

and Civil Service Committee, and that is as it should be, I think. We can look back a few years and a person either had to be a pauper or a millionaire to go to the hospital. Federal employees then had no hospitalization insurance and I asked what's the difference between a group hospitalization insurance policy for governmental employees numbering 2½ million or a group policy for General Electric or General Motors? None, they are just another group, so to speak. One is just larger than the other, but we shouldn't put a penalty on Government employees because there are more Government employees than there are workers at General Electric. Yet, when we first brought that up, there was a cry and they came to me, these private insurance companies, and said, "If you put in this hospitalization plan, why, we will go out of business. You are against private enterprise."

I said, "No, we're not against private enterprise. As a matter of fact, we want private enterprise to handle this if they want to."

So the first time we failed. The next time we came back we worked and we struggled and finally we got a hospitalization bill through and it is a good one. Today, there are some 10 of them that are taking care of the 2½ million Federal employees. These private insurance companies are making more money and selling more insurance today, and, if anything, they benefited by your group hospitalization insurance policies because they have brought it home to many people that didn't have it.

That is a benefit that hasn't cost anybody as far as the taxpayer is concerned. It hasn't cost them any money. You pay for your own insurance, but somebody had to get criticized for doing it. Well, the "water is under the bridge." You got the hospitalization insurance and I am still in Congress.

The same thing happened with your life insurance. Many people are working for the Government who can't pass a physical examination. Many of them are in the age bracket where life insurance would be prohibitive, but they need it more than anybody else. Well, the same cry went out when we tried to get a group life insurance policy for all Government people. It didn't hurt

the private insurance companies. They are selling more insurance today than they ever have before, but look what it has done in the way of giving security to the Federal employee.

I say that it isn't perfect, but we certainly have got a wonderful start. I will tell you this, I certainly look forward to taking that group life insurance policy and correcting many inequities in it and many of the things that could be improved in it, and I think that is something that will develop in the future for the benefit of every Federal employee.

I might also state that either this next week or the following week, the permanent Subcommittee on Civil Service, of which I happen to be chairman is to take up a lot of retirement problems and we are going to go into that very closely. There is one feature of it that I am sure you are interested in and that is the 30-year optional retirement. In the military service, you get retirement at the end of 20 years. There are some who say that you should be able to retire at 55 with 30 years, some say just 30 years, and some say that particularly in the Internal Revenue many, after 30 years and regardless of age are so burned out—like this gentleman said, "burned out before then." Others say they are just getting good after 30 years of work and so they might want to stay with the Government a little longer. Frankly, I feel like you might say that we could work out something that won't be mandatory but that will be optional and will please, I am sure, the vast majority of the employees of this great Nation of ours.

Today, I think, the feeling toward Government employees is much improved over what it was 10 years ago or 20 years ago, when I first went to Congress. I see students today who are coming out of colleges and they write me letters about going into the Federal Government. They never did that before. I think people today are awakening to the fact of how important employees of the Federal Government are and I think the people in the Federal employment by the same token have a greater respect for themselves and their jobs. The main reason is that they now have many of the fringe benefits they would have in private enterprise.

So I think we are entering into a period where you can say that if you are an employee of the Federal Government you can be proud of it. You can have self-respect and you can have devotion and dedication to your work. The Members of the Congress of the United States that represent the people of America have the respect that they should have for you by having provided for you the fringe benefits and the salary increases and the retirement improvements that you are entitled to.

I think we have accomplished a lot. It hasn't come as quickly as I would have liked for it to come and some of the other Members of Congress would have liked for it to come, but we have come a long way. So I say to you, let me be one of those to tell you that whatever I have done, whatever part I have played in making your life as a Federal employee better, making it more realistic, making it on a basis more equal and more comparable to private enterprise, it has been a great privilege to work for you. What I have done, I am proud of. I am not only very happy about the past, but I look to the future with more hope and optimism.

From all indications, it may be that the good people of the Sixth District, which incidentally is the best congressional district in the whole wide world, will see fit to reelect me to Congress. Maybe it will be my good fortune to be chairman of the committee in the foreseeable future. The chairman has already stated on several occasions that this might be his last term, that he is considering voluntary retirement. As to what happens after this term, your guess is as good or better than mine, but I believe that with the opportunity I might have as chairman of the House committee many of these things that will be for the further improvement of the Federal employees of this great Nation of ours, may yet come.

Anyhow, that is the way I look forward to what I think and hope will happen in the future. So I say to you, to your wonderful organization, to you distinguished officials, let me express my deep appreciation for the opportunity I have had of being able to be here with you, being able to be a part of your great convention. I want you to know that I stand ready to help you and your great organization at all times.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 7, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 41: 13: *For I the Lord thy God will hold thy right hand, saying unto thee, Fear not; I will help thee.*

Almighty God, our help in ages past and our hope for years to come, Thou alone canst guide and sustain us in these days when nations seem to find it so difficult to live together in peace and good will.

Grant that the time may speedily come when humanity shall know how to conquer the tensions and discords in the human heart and shall seek to call forth those nobler instincts and release their hidden splendor.

May we never be primarily interested and concerned in discovering the secret energies contained in the earth and soil and concealed in the sky, but show us how we may assist mankind in gaining wisdom to master its emotions and control its baser passions.

God forbid that any of the countries should ever again be turned into battlefields and its cities and hillsides be ground into dust and ashes by human rage and violence.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 324. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5555. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic

pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 812. An act to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the United States of America;

S. 1057. An act to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States;

S.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution granting consent for an extension of 4 years of the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas; and

S.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution favoring the holding of the Olympic games in America in 1968.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of

the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 64-2.

**ADJOURNMENT TO 11 O'CLOCK A.M.,
AUGUST 8, 1963**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow, August 8, 1963.

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

There was no objection.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. AYRES. 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. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the reference made yesterday that some Members of Congress are phonies, I disagree. To imply that Members of Congress are phonies is an insult to the electorate who, by their votes, sent the Members of this body here. However, it was interesting to note the large number of our Members with sizable Negro constituencies who came to the crowded well and qualified to vote their conscience. Yesterday was a sad day for civil rights legislation insofar as getting jobs for the minorities is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, how can I know what is best for the Negro when the five distinguished Negro Members of this body are so evenly divided on this issue? The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX] voted for the antidiscrimination amendment. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] voted against the amendment, and my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS] voted present.

Mr. Speaker, since I am to advise the Negro leadership of this country this afternoon as to my position on civil rights legislation, I would like to know what is the real position of the Negroes on antidiscrimination legislation.

FREEDOM TO BROADCAST

Mr. DORN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, radio and television broadcasters should be protected and encouraged in their constitutional right of free speech. The right of broadcasters to editorialize is a basic, fundamental, and essential freedom guaranteed by the Constitution. I have been shocked and alarmed at proposals and regulatory practices that would drive editorials from the air-

ways. This is a Fascist concept to intimidate those who do not agree and is a threat to all free speech. Sinister suggestions have been proposed that broadcasters be completely controlled by a powerful, growing, centralized Federal autocracy—sinister suggestions from those who would not dare propose book burning or censorship of editorials in periodicals and newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, many radio and television stations do not avail themselves of the privilege of editorializing. This is their prerogative and is a manifestation of the freedom of choice. However, I strongly feel that those who desire to editorialize should not be harassed, intimidated or censored by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, in times past we all know that broadcasters have been discriminated against in their access to the news. We can recall times when they have been treated as an unwanted stepchild here in this very Capitol. We have all been guilty of rushing to the great metropolitan press or to our favorite correspondents with our choicest news items. Radio and television broadcasters have very definitely been the victims of discrimination in the news. It is high time that this Congress makes sure that the right to editorialize be defended and maintained. Mr. Speaker, no single sentence in the Constitution means more to me than "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press." Mr. Speaker, it is our duty, as Members of the Congress, to see that no regulatory agency or bureaucrat abridges this sacred right in the field of broadcasting.

CHARGE OF "PHONIES"

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, I heard what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] had to say about the comments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] about phonies. I was here on the floor and listened to Mr. POWELL carefully and might have had his words taken down; but because I listened carefully I did not. I want to read to you what Mr. POWELL said; and I am reading verbatim from page 14293. He said:

There are phonies on both sides of this aisle. We all know that. I have been here 20 years.

That is what Mr. POWELL said.

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

Mr. HAYS. Yes, I would be glad to yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] is not on the floor—

Mr. HAYS. Yes, he is.

Mr. HALLECK. I am sorry; I took a quick look and did not see him. But I would like to say this. There was a very definite reference to phonies by one of the speakers on the amendment yester-

day, by a Member from California, not Mr. POWELL.

Mr. HAYS. I assumed he was talking about Mr. POWELL. I am concerned with what Mr. POWELL said.

Mr. HALLECK. While we are talking about phonies here, and with reference to the talk yesterday about how some of us were trying to defeat the bill, to my mind it is significant that the bill passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 377 to 21. In other words, there was substantial support for the bill; there was all the time. It was obvious to anyone who wanted to look and see that the bill was going to pass with or without the amendment.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has used up most of my time, but I have just this one comment. The gentleman put his own side on the spot until they could not do much else, and there was not much reason for a coalition after we beat the amendment.

**ATTITUDE OF CERTAIN MEMBERS
ON CIVIL RIGHTS**

Mr. SISK. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], referred to five distinguished Members of this House and their actions on this floor. I personally believe very devoutly, and I am sure that my good friend from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] would agree with me, that these five gentlemen are devoted advocates of civil rights legislation in this country.

A number of us had a difference of opinion on the result of the so-called Powell amendment with reference to the bill we had up yesterday. Mr. Speaker, I would like further to make a comment with reference to my good friend and colleague from California [Mr. HAWKINS] because of a reference that was made to his lack of legislative knowledge on yesterday. I should like to say that Mr. HAWKINS, in my opinion, is one of the most able and experienced legislators in this House, having devoted 30 years to the legislative processes of government, having been an outstanding legislator and a senior legislator and leader in the California State Legislature. He was a distinguished member of that body and is a distinguished Member of this body. I commend him on his courageous stand of yesterday.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 477 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7824) to continue, for the period ending

November 30, 1963, the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] 30 minutes, and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 477 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 7824, a bill to extend until November 30 the present debt ceiling of \$309 billion. It provides for 4 hours of general debate, and is a closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the resolution would be adopted and that the Committee on Ways and Means might be able to proceed to debate the issue.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] has explained, this resolution makes in order the consideration of H.R. 7824, a bill from the Committee on Ways and Means, under a closed or gag rule, a bill which would continue until midnight November 30, 1963, the present national debt limit of \$309 billion. Under this rule no amendment may be offered to or considered, except those offered by the Committee on Ways and Means, and only one motion to recommit with instructions can be offered.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman propose to speak extensively on this subject?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not know how extensively I shall speak, but I wish to speak, if I may, for a few minutes on this matter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I hope the gentleman will withhold that, because I am not sure that what I may say will have any particular influence on what is done in adopting this rule.

Mr. GROSS. I have found that the gentleman's words are more often than

not important to the House. If the gentleman is going to speak extensively, I think there ought to be more Members here to hear him.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is up to the gentleman.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 117]

Ashbrook	Grabowski	Powell
Baring	Griffin	Rivers, Alaska
Battin	Harding	Schenck
Belcher	Hardy	Shelley
Blatnik	Hébert	Sheppard
Brown, Calif.	Henderson	Sikes
Buckley	Johansen	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Jones, Ala.	Teague, Tex.
Cramer	Jones, Mo.	Trimble
Dawson	Karsh	Van Pelt
Derwinski	Kelly	Wharton
Diggs	Kilburn	Williams
Ellsworth	Knox	Willis
Evins	Martin, Mass.	Wilson, Bob
Fisher	Miller, Calif.	Wilson,
Fulton, Tenn.	Miller, N.Y.	Charles H.
Fuqua	O'Brien, Ill.	Winstead
Gary	Pilcher	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as I was saying at the time the point of order was made and the call of the House ordered, House Resolution 477 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 7824, under a closed or a gag rule which prohibits and prevents the offering of any amendment to the bill except those that may be offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule, however, does provide for the offering and consideration of one motion to recommit, either with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7824 is a very simple and a very easily understood bill, yet it is a very, very important measure because it would extend from midnight August 31, at which time the present temporary national debt ceiling of \$309 billion as provided by present law would otherwise die, until midnight November 30, 1963. In other words, it would continue the present \$309 billion temporary debt limit until midnight November 30.

It is my understanding that the motion to recommit which will be offered from this side of the center aisle will provide the present law be amended so as to fix the national debt ceiling, temporarily, at \$307 billion until midnight October 31, on the theory and belief of the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means that the Federal Treasury can live within that debt ceiling, or \$307 billion, until midnight October 31, with-

out difficulty, and that such a lower debt ceiling would act as a brake, restriction, or limitation on Government spending and greater deficit financing.

The national debt at the present moment, according to the records I have, which I believe are accurate, as furnished by the Department of the Treasury, is \$305 billion, of which \$5 billion is in the form of a cash balance. It is agreed, generally, I believe, even by Treasury officials, that it is not necessary to carry that heavy a cash balance in the Treasury, that is \$5 billion, but that perhaps in order to be safe in Government operations a cash balance of somewhere around \$2 billion to \$3 billion should be carried at all times, and therefore it would be possible to easily live with a debt limit of \$307 billion until October 31 without any other increase, such as is proposed, to \$309 billion or to continue it at that much, providing the Federal Government will hold down its expenditures, and not increase them above those to be expected within the next 60 to 90 days.

So here we go again. It was not long ago that I stood in the well of this House, and others stood with me, to point out that if we increased our national debt ceiling, as requested, that it would not be long before the Treasury and the administration would be before us requesting another increase in the debt limit. They got increases last May and June; the last became effective, of course, on the first of the new fiscal year, July 1. Part of it became effective before that date, as you know. But the balance, up to \$309 billion, became effective after midnight June 30. We have time after time increased the debt limit because we have failed, or have refused, to limit Federal spending, or to limit the amount the Federal Government can go out and borrow to meet deficits.

This House has finally become alarmed, as has the country generally, over the situation that confronts us of continuously and continually having the Federal Treasury come in and ask for increases in the national debt limit, and for authority to borrow more and more money to cover deficit financing, once or twice every year, so that on the last vote we had on this subject, if I am correct in my memory, the debt limit was raised by a vote or a margin of only five votes in this House. In other words, we were that close to saying to the Federal Treasury, "No, you cannot continue to come to the Congress, or to the House of Representatives at least, to go along with you in increasing the national debt so you can go out and borrow more and more money to spend." Now it is true, and I am happy to admit it and to agree to it, that we did have on June 30, at the close of the past fiscal year, a smaller budget deficit than was predicted the first of the year by the President, the Treasury, and by other fiscal authorities.

And, for two reasons: One was because there had been a pickup in earnings and profits, so the tax income of the Federal Government has been a little higher than had been expected.

The other is because the Congress had not appropriated for, or had not author-

ized, greater expenditures. And, let me be fair about it: The departments have not been able to spend all the money which has been appropriated, or authorized, quite as rapidly as expected. Therefore, the outflow from the Federal Treasury has not been quite as high as expected, so the deficit for the fiscal year was, I believe, \$6.2 billion and not the \$8 billion or \$9 billion that had originally been predicted.

Mr. Speaker, what about the future? Why is it now, despite the good fortune that we have had, that we have to increase this debt limit at this time? Why are they saying, "Hold the debt limit at \$309 billion, although we can get by on \$307 billion?"

The minority will ask for a debt limit of \$307 billion—not increase it or hold it at \$309 billion, the present figure, as requested. Why does the Treasury say "We can get by until midnight, November 30."

Mr. Speaker, why did the Treasury say that? Because they know that the income of the Federal Government in the latter part of this year will drop off and expenditures will increase, especially if the appropriations before Congress have been voted and finally enacted into law and are made available for spending by the administration. And, for another reason. Of course, such action means they will have to ask, just because of those circumstances, for an increase in the national debt limit next November, to be effective on December 1. But there is another reason behind this maneuver and I think we might as well bring it out and put it on the table here for everybody to see and to understand.

That is, within a week or two we will have before us the administration's tax reduction bill, a bill designed to cut Federal taxes. If we cut Federal taxes, while the cut will not become effective until January, it will not be long thereafter until the revenues of the Federal Government will become less, because the tax take will be less, and the Treasury deficit will increase. So, what is more logical than to say, "Well, Mr. Congress, you voted to cut taxes for the American people. You accepted our tax reduction bill and our proposed cut in taxes, so now we are in the position where we can and must increase our borrowing, for the Congress has voted, effective December 1, a rather hefty increase in the national debt limit. It has authorized the Treasury and the administration to go out and borrow the needed money for future generations to pay."

Mr. Speaker, borrow money for what purpose? Not only to meet operating deficits, deficits in the cost of running the Federal Government as it is now, but also, believe it or not, to borrow money for future generations yet unborn to pay in order to take care of our own cut in Federal taxes. In other words, say, "Well, yes, America, accept this big gift from a beneficent Government in the form of a tax reduction. Be smart about it. Do not pay as much tax, because we have cut the tax rates for you. We have reduced your taxes. We have been good to you. This administration has been good to you, and the Congress has been good to you. We have reduced

your taxes, but in order to take care of the needs of the Government, and in order to make up for the reduction in the Government's income as a result of this tax cut, we will have to go out and borrow a little money for your great, great grandchildren, yet unborn, to pay off."

So, in effect, we will be voting a tax cut, voting a tax cut now, remember, to be paid for with borrowed money which must be paid back, with interest, sometime or other, if this Republic is to remain solvent, not by our children; but by our children's children yet unborn.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the reason why down underneath, with all the camouflage torn away, with all the draperies pulled aside, we have this bill before us today.

That is the reason why we have this bill before us today. It is to continue the present debt ceiling of \$309 billion until midnight, November 30. Then, by that time, having squeezed through the administration's tax reduction bill then there will be a demand for a great big whopping increase in the national debt, so the Federal Treasury can go out and borrow more money to not only meet the deficit financing already planned or under way, but to also meet the cost of the tax reduction plan or program the administration is hoping to put through this Congress, and to sell to the American people.

It is just as simple as that. So simple that some of the planners believe the country and the Congress cannot understand it, but that the people will think there must be some other reason for it.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement and ask if he agrees with me that unless we face up to the financial facts of life in this country, we will be confronted with devaluation of our currency?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, there is not any question about that. Sooner or later the chickens are coming home to roost. In fact, that is the trouble we have today, and the reason why there is so much concern in high places. It is a fact that the chickens are coming home to roost financially and otherwise. We do have some very serious problems in this country that will grow worse rather, than easier of solution, and more difficult in the future, than they are at the present time.

I hope the administration will stand on the statement which has been issued recently that there will be no devaluation of gold. I hope that somehow or other we will not have to go very far down the path we have just started on, of the United States going into the money markets of the world and borrowing from foreign sources, from international organizations, to finance our Federal Government, or to help support the value of our currency in the markets of the world. It is a dangerous situation. We all know it, we all realize it. The country may not realize it, and I refer to the average American citizen, but I do not believe there is a fiscal expert, regardless

of his political affiliation, who is not concerned over the present situation. We have seen these troubles pile up as a result of many of the programs we have approved here. I am sorry to say we voted for some of them too often in this House. I am proud of the fact I have not voted for most of them. I am sorry if I voted for any of them.

Mr. GROSS. I understand arrangements have already been made by the Kennedy administration to borrow a half-billion dollars from the International Monetary Fund, which certainly means that we are at least in part borrowing our own money from this international lending agency.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think that is true.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Ohio has been here much longer than the gentleman from Iowa. Does the gentleman recall any previous borrowing of a half-billion dollars or anything approaching that amount from an international lending agency?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. Instead, we have been the international lender instead of the borrower through the years.

Let me conclude by just saying one other thing, one other quick statement:

We have had some legislation before the Rules Committee, some of it very important, and some of it very attractive. All of it would require a great deal of money to be spent on the theory the States and the local communities cannot afford to do these things for themselves. Yet, there is not a State in the Union, there is not a local community or a city in the United States, that is not in better financial condition today, and that is not more solvent, than the Government of the United States. Somehow or other, too many Americans, and I am afraid too many Members of Congress, have the peculiar idea and the mistaken belief that there is a magic source from which the Federal Government gets the money that it spends. Yet, every penny that is paid out of this Federal Treasury is first paid in, either by some taxpayer who has earned it in a hard and difficult way, or it has been borrowed at the expense of future generations yet unborn, to be paid off at a huge interest charge which is running now at a rate of better than \$10 billion a year, nearly three times more than the entire Federal Government cost—the interest charge alone is running today nearly three times as much as the entire Federal Government cost—to operate and to run when we first embarked on these socialistic programs about a third of a century ago, or a little less than that.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a table.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, evidence continues to accumulate as to the need to amend the budget law to require the President to update his January budget along about midway of the session, and

perhaps more than once, so that the Congress, in processing the \$100 billion budgets, in processing the appropriations, and the many propositions of new and expanded legislation, will be in position more intelligently to pass judgment on the questions.

