiec, Pittsfield; Rosemarie Regis, Peabody; Gary Blanchard, from my congressional district, Warren, Mass.; and George Dole, Shelbourne. Mr. Merle L. Howes, head of the University of Massachusetts Cooperative Extension of 4–H and Youth Programs, accompanied the group to Washington. He has done outstanding work in this field and I compliment him for his dedicated service in this great work and the fine programs that the University of Massachusetts administers and oversees.

Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the passage by Congress of the Smith-Lever Act which officially established the Cooperative Extension Service, and such cooperative extension work as 4–H programs. The 4–H Clubs and programs have constantly expanded and adapted to the needs of youth in our modern society, and have opened the door of opportunity for millions of young people through the last half century. The 4–H membership is now 2½ million boys and girls, ages 10 to 21, who benefit from the pooling of talent, time, and money contributed through the Cooperative Extension Service, the National 4–H Service Committee, the National 4–H Club Foundation and other friends of 4–H.

These boys and girls are helped by 4–H to acquire knowledge and skills, explore career opportunities, cultivate leadership abilities, gain satisfaction and recognition by useful work, constructively use leisure time, appreciate agriculture and home economics, value and use research, practice healthful living, cooperate with others, and live by citizenship ideals and values. The 4–H Club work is the youth education program of the Cooperative Extension Service, conducted through the joint efforts of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the land-grant colleges and universities and county governments. Members of 4–H have an inspiring pledge which reads as follows:

I pledge by head to clearer thinking, my heart to greater loyalty, my hands to larger service, and my health to better living, for my club, my community, and my country.

Yes, these boys and girls pledge head, heart, hands, and health, hence the appropriate club name of 4–H.

THE 4-H PROGRAM IN THE SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Speaker, there are 1,800 4–H Club members regularly enrolled in the 4–H Club program in my congressional district. The program is supervised by three full-time professionally trained county 4–H Club agents. These agents direct the work of volunteer county 4–H Club leaders (see attached list) who meet with local, small groups of 4–H members to teach skills related to the 4–H project.

The major 4–H projects include:

First. Food and Nutrition.
Second. Forestry and Conservation.
Third. Clothing.
Fourth. Gardening.
Fifth. Home Improvement.
Sixth. Child Care.

Literature in support of this teaching is prepared by staff specialists at the University of Massachusetts.

THE MASSACHUSETTS 4–H CLUB PROGRAM

Thirteen thousand young people are currently enrolled in the 4–H Club program in Massachusetts. This work is supported by 2,500 volunteer adult leaders who serve as "teachers" for 1,200 different 4–H Clubs.

The Massachusetts 4–H Club Foundation, a private organization responsible

for developing financial support for the Massachusetts 4–H program, is making a significant contribution to the total 4–H effort. Four hundred contributors, individuals, and Massachusetts industries supported Massachusetts 4–H through the foundation in 1963.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to pay tribute to the host of volunteer leaders serving the 4–H program in my congressional district of Massachusetts, comprising communities in Hampden, Hampshire, and Worcester Counties. They give freely of their time for this worthy cause and work in excellent cooperation with their respective county's extension service and with the University of Massachusetts Extension Service at Amherst. Under permission granted I place the names of these 4–H volunteers by community, with my remarks:

VOLUNTEER LEADERS SERVING THE 4-H PROGRAM IN SECOND DISTRICT, HAMPDEN COUNTY

Agawam: Mrs. Louis Caruso, Mrs. William Case, Mr. Carmen Cirillo, Mrs. George Collins, Mrs. Donald Cross, Mrs. Joseph Della Guistino, Mrs. George Gagliarducci, Mrs. Ronald King, Mrs. Stanley Lipski, Mrs. Edna Radding, Mr. Thomas Reidy, Mrs. George Webster, Mrs. William Yelinek, Miss Kathleen Yelinek.

Brimfield: Mr. Charles Deland, Mrs. Clarence Keith, Mrs. Alexander McVeigh, Mrs. William Pratt, Mr. and Mrs. Frederick Prentiss, Mr. Johnstone Prescott, Mrs. Thomas Reed, Mrs. Kenneth Silvius, Mr. Donald Spear, Mrs. George Tetreault, Mrs. Gladys Whitten, Mr. Roger Wightman, Mrs. Herbert Wright.

Chicopee: Mrs. George Bedard, Mrs. George Beeler, Mrs. Albert Boutin, Mrs. Myles Brennan, Mrs. Jean Briere, Mrs. Frank Czaporowski, Miss Janice Langevin, Mrs. Alfred Ducharme, Mrs. August Giera, Mrs. Thomas Houlihan, Mrs. Henry Le Mieux, Mrs. Henri Marcotte, Mrs. Ethel Stonina, Mrs. Richard Therrien.