The wide margin by which the final budget results missed not only the original rosy budget predictions from the President but every intervening official revision, and the timing of some of the revisions, demonstrate the need for Congress to be more fully, frequently, and officially advised of the changed and changing budget outlook and the economic assumptions on which to an important degree the budget balance or imbalance rests. And further evidence is also in the report of the Committee on Ways and Means on the pending debt limit extension.

Let me just briefly recall the chronology of the distressing fiscal 1963 budget results. The President's original budget submitted in January 1962 projected a small, hoped-for surplus of \$463 million. The country generally applauded the prospect of a budget balance. But long before the summer of 1962 arrived, virtually every competent authority was predicting a deficit instead of a surplus. It was then obvious that the revenue assumptions in the budget were too rosy, too optimistic. A substantial deficit was granted. But no official revision, no updating was received from the President. Congress proceeded to process the pending appropriation bills and other legislation calling for more Federal expenditures under the official illusion of a budget surplus. The country and the Congress would have been alerted to the radically changed outlook—and it was bleak by comparison to only a few months earlier—and could have guided themselves accordingly had the President so advised when the changes became apparent, as they were indeed apparent, and as they must have been apparent to the authorities in the executive branch.

But not until after the November elections did the executive branch officially concede the obvious. On November 13 they issued a revised forecast for fiscal 1963—the prospective surplus of \$463 million had gone glimmering and a huge deficit of \$7.8 billion was then forecast. But that came too late to affect the situation; Congress had adjourned and gone home a month before. And the worsened outlook resulted not from congressional action or inaction on the budget in the session just then concluded but rather from the overoptimistic revenues and expenditure forecasts in the President's original budget. Revenue expectations were down \$7.1 billion, and expenditure estimates were up \$1.2 billion even though Congress had cut the appropriation budget requests; approximately one-third of annual expenditures—disbursements are from appropriations of earlier sessions and thus not directly affected by action on the current appropriation bills.

The President further updated the fiscal 1963 budget when he submitted his 1964 budget last January. Both the rev-

enue and the expenditure sides were changed and resulted in an \$8.8 billion deficit forecast—\$1 billion higher than in mid-November. Then when the debt ceiling bill was reported here on the floor last May it was disclosed that the Budget Bureau had told the Committee on Ways and Means the expected budget deficit

for fiscal 1963 had declined to \$8.4 billion as a result of revised expenditure expectations.

As we now know, Mr. Speaker, the final budget results for fiscal 1963 show a deficit of \$6.2 billion. For convenience of reference, I will tabulate here the chronological totals:

Fiscal 1963

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget receipts	Budget expenditures	Deficit (-) or surplus (+)
1. President's original budget, January 1962.....	93.0	92.5	+0.5
2. Revised by executive branch, November 1962, after Congress adjourned....	86.9	93.7	-7.8
The change between January and November.....	-7.1	+1.2	-8.3
3. President's updated estimates, January 1963.....	85.5	94.3	-8.8
The change between November and January.....	-.4	+.6	-1.0
4. Executive branch revisions, May 1963 to Ways and Means Committee....	85.5	93.9	-8.4
The change between January and May.....	0	-.4	-.4
5. Final results for 1963, per Treasury statements for June 30, 1963.....	86.4	92.6	-6.2
6. Comparisons of final results (item 5) with—			
(a) Original budget, January 1962.....	-6.6	+1	-6.7
(b) Revised estimates, November 1962.....	+1.5	-1.1	-1.6
(c) Revised estimates, January 1963.....	+1.9	-1.7	-2.6
(d) Revised estimates, May 1963.....	+1.9	-1.3	-2.2

Mr. Speaker, my purpose here today is not to indulge in hindsight criticism although many responsible people thought at the time that the President's original budget predictions were unduly rosy and that failure to publicly admit the facts to the American people until after the November elections was politically motivated.

My purpose is to call attention to the urgent need of Congress being currently and authoritatively advised of significant changes in the fiscal outlook—advised in time to afford opportunity to take such measures as the changed and changing situation may call for and not be left groping in the dark. Under present procedures, with ever-changing economic forces, and the uncoordinated, fragmented legislative practices in processing appropriation and spending legislation, the left hand does not—indeed, cannot—know what the right hand is doing.

Further evidence of the need for authoritative budget updating—and in time to afford opportunity for Congress to take account of the changed conditions and outlook—is apparent in connection with the pending 1964 budget, only a small fraction of which has been finally enacted into law.

Under the assumed economic conditions and his legislative and appropriation recommendations, the President's original fiscal 1964 budget last January foresaw a budget deficit of \$11.9 billion. Yet only 4 months later, Treasury Secretary Dillon told the U.S. Chamber of Commerce that the revenue outlook for fiscal 1964 was perhaps a billion dollars brighter than the President's January budget assumptions. That was back in May. Now comes the pending debt limit extension bill. Evidently the budget outlook has further brightened. And enough is evidently already known about fiscal 1964 prospects to justify the Secretary asking, on behalf of the administration, for a 3-month extension of

the \$309 billion debt limit without change, without increase. And the Secretary also advises that the next debt ceiling request, the one beyond November 30, will be substantially below—those are the words used—the \$320 billion figure frequently mentioned earlier.

One widely circulated publication, claiming contact with knowledgeable Government sources, suggests that the 1964 deficit will be substantially less than the original \$11.9 billion figure.

Mr. Speaker, Congress does not authorize the collection of taxes or the bills. It makes these decisions on tax bills and appropriation bills. And in this session, most of those bills are still pending. It is when we act on those bills that we need the most up-to-date reading on the condition of the Treasury and the most authoritative budget outlook. It comes too late to significantly affect the situation after those bills are processed and we are struggling with a post-mortem debt ceiling.

But some will contend it is too early to make accurate revisions of the budget; that we are not far enough along on the legislative business and the appropriation bills to make intelligent revisions; that it is unrealistic to expect the President to put himself in position of changing the January budget from a "plan" to a "forecast."

I would be the last to argue that anyone should or could be expected to make a hard and fast, precise-to-the-last-dollar budget for anything as vast and complex as this \$100 billion-plus business; that under our system anyone could, so to speak, declare the end from the beginning.

But Mr. Speaker, I do say, and I do contend, that the President is in far better position in August—after the fiscal year has begun—to render a budget prospectus than he was back in January—6 months before the year began. And if the Secretary of the Treasury is in possession of enough information

about the budget to be able to recommend, as he has done, a debt limit unchanged over the first 5 months of the fiscal year, then the President is in far better position to up-to-date his budget and render a far more accurate prospectus than he was last January. The revenues are almost entirely a forecast under present laws, and often they are solely that. And roughly one-third of the expenditures in any year are made from appropriations of past years and therefore not directly or substantially affected by current congressional action. And I would hazard the guess that the economic advisers have in hand, and under constant study, informed projections of such key indicators as gross national product, corporate profits, and personal income on which budget revenue estimates so directly rest.

Mr. Speaker, no matter what the political philosophy, timely information from the authoritative source is indispensable to intelligent legislative consideration. Bleak though it is, evidently the budget outlook is not quite as bad as the President's original budget. If it is not, the President ought to advise us. The original budget is here; most of it is yet to be processed.

When the budget came last January I introduced House Joint Resolution 129 for the purpose of changing the law to secure an authoritative budget updating. I hope the additional developments will impress upon the committee the merit of adopting some such revision as the resolution contemplates.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, this is the rule, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has pointed out, on whether or not to debate on the floor of the House the proposals for increasing the public debt limit. I am in favor of the rule. We have to have this matter before us because the permanent debt ceiling is still \$285 billion, which is completely unrealistic. I had hoped that the Congress, the last time we had this matter up, which was in May, would have accepted the Republican proposal to make the permanent debt ceiling a realistic ceiling so that we could use a debt ceiling, as it should be, to bring about an exercise of expenditure reform if it was the will of the Congress that the executive exercise expenditure reform.

We are going to have tomorrow again a real test of those who have been talking in their communities about economy, saying that they are opposed to the President's theory of deficit financing. Here is an opportunity for them to demonstrate by a vote whether or not they really mean it.

Regrettably we do not hit this thing through the appropriation bills. The fact is that this year's appropriation bills apply only partially to the fiscal year immediately ahead of us, that is, fiscal year 1964. The requests for new obligational authority of about \$108 billion for this present Congress are actually obligational authority that will be spent, partially in fiscal 1964, in fiscal 1965, fiscal 1966, and fiscal 1967. We

have to relate any new obligational authority to the carryover balances from previous authorities to spend that the Congress has granted.

If we grant the President \$108 billion, which he has requested, he will have in addition around \$87 to \$89 billion of carryover authority to spend, or \$195 or \$197 billion. It is only the President who has told the Congress that his expenditure rate will be \$98.8 billion. Congress has no control over that expenditure figure for the fiscal year 1964. We have granted this authority to spend. But there certainly is some real flexibility in the hands of the President to cut that expenditure rate. And the interesting thing is this, in the testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means by the Secretary of the Treasury. I asked him, "Have you revised downward the expenditure rate of \$98.8 billion that you have projected for fiscal 1964?" And the answer was, "No," they had not touched that figure in spite of the fact that some of their requests for new obligational authority have been revised downward, such as foreign aid; in spite of the fact that this Congress, because it has not acted upon appropriation bills, has put the administration in the position where the executive departments are spending at the 1963 expenditure level of \$92.3 billion, not \$98.8 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the minority views in the committee report, because we go into this business of expenditure rates and we also point out what is very clearly the fact, that because we did give a tight ceiling earlier this year and last year, there have been what are called expenditure reforms; but, as we point out, that is because of the single-entry bookkeeping techniques of the administration, by calling sale of capital assets expenditure reductions. Actually this is not true expenditure reform. Let us illustrate. There is supposed to be a cut of about \$1 billion in Agriculture. Actually there is an increase of \$1.5 billion in the current expenditure rate in Agriculture. Then how can it show a cut of \$1 billion? Because they anticipate selling off \$2.5 billion of assets.

Mr. Speaker, we are discussing the rule. Why this should be before the House. I want to call attention to some of the features in it. Essentially the Republican position is going to be, as our minority views point out, that that \$307 billion instead of \$309 billion can be lived with. It will be a little tight and we may force some real expenditure reform as the result of it—not this business of just selling off capital assets and doing nothing about the expenditure rate.

I would like to call attention to a speech that I made on the floor of the House on Monday appearing on page 14122 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 5. It is entitled "U.S. Balance of Payments." Underlying our problem in balance of payments and the gold flow is this fiscal irresponsibility of continuing to spend more money than we are taking in at the Federal level. It points out, and I try to point out in detail, why the theories of this administration are wrong when they tell the people, "Don't

worry about the debt." I also point out in these remarks I made on Monday the speciousness of the arguments of the administration which has been made for some time, for many months, to the public, when they say, "Don't worry about the size of the Federal debt, we owe it to ourselves"; or, "It is a lesser ratio of the gross national product than it was in 1946," and other arguments of that kind.

Let me say this, that the size of the debt of the U.S. Government makes a tremendous difference and underlies among other things our serious situation in the matter of balance of payments, this follows a discipline over which we do not have control.

The foreign marketplace enters this picture and we are beginning to have to face up to some of the results of our expenditure policies under this administration.

Tomorrow we are going to see a test again of whether or not this Congress does believe in the Puritan ethic, which is, that we have to move toward a balanced budget not in 1972, which the administration theory would give us, but a balanced budget immediately. That can only be done with expenditure reform. Furthermore, we cannot have a tax cut that is going to help this country unless it is in context with expenditure reform.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 303, nays 72, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

YEAS—303

Abbott	Brooks	Dague
Addabbo	Broomfield	Daniels
Albert	Brotzman	Davis, Ga.
Alger	Broyhill, N.C.	Davis, Tenn.
Arends	Broyhill, Va.	Dawson
Ashley	Burke	Delaney
Aspinall	Burkhalter	Dent
Auchincloss	Burleson	Denton
Avery	Burton	Dingell
Ayres	Byrne, Pa.	Donohue
Baker	Byrnes, Wis.	Downing
Baldwin	Cahill	Dulski
Barrett	Cameron	Duncan
Barry	Cannon	Dwyer
Bass	Carey	Edmondson
Bates	Casey	Edwards
Becker	Celler	Elliott
Beckworth	Chamberlain	Ellsworth
Beermann	Chelf	Everett
Bell	Chenoweth	Fallon
Bennett, Fla.	Clark	Farbstein
Bennett, Mich.	Cleveland	Fascell
Berry	Cobelian	Feighan
Betts	Coilier	Findley
Boland	Corbett	Finnegan
Bolling	Corman	Fino
Bonner	Curtin	Flood
Brademas	Curtis	Flynt
Bray	Daddario	Fogarty

Ford	Libonati	Roberts, Tex.
Foreman	Lindsay	Robison
Fountain	Long, La.	Rodino
Frelinghuysen	Long, Md.	Rogers, Colo.
Friedel	McClory	Rogers, Tex.
Fulton, Tenn.	McDade	Rooney, N.Y.
Gallagher	McDowell	Rooney, Pa.
Garmatz	McFall	Roosevelt
Gathings	McIntire	Rosenthal
Gavin	McMillan	Rostenkowski
Giaino	Macdonald	Roush
Gibbons	MacGregor	Roybal
Gilbert	Madden	Rumsfeld
Gill	Mahon	Ryan, Mich.
Glenn	Marsh	Ryan, N.Y.
Goodell	Martin, Nebr.	St Germain
Goodling	Mathias	St. Onge
Green, Oreg.	Matsunaga	Saylor
Green, Pa.	Matthews	Schneebell
Griffiths	May	Schweiker
Grover	Milliken	Scott
Gubser	Mills	Selden
Gurney	Minish	Senner
Hagan, Ga.	Monagan	Shipley
Hagen, Calif.	Montoya	Shriver
Haley	Moorhead	Sickles
Halleck	Morgan	Skubitz
Halpern	Morris	Slack
Hanna	Morse	Smith, Iowa
Hansen	Morton	Stafford
Harding	Moss	Staggers
Harris	Multer	Steed
Harvey, Ind.	Murphy, Ill.	Stephens
Harvey, Mich.	Murphy, N.Y.	Stinson
Hawkins	Murray	Stratton
Hays	Natcher	Stubblefield
Healey	Nedzi	Sullivan
Hébert	Nix	Talcott
Hechler	Norblad	Taylor
Hemphill	O'Brien, N.Y.	Teague, Calif.
Henderson	O'Hara, Ill.	Thomas
Herlong	O'Hara, Mich.	Thompson, N.J.
Hoeven	Olsen, Mont.	Thompson, Tex.
Hollifield	Olson, Minn.	Thornberry
Holland	O'Neill	Toll
Horton	Osmer	Tollefson
Hosmer	Ostertag	Tuck
Huddleston	Passman	Tupper
Hull	Patman	Tuten
Hutchinson	Patten	Udall
Ichord	Pelly	Ullman
Jarman	Pepper	Utt
Jennings	Perkins	Van Deerlin
Joelson	Philbin	Vanik
Johnson, Calif.	Pike	Vinson
Johnson, Wis.	Pirnie	Waggoner
Karsten	Poage	Wallhauser
Karsh	Powell	Watts
Kastenmeier	Price	Weaver
Kee	Pucinski	Weitner
Kilgore	Purcell	Westland
King, Calif.	Quie	Whalley
King, N.Y.	Rains	White
Kirwan	Randall	Whitener
Kluczynski	Reid, N.Y.	Wickersham
Kornegay	Reifel	Widnall
Kunkel	Reuss	Wright
Landrum	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wydler
Lankford	Rhodes, Pa.	Wyman
Leggett	Riehlman	Young
Lennon	Rivers, Alaska	Younger
Lesinski	Rivers, S.C.	Zablocki

NAYS—72

Abele	Dorn	Nelsen
Abernethy	Dowdy	O'Konski
Adair	Forrester	Pillion
Anderson	Fulton, Pa.	Poff
Andrews	Gross	Pool
Ashmore	Hall	Quillen
Bolton,	Harrison	Reid, Ill.
Frances P.	Harsha	Rich
Bolton,	Hoffman	Roberts, Ala.
Oliver P.	Horan	Roudebush
Bow	Jensen	St. George
Brock	Jonas	Schadeberg
Bromwell	Keith	Schwengel
Brown, Ohio	Kyl	Secrest
Bruce	Laird	Short
Cederberg	Langen	Sibal
Clancy	Latta	Siler
Clausen,	Lipscomb	Snyder
Don H.	McCulloch	Springer
Clawson, Del	McLoskey	Taft
Conte	Martin, Calif.	Teague, Tex.
Cunningham	Michel	Thomson, Wis.
Derounian	Minshall	Watson
Devine	Moore	Whitlen
Dole	Mosher	Wilson, Ind.

NOT VOTING—59

Ashbrook	Brown, Calif.	Diggs
Baring	Buckley	Evins
Battin	Colmer	Fisher
Belcher	Cooley	Fraser
Blatnik	Cramer	Fuqua
Boggs	Derwinski	Gary

Gonzalez	Mailliard	Smith, Calif.
Grabowski	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Va.
Grant	Meader	Staebler
Gray	Miller, Calif.	Thompson, La.
Griffin	Miller, N.Y.	Trimble
Hardy	Morrison	Van Pelt
Johansen	O'Brien, Ill.	Wharton
Hardy	Pilcher	Williams
Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Fla.	Willis
Jones, Mo.	Schenck	Wilson, Bob
Kelly	Shelley	Wilson,
Keogh	Sheppard	Charles H.
Kilburn	Sikes	Winstead
Knox	Sisk	
Lloyd		

So the resolution was agreed to:
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Cramer against.
Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Schenck against.
Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Colmer against.
Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Sikes against.
Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Baring against.
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Winstead against.
Mr. Grabowski for, with Mr. Williams against.
Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Rogers of Florida against.
Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Battin against.
Mrs. Kelly for, with Mr. Fisher against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Belcher against.

Until further notice:
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Gary with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Johansen.
Mr. Staebler with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Gonzalez.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Smith of Virginia.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Brown of California.

Mr. MICHEL changed his vote from yea to nay.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
The doors were opened.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.
Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp to honor Frederick Douglass. My bill would commemorate the publication by Mr. Douglass of the North Star, an abolitionist newspaper which he published in Rochester, N.Y., a community I have the honor to represent in Congress, by directing that this stamp be placed on sale in Rochester 1 day before it is made available elsewhere.

In the nearly 80 years he lived, Frederick Douglass saw life from many dif-

ferent perspectives. He was born into slavery in the year 1817. His early childhood, spent in Talbot County on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, was an experience of neglect and cruelty, indulgency and hard work, and the tyranny of human enslavement.

Resistance built inside young Frederick Douglass. He turned at last upon his cruelest master and was sent off to Baltimore as a house servant. Here, he learned to read and write with the help of his master's wife.

As he grew so did his desire for freedom. His first escape attempt was betrayed and he was thrown into jail. However, a second attempt to escape in 1838, when he was 21, was entirely successful. He went to New York City and on to New Bedford, Mass., where he hired out as a laborer.

It was in 1841 during his attendance at a convention of the Massachusetts Antislavery Society that a career opened for him. An impromptu abolition speech he delivered had such extraordinary effect that Mr. Douglass was hired as a full-time antislavery lecturer.

In 1847, after 2 years of touring in Great Britain and Ireland making abolition speeches, he returned to the United States and moved to Rochester. He established the North Star and issued it for the next 17 years. His printing establishment cost nearly \$1,000 and was the first in America owned by a Negro. It is written that he was a careful editor who insisted on high standards from office assistants and the contributors of weekly newsletters.

In addition to publishing his newspaper in Rochester, Mr. Douglass took part in another of the organized forms of action against slavery, the underground railroad. He was superintendent of the Rochester terminus of the underground railroad; his house was its headquarters.

With the Civil War came his great opportunity. He recruited Negroes to fight for the cause of emancipation and gave his own sons as first recruits. During Reconstruction, President Lincoln frequently conferred with Mr. Douglass and relied on his counsel in matters of civil rights for the freed men.

His last years were filled with official duties. He was successively secretary of the Santo Domingo Commission, marshal and recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia, and finally U.S. Minister to Haiti. Even to the very close of his career, he took active part in supporting his social convictions, having attended a woman suffrage convention on the day of his death.

In "Frederick Douglass," a biography by Arna Bontemps, the author has written:

Until his death in 1895, Douglass remained an honored figure in Washington and throughout the United States. But it was his brave fight for the freedom of the slaves which most people remembered best. In this fight, there was no greater hero than Frederick Douglass.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of my home city of Rochester have memorialized Frederick Douglass with a statute in the downtown community. I ask that the

citizens of the United States now do his memory another honor through their elected Representatives granting favorable consideration to this bill which would authorize the issuance of a postage stamp commemorating his achievements.

In a recent issue of Time magazine, there was published a book review of "Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass," Mr. Douglass' autobiography. As detailed in this magazine review, the work was published originally in 1845 and now has been reissued. For the additional insight it offers on the life of the man whose memory would be honored by this commemorative stamp, I would like to include this article with my remarks:

THE BLACK ABOLITIONIST

Though he was the greatest American Negro of the last century, Frederick Douglass was all but forgotten after his death in 1895. The Nation was weary of the Negro problem, and Douglass, a Negro militant well in advance of the NAACP and CORE, did not suit the national temper. His reputation was eclipsed by the more accommodating Booker T. Washington, who supported segregation. U.S. historians have heaped praise on Washington while ignoring Douglass and, in one case, misspelling his name.

But the new attack on segregation has revived interest in Douglass. His early autobiography, published in 1845, has now been reissued. Written when Douglass was 27 or 28 (he was never certain of his age, since the births of slaves were rarely recorded), it is a classic of abolitionist literature without the steamy rhetoric of much abolitionist writing.

BEATING BY SCRIPTURE

The "fatal poison of irresponsible power" made brutes of most slaveholders, writes Douglass. Even in the border State of Maryland, where Douglass lived, slaves were regularly flogged by masters who were fond of paraphrasing scripture. "He that knoweth his master's will, and doeth it not, shall be beaten with many stripes." Douglass knew of a white overseer who shot down a slave for refusing to obey. He tells of a 15-year-old girl who was beaten to death for letting a white baby cry. The slaves were helpless, since their testimony was not accepted in court. Most had to work from sunrise to sunset, and often longer. They ate from a common trough like pigs.

Douglass was better treated than most. A mulatto, he had a hunch that his master was his father. At about the age of 7 he was loaned to his master's relatives in Baltimore, where his new mistress started to teach him to read until her husband grumbled that literacy would make the boy "unfit to be a slave." Douglass snatched books from the house and bribed little white boys to help him with the hard words. He scrawled letters on any available walls. Eventually he mastered the language and held classes to teach his fellow slaves. "Those," he recalled, "were great days to my soul."

Douglass' Baltimore idyl came to an end. He was sent back to rural Maryland and farmed out to a cracker named Edward Covey, who enjoyed a reputation as a "nigger breaker." Covey very nearly broke Douglass. Called the Snake because he was always sneaking up on the slaves at work, Covey ruled by terror. "My natural elasticity was crushed," writes Douglass, "the disposition to read departed, the dark night of slavery closed in upon me." But Covey flogged Douglass once too often. In a fit of rage, Douglass grabbed Covey by the neck and beat him up. Covey never called the police, Douglass reasoned, because he was afraid of tarnishing his "nigger breaker" reputation. Douglass recovered his spirit

from the fight and made a hair-raising escape North in 1838.

STALWART REPUBLICAN

Douglass ended his youthful autobiography just when he was becoming famous. He joined the fiery William Lloyd Garrison's band of abolitionists. A powerfully built man with a great shock of hair and a sonorous voice, he was the best orator of the lot. When the fugitive slave law was passed, enabling slaveowners to recover their runaways, Douglass thundered: "The only way to make the law a dead letter is to make half a dozen or more dead kidnapers." His lecture tour of Britain was credited with helping to keep Britain from recognizing the Confederacy during the Civil War. But he taxed the tolerance of even the abolitionists when he married a white woman of good colonial family who qualified for the DAR.

For all his militancy, Douglass was a practical man. When Garrison denounced the U.S. Constitution and urged the dissolution of the Union, Douglass broke with him, fearing that slaves would be helpless if left to the mercies of the South. He hoped to abolish slavery by the ballot and became a stalwart of the Republican Party, later helped to swing the Negro vote to a series of Republican Presidents. He was finally rewarded with the post of Minister to Haiti.

But his career was to end in disappointment, as he saw Negro rights steadily snuffed out in the South. He died at 77 (or 78), the same year that Booker T. Washington delivered his famous Atlanta address, agreeing that the white and black races should remain "in all things social * * * as separate as the fingers."

U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means I have had the pleasure and I might say the good fortune of working with officers of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Therefore, it comes as a surprise to me to read a speech which is being delivered now at the Press Club by the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Edwin P. Neilan, in which he describes Members of Congress generally, if not categorically, as "political bagmen." As a matter of fact, the title of the speech as released is "What Is Our Public Scandal, Vote Buying and Selling?"

I think this is an unfortunate thing, Mr. Speaker. Members of Congress agree and disagree on many things, and that is as it should be in our representative form of government. But to question the basic integrity of the Members because they may work for projects, whether they be flood control projects, navigation projects, public works projects, shipyards, and all the other things that go to make up this vast economy of ours, as being politically immoral and compare them to the sex and security scandal going on in Great Britain today I think is unbecoming of the president of a great national organization, and I am sorry to hear him make the speech.

At this time I think it appropriate to include a list of something like 600 mem-

bers of chambers of commerce throughout our country who have participated in joint programs beneficial to all of our people.

LOCAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PARTICIPATION IN AREA REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

ALABAMA

Fayette County Rural Areas Development Committee: Sam J. Renfro, president, Fayette Chamber of Commerce (1962); W. J. Holladay, vice president, chamber of commerce; Harlan Prater, president, chamber of commerce (1963).

Greene, Hale, Perry, and Wilcox Counties Rural Areas Development Committee: J. E. Banks, president, Eutaw Chamber of Commerce.

Lamar, Pickens, and Tuscaloosa Counties Rural Areas Development Committee, Don Hyames, president, Aliceville Chamber of Commerce; Lynn T. Webb, executive secretary, chamber of commerce.

Limestone County Rural Area Development and Technical Panel: John M. McDonald, president, Athens Chamber of Commerce; Ed Sandlin, manager, chamber of commerce.

Marion County Area Redevelopment Committee: E. L. Pearce, secretary, Hilton Chamber of Commerce.

Northeast Alabama Rural Areas Development Committee and Technical Panel

Cherokee County: Jerry Dan Stone, president, Centre Chamber of Commerce.

DeKalb County: Mrs. Glenn Gravitt, secretary, Fort Payne Chamber of Commerce.

Madison County: Mrs. W. E. McBride, secretary, Huntsville Chamber of Commerce.

Marshall County: Dr. James Horton, president, Guntersville Chamber of Commerce.

Walker County Industrial Development Board: W. W. Cannon, president, Jasper Chamber of Commerce.

Choctaw, Clarke, Marengo, and Sumter Counties Rural Areas Development Committee

Choctaw County: F. M. Myatt, vice president, Barber Chamber of Commerce; W. R. Lanier, president, Butler Chamber of Commerce.

Clarke County: Thomas B. Kennedy, president, Thomasville Chamber of Commerce; Donald Duff, president, Grove Hill Chamber of Commerce.

Marengo County: J. C. Camp, secretary, Linden Chamber of Commerce; Ed Fendley, secretary, chamber of commerce; F. R. Ott, president, Thomaston Chamber of Commerce.

Sumter County: Leon L. Goggans, chairman, North Sumter Chamber of Commerce; Ira D. Pruitt, Jr., secretary, Livingston, North Sumter Chamber of Commerce; Joseph Stallworth, president, York Chamber of Commerce; Dr. D. P. Culp, president, Livingston, North Sumter Chamber of Commerce.

Barbour, Bullock, and Macon Rural Areas Development Committee

Barbour County: James E. Daniel, president, Clayton Chamber of Commerce; Robert Beaty, Jr., past president, chamber of commerce; Robert Hornsby, director, Eufaula Chamber of Commerce.

Russell County: O. L. Randall, secretary, Phenix City Chamber of Commerce; O. W. Taff, president, Phenix City Chamber of Commerce.

ALASKA

Ketchikan Area Redevelopment Committee: Bill Boardman, manager, Ketchikan Chamber of Commerce.

Nineteenth Election District Economic Development Committee: Conrad Miller, president, Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce; Arthur Noffke, director, chamber of commerce.

Kuskokwin Valley Development Committee, Bethel Area: Bob Mulcahy, president, chamber of commerce.

Economic Development Committee for the 17th Election District: Gordon Osborne, president, Barrow Chamber of Commerce.

The city of Anchorage Area Redevelopment Commission. All general development and statistical data compiled by the Greater Anchorage Chamber of Commerce: John E. Croul, Jr., vice president, Alaska Chamber of Commerce, chairman, local chamber of commerce; Walter J. Hickel, chairman, State chamber of commerce; Thomas E. Kelly, division director; John M. Anderson, division director; Raymond I. Peterson, local chamber of commerce division director and acting chairman; D. J. Smith, transportation adviser, State chamber of commerce.

Economic Development Committee for the 18th District: Donald M. Hoover, director, Alaska Chamber of Commerce.

ARKANSAS

Madison County Rural Development Board: Jasper Northcutt, president, Huntsville Chamber of Commerce.

Lawrence County Development Council: Jim Snapp, past president, Walnut Ridge Chamber of Commerce; Arthur Cleveland, president, Walnut Ridge Chamber of Commerce; Jerry Bassett, past president, Walnut Ridge Chamber of Commerce.

LaFayette County Development Council: W. J. Lee, president, chamber of commerce; Frank Schweitzer, president, chamber of commerce; Frank Key, secretary, chamber of commerce.

Crittenden County Development Council: Bob Eden, president, chamber of commerce.

North central Arkansas—Fulton, Independence, Izard, Sharp, and Stone Counties—the Five County Area Rural Development Council: Jack Cochren, member, Fulton Chamber of Commerce Board.

Ashley, Chicot, Desha, Drew, Lincoln Counties, the Southeast Arkansas Chamber of Commerce: Benjamin O. Bynum, president, Dermott Chamber of Commerce; Carl Luckey, president, McGehee Chamber of Commerce; Claude T. Frank, secretary, Southeast Arkansas Chamber of Commerce.

Van Buren and Cleburne County, Ark., Development Council: Jack Ducksworth, vice president, and president elect of Heber Springs Chamber of Commerce; Tom Olmstead, president, chamber of commerce.

CALIFORNIA

Plumas County Planning Commission: Irwin Joy, director, Portola Chamber of Commerce; John Allen, president, Lake Almanor Chamber of Commerce.

COLORADO

Area Redevelopment Committee—Trinidad and Las Animas County: Tom Cimino, president, Trinidad Chamber of Commerce.

Huerfano County Redevelopment Commission: James Boles, vice president, chamber of commerce; Louis Nardini, manager, chamber of commerce; Gilbert Arnold, president, La Vete Chamber of Commerce.

CONNECTICUT

Gateway Regional Development and Industrial Commission, New Haven County: Edward W. Mullaney, president, Ansonia Chamber of Commerce.

FLORIDA

Pasco County Development Association: Lawrence Puckett, president, chamber of commerce, Dade City; R. H. Johnson, president, Zephyrhills Chamber of Commerce.

Northwest Florida Development Committee, Franklin County: Robert Connell, president, Apalachicola Chamber of Commerce.

Calhoun County: Col. W. L. Baily, president, Blountstown Chamber of Commerce.

GEORGIA

The Barrow County Redevelopment Corp.: C. L. Light, president, West Barrow Chamber of Commerce; H. O. Smith, director, chamber of commerce; J. B. Lay, board of commissioners; J. D. Watson, past president, chamber of commerce.

Carroll County Development Corp.: M. C. Wiley, executive director, Carrollton Chamber of Commerce; Chick Almon, director, chamber of commerce; Harold Border, director, chamber of commerce; Henry Burson, director, chamber of commerce; Woodfin Cole, director, chamber of commerce; Ebb Duncan, director, chamber of commerce; MacGregor Flanders, director, chamber of commerce; John Fletcher, director, chamber of commerce; J. B. Grooms, director, chamber of commerce; J. C. Harris, director, chamber of commerce; Ed Harman, director, chamber of commerce; Henry Head, director, chamber of commerce; I. S. Ingram, president, chamber of commerce; Russell O'Neal, director, chamber of commerce; Stanley Parkman, director, chamber of commerce; Chester Roush, director, chamber of commerce; Roger Sohoerner, director, chamber of commerce; Frank Searcy, director, chamber of commerce; Tom Vassy, director, chamber of commerce; M. C. Wiley, executive director, chamber of commerce.

Dougherty County Redevelopment Corp.: Hoyt Edge, president, Albany Chamber of Commerce; A. W. Holloway, director, chamber of commerce; Allen Churchwell, director, chamber of commerce; Walter Brown, vice president, chamber of commerce; Charles E. Franklin, assistant manager, chamber of commerce.

Early County Redevelopment Area Corp.: H. M. Richardson, president, Blakely Chamber of Commerce.

Gordon County Area Development Committee: Hoyt Edwards, president, Gordon County Chamber of Commerce.

Laurens County Development Corp.: R. L. McMillan, director, Laurens Chamber of Commerce.

Johnson County Redevelopment Corp.: W. P. Garner, secretary, Johnson County Chamber of Commerce.

Hart County Rural Area Development Committee: Lee E. Carter, secretary, Hart County Chamber of Commerce; W. P. Carter, chairman, industrial commission, chamber of commerce; James Mauldin, president, Hart Chamber of Commerce.

Habersham County Redevelopment Corp.: Paul Pitts, past president, Cornelia Chamber of Commerce.

Terrell County Redevelopment Corp.: Mrs. Francis Christe, secretary, Dawson Chamber of Commerce; Walter Childress, president, chamber of commerce.

Toombs County Overall Economic Development Program Committee: H. S. Vandiver, secretary, Vidalia Chamber of Commerce; Wilbur Gibbs, secretary, Lyons Chamber of Commerce.

Washington County Redevelopment Corp.: Cecil M. Hodges, Jr., past director, Sandersville-Washington Chamber of Commerce; Tom R. Simmons, past director, chamber of commerce; Maurice Friedman, past director, chamber of commerce; L. W. Smith, Jr., director, chamber of commerce; T. W. Gilmore, committee chairman, chamber of commerce.

Wayne County Redevelopment Corp.: George L. Massey, manager, Wayne Chamber of Commerce.

Wilkes County Redevelopment Corp.: W. A. Pope, president, Wilkes County Chamber of Commerce.

IDAHO

Idaho County, Opportunities Unlimited: Warren Parks, past president, Grangeville Chamber of Commerce, Floyd Swanson, president, chamber of commerce.

Kootenai County Area Redevelopment and Rural Area Development Committee: Kyle Walker, secretary, Coeur d'Alene Chamber of Commerce.

ILLINOIS

Clark County Area Redevelopment Conference: Homer Smith, chairman, industrial development committee, Clark Chamber of Commerce; Russell C. Colvin, manager, chamber of commerce.

INDIANA

Clay County Area Development Association: Robert H. Dix, president, Brazil Chamber of Commerce.

Evansville Future Inc.: D. W. Vaughn, president, Evansville Chamber of Commerce.

Greene County, United Area Economic Development Committee, Inc.: Jack Kennedy, president, chamber of commerce.

Harrison County Redevelopment Council: W. A. Parker, president, Corydon Chamber of Commerce.

Henry County Redevelopment Committee: Franklin George, vice president, New Castle Chamber of Commerce; Larry Haffer, president, chamber of commerce.

Jennings County Economic Development Committee: Joseph Caradonna, secretary, chamber of commerce.

Orange County Development Committee: Raymond Brosmer, director, French Lick-West Baden Chamber of Commerce; Ralph Pate, president, Orleans Chamber of Commerce.

Perry County Area Redevelopment Council: Frank Clemens, president, Tell City Chamber of Commerce.

Pike County Economic Development Committee: Omer Kipsch, president, Petersburg Chamber of Commerce.

Washington County Economic Development Committee: Clyde Goen, president, Salen Chamber of Commerce.

KANSAS

Cherokee-Crawford Counties Area Redevelopment Association: Victor J. Waite, manager, Pittsburg Chamber of Commerce.

Rice County Development Association: Al Pearce, manager, Lyons Chamber of Commerce.

KENTUCKY

Caldwell-Crittenden-Livingston-Lyon Area Program Council: F. M. Wilcox, president, Princeton Chamber of Commerce.

Boyd County Area Program Council: Allan Collier, president, Catlettsburg Chamber of Commerce.

Floyd, Johnson, Lawrence, Magoffin, Martin, Pike Counties—Big Sandy River Valley Area Program Council: H. H. Kincaid, president, Pike County Chamber of Commerce; George Branham, president, Paintsville Chamber of Commerce.

Christian-Todd-Trigg Area Program Council: Robert Cayce, president, Hopkinsville Chamber of Commerce; A. G. Campbell, president, Elkton Chamber of Commerce.

Cumberland Valley Area Economic Area Program Council, Bell County: Ernest H. Smith, president, Harlan Chamber of Commerce; Maurice Henry, past president, Kentucky Chamber of Commerce; Bill Narr, president, Knox County Chamber of Commerce; Roy Brown, president, Rockcastle Chamber of Commerce.

East Lake Cumberland Area Program Council: Dr. I. K. Cross, president, chamber of commerce.

Hopkins-Muhlenburg Area Program Council: N. S. McGaw, executive committee, Madisonville Chamber of Commerce.

McCracken County Area Program Council: Russ Chittenden, manager, Paducah Chamber of Commerce; Frank R. Paxton, president, Paducah Chamber of Commerce.

Middle Kentucky River Valley Area Program Council: W. H. Reynolds, chamber of commerce representative.

Northeastern Kentucky Area Program Council: William Whitaker, secretary manager, Morehead Chamber of Commerce.

Pendleton County Area Program Council: A. B. Arnold, secretary, chamber of commerce.

Southern Kentucky Counties Area Program Council—Allen, Butler, Edmonson, Grayson, Logan, Simpson, Warren: Harold Huff, president, Bowling Green Chamber of Commerce; F. L. Price, president, Adairville Chamber of Commerce; Bob Guion, president, Russellville Chamber of Commerce; James A. Durr, president, Auburn Chamber of Commerce.

Upper Kentucky River Valley Area Program Council—Knott, Leslie, Letcher, Perry Counties: Albert F. Stamper, president, Hindman Chamber of Commerce; Cossie Quillen, president, Whitesburg Chamber of Commerce.

West Lake Cumberland Area Program Council—Adair, Cumberland, Green, and Russell Counties: Lynn Jeffries, Kentucky Chamber of Commerce, fourth district.

LOUISIANA

Natchitoches Area Economic Development Association: Jack O. Britain, past president, chamber of commerce.

Sabine Development Association: C. G. Bullard, vice president, Sabine Parish Chamber of Commerce.

Vernon Area Redevelopment Corp.—Leesville and Vernon Parish: Russell Bailes, president, Leesville-Vernon Chamber of Commerce.

MAINE

Aroostook County Rural Area Development Committee: Francis S. Demir, executive director, Caribou Chamber of Commerce (all directors, not named).

Biddeford-Sanford Redevelopment Area Committee: Ronel Dubois, president, Sanford Chamber of Commerce.

Sanford-Springvale Chamber of Commerce: Ronel J. Dubois, president, Sanford Chamber of Commerce; Joseph T. Barberie, vice president, Sanford Chamber of Commerce; William E. Roberts, secretary, Sanford Chamber of Commerce; Charles D. Colson, director, Sanford Chamber of Commerce; William J. St. Onge, director, Sanford Chamber of Commerce; Andrew G. Chabot, director, Sanford Chamber of Commerce; Lawrence W. Jackson, director, Sanford Chamber of Commerce; Saul Shalit, director, Sanford Chamber of Commerce; David B. Thurston, director, Sanford Chamber of Commerce; Robert J. Trembley, director, Sanford Chamber of Commerce; Everett A. Weiss, director, Sanford Chamber of Commerce; John H. Folsom, director, Sanford Chamber of Commerce; John E. Garnsey, director, Sanford Chamber of Commerce; Harold F. Gates, director, Sanford Chamber of Commerce; Keith R. Goodrich, director, Sanford Chamber of Commerce; Robert S. Jagger, director, Sanford Chamber of Commerce; Ernest N. Kostis, director, Sanford Chamber of Commerce; Edgar A. Roberge, director, Sanford Chamber of Commerce; Wendell B. Thayer, director, Sanford Chamber of Commerce.

Washington County Rural Areas Development Committee: V. P. McFadden, executive committee county chamber of commerce.