East Longmeadow: Mr. Roland Chapdelaine, Mrs. Theresa Chapdelaine, Mrs. Harry Coles, Mrs. Wesley Collins, Mr. Ed Craven, Mr. Benedict Grabierz, Mrs. Josephine Grabierz, Mrs. Elizabeth Wright, Mr. Merritt Wright, Miss Nancy Wright.

Hampden: Mrs. Antonio Esposito, Mrs. Croyden Kibbe, Mrs. Harry Johnson, Mrs. Ralph Miller, Mrs. Peter Terzi, Mr. James Whipple.

Holland: Mrs. Ronald Croke, Mrs. Raoul Gendreau, Miss Eunice Foster.

Ludlow: Mrs. Ralph Barth, Mrs. Leonard Brennan, Mrs. Herbert Dickey, Mrs. Ernest Flebotte, Mrs. Elizabeth Gaviglio, Mr. Harold Griffing, Mr. Dorval Giguere, Mrs. Donna Haluch, Mr. Ray Haluch, Mr. Dexter Hiersche, Mrs. Elsie Hiersche, Mrs. Martha Hiersche, Thomas Hiersche, Mrs. Robert Koshinsky, Mrs. Herbert McChesney, Mr. Francis McMenamin, Mrs. Francis McMenamin, Mrs. Gerald Paul, Mr. John Polansky, Mrs. Wesley Rhodes, Mrs. Bertha Tower, Mrs. Geo. Walls.

Longmeadow: Mrs. Ann Brunton.

Monson: Mrs. Jane Anderson, Mr. Paul Brown, Mr. Henry Czajka, Mrs. Wm. Emerson, Mrs. Earl Gilbert, Mr. Steve Grudzien, Mrs. Douglas Habel, Mr. William Hubert, Mrs. Randall Ketterman, Mrs. Victor LePace, Mr. Truman Lowra, Mrs. Donald Nothe.

Palmer: Mrs. Joseph Bolow, Mrs. Carl Brodeur, Mrs. Fred Piechota.

Springfield: Mrs. Louis Berrelli, Mrs. Gladys Dykstra, Mrs. David Picard, Mrs. Walter Reardon, Mrs. Clarence Smith, Mr. Clarence Smith, Mrs. Walter Thorn, Mrs. Lester Woodbury, Mrs. Fred Yates.

Wales: Mrs. Agnita Baker,

West Springfield: Mrs. Howard Burnham, Mrs. Ralph Criscio, Mr. Joseph Dupius, Mrs. Mary Dupius, Mrs. Charles Gervickas, Mrs. Samuel Hardcastle, Mrs. Rose Nash, Mr. Thomas Nash, Mrs. Everett Wilder.

Wilbraham: Mrs. Irving Agard, Mr. William Duval, Mr. Thomas Erwin, Mrs. L. W. Gould, Mrs. Herman Grandchamp, Mrs. John LeBlanc, Mrs. Robert Maynard, Mrs. Carl Meier, Frances Mell, Mrs. John Nelsson, Mrs. Ronald Nobbs, Mrs. Elsie Randolph, Mrs. Winifred Rice, Mrs. Denny Richter, Mr. Lucien Riendeau, Mrs. Lucien Riendeau, Mrs. Everett Warner.

VOLUNTEER LEADERS SERVING THE 4–H PROGRAM IN THE SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, HAMPSHIRE COUNTY

Belchertown: Mrs. Edwin Whipple, Mrs. Preston Atwood, Mr. Wallace Chevalier, Mrs. Richard I. Cole, Mr. George Foster, Mrs. Julian H. Hussey, Mrs. Fred Opielowski, Mrs. Edward H. Rice, Jr., Mrs. Godfrey Wenzel, Mrs. Omer Dupuis, Mrs. M. McLean, Mrs. Jack Poole.

Granby: Mr. Roy W. White, Mrs. Philip Denette, Mr. Francis E. DeWitt, Mrs. John Erickson, Mrs. Robert L. Hatch, Mrs. Arthur A. Hauschild, Mrs. Harvey LaFleche, Mr. Warren McKinstry, Mrs. Lindolph O. Parker, Mrs. Earl Poitras, Mrs. Roy E. Simmons, Jr., Mrs. Edward Trompke, Mr. Frederick Wilson, Mrs. John Zucker, Mr. Armand C. Cormier, Mr. Kenneth Fortier, Mr. Carlton S. Nash.