MARYLAND

Cecil County Industrial Association, Inc.: George Lutz, president, chamber of commerce.

Dorchester County Industrial Development Corp.: Doris G. Cook, representing chamber of commerce.

Garrett County Development Corp.: Lowell Loomis, director, chamber of commerce; Mount Top Chamber of Commerce; Helmut Heise, director, Mount Top Chamber of Commerce; Frank McDaniel, director, Mount Top Chamber of Commerce; Wesley Schaible, director, Mount Top Chamber of Commerce.

MASSACHUSETTS

Dukes County Area Development Committee: Leo J. Connery, president, Martha's Vineyard Chamber of Commerce; Benjamin F. Morton, secretary.

Greater Fall River Area Development Committee: Walter Brown, president, chamber of commerce; George Delano, chairman, of commerce committee.

Gloucester, Rockport, Essex Economic Development Committee: Robie H. Liscomb, secretary, chamber of commerce.

Greater Lowell Economic Development Committee: Thomas J. Hickey, president, Greater Lowell Chamber of Commerce.

MICHIGAN

Charlevoix County Area Redevelopment Planning Committee: Paul Kohler, secretary, Charlevoix Chamber of Commerce.

Cheboygan County Area Redevelopment Planning Committee: Betty Jane Minsky, secretary-manager, chamber of commerce; Victor Leonall, representative, Cheboygan Chamber of Commerce; Lewis Chalker, representative, Indian River Chamber of Commerce; Sebastian LaTocha, representative, Mackinaw Chamber of Commerce.

Dickinson County Preliminary Overall Economic Development Committee: Enio Kolemajnen, secretary, chamber of commerce.

Emmet County Redevelopment Committee: Chet Crago, president, Petosky Chamber of Commerce.

Gratiot County Redevelopment Area—Overall Economic Development Committee: R. L. Wilson, chamber of commerce officer (no title); Paul Bennett, president, St. Louis Chamber of Commerce; R. M. Henneberger, board of supervisors, St. Louis Chamber of Commerce; Fred Carter, committee chairman, St. Louis Chamber of Commerce.

Huron County Area Redevelopment Committee: James Baker, director, Port Hope Chamber of Commerce.

Luce County Area Redevelopment Association: R. J. Beach, president, Luce County Chamber of Commerce.

Osceola County Economic Development Organization: chamber of commerce named board of directors (19).

Otsego County ARA Committee: Glen Catt, president, chamber of commerce.

Schoolcraft County Area Redevelopment Committee: Carl Graves, secretary, chamber of commerce.

Van Buren County Area Redevelopment Committee: M. J. Breitenbach, president, Lawrence Chamber of Commerce; Kenneth Davis, secretary, Decatur Chamber of Commerce; Louise Engle, secretary, Hartford Chamber of Commerce.

Economic Development Board of Wexford County: Hall Bell, secretary-manager, Cadillac Area Chamber of Commerce.

MINNESOTA

Itasca County Area Redevelopment Agency: Gene Roth, past president, chamber of commerce.

MISSISSIPPI

Holmes County Area Redevelopment Association: A. L. Gibson, president, Lexington Chamber of Commerce.

Lafayette County Rural Areas Development Committee: Robert McClain, manager, chamber of commerce.

Lincoln County Rural Areas Development Program (this is the chamber for this area): Gerald Kees, immediate past president; Tom L. Moak, president; Victor Becker, vice president; Frank Oakes, manager; Travis Tadlock; Sara Jane Craig, executive secretary; J. E. Spring, director; Glenn Smith, director; Owen Roberts, director; Ernest Norton, director; E. L. Boyce, director; Chester Burnham, director; Mike Carr, director; F. F. Becker, director; Cramer Roberts, director; W. W. Godbold, Jr., director; L. L. Entrican, director.

Oktibbeha Area Development Committee: Listed as representing the chamber are: James H. Cook, T. E. Easterwood, O. F. Parker, L. M. Pritchard, Bill Harpole, Ben Hillbun, Dr. F. H. Josey, T. E. Veitch, O. W. Charles, Jim Wilson, Cecil Rackley, P. L. Douglas, Guy W. Thaxton, Jim Crowe.

Tippah County Rural Areas Development Organization: Dr. W. E. Johnson, president, Ripley Chamber of Commerce.

MISSOURI

Howell County Rural Areas Development Committee: W. J. Bratton, president, West Plains Chamber of Commerce.

Ripley County Rural Area Development Council: Adolf Roberts, secretary, chamber of commerce.

MONTANA

Butte Development Corp. (Silver Bow County): Harold McGrath, secretary, chamber of commerce; John J. Burke, committee chairman, chamber of commerce.

Crow Indian Reservation: E. O. Preston, secretary, chamber of commerce.

Flathead County Area Redevelopment Interim Board: E. F. Matelich, industrial development committee, Kallispell Chamber of Commerce; Carlyle Crum, manager, Whitefish Chamber of Commerce.

NEW JERSEY

Passaic County Area Redevelopment Board: Edwin J. MacEwan, executive vice president, Greater Paterson Chamber of Commerce; Sidney R. Milburn, executive secretary, Wayne Chamber of Commerce.

NEW MEXICO

San Miguel County Area Development Committee: Dale B. Gereman, past president, Las Vegas San Miguel Chamber of Commerce; Charles P. Trumbull, director, chamber of commerce; Tom Clark, director, chamber of commerce; Richard B. Cavanaugh, past president, chamber of commerce.

Santa Fe County Resources Planning and Development Organization: Raymond E. Franz, manager, Santa Fe Chamber of Commerce.

Grant County Development Committee: Ed Stevens, past president, Silver City Chamber of Commerce.

NEW YORK

Area Redevelopment Committee of Montgomery County: Thomas Zappone, executive manager, Amsterdam Chamber of Commerce; Edward L. Wilkinson, executive director, chamber of commerce.

Essex County Development Committee: Francis Malaney, director, chamber of commerce.

Franklin County Area Redevelopment Committee, Ogdensburg-Massena Malone Area: Otis Schulz, president, Malone Chamber of Commerce; Jacques De Mattos, president, Saranac Lake Chamber of Commerce; James Kissane, director, Chateaugay Chamber of Commerce.

Fulton County Area Redevelopment Committee: Mrs. Anna D. Kukla, secretary, chamber of commerce; Ralph P. Van Woert, president, Gloversville Chamber of Commerce.

Area Redevelopment Organization of Jefferson County: Warren G. Gamble, president, Jefferson County Chamber of Commerce; Gordon W. Bryant, director, Watertown Chamber of Commerce.

Redevelopment Area Organization of the Auburn Labor Market Area: William E. Bouley, past president, Auburn Chamber of Commerce; Michael L. Peduto, executive manager, Auburn Chamber of Commerce; Col. William K. Walker, past president, Auburn Chamber of Commerce.

Chautaugua County Planning Board: Theodore Rabb, business manager, Dunkirk Chamber of Commerce.

NORTH CAROLINA

Avery County Planning Board: J. Ray Braswell, president, chamber of commerce; Frank Welch, secretary, chamber of commerce; Dr. E. H. Smith, vice president, chamber of commerce.

Edenton-Chowan Planning Board: J. H. Conger Jr., president, Edenton Chamber of Commerce; J. M. Robinson, executive vice president, Edenton Chamber of Commerce.

Lincoln County Planning Board: Gordon Goodson, president, chamber of commerce.

Mitchell County Planning Board—Spruce Pine area: B. E. Ragan, president, Spruce Pine Chamber of Commerce.

Swain County Planning Board: J. A. Hensley, vice president, chamber of commerce.

Plymouth and Washington County Planning Board: Ed Evensen, manager, Plymouth and Washington Chamber of Commerce.

Watauga Area Redevelopment Committee: H. W. Wilcox, president, Boone Chamber of Commerce.

OHIO

Ashtabula County Industrial Development, Inc.: Ralph Graham, president, Orwell Chamber of Commerce; William R. Hubbard, secretary, Conneaut Chamber of Commerce; Clinton E. Jolly, secretary, Geneva on the Lake Chamber of Commerce; Walter C. Smith, president, Jefferson Chamber of Commerce; James W. Wentling, president, Ashtabula Chamber of Commerce.

Guernsey Regional Planning Commission: Dale J. Abbott, committee chairman, Guernsey County Chamber of Commerce; Willard W. Smith, director, chamber of commerce.

Lawrence County Redevelopment Committee (Huntington-Ashland part): Volley Boggs, president, Ironton Chamber of Commerce; Zeller Henry, manager, Ironton Chamber of Commerce; C. W. Bloss, officer, Lawrence County Chamber of Commerce; B. B. Mills, director, Ironton Chamber of Commerce; W. B. McGurk, director, Ironton Chamber of Commerce.

Meigs County Resource Development Committee: Clyde Kirkland, president, Pomeroy Chamber of Commerce.

Monroe County Resource Development Committee: James Diehl, vice president, Woodsfield Chamber of Commerce.

Morgan County Rural Areas Development Committee: Robert Christie, industrial committee, McConnellsville Chamber of Commerce.

Portage County Development Committee: Walter N. Miller, manager, Ravenna Chamber of Commerce; Edward Alberty, manager, Kent area Chamber of Commerce.

OKLAHOMA

Latimer County Area Redevelopment Committee: Mrs. Donna Booth, secretary, chamber of commerce.

Adair County Area Redevelopment Committee: Tobe O'Neal, president, Stillwell Chamber of Commerce.

Coal County Area Redevelopment Committee: Eileen Ronald, secretary, chamber of commerce; George Brown, president, Coalgate Chamber of Commerce; Dr. Doyle L. Patten, past president, Coalgate Chamber of Commerce; Dr. Wallace Byrd, past president, Coalgate Chamber of Commerce.

Delaware County Redevelopment Committee: Frank Graham, president, Jay Chamber of Commerce; Otto Earp, past president, Grove Chamber of Commerce; Lou Ryan, president, Bernice Chamber of Commerce; Mart Potter, past president, Colcord Chamber of Commerce; Otto Earp, past president, Colcord Chamber of Commerce.

Hughes County Area Redevelopment Committee: C. A. Sanders, committee chairman, Holdenville Chamber of Commerce; Clem Pollock, secretary-manager, Holdenville Chamber of Commerce.

Le Flore County Area Redevelopment Committee: Hildred La Fevers, president,

Poteau Chamber of Commerce; Jay P. Dalley, manager, Poteau Chamber of Commerce.

Love County Area Redevelopment Committee: Clarence Cochran, industrial committee member, Marietta Chamber of Commerce; D. Joyce Coffey, president, Marietta Chamber of Commerce; William R. Brannan, vice president, chamber of commerce.

Mayes County Area Redevelopment Committee: M. L. McFarlin, manager, Pryor Chamber of Commerce; Jack Noles, president, Locust Grove Chamber of Commerce.

Murray County Area Redevelopment Committee: Jack Patten, Davis Chamber of Commerce; R. L. Boles, president, Sulphur Chamber of Commerce.

Muskogee County Area Redevelopment Committee: Jim Jordon, manager, chamber of commerce; Bob Jahrman, president, chamber of commerce.

Nowata County Area Redevelopment Committee: Dr. Homer Flora, chairman, industrial committee; Nowata Chamber of Commerce; James L. Sontag, president, Nowata Chamber of Commerce; Dean Shackelford, manager, Nowata Chamber of Commerce.

Okfuskee County Area Redevelopment Committee: Col. J. O. Smith, secretary, Okemah Chamber of Commerce; John M. Rasberry, president, Weleetka Chamber of Commerce; Marvin W. Lee, Jr., president, Boley Chamber of Commerce; J. Miller, president, Okemah Chamber of Commerce.

Ottawa County Area Redevelopment Committee: F. E. Farrier, president, Miami Chamber of Commerce.

Cherokee County Area Redevelopment Committee: Col. Martin A. Hagerstrand, manager, Tahlequah Chamber of Commerce; J. L. La Fevers, industrial committee, Tahlequah Chamber of Commerce; Hal Reed, president, Tahlequah Chamber of Commerce.

Industrial Development Trust of Chickasha, Okla. (Grady County): Clyde Cole, manager, Chickasha Chamber of Commerce.

Okmulgee County Area Redevelopment Committee: L. L. Altermatt, president, Henryetta Chamber of Commerce; Lynn Edenborough, president, Okmulgee Chamber of Commerce.

Pittsburg County Area Redevelopment Committee: Dale Dalton, president, Quinton Chamber of Commerce; Rex B. Ross, manager, McAlester Chamber of Commerce; S. Arch Thompson, president, McAlester Chamber of Commerce.

Pontotoc and Adair Counties Redevelopment Area Organization: Ted R. Savage, manager, chamber of commerce; Orval Price, chamber board; Denzil Lowry, chamber board; J. B. Lyon, chamber board; David O. Howe, chamber board; Bart Todd, chamber board; Tom O'Dell, chamber board; Lee McDonald, chamber board.

Atoka County Planning and Rural Areas Development Council: Harvey Bettis, secretary, chamber of commerce.

Greer County Area Redevelopment Committee: James P. Garrett, president, Mangum Chamber of Commerce; Eugene Hahn, president, Granite Chamber of Commerce; William Gill, Sr., manager, Mangum Chamber of Commerce W. T. Green, president, Duke Chamber of Commerce.

OREGON

Columbia County Redevelopment Committee: Forris Humphrey, president, Clatskanie Chamber of Commerce.

Josephine County Area Redevelopment Committee: Jack McMahan, manager, Grants Pass Chamber of Commerce.

PENNSYLVANIA

Pittsburgh Regional Industrial Development Corp. (Allegheny, Beaver and Westmoreland Counties)

Westmoreland County: Mrs. Elizabeth S. Blissell, executive director, New Kensington Chamber of Commerce; B. Carlson, executive

secretary, Irwin Chamber of Commerce; John E. Kennelly, executive secretary, Greensburg Chamber of Commerce; Ginger Joyce, executive director, Jeannette Chamber of Commerce; Virginia Swank, executive director, Ligonier Chamber of Commerce; Betty Douglass, secretary, Mt. Pleasant Chamber of Commerce.

Blair-Bedford Area Development Council: Thomas Staphenson, promotional manager, Tyrone Chamber of Commerce; G. Stanley Ruth, executive, Altoona Chamber of Commerce; Olin Horton, president, Saxton Chamber of Commerce.

Bradford County Planning Commission: Gene Paluzzi, secretary, Sayre Chamber of Commerce.

Butler County Area Redevelopment Council: A. Wendell Weihe, executive secretary, Butler Chamber of Commerce; Paul L. Klingler, secretary, Mars Chamber of Commerce.

Indiana County Planning Commission: William Ingersoll, executive secretary, Indiana County Chamber of Commerce.

Greater Johnstown Chamber of Commerce Industrial Development Division and Somerset County Development Council: Robert Martin, representing Somerset Chamber of Commerce; John Stein, representing Somerset Chamber of Commerce; Wayne Pile, representing Somerset Chamber of Commerce; Blair Barkman, representing Somerset Chamber of Commerce; George Foy, representing Meyersdale Chamber of Commerce.

Armstrong County Area Redevelopment Council (Kittanning-Ford City): Don Mash, manager, Kittanning Chamber of Commerce; Robert D. Noel, Jr., president, Kittanning Chamber of Commerce.

Redevelopment Area Organization of Lackawanna County (Scranton): Ronald C. Jones, chairman, Scranton Chamber of Commerce; Robert L. Justin, president, Scranton Chamber of Commerce; James L. Noecker, president, Carbondale Chamber of Commerce; Robert Morgan, president, Archbald Chamber of Commerce; James F. Arthur, president, Dickson Chamber of Commerce; Franklin Price, president, Moosic Chamber of Commerce.

Northeast Pennsylvania Industrial Development Commission, Luzerne County: Louis G. Feldmann, vice president, Hazleton Chamber of Commerce; A. J. Sordoni, Jr., president, State Chamber of Commerce; Andrew Hourigan, Jr., president, Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce.

Northumberland County: Edward Barr, secretary, Shamokin Chamber of Commerce.

Wayne County: Lewis Howell, president, Honesdale Chamber of Commerce.

At Large: Frank A. Ernest, executive secretary, Wilkes Barre Chamber of Commerce; Cliff Jones, executive secretary, Hazleton Chamber of Commerce; Willis W. Jones, executive vice president, Scranton Chamber of Commerce; Vincent T. O'Hara, executive secretary, Scranton Chamber of Commerce.

Northwestern Pennsylvania Conference for Economic Development Crawford County: B. J. Smith, representative, Meadville Chamber of Commerce; W. C. Wenner, secretary, Cambridge Springs Chamber of Commerce.

Erie County: W. Dudley, Jewell, executive vice president, Greater Erie Chamber of Commerce.

McKean County: A. Robert Hill, president, Mt. Jewett Chamber of Commerce; David L. Scott, executive secretary, Bradford Chamber of Commerce.

Mercer County: Michael C. Yourga, president, Shenango Chamber of Commerce.

Venango County: Elwood B. Deeter, president, Franklin Chamber of Commerce; Francis B. Hall, manager, Oil City Chamber of Commerce; Robert Rhoades, president, Oil City Chamber of Commerce.

Warren County: Ray Stein, chairman, Warren Chamber of Commerce; Col. Henry Kerlin, executive vice president, Warren Chamber of Commerce.

Schuylkill County Planning Commission: Richard F. Higgins, president, Pottsville Chamber of Commerce.

Susquehanna Economic Development Association: Robert Lyons, president, Lewisburg Chamber of Commerce; G. Guy Luck, secretary, Middleburg Chamber of Commerce; Gilbert T. Hess, president, Middleburg Chamber of Commerce; Herbert Bendt, secretary, Lewisburg Chamber of Commerce; E. L. Gill, secretary, Central Susquehanna Valley Chamber of Commerce; Dr. G. R. Varano, secretary, Mt. Carmel Chamber of Commerce; Roland F. Harbeson, secretary, Milton Chamber of Commerce; William Belford, president, Milton Chamber of Commerce; Mrs. Katherine Gunter, secretary, Bloomsburg Chamber of Commerce; Warren E. Hause, secretary, Berwick Chamber of Commerce; William Booth, secretary, Danville Chamber of Commerce; Edward P. Barr, secretary, Shamokin Chamber of Commerce; H. Leighton Williams, secretary, Greater Williamsport Chamber of Commerce; Frank O'Reilly, president, Clinton County Chamber of Commerce; Richard A. Morse, secretary, Clinton County Chamber of Commerce.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Jasper County Redevelopment Committee: M. A. Garr, president, Hardeeville Chamber of Commerce; Mrs. Margie Wise, president, Jasper Chamber of Commerce.

Kershaw County Redevelopment Committee: W. Ed Mitchell, manager, Camden Chamber of Commerce.

Lancaster County Redevelopment Council: David McInnis, manager, Lancaster Chamber of Commerce.

Sumter County Economic Development Committee: James E. Boling, secretary, Sumter Chamber of Commerce.

Barnwell County Rural Areas Development Committee: Bill Hanks, president, Barnwell Chamber of Commerce.

Colleton Redevelopment Council: Leon Gelson, president, Walterboro Chamber of Commerce.

Orangeburg County Economic Development Council: T. S. Taylor, president, Orangeburg Chamber of Commerce; J. L. Gammon, vice president, chamber of commerce; W. D. Kirkpatrick, manager, chamber of commerce.

TENNESSEE

Dickson County Area Redevelopment Corp.: president, Dickson County Chamber of Commerce (no name).

Houston County Area Redevelopment Committee: Ralph Lynn, president, Houston Chamber of Commerce.

Marion County Industrial Committee: Howard Horn, president, chamber of commerce.

Putnam County Overall Economic Development Committee: E. H. Hooper, president, chamber of commerce.

Robertson County Redevelopment Committee: Charles Ralph, secretary, Springfield Chamber of Commerce.

TEXAS

Texarkana Area Redevelopment Committee (Bowie County): F. E. Hightower, president, Texarkana Chamber of Commerce; W. E. Drummond, vice president, Texarkana Chamber of Commerce; Winn Smith, treasurer, chamber of commerce; L. E. Gilliland, manager, chamber of commerce.

Red River Industrial Foundation: Pat O. Beadle, past vice president, Clarksville Chamber of Commerce; Byron B. Black, past president, Clarksville Chamber of Commerce; A. N. Quarles, secretary, chamber of commerce; Billy E. Barker, director, chamber of commerce; Charlie M. Conine, past director, chamber of commerce; Austin Guest, past president, chamber of commerce; George F. Sunkel, past president, chamber of commerce; James W. Vaughan, past president,

chamber of commerce; Harry Whitehouse, director, chamber of commerce; Cab N. Wolf, director, chamber of commerce.

Zapata County Rural Area Development Committee: Rafael San Miguel, president, Zapata County Chamber of Commerce.

Collingsworth County Overall Economic Development Planning Board: Jack Sanford, president, chamber of commerce.

Henderson County Redevelopment Committee: Dan Royall, Jr., president, Malakoff Chamber of Commerce; Finis Hardy, secretary, Malakoff Chamber of Commerce; Chester Bradley, president, Trinidad Chamber of Commerce.

Laredo Redevelopment Area Organization (Webb County): E. H. Borchers, president, chamber of commerce; S. K. Mason, first vice president, chamber of commerce; Tom F. Herring, second vice president, chamber of commerce; T. B. Miller, treasurer, chamber of commerce; Frank Y. Hill, immediate past president, chamber of commerce; Maurice M. Alexander, director, chamber of commerce; Roberto M. Benavides, director, chamber of commerce; Alfonso Casso, director, chamber of commerce; Rodrigo DeLlano, director, chamber of commerce; A. E. Guajardo, director, chamber of commerce; Armengol Guerra, Jr., director, chamber of commerce; George L. Hachar, director, chamber of commerce; W. B. Johnson, Jr., director, chamber of commerce; Col. W. J. Jones, director, chamber of commerce; Palmer F. King, director, chamber of commerce; Oscar M. Laurel, director, chamber of commerce; Robert E. Levy, director, chamber of commerce; J. C. Martin, Jr., director, chamber of commerce; Sam Meyer, director, chamber of commerce; Col. Roger C. Pryor, director, chamber of commerce; Francis Richter, director, chamber of commerce; R. H. Riestenberg, director, chamber of commerce; Harry Sames, Jr., director, chamber of commerce; Allan C. Skinner, director, chamber of commerce; George Spence, director, chamber of commerce; Vella Uribe, director, chamber of commerce; C. C. Whitworth, director, chamber of commerce; Ben F. Wright, Jr., director, chamber of commerce; Renato Zapata, Sr., director, chamber of commerce; Fernando Zuniga, director, chamber of commerce.

Jefferson-Marion County Planning Commission: B. Koontz, director, Marion County Chamber of Commerce; U. L. Williamson, past president, Marion County Chamber of Commerce; Ray Thomas, director, Marion Chamber of Commerce.

McCulloch County Program Building Committee: George Purcell, manager, chamber of commerce.

Morris County Program Building Committee: L. Jack Coker, president, Naples Chamber of Commerce.

UTAH

Wasatch County Redevelopment Committee: Don Barker, committee chairman, chamber of commerce; Russell Wall, president, Wasatch Chamber of Commerce.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Economic Development Board of the Virgin Islands of the United States: D. Victor Bornn, director, St. Thomas Chamber of Commerce; James A. Bough, president, St. Thomas Chamber of Commerce; Van B. Hooper, St. Croix Chamber of Commerce Advisory Committee; Alexander A. Moorehead, president, St. Croix Chamber of Commerce.

WASHINGTON

Grays Harbor Area Redevelopment Agency: John Forbes, manager, Grays Harbor Chamber of Commerce. Three additional managers not named.

Pacific County Area Redevelopment Association: R. W. Casebolt, secretary, Ilwaco Chamber of Commerce; E. R. Maddin, past president, Ilwaco Chamber of Commerce.

Skagit County Development Association: Gene Hopkins, manager, chamber of commerce.

Douglas County Redevelopment Council: Zoss Wilkinson, president, chamber of commerce.

WEST VIRGINIA

Calhoun County Resource Development Committee: Rymer Law, chamber of commerce representative.

Fayette County Development Corp.: Gene Imbrogno, president, Montgomery Chamber of Commerce.

Industrial Development Committee for Harrison County: president, Clarksburg Chamber of Commerce (no name).

Huntington (Cabell-Wayne Counties) Development Commission: John Rutherford, representing Wayne Chamber of Commerce; Glenn Fogle, representing Ceredo-Kenova Chamber of Commerce; C. McD. England, Huntington Chamber of Commerce.

Mason County Redevelopment Association: Cecil Deverick, managing director, Mason County Chamber of Commerce.

McDowell County Development and Improvement Corp.: Claude R. Kirkland, president, Welch Chamber of Commerce.

Bluefield Area Development Corp.: W. J. Gillespie, president, Bluefield Chamber of Commerce; Dodd Martensen, representing Bluefield Chamber of Commerce.

Lewis County Development Committee: Mrs. John R. Davis, representing chamber of commerce.

Monongalia County-Morgantown Community Association: Dean Chester A. Arents, president, chamber of commerce; Raymond E. Shafer, industrial committee, chamber of commerce; James R. McCartney, manager, chamber of commerce.

Monroe Industrial Development Corp.: O. B. Grimmett, president, Union Chamber of Commerce.

Raleigh County Development Association (Beckley Area): Eugene Morehouse, president, Beckley Chamber of Commerce.

Randolph County Planning Commission: Cyrus S. Kump, director, Elkins Chamber of Commerce; Carl L. Wilmoth, director, Elkins Chamber of Commerce.

Wetzel County ARA-RAD Committee: W. E. Durig, vice president, New Martinsville Chamber of Commerce.

WISCONSIN

Door County Industrial Development Agency: Tom Pinney, Jr., president, Door County Chamber of Commerce.

La Crosse County Industrial Development Council: One representative from La Crosse County Chamber of Commerce; one representative from City Chamber of Commerce (no names).

Portage County Area Development Committee: Carl Wallace, secretary-manager, Stevens Point Chamber of Commerce.

WYOMING

Teton County Rural Area Development Committee (Jackson area): Dean Driskell, president, Jackson Chamber of Commerce.

Since April 20, 1963, when this report was prepared, ARA has received 51 new economic redevelopment plans prepared by local committees. In these plans 41 chamber of commerce officials and representatives are actively serving on ARA development committees.

ALABAMA

Cullman County Rural Areas Development Committee: L. C. Norrell, chairman, agriculture committee, chamber of commerce; O. M. Willoughby, president, chamber of commerce.

ARKANSAS

Faulkner County Development Council: Guy Murphy, representing Conway Chamber of Commerce.

Chicot County Development Council: Mrs. F. R. Paris, Dermott Chamber of Commerce;

Joe Lilly, Eudora Chamber of Commerce; J. H. Fondren, Eudora Chamber of Commerce; George Walker, Lake Village Chamber of Commerce.

Ashley County Development Council: Earl Scott, president, chamber of commerce; Don Rogers, secretary, chamber of commerce.

COLORADO

Fremont County Area Redevelopment Organization: Ray Shoop, chairman, agriculture committee, Canon City Chamber of Commerce; Dr. Howard Miller, chairman, recreation committee, Canon City Chamber of Commerce; Pauline Bryan, manager, Canon City Chamber of Commerce.

FLORIDA

Franklin County Planning and Development Committee: W. C. Buzzett, former president, Apalachicola Chamber of Commerce (ex officio); R. E. Connell, president, Apalachicola Chamber of Commerce.

Jackson County Development Council: William Avery, secretary, chamber of commerce.

Industrial Development Commission of St. Lucie County: Philip C. Gates, president, Fort Pierce Chamber of Commerce.

GEORGIA

Bulloch County Redevelopment Corp.: A. R. Gibson, Sr., manager, Bulloch Chamber of Commerce; Charles M. Robbins, Jr., president, Bulloch Chamber of Commerce.

KENTUCKY

Garrard County Area Program Council: Tillo B. Martin, representing chamber of commerce; Jack Zanone, representing chamber of commerce.

LOUISIANA

Springhill Overall Economic Development Program Committee: Tom Stevenson, manager, chamber of commerce.

MICHIGAN

Omegaw County Redevelopment Area Organization: Adrian Dantzer, West Branch Chamber of Commerce.

MISSISSIPPI

Leake County Rural Areas Development Committee: Carl Fulton, manager, chamber of commerce.

Warren County Rural Area Development Committee: Robert G. Geoffroy, manager, chamber of commerce.

MONTANA

Granite County ARA Committee: O. H. Christensen, president, Philipsburg Chamber of Commerce.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Carroll County RAD Committee: Lawrence H. Sherman, director, North Conway Chamber of Commerce; Ralph Grindle, president, Conway Chamber of Commerce.

Coos County rural areas development program: John P. O'Neil, past president, Berlin Chamber of Commerce; A. W. Warren, director, Berlin Chamber of Commerce.

OKLAHOMA

Lincoln County Area Redevelopment Committee: Bo Belcher, president, Chandler Chamber of Commerce; Ceel Ford, president, Davenport Chamber of Commerce; Leo Moore, president, Prague Chamber of Commerce; Milton Wolff, president, Stroud Chamber of Commerce; Floyd Key, president, Wellston Chamber of Commerce; P. J. Nunnery, representing Meeker Chamber of Commerce.

PUERTO RICO

Guayama Redevelopment Area Committee: Luis Blondet Bloise, president, Guayama Chamber of Commerce.

TEXAS

Camp County Redevelopment Area Organization: Neal Ray, three-time president, chamber of commerce; Murray Maddox, past

president, Camp County Chamber of Commerce.

Maverick County Redevelopment Area Committee: Harvey Seymour, representing chamber of commerce.

Val Verde Overall Economic Development Program Committee: Jack Robinson, president, Del Rio Chamber of Commerce (entire program submitted by Del Rio Chamber of Commerce Area Development Foundation, Inc.).

WASHINGTON

Chelan County Overall Economic Development Committee: Dr. Alfred J. Stojowski, representing Wenatchee Chamber of Commerce.

GESELL REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have a very important announcement. To your keen disappointment, I shall not speak 2 hours. On the contrary, we will have a number of contributors to this discussion, but I will do the best I can to pay the proper respect to one of the most infamous documents ever devised by human hand, known as the Gesell report.

Mr. Speaker, as the ranking majority member of the House Armed Services Committee I would be remiss in my duties as a Member of the Congress, a citizen of the United States, and particularly as a member of this committee if I did not tell the House of Representatives the effect of the recent directive issued by the Secretary of Defense based on this report, and what it will do to the combat efficiency of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Now, you spend over \$52 billion a year on the military. This destroys it. This Nation from its inception has prided itself on the fact that we have constantly kept our Armed Forces out of the political area. Every officer in our Armed Forces learns from the day of his entry into a commissioned status that he must keep himself free from local, State and Federal civil affairs that are not directly related to his primary mission of being combat-ready at all times. We have Armed Forces for one reason and one reason alone, for the defense of the United States of America. The career men and women of our armed services are dedicated to the preservation of the United States of America. They lead a life that is different from that of the ordinary citizen for during a normal career they rarely can call any place home.

Our officers and men come from all walks of life, from all sections of this Nation and from a variety of backgrounds. At only one time in our prior history as a nation have our Armed Forces been divided. I need not remind this House of that unpleasantness, 100 years ago. Only one time in our history have our Armed Forces been divided in their loyalties to the single duty of providing for the defense of this country.

But just the other day this highly inflammatory, vicious, and extremely prejudiced report was issued, forwarded to

the President of the United States, and to the Secretary of Defense, and on the basis of that report a directive has now been issued implementing this report. The major parts of this report I warn you here and now will seriously affect if not destroy the combat efficiency of your Armed Forces. The directive issued by the Secretary of Defense takes the military out of the role of providing for the national security and plunges them into the role of social reformers.

Now, all of us have separate views on civil rights, and I would not impugn the motives of any of you, my colleagues, regardless of your position.

But the laws of this Nation are made by the Congress of the United States, they are not made by the Secretary of Defense nor, indeed, by the President of the United States. I do not care what the Executive order may be. Executive orders must be based on the law of the land. But what we have today is a directive in which a captive group of men and women wearing the uniform of their country, your country, are being ordered and directed to bring about forced integration not only among themselves and their social activities off base and off duty, but in addition they are being told in no uncertain terms—now, get this—they are being told in no uncertain terms based on this that their careers are ended if they do not become protagonists of a philosophy of life that has not even been endorsed by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, when we reach the point in this Nation where the full force and power of the Armed Forces is being used against a large segment of our population in this Nation, I need not tell you that there is no question of the proof that the security of this Nation and the combat efficiency of our Armed Forces is in serious jeopardy. Indeed, it may have passed the point of no return. Our country is being challenged not from without but from within.

I will discuss with you now this directive issued by the Secretary of Defense, which, incidentally, I will make a part of my remarks, and which, in my considered opinion, will destroy the morale of our Armed Forces and will do more to divide the singleness of purpose of our Armed Forces than the fall of Fort Sumter in 1861, and I know something about that, if you catch the point.

Let me say by way of interpolation that here are excerpts from reports of the Secretaries of the services.

They warned against this. I do not think I had better put this in the Record, but that is contained in here, which I have in my possession, and they did not recommend it. They said, "Lay off this thing at least until the Congress has spoken on the public accommodations of the Celler and whoever else's name is attached to the new civil rights bill."

Let us go into this thing. I tried my best to give you the benefit of this and the directives as best I could. The directive issued by the Secretary of Defense on the subject of equal opportunity in the Armed Forces is based on the recommendations, as I have told you, of this report, and you can see it. Anybody

can see it. If I can get permission, I will put this in the RECORD.

This committee can hardly be called an impartial committee. The findings of this committee could be anticipated before the committee met, if you read the membership. About 90 percent of our Armed Forces are white and less than 10 percent are Negroes, yet no attempt was made to integrate the forces off base, when they have no business being integrated, as recommended and directed by this report.

Now—

(a) The morale of the Armed Forces—

None of these things were discussed. None of these things were taken into consideration. The morale of the Armed Forces, the ability of the Armed Forces to recruit competent personnel, the ability of the Army Forces to retain competent personnel.

The Department of Defense directive requires the military departments to issue all appropriate instructions, manuals, and regulations in connection with the leadership responsible for equal opportunity off base—

Not on base—

and continuing guidance for its discharge.

Period.

The assumption is that Negroes because of their color must be given equal opportunity on and off base in all respects. The implication is clear that without regard to competence, a percentage of distribution will determine promotion opportunities and assumption of responsibility. This thing is altogether wrong. The directive talks in terms of "equal opportunity". But since each military department will be required to institute a system for regularly reporting, monitoring and measuring progress in achievement of equal opportunity off base, it is clear that only percentages will be the deciding factor.

Can you imagine this? Competence? No. The military department says, "Go slow on this. We cannot do this." But they did it. There is a vast difference, my colleagues, between equal opportunity and forced equality. Yet, no commander will be able to survive in an atmosphere, no commander, and I do not care what his military competence is—no commander may survive in an atmosphere of that directive unless he can clearly demonstrate that for each 1,000 enlisted men 10 percent of the master sergeants are colored.

Ten percent of the E6's are colored, and so on up and down the line regardless of competence. I do not know about Indians. I do not know about Hindus. I do not know about this—Chinese, Japanese—I do not know. But I am just telling you what is in this report.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HÉBERT. I have in my hand, for the benefit of the Members of the House and for my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, a copy of this so-called Gesell report. In order that there may be no doubt in anybody's mind as to the authenticity of what the

gentleman from South Carolina is now referring to, I want to read this shocking statement from the report in connection with the advancement of officers in the military in line with what the gentleman has just said. I read from the report:

It should be made clear that officers, for showing initiative and achievement in this area—

And I put in parenthesis to explain in this area means the area of integrating local communities—

will enhance their performance ratings and obtain favorable consideration for promotion and career advancement.

Those are the words of the report, subscribed to by the President in his order to the Secretary of Defense and implemented in the order of the Secretary of Defense to the military—a most shocking and damnable procedure.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. And what else did they do? Anything short of this—now listen to this—anything short of this will automatically identify this commander as uncooperative under the equal opportunity directive. But beyond this is the responsibility imposed on the military commander by the directive.

Under the directive every commander has a responsibility to oppose discriminatory practices affecting men and their dependents and to foster equal opportunity for them not only in areas under his immediate command. We understand this. This is a fact and we all know it. It should be like this. But, also, in nearby communities where they live or gather in off-duty hours.

Mr. Speaker, if the commander has authority and does not carry out these directives, he is as dead as a mackerel. This is what this says in mind and body and estate, as they say in the church of which I am a communicant about as much as most of you are. This is the way it will be done. They are dead under this directive. I ask you this question: If we live by this and the directives emanating from it what good is West Point, what good is Annapolis, what good is the Air Force Academy, what good is the science of warfare, combat efficiency, combat readiness, which are all subordinates to sociological change as long as you wear the uniform of this country? How can a man save this homeland under such a program as we are witnessing here? Never in my 23 years as a Member of this body have I seen anything even approximating this and its impact upon the future of military commanders. This is a scythe held over the head of every community, the everlasting sword of Damocles over its economic future and its survival. This is in addition to all of this, other because elsewhere in this report it says that as a last resort we will close up any military installation, and I do not know what else they will do. Maybe they will tie a key on a jackrabbit and give him a swift kick. I do not know. The implications are clear that it will be the responsibility of the commander to force social integration upon the members of his command, notwithstanding their own heritage, notwith-

standing their own background, notwithstanding the mores and the customs of the community in which they reside.

Mr. Speaker, if a battalion commander gives a dinner party and fails to invite one of his officers who happens not to be white, obviously this will be reflected in his fitness report because he has not fostered integration. The base commander will be remiss in his duty if he does not bring this to the attention of his commander.

Mr. Speaker, the effects of this directive are as dangerous to the combat efficiency of our Armed Forces as any action that has been taken by a nation unfriendly to this country. There are large segments of the American population who still believe in personal freedom who will refuse to become a part of an organization in which forced social integration will become a part and parcel of their way of life. The directive means only those who are willing to accept integration completely and without reservation as a way of life will henceforth be able to make a career of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, recruiting results will, of course, reflect the effect on enlisted personnel and applications for a commission from among officers will undoubtedly show a marked decline after the directive fully becomes implemented.

To this, Mr. Speaker, add the unsailable argument that for the first time in the history of this Nation a base commander has been ordered by higher authority to directly involve himself in local affairs to the extent of requesting the use of off-base limit sanctions against persons off of the base who refuse to submit to commingling of the races. The base commander will not only have an economic weapon but he will be unable to remain aloof from the local governmental affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the directive places in the hands of the military a power that has already been considered unacceptable to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, this is the beginning of the police state and the commissar program in America, the United States of America.

The Department of Defense is under the overall control of the Secretary of Defense and the directive of the Secretary of Defense supercedes the position of any individual department commander. It would appear reasonable to raise the question as to whether each of the military departments completely endorses the directive issued by the Secretary of Defense. I will tell you now they did not do it. They did not wait until we took action on the MacGregor bill. We have not passed the MacGregor bill as yet.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the distinguished minority leader of the House and the ranking minority members of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. ARENDS. In view of what the gentleman has stated and recognizing this to be an Executive order which the Secretary of Defense will carry out, does

the gentleman have any information as to the attitude of the Secretary of Defense on this particular Executive order?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We met with the Secretary of Defense. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], and myself met with the Secretary of Defense. I believe that was the group.

We cautioned him not to let this report warp his judgment; that this report was a biased one. I know the membership. I can tell you where it comes from, every single one of them. We asked him not to submit to it. He constantly told us his prime mission was the combat readiness of his forces and he regarded this as his prime responsibility. He listened to us and took down a lot of notes. Does that answer the question? A directive was issued.

May I also state that my chairman joins with us in the request that this is not the time. At least, let the Congress of the United States speak, that we do not put the military up to its neck in politics on every military post in the United States.

This does not affect me. My town of Charleston is a thousand years ahead of most of your districts. We have been living next door to colored people in my community for a 100 years, as well as my people before me. So it does not worry me. I am not worried about it. We have a golf course. We have our libraries. We have everything on earth. I represent 300,000 colored people, and they vote. I do not have any problem. I never had it so good. Can you say that? But I can tell you what is going to happen to all of you. It is wrong. We do not have to do this. This thing is unconstitutional, it is not the law of the land. If you pass the law to put in public accommodations at least we will have debate. This has been written by people who do not even go 30 feet from Washington to write it.

Legislation dealing with public accommodations is now pending. It would appear a permanent question should be asked, whether any military department has recommended this. They have not done so.

No person serving with the armed services should be deprived of promotion because of race, color or religion. I repeat that: No person in the Armed Forces should be deprived of promotion because of race, color or religion, and I will defend with my life their right to such consideration. At the same time, no person should be given preferential rights because of his race, his color or his religion.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. After setting up what may well be described, I am sure, from reading the entire report backward and forward, after setting up what will become a commissar on each base, an offi-

cer to hear complaints, the report reads as follows:

All personnel, officers and enlisted men should be free to contact the officer designated to receive complaints at any time without the consent, knowledge or approval in the chain of command.

Gone is the day when the private is required to go to his top sergeant in order to get to the company commander.