South Hadley: Mr. Alfred Sebastyanski, Mrs. Warren Bock, Mrs. John Conant, Jr., Mrs. Raymond Dressell, Mrs. Edward Ezold, Mrs. Whitfield B. Hallett, Mrs. Casimir Klekotka, Mrs. Edward Laferriere, Mrs. Walter Malec, Mrs. Daniel Mulvenna, Mrs. Everett Reed, Mrs. Wistar Goodhue, Mrs. Alfred Sebastyanski, Mrs. John M. Sullivan, Mrs. Michael Sullivan, Mrs. Francis Williams, Mrs. William Williams, Mrs. Alan Craven, Mrs. Felix Gagne, Mr. A. A. Soander.

Ware: Mr. Eugene Bourgault, Mrs. James Bradley, Mrs. Bernard Dulak, Mrs. William Duval, Mr. Michael Guzik, Mr. Julian J. Knapp, Mrs. Frank Krusik, Mrs. Walter Olszewski, Mrs. Alida Phaneuf, Mr. John J. Schott, Mrs. Walter Swinarski, Mr. Lloyd H. Thomas, Mrs. Stanley Wyrobek, Mrs. Mary Riggie, Mr. Francis Cote, Mr. Robert Heavey, Mr. Leo Hevey, Mrs. Joseph Jurczyk, Mr. Charles Lemaitre, Mrs. Donald St. Germaine, Mr. William F. Wade.

VOLUNTEER LEADERS SERVING THE 4–H PROGRAM IN THE SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT (WORCESTER COUNTY)

Brookfield: Mrs. Michael Pecha, Mr. Michael Pecha.

East Brookfield: Mrs. Sybil Hingston, Mrs. Robert Jaquith, Mrs. Harold Lovejoy, Mrs. John Treadwell, Mrs. Arthur Germaine, Mrs. Richard Pelletier, Mrs. Francis Vivier, Mrs. Philip Terry.

North Brookfield: Mrs. Janet Snelling, Mrs. Edith Prothro, Mrs. Raymond Waydaka, Mrs. George Sullivan, Mrs. Edmund Evans, Mrs. Roger Ducasse, Mrs. Laurence Thayer, Miss Christine Hayden, Mrs. Rene Lambert, Mr. Rene Lambert, Mr. Philip Waugh, Mr. George Frizzell, Mr. Henry Marchessault, Mr. Robert Munyon, Mr. George Cross, Mr. Ronald Fritz.

Sturbridge: Mrs. Stephen Grudzien, Mr. Stephen Grudzien.

West Brookfield: Mrs. Bernard DuPaul, Mrs. Richard Frew, Mr. Richard Frew, Mrs. Oliver Hill, Mrs. David Stevens, Mrs. Stanley Koziol, Mrs. Richard Standish, Mrs. Arvid Silverberg, Mrs. Virgil Martin, Mrs. Milton Potter, Mrs. Francis Ploof, Mrs. John Sauer, Mr. John Sauer, Mrs. Donald Williams, Mr. Donald Williams, Mrs. Roger Persons, Mr. Roger Persons, Mrs. John Lapierre, Mr. John Lapierre, Mrs. Richard Morse, Mr. Richard Morse.

Warren: Mr. James Blanchard, Mr. Boleslaw Doktor, Mrs. Doris Gravelin, Mrs. Robert Hastings, Mrs. Robert McCarthy, Mr. Leroy Richardson, Mr. David Shepard, Mr. Robert Williams.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 24, 1964

(Legislative day of Monday, March 30, 1964)

The Senate met at 10 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 from whom all blessings flow, as we stretch lame hands of prayer to Thee, grant us the benediction of Thy healing peace. Draw very near unto us. Teach us to weave the concerns of these troubled days into the perspective of the long years.

The cries of the crowds about us but bring us to confusion without and perplexity within. As, for this solemn, searching moment, the words of this Chamber are hushed to silence, breathe upon our thinking with Thy truth, breathe upon our understanding with Thy light, breathe upon our attitudes with Thy love.

May the heavy pressures of the world not mold us; but may we be so strengthened with might in the inner man that we may help mold the world nearer to the fashion of Thy righteous will. From the perplexing problems whose attempted solutions so often tend to divide us in our judgment, at this common altar of prayer we find a unity which ties us together, even amidst all the diversities of our thought.

Beset by the confusion of these days, when honest and sincere men differ, may we never forfeit our own self-respect or the confidence of those who trust us, as we dedicate our highest and best to the service of the Nation.

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 23, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States