Gone is that day. Continuing to read from the report:

Communications between servicemen and this commissar should be privileged and service regulations should prohibit the disclosure of such communications, or the identity of the complainant without the serviceman's consent.

This will create, if put into effect, the biggest army of snoopers and informers that the military has ever heard of. This is an outrage.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. It could be the beginning of SS troops in America.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, God forbid that we have an OGPU or an SS in our military. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina. I have serious doubts about the military or the legal qualifications of this study committee, and I have serious doubts about its implementation as a function of the armed services.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. In this report they recommend seminars and schools better to equip these commanders to carry out the sociological directives. It would be interesting to know if any department recommended this. I can tell you that they have not so far as I have been able to find out.

I am going to finish and let somebody else talk. This is your country as well as mine. You still have time to do something. You are making history and so am I.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I wanted to inquire if that report is available or, if not, if it would be put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. If it is not available to you, it is available to you in my office.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Thank you.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. And I will send it to your office and you can read it. If you will read it, as I am sure you will, you will agree with me. It is a report prepared by highly prejudiced people which was submitted to the President and transmitted to the Secretary, which has been used as the basis for a directive issued by the Secretary of Defense which will, without question, adversely affect the ability of our Armed Forces to carry out their primary mission. Many officers in our Armed Forces

will become social reformers by directive. Percentage distribution will take the place of competence for the purposes of promotion. The responsibilities that are commensurate with rank will lead to the placement of individuals in decision-making areas who do not have the competence to make these important decisions. The net effect of the report and the directive is a gain for those who insist upon forced integration of the races and a very serious loss to the combat efficiency of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this ends my lesson. I ask permission to place in the RECORD at this point a statement by the distinguished Representative from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it will soon be mid-August. Few Congresses have enacted less legislation than this one. At this time of year we should be ready to adjourn. Now, it may not be all to the bad that we have enacted so little legislation. No legislation is better than bad legislation. The civil rights legislation which has been proposed is bad in every sense of the word. And as a result Congress is spinning its wheels instead of accomplishing things that are needed. Much more harm has been done in the name of civil rights through legislation and court orders than can possibly be accomplished for good. Certainly the proposed civil rights measures will not solve the problems between the races. The Russian technique has long been to create problems and then to gain concessions in the solutions of these problems. I am sure some racial demonstrations were promoted in this country to create trouble and to involve the participation of the U.S. Government. They have left bitterness instead of good; chaos instead of solution. Administration force should never be used to bail out those responsible.

Many outstanding lawyers have said the proposed civil rights bills are unconstitutional. I do not think much comfort can be taken from these statements. In my opinion they would be upheld in the U.S. Supreme Court regardless of constitutionality. These bills should not under any circumstances become law. If they are enacted, that part of the Constitution which has been left us by the Supreme Court would largely be destroyed. As I read the bills, they would completely set aside the guarantee of individual rights that are contained in the Constitution.

In recent weeks, a new problem has been tossed in our laps. A report released by the Gesell Committee has in substance recommended that the defense functions of the military forces be subordinated to achieving the goal of complete integration. In a set of findings that are wholly unbelievable, there are

recommendations that promotion of officers be based upon the effectiveness they demonstrate in bringing about integration; that military bases be removed from segregated areas; that base commanders be instructed to list as "off limits" to military personnel the business facilities which practice segregation.

Can it be that men sufficiently deserving of recognition to be named by the President of the United States to a committee are so completely blind on the problem of America's defense? Are they so naive that they consider military bases are located to satisfy prejudice or to keep racial problems quiescent or for any reason other than for the defense of the United States?

Military bases are located according to the desirability of training conditions or because of the necessity of locating defenses at strategic locations. The cost alone of relocating bases would run into billions.

Equally without merit are attempts to force integration on off-base business establishments through threats of off-limit designation. Off-limit designations were intended to apply only in those cases where health and moral conditions are considered substandard. Any departure from this precept would, in my opinion, be unlawful. To require that a base commander spend his time chasing will-o'-the-wisp complaints about the business houses of his area would completely destroy his usefulness as a military leader. I respectfully suggest to the Gesell Committee, integration is one thing, defense is another.

To attempt to determine an officer's capability for promotion on the basis of his effectiveness in promoting integration would in like manner destroy that officer's usefulness as a military leader.

No longer would bravery, honor, and ability count. To get ahead in the service, an officer would have to become a snooping, groveling, commissar type, taking particular pains not to offend anyone who might complain he was being discriminated against on the basis of color.

These suggestions are an insult to the intelligence of the people of the United States and a disservice to the administration.

They would limit the effectiveness and lower the morale of the personnel of the Armed Forces.

This is the kind of thing that destroys confidence in the administration and in the American system at a time when Americans need so very much to find a way to stand together. The Gesell committee should have the good grace to resign in a body for having made such a colossal blunder. Failing to do this, they should be fired outright by the administration.

Now, I realize this is not going to happen. I realize it is going to be up to the Congress to attempt to bring order out of this unwarranted and unneeded situation.

In this connection, I am constrained to remind you of the unique and responsible place occupied by Southern leaders

in Congress. They are the very same leaders who are making a last-ditch fight to prevent the passage of unconstitutional and unwarranted civil rights legislation, and are in the main, the men who are depended on to bring about the passage of the essential programs of Government. By virtue of competence, influence, and seniority, they are the key men who dominate most of the Nation's legislation. It is to their great credit that these patriotic Members of the highest deliberative body, support the Constitution and help to preserve the Nation's governmental process. If they chose to do so, they could create havoc with the programs in Congress and block much essential legislation.

We have a problem at home serious enough to obscure most happenings abroad. And I fear we are in danger of losing the image of freedom at home which we are seeking to establish for people abroad. Here in America, race has been set against race by glory seekers or vote seekers who are attempting to bring about through riots and unwanted and unneeded legislation what can only be accomplished through voluntary cooperation. In this crisis, which I trust may now be abating, there has been a void of responsible leadership. I hope and I pray that in the days ahead America will not be swayed by hysterical demands for "everything now," and instead that the moral energy of our leaders will be used to require calm and logical consideration of what is right and what is needed. America needs most of all right now a season of understanding and an acceptance of responsibility at all levels.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman yields the floor, he mentioned during his remarks that he could identify each of the persons on this so-called advisory committee. I think it might be well if he would inform the House who these people are and what he knows about them in order that we may evaluate them.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Since I come from the no man's political land of the United States, I had better not refer to these people and who they are. I will give you their names, and you can look them up, too.

Nathaniel S. Colley comes from California. Abe Fortas. You have heard of Abe Fortas. I think he practices law with Paul Porter. I do not know, but I believe he is around here in Washington. Gerhard A. Gesell is the chairman. Louis J. Hector, Benjamin Muse, John H. Sengstacke. I think he was born in Savannah, Ga., sometime in the past. Whitney M. Young, Jr., and their counsel was Lawrence I. Hughes III. He was committee counsel.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a point of clarification?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman as much time as he desires.

Mr. HEBERT. No; I shall ask that later. But I want to clarify this question. While the name of Gerhard A.

Gesell is carried as Chairman he was, in fact, a protocol chairman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. He did not write the report.

Mr. HEBERT. He did not write the report. The report was written by Nathaniel S. Colley who was a graduate of Tuskegee Institute of Alabama and a graduate of the Yale Law School, and I understand is an official of the NAACP and now resides in California.

Also I think it important for the House to know that the people who did the visiting to the camps in a sort of a fly-by-night way were headed by Mr. Colley. Very little time was spent in the camps in America. Many of these recommendations are the result of information gained from tours in Okinawa and in Japan. But in the ultimate the committee was controlled by the author of this document. In fairness to Mr. Gesell, and I say very unwisely, his name was loaned to it. I do not know what part he had in the committee activities.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER] for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and of the country. Our Military Establishment is for the national defense of our country and not for the purpose of social, political, or philosophical reform. If Secretary McNamara carries out the program of this report now under discussion he will be bringing to our Nation a modern-day inquisition. I understand that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] has introduced a resolution for the investigation of this report, its formulation, and its appropriateness. I sincerely hope that the Rules Committee will grant this request and that the matter can be deliberately and properly investigated at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina and associate myself with the remarks he has made.

It is traditional in America that our Armed Forces remain absolutely free of politics. Our Nation's basic defense depends upon it; this premise is vital to our security.

When our men in uniform are forced to enter politics, when the troops of this country are used for anything but defense, we are getting onto dangerous ground.

Someone in authority in the executive branch of our Government has got to realize that force is not the answer to the racial problem. Economic reprisals will not solve this situation.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina for giving us the benefit of his views on this shocking and almost unbelievable report. I would like to ask the gentleman two questions. What can the Committee on Armed Services do about this; and second, what can the House of Representatives do about it?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I do not know. I know what RIVERS is going to do, as long as one end of my tongue is loose.

Mr. HOEVEN. Can the gentleman answer my questions?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I cannot answer them.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONER. Would the gentleman object if I attempted to answer the question which has just been propounded to him?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Positively not. I would be delighted to have some assistance. I always need help.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I think if the gentleman had been following the sequence of events with regard to this report he would have been alerted, some 3 weeks ago at least, to what had been going on, because on July 12 I mailed out a newsletter, which I normally mail to the people residing in my district, on this particular case. Sensing the seriousness of the implications of this Gesell report I mailed not only to the people residing in my district in Louisiana, but to the President, the Secretary of Defense, his secretaries, and the various departments as well as to each Member of the Senate and each Member of the House of Representatives that newsletter pointing out the difficulties and the problems created by the possible implementation of this Gesell report.

Some time later, after its implementation, I mailed a letter back again to all of my colleagues, telling them what I had done and asking them to join with me in bringing pressure to bear on the President and on the Secretary of Defense, asking that this report and its authority be rescinded.

These special orders today are an effort on our part, a sincere effort on our part to create and to gain an understanding by the Members of the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, of the report, so that we might solidify our position and bring that pressure to bear by saying to the President and the Secretary of Defense that we will have no part of your using the military in this fashion. And if this House of Representatives so desires it can do exactly that.

Mr. HOEVEN. I would very much like to have a reply to my two questions. Is there anyone present from the committee? I do not see the chairman of the Armed Services Committee present. Certainly someone from the Armed Services Committee can speak for the committee. What do they intend to do about it? I think the Members of the

House of Representatives are enough interested that they want to do something about it, and we are looking for guidance.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I do not know anybody that could do something about an Executive order. I would like very much to do something about it. I would like to see it put to a secret vote.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. I am sure the gentleman is familiar with the principle of the separation of powers. This is not the first instance of Executive orders that have transgressed the proper legislative functions and prerogatives of the Congress. I remember that the Federal Housing Administrator, Mr. Weaver, in 1962, put an order into effect in connection with the Housing and Home Finance Agency. By the terms of this order federally financed assistance would be denied to citizens who bought or sold in violation of antidiscrimination regulations. This was done by the Executive deliberately, although it was well known that Congress had several times refused to so legislate. The Congress can rescind this Executive order by legislation right now. We ought to do this because while it is patently a violation of the constitutional enjoiner that legislation is for Congress, for the military to legislate in this fashion, I fear it will be a long day in Siberia before the U.S. Supreme Court as presently constituted so decrees. Furthermore, the damage will be largely done before an appeal would reach the High Court.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Nobody ever took a military man and put him in a community and told him to put a decal or a placard up and say, "If you don't subscribe to this, you are off limits." This has never happened in America since Washington knelt at Valley Forge.

Mr. WYMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina just told the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDT] that the Secretary of Defense thought it was his prime responsibility to have a military establishment that would operate effectively. The gentleman from South Carolina also said it was his opinion that this report, if implemented, would undermine and destroy the Military Establishment. Did the Secretary take that position?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The Secretary said his primary responsibility was combat effectiveness.

Mr. WYMAN. Is it not the contention of the gentleman that this report if implemented would destroy that combat effectiveness?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. So fast it would make your head swim.

Mr. WYMAN. I would like to say I agree with the gentleman. I would say, further, that for the life of me I cannot understand what appears to be a deliberate and intentional scuttling of morale and efficiency in the Armed Forces in this way. It is clear from Mr. McNamara's letter to the President, announcing this policy, that he is doing so on

orders from the White House. Is it possible the President has such a stranglehold on his Cabinet that political considerations even in the armed services are now permitted to outweigh the defense and security of the United States? If this is the case, the American people should know it now—and the Congress should act to rescind this order.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], and to congratulate and commend him for bringing this report to the attention of the House of Representatives as he has so ably done today.

I think it would be appropriate for the RECORD to reflect at this point that present on the House floor today is as large a number of Members of this body as has been present at a special order in at least quite some time. I think that the presence of this large number of Members of the House of Representatives here today indicates the concern that the Members of the House have in connection with what the gentleman from South Carolina has been discussing. I think it also reflects the interest that the Members of this body have in expressing alarm and grave concern over the recommendations which are contained in this report.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that in my judgment if the recommendations contained in this report are implemented it would mean that the primary purpose for which the Department of Defense, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard are created and are in existence in this country today, would be subverted into making the entire Department of Defense a political entity whose primary purpose would cease to be maintaining the national security of the United States but would become secondary to implementing the political philosophy that is expressed in this report.

Mr. Speaker, may God forbid that the Defense Establishment and the Department of Defense of the United States of America will ever be swerved or turned from its primary purpose of defending the United States of America, its territories, and its people, and be used as dictators in other lands have used the armed forces of those countries, to destroy the rights of all the people of the country that it is supposed to protect.

The recommendation contained in this report would seem to have come more from a totalitarian group such as existed in Germany between 1933 and 1945 under the Government headed by one, Hitler, the head of the Nazi party, and contemporaneously the head of the German Government.

It would appear more likely to have come from a Communist totalitarian government whereby the Armed Forces of the Nation might be used to destroy rather than to protect individuals and citizens and the rights and liberties of its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, may God forbid any implementation of this report which

the gentleman from South Carolina has so ably brought to the attention of the House.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the views expressed by this great and patriotic American, the gentleman from South Carolina. He has today, as is his custom, stated his position frankly, clearly, and courageously.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting the stand taken by my distinguished friend, let me say that no matter the source of the motivation for the Executive directive authorizing the Military Establishment to engage in economic strangulation of American free enterprise in certain areas of the United States—by designating as "off limits" to servicemen certain establishments and even entire communities in which privately owned businesses see fit, fully within their legal and other rights, to exercise their own discretion as to whom they will accept as guests and serve as customers—the logical place for this dangerously absurd plan to be consigned is to the Pentagon's incinerators.

It is highly unlikely that Secretary McNamara, personally, was the author of this hardly believable brainstorm. And it is rather certain that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had nothing to do with the formulation of this incredible policy for making the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps—the guardians of our safety, the defenders of our security—instruments for forcing domestic social action to conform to politicians' whims.

It is obvious, of course, that the so-called Gesell report—which, as I interpret its recommendations, would virtually transform our armed services into forces for sociological and political pressure here at home—is the foundation on which the "off limits" directive was based. And it is a rather accurate assumption, I believe, that the Office of the Attorney General of the United States, and most likely Mr. Robert Kennedy himself, directly triggered this amazing action. If that assumption is indeed a fact, it is a tragic state of affairs of our country—that the formulation of the purposes and the direction of the missions of the Military Establishment would be coming from the Justice Department, and not from the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, this is, unquestionably, an extremely dangerous policy. And the authority of this particular directive, if it should ever be implemented, would be entirely foreign to the military function and the American system. This matter, along with the other phases of the Gesell report, is an attempt, in varying degrees of unwarranted encroachment, to prostitute our Armed Forces, to make them subservient to the uses of those who would, by fiat, force upon people compliance with their personal views on the issues and in the problems of so-called

civil rights. This is, Mr. Speaker, a radical attempt to take over our Defense Establishment; and, in the national interest, it must not be allowed to proceed. Upon sober reflection the Secretary of Defense must surely recognize that it is his duty to rescind this unjustified and unjustifiable order and, then, promptly to act accordingly.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina for the courage, vision, and foresight that he is showing here this afternoon in bringing to the attention of the House of Representatives this very serious threat that is presented by the so-called Gesell report. We in America have over the past 180 years been witnessing a great experiment—an experiment in democracy. Over the centuries we have seen similar types of experiments fail in other parts of the world as efforts have been made to assure that the people have a voice in their government and that their government be not run by executive fiat or by dictation from authority concentrated in a single source. One of the greatest safeguards in our system, and one of the reasons it has survived—one of the major reasons it has continued to exist is the fact that we have assiduously and jealously maintained a separation between the civilian aspects of our Government and the military aspects. We have over the years indoctrinated in our military forces and in the leaders of our military forces the principle that they must not become involved in the political aspects of American life.

It seems to me, the greatest threat that is presented today by this Gesell report and any proposed implementation of that report is the intention and the effort that is being made through that report to bring our military leaders and our military forces into the political arena. If this is allowed to continue, and unless this great body, the Congress, rises and makes known its desires, then this system of ours, the American system of Government, is not going to continue. Fail to act now against this report and we make a major contribution to the death of the democracy that we love so dearly.

Mr. Speaker, again I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for the great contribution that he is making here today.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, at least there are some of us here in this Chamber today who believe that we have reached a rather tragic point in our national history when we feel the necessity of asking for the time to express our opinions, collectively and individually, as to what is about to happen to those responsible for our military posture.

Mr. Speaker, I want to personally commend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], as the ranking majority member on the House Armed Services Committee, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], as well as some of the other gentlemen who have spoken, for the initiative demonstrated in bringing this matter to the attention of the Members of the House. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what motivated the President's request early in June to call for this study which produced the so-called Gesell report. It is the first so-called significant, if you want to define it as that, study that has been made now in some 16 years of the alleged problem of our armed forces at our respective military installations in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I have the great honor and I believe the great distinction of having in my congressional district perhaps the largest military installation in the land. It is the home of the airborne service and the home of the Strategic Army Corps, consisting of some 100,000 personnel, with their dependents and with the civilian personnel.

Mr. Speaker, Fort Bragg was built in 1918. It has been the right arm of the Army for that many years. Over those years the commanders at that base and all of the personnel and their dependents have enjoyed the finest spirit of cooperation and understanding with the people of the community of the city of Federal, N.C.

I have grave fear, Mr. Speaker, that if this report is implemented to the extent and as aggressively as I understand it is to be done, then I can see nothing but dissension, strife, and misunderstanding. I trust that the Members of this House will have an opportunity to read this report. It goes further than anything I have ever known to happen in our Armed Forces. It suggests the social attitudes, if you please, Mr. Speaker, on the part of the young ladies who are invited to participate in the social affairs at the various bases. It even, Mr. Speaker, goes further than that, when the commander of the base is told in no uncertain terms that his promotion, his opportunity for advancement, will be oriented or attuned to his initiative and ability to initiate and effectively carry out the suggestions of this report. It goes, Mr. Speaker, further than that, when you go into a community and put the swastika, if you will, the decal, in the window by the military, if you please, and say by that decal or that placard in the window, "You do not cross these doors, you are off limits."

Now, Mr. Speaker, why have the civil rights bill? I believe, Mr. Speaker, there may be segregationists in the membership of this great House, and there are moderates, but there are few if any races of which we cannot be proud. However, I think, sir, that the implementation of this order will cause the hearts and minds of a lot of people in the Southland to be hardened by just such an action as projected by this report.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, why consider the six- or seven-pronged civil rights bill? Why consider the public accommodations section, if by an Executive order the President of the United

States can outlaw alleged discrimination or segregation in those areas of public accommodations?

I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, of Executive Order No. 11114 that was handed down by the Executive on June 22 at about 2 o'clock of that date this year after a conference with the Negro leaders of this country, in which that Executive order of the President of the United States did exactly what is proposed to be done by titles 6 and 7 of the so-called Civil Rights Act. If you do not believe that is so look in the Federal Register of June 25 and you will find Executive Order No. 11114 which was promulgated on the Saturday preceding that. Read the language of that, then read sections 6 and 7 of the so-called Civil Rights Act.

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

Mr. LENNON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. I wonder if the gentleman realizes the language of that Executive order makes it mandatory upon the elected officials of a State receiving Federal funds to enforce the so-called nondiscriminatory clause?

Mr. LENNON. Yes.

Mr. HÉBERT. I am sure the gentleman realizes that this is another implementation of the Public Accommodations Act. Again, keeping in mind what has been done, we have the spectacle of brothers, our own friends, our own neighbors, serving their country in the National Guard, serving under the orders of their Executive, their Commander-in-Chief, the Governor, in enforcing the orders of a State one day and by the flip of a pen under federalization serving under orders from the other side, serving on one side one day and on the other the next day. I am sure the gentleman realizes that makes the Governor of a State or any elected official become the Department of Justice enforcer in that particular State, contrary to his will, contrary to his ideas, in substance saying "If you want it you have to pay for it." Prostitution in Government, I call it.

Mr. LENNON. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

If you will read the implementation of that Executive order I referred to, which I believe is found in the Federal Register of July 23, that exact language appears.

I shall not take any more of the gentleman's time except to express the hope again that those of you who believe in the military power of this country, and who want to keep it that way, should read this report, then express your opinion.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. In July I read in Mr. DeCourcy's weekly review, which comes out of London, an item that disturbs me very much. But I could not see how it would be possible. I want to read to you what he related as to an individual who was talking with Mr. Khrushchev, one who related this as having been told to

Mr. Khrushchev. This individual made the suggestion to Mr. Khrushchev that Russia should be less impressed by America, that there were a sufficient number of key men who were now placed in America to stop President Kennedy from any drastic moves. It was not more than a week to 10 days later when Mr. Khrushchev then changed and said he was willing to accept the treaty for a test ban. I have no authenticity or background for this statement other than Mr. DeCourcy's review, but the more I see of the directives coming out and the more I see of what is going on in Washington, and when I think of Cuba and what is happening within 90 miles of our shore, I am not so sure but what Mr. DeCourcy's statement was a warning to us.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks following those of Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina?

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in the recent past, civil confusion in key cities has served as an excuse for our Chief Executive to order Federal troops into a given State in order to implement Federal court orders. Although there have been spokesmen who raised questions regarding the constitutionality of military enforcement of court orders without State requests, most Americans, because of the critical issue involved—civil rights—were reluctant to criticize this action at the risk of being branded as "segregationists."

Today, our Nation is confronted with a different and, in my opinion, much more serious action by the Federal Government. Again the issue involved is packed with emotion and tends to obscure a basic question. On July 26, 1963, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara issued a directive to all branches of the Armed Forces which was designed to implement the recommendations of President Kennedy's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces. Examination of this report and the ensuing directive is shocking. The recommendations made in the report and in the directive indicate a narrowness of vision which, in seeing only the civil rights issue, has blinded itself to the question of whether it is proper to use the Armed Forces to enforce a moral or social, rather than a legal, issue in the civilian sector.

After citing instances of discrimination in communities adjacent to Armed Forces installations, the President's Committee asserted that a base "commander's performance must be rated, monitored, and supported" on how effectively he pressures nearby communities into acquiescence with the President's political position on questions involving integration. Is this government by law, or man?

The report goes on to state:

It should be made clear that officers showing initiative in achievement in this area (elimination of discrimination) will enhance their performance ratings and obtain favor-

able consideration for promotion and career advancement.

The directive seeks to implement this in a direct manner. It states:

Every military commander has the responsibility to oppose discriminatory practice, * * * not only in areas under his immediate (and legal) control, but also in nearby communities.

The important question raised by this directive is twofold: The commander is subjected to judgment and appraisal on political issues, and by requiring the base commander to implement moral and social values in an area outside of his specific realm of action, the Defense Department has, in effect, demanded that he lead a crusade which may conflict with his own beliefs, and outside his legal area.

Even more important, is the fact that military commanders are told to enforce a political position which has no legal basis. There is no law at this time which requires that all public accommodations be open to all persons regardless of race, creed, or color. In fact, the Congress is now considering adoption of such legislation. If it were already the law of the land, what would be the need for submitting such legislation to the Congress? Why indeed, if it can be done by civilian order or Executive decree?

Military commanders thus are being ordered to assist in carrying out a law which has not yet been adopted. Or to put it another way, they are being ordered to take action which could be the basis for a lawsuit, against them personally, for issuing orders which result in damages and loss of business. Technically, the commander who issues an off limits directive is responsible for his orders, and he, not President Kennedy, is the one who might be required to pay damages in the event of a court suit.

Aside from this question of personal liability, the directive of the Defense Department severely threatens the role of State and local authorities in dealing with problems at the local level. This is serious for many reasons, not the least of which is the fact that many local communities are now negotiating solutions to these very difficult and emotional problems. One has to look only to Atlanta and Memphis to see leaders of both races cooperating to solve problems in a reasonable manner.

The report states:

The pattern the community chooses to follow as to its own civilians cannot be accepted as the pattern which must be imposed upon men in uniform or their dependents, when that pattern is detrimental to military morale and efficiency.

Must we now forsake due process of law and traditional separation of the military and civilian authority?

The report looks critically upon the use of the courts as a method of correcting abuses in the field of civil rights. The committee almost contemptuously reports that "even in cases in which such litigation offers some hope of eventual success, it is piecemeal and time-consuming at best," seeming to suggest that a quicker and more efficient way of dispensing justice can be found. Is the Federal Government actually encouraging

"vigilante" operations in reverse? Such a method was suggested by the committee, and provision has been made in the Defense Department directive for its implementation. The committee recommends and the directive provides for what is more commonly known as extortion. The report states that "the commander should develop a plan under which military personnel of all races would be permitted to patronize only those facilities which receive his express approval."

The report seemingly admits that such judgment by the base commander is but a foot in the door of controlling the economic life of the community. It says:

One of the requirements for such approval should be a guarantee from the proprietor that the establishment will be open to all servicemen.

Aside from the question of the legal rights of the individual business concern, what about the legal rights of the individual soldier to patronize any firm he desires? Certainly the individual soldier, if he so desires, has the right not to patronize any business firm if its policies regarding integration, segregation or any other issue, do not confirm to his own. But must he acquiesce to the decision of someone else? Does any commander have the legal right to tell soldiers, even on his own command, whom they may or may not patronize so long as his health and safety are not involved? If he can issue such an order today, can he not issue one tomorrow which says that he must buy his groceries at the commissary, and is forbidden to shop at the local supermarket; or he must buy his gasoline on the base and is forbidden to purchase gasoline at a service station outside the base?

Do we now hold the philosophy that the end justifies the means?

Mr. Speaker I submit that the actions of the Defense Department are indefensible and should be serious concern to all Americans, whether Negro or white.

Lest my own position on civil rights be made an issue in these remarks, I would remind my colleagues that on a key vote yesterday, I supported an amendment to the Vocational Education Act which would have guaranteed civil rights to all those who participate in this program. I note that many on the other side of the aisle who speak so vociferously on this subject opposed this amendment. Their actions speak so loud that I cannot hear what they say.

I hope this administration, while seeking, belatedly, to meet the civil rights problem, will not abandon concepts of due process which have been part of our history and tradition since this Nation was founded.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield the gentleman all the time he wants.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I first want to congratulate my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I also want to congratulate my distin-

guished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER], who was the first Member of this House to become awakened to the viciousness of this report. He has detailed to you some very interesting things today which I think will bear comment. In addition to what he has told you about mailing to each Member of this House his evaluation of this report, he also mailed to every daily newspaper in the United States, every major wire service in the United States, every major broadcasting company in the United States his observations on this matter. It was not until the New Orleans States Item and the New Orleans Times Picayune, at my request, brought this matter to the attention of the public that I became knowledgeable of any reference to it being made in our news media. Even as of this moment when the Secretary of Defense issued his directive and sent his memorandum to the President, the news media have yet to mention what is contained in the report. They tell you that the order was issued; they tell you the Secretary of Defense sent a memorandum to the President; they give you a biography and a eulogy of Mr. Pitts, who is to become the chief commissar under these orders, but I have not seen discussed any place the contents of this report except that by Mr. David Lawrence, the articulate columnist of recent days, referred to the debate which took place in the other body and which was indulged in by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and the distinguished Senator from Arizona. Let me say this in that connection: The distinguished Senator from Arizona made the statement on the floor of the other body that the Defense Department had in its possession the income tax returns of individuals. A denial was quickly and heatedly issued from the Pentagon. Let me suggest now that I make this unequivocal statement here, that the Defense Department has in its possession right now dossiers, little black books, if you please, on leading citizens of the State of Mississippi, and I challenge them to deny it, because if they do, I will release the names and what has been said about them. I further say to you that the Defense Department has in its files economic reports on military bases in segregated areas and communities.

I further say this: That as to any statement I make here today, the same challenge goes to the Department of Defense. I do not make statements if I do not know what I am talking about and if I am not ready to document them. So if they want to challenge any statement I utter here today, let them challenge it, and I will confront them with the facts. There is no deadline on this challenge and I suggest that failure to accept this challenge and failure to call my hand indicates the authenticity of my remarks and charges.

I think it has come to a pretty sad state of affairs when we are on the brink or on the eve in America of waiting for the knock on the door after midnight. That is the next step. I say to you, gentlemen, that I speak with authority and knowledge because I have lived under dictatorship; I have lived under

the only American dictatorship known in history—I come from Louisiana, and I know what sanctions are, political sanctions; I know what threats are; I know that the policy of believing every man has his price, be it for good or evil, is very effective.

I said this was governmental prostitution, and that is exactly what I mean. I do not subscribe to the philosophy of selling my political body for Federal money or largesse. Until the day comes when the American public and the governments of our several States realize that this is nothing more nor less than a political soul for sale in order to get temporary grants of money—well, I have some words of Mr. McNamara that I am criticizing and so I will not go beyond that; but I am sure you get the comparison.

As you well know I am not given to reading speeches. Unfortunately, there are several quotes which I want to make and I want to be very accurate. For that reason I will ask you to indulge me while I read in order that I may be most accurate, because I have a fetish for accuracy. And I hope it will not take away from the full meaning of these words, my inadequate and limited way of reading them.

Mr. Speaker, operating a bawdy house and practicing segregation apparently are both vices that can bring about the off-limits sanction, according to the Secretary of Defense. A respectable business is compared to a bawdy house, or bistro, or other kinds of houses.

On July 24, 1963, in a memorandum to the President of the United States the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara said—and I quote him, and I urge you to weigh well his words, or the words for which he is responsible.

Certainly the damage to military effectiveness from off-base discrimination is not less than that caused by off-base vice as to which the off-limits sanction is quite customary.

There can be no mistake as to the meaning or the implication of those words. The Secretary went on to say that while he hoped such a sanction would never be put into effect, nevertheless such a sanction against segregation must be available.

Let me say this. If I could only disassociate myself from the issue of segregation or integration I would be happy, but unfortunately I was born in a State which can never disassociate any statements I make from that emotional issue. I am asking you to take my own word that I am not as concerned about integration and segregation as I am concerned about the paramount principle involved in what we are talking about today. Forget segregation, forget integration. It is the principle of using the military might and power of this country to enforce a political philosophy of an administration that is in power at the moment.

I say to you, look back several years ago; and again I say let us disassociate ourselves from integration or politics or the right or the left, and talk about individuals. I take the case of General Ted Walker. If General Walker did what he was accused of doing, he was wrong.

He should not have done it. He had no right to do it if he did these things, to urge his own political philosophy upon his troops. It cost him his military career.

What General Walker was cited for is being ordered to be done by this Executive order upon all military base commanders. It makes little difference whether you are to the right or left, a conservative or a liberal, it is just as wrong on one side as on the other.

I say this in an effort to draw the point of principle that I am talking about. These are the things we should concern ourselves about lest we lose the very Government we are trying to defend. Do not say it cannot happen here. Wake up. It is happening here. The battle for civil rights has thus reached a point where the power of the Armed Forces of the United States may be used against every person, no matter where situated, who adheres to the social structure which was a part of his heritage.

There was a time, not long ago, when the Secretary of Defense told me, and as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] has referred to, he told the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], that he had one function and one function only; namely, to be ready to fight the Nation's battles. But now the armed services will be used to bring about a change in our social environment with the threat of sanctions, intimidation, and even with the threat—hear me well; it is in the report—even with the threat of closing down military bases in segregated areas of this country. If you do not believe in segregation, you are not worth saving.

This report has now been implemented by the Secretary of Defense, as you know, the same Secretary of Defense who said his mission was to keep the combat readiness of the military at its highest peak.

The report says:

Should all other efforts fail, the services must consider a curtailment or termination of activities at certain military installations near communities where discrimination is particularly prevalent.

The Secretary of Defense did not reject this proposal. Instead, he said this in a letter to the President. These are again his words or the words for which he is responsible:

I do not regard this as a feasible action at this time.

At this time? 24 hours, 48 hours, 72 hours, a week, a month, a year. I may regard it as feasible. The time will come then that the bases will be closed.

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

Mr. HEBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. The gentleman just made reference to the fact that some of these actions, some of these words, might not be those of the Secretary of Defense himself, but that other speakers might be speaking for him and putting papers in front of him to sign. Is that what the gentleman believes is going on in the Department of Defense?

Mr. HEBERT. I will develop that to a great extent in just a few seconds.

I repeat, I participated in that discussion with the Secretary of Defense just a few days ago and at that conference which was held on Friday before this order was issued, I was certainly led to believe, and I am sure other members of the conference were led to believe, that such action would never be considered feasible by the Secretary.

It is apparent that what the Secretary says privately and what he says publicly are two different things. Now let him deny that.

Adam Yarmolinsky—remember that name, the special assistant to the Secretary of Defense, is the author of the new directive issued by the Secretary of Defense although the order is signed by the Secretary of Defense. I make that statement with no qualifications. Do not let anybody ask me to prove it, if they do not want to have a red face afterward.

Mr. Yarmolinsky has one objective in mind—with an almost sataniclike zeal—the forced integration of every facet of the American way of life, using the full power of the Department of Defense to bring about this change.

Mr. McNamara, understandably so—admirably so—accepts the responsibility for the directive but he cannot deny the fact that Mr. Yarmolinsky is the author, although Mr. McNamara did not go so far as Mr. Yarmolinsky would have liked.

The words are Mr. Yarmolinsky's, the signature is Mr. McNamara's.

Now, under the new director, a new policy for the Armed Forces has been established. All members of the Department of Defense are enjoined to remove segregation practices on every occasion and they are directed to foster equal opportunity for servicemen and their families on and off base.

Equal opportunities on and off base.

Now I presume this includes all forms of recreation, social activity.

How far this directive would go remains to be seen.

An officer or an enlisted man who has any desire to achieve a higher grade or rank would certainly be well advised to adhere to the directive that is now in effect. And if he does not, the directive goes further and says:

The military departments shall institute in each service a system for regularly reporting, monitoring, and measuring progress in achieving equal opportunity on and off base.

Now if servicemen and their dependents refuse to use a swimming pool that is integrated, they are obviously violating the new directive.

If they sat in a restaurant that refused admission to persons because of race, color or creed, they may be stopped by a military policeman on their return visit, when they may find the restaurant has been declared off limits.

If they belong to a golf club that discriminates against persons because of race, creed or color, they are undoubtedly in violation of the directive because they are not fostering equal opportunity for servicemen and their families on and off base.

Men and women of our armed services and their dependents will no longer be

given the freedom of choice as to how they will spend their off-duty time.

They no longer have the privilege of selecting their own friends.

Their lives will be regulated by a directive which will force them to integrate—or else.

There are no adequate words to describe the viciousness of this directive. Not only is it contrary to every concept that has kept our Armed Forces from participation in civilian affairs, but active participation in reshaping our social order in other parts of the United States is now directed.

The only thing the directive does not specifically contain is a requirement on the part of all commanders to instruct all persons in their command on how to vote. And yet, an ambitious commander might well interpret this directive as a mandate to participate in political activities, for it says:

Every military commander has the responsibility to oppose discriminatory practices affecting his men and their dependents and to foster equal opportunity for them, not only in areas under his immediate control, but also in nearby communities where they may live and gather in off-duty hours.

If a candidate for political office is opposed to integration, and the base commander has the responsibility to oppose discriminatory practices, obviously he also has the responsibility to oppose those who support segregation.

The effects of this directive, signed by the Secretary of Defense, will be as far reaching as any in the history of this Nation. For the first time, the Armed Forces are to be directly involved in local affairs. They are not only urged to remove discriminatory practices, but are required to actively oppose them.

There is not one word in the directive concerning the harmful effects upon the military effectiveness of the Nation as a result of the new directive. Men and women of our Armed Forces, 90 percent of whom are Caucasian, will henceforth be banned from utilizing segregated facilities, even though many members of our Armed Forces have been brought up in an environment in which separate but equal facilities are maintained for colored and white.

Henceforth under this directive, participation in off-base activities that are segregated may threaten their careers.

And a new gestapo has already been established in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, known as the Office of the Deputy Secretary of Defense to whom I referred a few minutes ago.

While the directive does not state that the career of every base commander may depend upon the manner in which he faithfully pursues the objectives of the directive, there can be little doubt that a base commander who does not take immediate steps to force social integration upon his entire command, has shortened his career in the Armed Forces. And there is no reason to believe that this policy will not go to every grade and rank on the base. This is the result of it.

Mr. Speaker, this directive I submit and suggest to the Members of this body is an insult to every man, woman and

child in this country. I suggest to you that it openly invites mob violence, though that seems to be the pattern of the day, with the approbation and God's blessings of some people.

Mr. Speaker, it is an insult to every member of the Armed Forces who felt that until now he belonged to an organization that existed for the sole purpose of providing for the security of the Nation. Instead, he now finds that he has become the political tool of a President, an Attorney General, or a Secretary of Defense, or whomever may be in that power.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House have indulged me long and I appreciate it. I am most grateful for your attention. There will be others who will discuss other matters here. But I have such a deep feeling and a deep sense of conviction about this that I just had to bring this to your attention. I had to alert you to it. At the proper time the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] I am sure, in following the rules of the House, will obtain permission to include the full text of this Gesell report in this discussion so that all Members may be able to read it. Because, I assure you, that you do not get the full impact of the feeling of nausea until you have read the words and seen them in black and white. This is a time when your blood does boil, when you find yourself asking the question as you read page after page and understand word after word, is this my country? Is this the country that I was born into? Is this a democratic process where we have ceased to become a government of law instead of men, but have become a government of men capricious for political power and political gain.

Mr. Speaker, I may be the last standing but I will be standing until the bitter end and I know I will not be standing alone.

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

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GRANT. I was prepared a few minutes ago to ask the gentleman where this thing came from. I thought, probably, it was from Sweden. But I notice that he stated it was written by a Tuskegee Institute graduate down in my State, but that he had been elsewhere to school since he finished at Tuskegee.

I want to say this, however. I doubt that he got these ideas down there.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman refers to segregation and integration but to get away from that I want to refer to page 59 of this report on equality of treatment and opportunity in the armed services where it is said:

It is not surprising, therefore, that the base commander without instructions, experience or technical support keeps in mind his emphasis solidly on the military aspect of his base.

The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Armed Services. I would like to ask him what other interests should a commander keep in mind?

Mr. HÉBERT. The responsibility and the duty of the commander is to sustain the morale and effectiveness of his troops

in every way, and with good community relations, not to disrupt community relations. His responsibility ends at the gate of the post. However, in this report, if you will read it, it says the base commander shall be informed as to his primary responsibility with local problems.

Mr. GRANT. Someone said a few minutes ago, I believe the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] stated that this is one of the largest crowds he had ever seen on the floor at a special order. I want to say if some of you had read this thing like I did—I got up about 5 o'clock this morning to read it—I believe every Member of the House would be here. This is something that transcends anything we have had to deal with in recent months, and I do not believe this Congress is going to let the Defense Department get away with such a thing.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see how anyone who is vitally interested in the defense of our Nation can sanction or approve the initial report of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunities in the Armed Forces. This so-called equal opportunity is a high-sounding phrase; however, a glance at the Gesell report will convince one that this is another treatise similar to the Gunnar Myrdal study.

The introduction to the Gesell report calls attention to the Executive order issued by President Truman in July of 1948, which order declared it to be the policy of the President that there should be equality of treatment and opportunity to all persons in the armed services, without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin. However, the report is silent as to what the press stated in reference to Mr. Truman's statement some months ago in which he is quoted as saying:

If anyone came into my store and tried to stop business, I would throw him out. The Negro should behave himself and show he is a good citizen. Commonsense and good will can solve this whole thing.

I am not talking about integration in the various defense establishments.

This is a fixed policy. What I am concerned with at the present time is the recommendation in this report that the Government declare an economic boycott upon the people of a given community and, may I say, who are trying to make a decent living—both white and colored.

Let us, for example, take the city of Montgomery, Ala. Here we have Maxwell Field, established many years ago, and the Air University. There has always been a wonderful cooperative spirit between the personnel of these establishments and the general public. Do you mean to tell me that just because a Negro airman is not served in a local business place, a white airman is to be deprived the privilege of entering a business where Negroes are not served? In other words, a club is being held over the heads of local business people with the threat of declaring their premises off limits unless they agree to violate the laws and customs of their city and State. This is preposterous; it is undemocratic; yes, it is un-American. What are we supposed to be fighting? Why are we spending bil-

lions—yes, hundreds of billions—of dollars? There is only one answer, and you know that it is to fight communism. Yet on the other hand, you would—by carrying out the recommendations of this Committee—be doing something that even Hitler never dared to do in his heyday.

Much is being said these days about so-called civil rights. Does this mean that a person in service surrenders all civil rights when he enters service? Read this report and read it carefully. Do you see anything in here to protect the rights of a white serviceman? I anticipate if such a ruling is carried out by the armed services, this matter will be carried to the Supreme Court and also to the last military court of appeal. Congress had better stop, look, and listen. It has about come to the point where an officer in the armed services dare not say anything about communism to the men under his command. Some have been reprimanded for just this. Yet they are now—if this report is carried out—designated as emissaries to carry out every phase of civil rights, even to the public in towns where military installations are established.

I am not arguing as to the right of the military command to place a section or entire city off limits where it is crime ridden, or for any other serious matter, but I do vehemently denounce this threat that would have the military assume any such dictatorial power over a given community.

Negroes enjoy serving at Maxwell Field. They are well treated in Montgomery. This report is an insult to the many good white and Negro citizens of Montgomery who have nice places of business. Yes; it is all right for the merchants and business people to be threatened and placed off limits, just so you do not say anything derogatory about communism. It is high time that Congress reassert itself, not only in this particular instance, but in many others. We have a duty and responsibility that far exceeds the mere voting of appropriations for the military. Do we want to create a military dictatorship? If so, we could be on the road to doing so.

Let us take a hard look at this report. It sets out that a procedure must be developed which will eliminate the fear of criticism and reprisal. Is only a Negro to be given this protection? Furthermore, an officer is to be designated at each base to receive complaints; this officer must have full access to the base commander or his deputy for the immediate purpose of discussion of any Negro's problem. In addition, this officer is to be chosen as one who will insure that he is sensitive to problems of discrimination, which will all be handled confidentially. In addition thereto—to keep this matter stirred up—it is suggested that all base personnel be repeatedly advised of the identity of the complaint officer. And listen to this: Anyone who forbids or in any way attempts to discourage the presentation of a complaint is subject to disciplinary action. It is also provided that day-to-day efforts will be made to discover examples of discrimination and to insure that none are overlooked, that there will

be periodic field visits from personnel of the Department of Defense who will give full time to the problem.

The report calls attention to the fact that at some bases forms of segregation are practiced and especially where there is more than one NCO or service club on the base in that the whites tend to go to one club and Negroes to the other. It recommends that where there are too few or no Negro girls on the base that they should be secured for the dances and the happy solution to the problem sets out that one of the most successful service clubs is at an Army base in the South operated by a very able Negro hostess who attracts local volunteer workers and servicemen of both races.

No one can help but be sympathetic toward any race that wishes to obtain proper housing; however, the recent Secretary of Defense's memorandum now providing that private housing leased by the services for assignment to military personnel may be obtained only where the lessor agrees that the services may assign it without discrimination, should be countermanded. It is working a hardship on white servicemen as well as landlords. I know of a case where a widow has as her only source of income a two-apartment house. She lives in one apartment and rents out the other to service families. It is unfair to ask her to sign an agreement to accept anyone the service might send there because she would be ostracized if she rented to a Negro family and the Negro family would be unhappy in the surroundings, so why punish this poor woman?

The report states:

No one has suggested to base commanders that their achievements in dealing with such problems will be considered in rating their performance of duty and in promotion selection.

Then later on, under the recommendations for an urgently needed program, the Committee recommends that a different concept of the base commander's functioning in the racial field must be evolved. Then as a threat it is further recommended, and I quote:

It should be made clear that officers showing initiative and achievement in this area will enhance their promotional and career advancement.

What have we come to? Is it a criterion for officer promotion to overlook the things that have heretofore been the basis for advancement or are all of these to be abandoned in this civil rights craze?

The report concludes that at both home and abroad the armed forces must be leaders rather than followers in establishing equal opportunity. So far so good, but listen to this last suggestion "to the extent they practice and preach equality without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin."

Does the establishment of equal opportunity justify some of the pictures that we see from foreign lands where Negro servicemen and white girls are dancing together? The right-thinking people in neither race want this.

Whether intended or not this report is one step further toward the recommendation of a mongrelized race.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I would like, of course, to commend my distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], and also my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER], who first brought this report to my attention and to the attention of the Congress and who first placed it before the American people. I want to thank my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT], and others. These gentlemen deserve the congratulations and gratitudes of all the people in the United States who cherish freedom.

May I say to the Speaker and to the House that today in my congressional district in South Carolina and that of my distinguished colleagues, the gentlemen from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE and Mr. HEMPHILL], there are being conducted the largest peacetime maneuvers of the Armed Forces of the United States in the history of this country. More than 100,000 men are engaged in this joint operation making every effort to prepare our Armed Forces for any emergency. Simulated battle conditions to prepare our men to defend our country in this hour of great crisis and international peril.

The people of my State have been requested to cooperate with the Armed Forces to maneuver in our area. I was one of the thousands of citizens who signed up so that our farmland could be used. The report I received this morning was to the effect that these maneuvers are a magnificent success. These stupendous peacetime maneuvers are moving forward with the cooperation not only of all the branches of the Armed Forces of this great Nation, but with the cooperation of every single policeman, every single magistrate, every single sheriff and deputy sheriff wearing the badge, and every State policeman. These local officials and officers are cooperating in these great military maneuvers to help prepare the defense of this great country.

Mr. Speaker, the cooperation of local government, State government, and the individual citizen is necessary to the Armed Forces in peace and in war. We must permit nothing which would jeopardize this mutual respect and understanding. This Gesell report if fully implemented would greatly impair the splendid public relations always existing between the civilian and the military. This report is a serious threat to the security of America and our leadership of the free world.

Policemen, sheriffs and State officials are standing on the firing line to preserve freedom—on the front line today against subversion and sabotage, cooperating with the Armed Forces of this great Nation and the FBI to defend our liberty and to save our heritage. This report here would jeopardize that splendid cooperation so paramount and so mani-

fest through the years between local government, State government, and the Armed Forces of the United States.

This report is one of the most dangerous and sinister threats to the freedom of this country in all our history. It will cause confusion and disrespect for the uniform. This report will encourage mob violence and disrespect for law and order. It will force the military to back mob rule. Oh, my friends, I wish I had time to detail for you accounts of the barrage of whisky bottles and beer cans lately being thrown at local peace officers wearing the uniform in practically every State in this Union. Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, it may be the sheriffs today in your State, it may be the local policeman in your State, but tomorrow it will be lead and beer bottles at the Armed Forces of the United States of America. We must maintain respect for those men who wear the uniform and give them the opportunity, as they have traditionally always done, to defend the United States of America in the best way they know how. Mr. Speaker, my plea to this House is to rise up and prevent this Gesell report from being forced on our distinguished officers and men of the Armed Forces. Such a report as this is as much of a threat to the security of our country as Castro and Cuba and even the Communists abroad. This is a dire threat from within.

So I want to commend my colleagues today for bringing to the attention of the House and to the attention of the people of this country this threat to our security and individual liberty in an age and a day and a time when we should be an example to the world of perfection in protecting the rights, liberties, and freedoms of all our people, local, State, and national. Mr. Speaker, this report will weaken our military and set the stage for dictatorship. The people are looking to Congress. We must stand up and be counted.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT] say that the author of the directive was Mr. Adam Yarmolinsky, and I should like to say that, if this is indeed the fact, I commend Mr. Yarmolinsky for the directive and also for the dedication which was attributed to him by the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I want to thank the gentleman, and if you had said anything else, I would have been surprised.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend and thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and the gentlemen from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER and Mr. HEBERT] for bringing this tragic report to the attention of the American people and of the Congress today. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina, Is there any doubt

in your mind but that this Committee, this report, these implementing orders are solely for political reasons?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That question suggests the answer. Yes. There is not any other reason.

Mr. ANDREWS. Has there been any time in the history of this country when the Army was used for political purposes?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. If there were an association known as the National Association for the Advancement of Indians, they would have a shoo-in in this country.

Mr. ANDREWS. I think the gentleman will agree with me when I say it is my opinion that this is the first time in the history of this country that our Armed Forces have been used solely for political purposes.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In order to make this record complete, I trust that the gentleman will put in the Record with his remarks the letter of transmittal of the Gesell report from the White House to the Secretary of Defense, and the directive that was issued by the Secretary of Defense. And I trust, if he is going to insert in the Record these communications, he will also include the letter from the President to Mr. Gerhard A. Gesell. If the gentleman will bear with me further I would like now to read the last paragraph of the President's letter to Gesell acknowledging receipt of and praising this wicked recommendation without a single exception. It reads as follows:

The timeliness of your report is, of course, obvious, and I hope you will convey to the other members of the Committee my appreciation for the constructive report that has been prepared. I am confident that the Committee will bring to its remaining tasks the same high degree of effort, competence and understanding that characterizes your initial report.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman think there is any politics in that letter?

Mr. GROSS. I would not be able to pass upon that, I will say to the gentleman. But I will say this, as I have said before, that after reading the report and reading it thoroughly, if the report and its recommendations are fully implemented, and apparently it is going to be made completely effective by the Secretary of Defense, if I were a base commander I would get my affairs in order and resign immediately. I would not want to be the commander of a single military base in the United States and be compelled to submit to this kind of a directive and the political dictatorship recommended in the Gesell report.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the thing that frightens me is the use being made of Government agencies to carry out a political philosophy in this country. Now we find the Army being used as an agency for political purposes.

Recently the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of this House made a statement here in Washington, according to the Associated Press:

Representative EMANUEL CELLER yesterday said he is keeping a "watchful eye" on Federal judges who delay decisions in civil rights cases.

I construe that to be a threat to every district judge in America; that is, if you do not act quickly in these integration cases that watchful eye may have you before the Judiciary Committee for action.

Last week in New Orleans a member of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals made a statement to the effect that the chief judge of that fifth circuit was rigging panels—imagine—rigging panels of that court in an effort to get favorable decisions in integration cases. And on Monday of this week I introduced a resolution calling on this Congress to investigate those serious charges made by Judge Cameron about the chief judge of this court of appeals.

So I am frightened, Mr. Speaker, when I think about the extent to which this administration is going in an effort to carry out its political promises of integration. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina if this committee report recommends a spy system to be called a monitor, with an especially sympathetic monitor through the range of troop levels in order to check on commanders as to how they carry out this function.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The answer to that is yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is there any precedent in America for such a spy system in the armed services?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I do not know. I have never heard of one. I have never heard of anything like that since I have been in Congress.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is it not true that the Communists have such a spy system and have had it since the beginning of the Russian Revolution in 1917?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. There are some other Members of this body more informed on communism than I am.

Mr. ANDREWS. I can tell you from what I have read and according to my best information, there is such a spy system and it is directed by a man known as the political commissar, whose business it is to watch all military commanders and to report to another agency on the manner of the performance of that duty.

Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion, if this committee report is implemented, and certain implementing orders have been issued, if it is implemented, we are well on the way to dictatorship in this country. I certainly hope that the Armed Services Committee can come up with legislation that will keep these recommendations from becoming law.

Never has our Nation faced such a threat. Never have we been faced with such devastating implications. The President is playing with an ominous toy. He would make the military a political puppet controlled by strings pulled only by the Executive.

I hoped that my fears would be abated by the actual report. Surely, I thought, a group of military organizational experts would make the report and would politely show the President how he "had a good idea but that it just would not work."

But I was wrong, Mr. Speaker, I had not imagined that the investigation squad would be so carefully chosen as to assure the outcome of the report.

Three of the members of this Committee are Negroes and the other four are in some way connected with the ADA or the ADL or the NAACP. I do not have to remind you how these groups feel on this issue. Not a one appears to have a practical and objective approach to the subject of integration.

How could we expect the report of this Committee to be objective in any sense of the word?

We could not expect it and it was not. Many of the outstanding characteristics are not only outstanding but are outlandish. Let me mention a few.

The so-called Gesell report demands in the name of "equal opportunity" a higher percentage in Negro promotions. The report does not ask to base promotion on education, age, time in service, and the more fundamental consideration of merit; but rather the sole determiner would be a percentage.

It encourages and recommends the establishment of an agency whereby accusations of "discrimination" may be made by secret testimony without the person accused even being given the source of the accusation.

It recommends a "spy system" to be called monitoring with an especially sympathetic monitor throughout the range of troop levels in order to report on responsible commanders as to how they carry out their functions.

But in this instance the committee is not without precedents, as in other proposals, in their suggestion of a monitoring system. They have copied experts. A system which has proved its efficiency and effectiveness.

The Communist Soviets have just such a system and have had it since the beginning of the Russian Revolution 1917. It is directed by a man known as the "political commissar," whose business it is to watch all military commanders and to report to another agency on their manner of performance of duty.

The effrontery of this committee to propose such a departure from the system of integrity of such long standing in the military services is shocking and revolting.

Let me emphasize and point out to my colleagues so there will be no misunderstanding: this monitoring system is not a trinket for debate, but is being put into effect.

It will be implemented on the ides of this very month by Department of Defense Directive 5120.27. In this directive the Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to "monitor their"—members of the Armed Forces—"performance through periodic reports and visits to field installations."

This directive goes further to set up this system explicitly. "The military departments shall institute in each service

a system for regularly reporting, monitoring, and measuring progress in, achieving equal opportunity on and off base."

Where are we letting the times lead us? What direction are we taking when we allow the Executive to use the military to propagate its doctrines of social reform?

We do not have to look far for an answer. Our neighbors to the South should have taught us our lesson. Look at the price that many Latin American countries have had to pay for mixing the military with politics.

In this connection allow me to quote Senator STENNIS of Mississippi:

This may only be the beginning. If political activity is condoned in this field, the President someday may not be able to extricate the military from other political activity that could follow.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I will be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding.

This is an important discussion we are having here on the floor of the House. I am sure the gentleman from South Carolina realizes that several Members of the House have received telephone calls from the Department of Defense within the last 24 hours urging them to come to defense of the Gesell report. I think it is interesting to note that there has been a lack of defense for the broad scope of this report, even though the Department of Defense offered to do a little speech writing for proper planting with Members of the House.

As a Member of this House I have always supported civil rights legislation and will continue to press for solid progress in the field of human rights. Our Government certainly must act to help establish conditions of equal opportunity for all people and to help assure that no one is denied the requisite for a dignified life.

The important point for each of us to keep in mind is "equal opportunity"—equal opportunity for all citizens. The Gesell report goes beyond any civil rights proposal yet suggested and borders on the area of preferential treatment. I hope that the gentleman's committee will give some real consideration to this whole area.

I heard mentioned the name Adam Yarmolinsky. I have served on the Board of Advisers of the Air Force Academy, the Naval Academy, and the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. I have enjoyed this experience on these Military Academy boards. It was just 2 years ago that Adam Yarmolinsky made a recommendation to the Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel that the procedures for admittance to the service academies, particularly Annapolis, be changed so that the college board exams and the other required examinations for admittance to the Academy be set aside so that special exam-

inations could be given in order to afford preferential entrance treatment.

This recommendation went far beyond equal opportunity.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We call that a "fair" advantage.

Mr. LAIRD. Within the last month in my State of Wisconsin, the Department of Defense has gone beyond its scope and its responsibility in the awarding of Government contracts on a competitive bid basis. The clear intent of the Department was to bring about economic and sociological change through the abuse of its power to review and award contracts.

In this case, bids were put out by the Department of Defense. The low bidder happened to be a concern in Wisconsin. The award of the bid was delayed because in answer to a Department of Defense questionnaire, this corporation showed that they had no Negroes on their payroll. This kind of delay in awarding a bid to a low bidder is absolutely uncalled for. In the community involved, there could not be any Negroes on the payroll as there are none in the area, and if this were required by the Department of Defense, it would necessitate the importation of individuals to work in this community.

The fair employment clause, it seems to me, in defense contracts was established to provide that no discrimination occurred in the hiring of individuals. It certainly does not guarantee jobs to Negroes in communities where no Negroes reside, nor does it make the hiring of Negroes a prerequisite for obtaining a Government contract.

It seems to me, this whole operation of the Department of Defense in the economic and in sociological areas must be brought under close examination by the Committee on Armed Services. I believe the committee will be derelict in its duty if it does not investigate this matter thoroughly to see that all citizens are guaranteed equal opportunity—but let us not go beyond the assurance of equal opportunity and insist on preferential opportunity gained through the abuse of power by the Secretary of Defense and his Department.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I have to yield to my distinguished friend, in celebration of his return to the House—because we have missed you an awful lot.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly am grateful for the fact that the gentleman from South Carolina and the two gentlemen from Louisiana have brought to the attention of this body and to a common Congressman like me the facts that have been related from the well of the House here today.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I wish I were as common as you are.

Mr. FORRESTER. Thank you, sir—the gentleman is unduly modest.

Let me say this: You know I was not surprised; somehow, in some way, there is always some man or some set of men

who will reveal facts to the people in times of stress and danger. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I try to make a few comments here today, I want to say this to you: I do not know whether anyone is playing politics with questions affecting the future of America, but whoever does it, I want you to know he has my severe and my utter and my complete denunciation and contempt. As I stand here before this microphone—privileged to speak in this great House of Representatives of the United States, and particularly when I speak about the defense of America, I feel that I am standing on hallowed ground.

Mr. Speaker, I feel almost like taking off my shoes in the presence of the Lord God Almighty whom I believe looked down from the heavens and smiled upon the ambitions of those patriots of old who were all complete Americans, 100 percent Americans, and when at that time it was not unfashionable to be 100 percent right or unduly patriotic. In other words, I think that this country was given to us by God and I think that God and godly people are the ones who are going to preserve it.

There is no one, I do not believe, in this Chamber who recognizes any more keenly than I do that the President of the United States has a tremendous job. He has an overwhelming job. He has one in which the only way it can be carried out properly, I would think, would be under the guidance and leadership of our God, the God Jehovah, and he should if possible have the assistance, the respect, and the aid of every person in this country.

With that end in view, I do want to make a few remarks. I simply could not have believed the facts that I have heard related here today had they not been said here by members of the Armed Services Committee and by the production of the documents themselves, indicating that those things definitely are true.

Mr. Speaker, I could not help but think as I was hearing some of the comments made here, if they were going to impose upon the military duties not connected with the military and if they were going to be ordered by their superiors to inflict their personal opinion upon these boys—these beardless boys, these boys from every section of the country including mine, who are performing their duty in the military because they are American citizens, but sometimes a little bewildered because they do not quite understand just what we are trying to do, and if it has now become fashionable to inflict personal opinions upon those boys I now wonder if they would not want to apologize to General Walker.

Mr. Speaker, I think I am a constitutionalist. I hope I am. I believe in the Constitution. I agree with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] that if General Walker were trying to inflict his personal opinion upon the soldiers, I think he was wrong. But at the same time I do not lose sight of the fact that this gentleman who probably had an overdose of patriotism according to some people, personally I do not think you can. Sometimes I wonder just what would be the regard that some of the people would

have toward George Washington and Nathan Hale and so forth—but that is another story. But anyway, if he did commit some infraction of the rules of the military, I think we ought to be a little merciful with him because of the fact I cannot forget, despite every sentiment that he had, he was the commander of the troops down at Little Rock when we captured Little Rock. There was a U.S. general, no matter how distasteful it was, who performed the duties of the military.

Mr. Speaker, if it has now become fashionable, if what he introduced has now been found to be proper, then I think we acted in great haste and we ought to call back the general and tell him to come on back here, that we need him because we have work for him to do. I understand that these orders have been based upon that premise that segregation has undermined the morale of the U.S. Army.

Thank God, Mr. Speaker, I have a whole lot more regard for the U.S. Army and I just simply know that is not so. It did not hurt us in the Revolution, it did not hurt us in the War of 1812, it did not hurt us in World War I, and it has not hurt us in any war and it never will hurt us. But I will say this: If our Army has sunk to that low or if we have come to the point that segregation or integration has destroyed the morale of our Army, the military, we might as well call off the dogs, because it simply is not worth saving.

Mr. Speaker, we might as well get down to brass tacks on that, because that is the truth. I think when you consider this statement, with truth, that this kind of action is shattering to the morale of the military and particularly to those who are making the military a profession and who are going to really stand for you when the chips are down, this kind of argument, in my opinion, is about as insipid, about as unsound, and about as erroneous, as the same argument that they are going to cancel out all military installations in the South if we do not accept integration.

Well, now, you know I do not think we ought to compound error. A lot of people down my way, because we live close to Cuba—it is 90 miles from the coast of the United States—think we made a grievous mistake about Cuba, and one which may rise up to haunt us. I hope you will not compound it now because if you take away those military installations in the South which are our closest defense against Cuba I do not know how we will defend America. I do not believe the Congress of the United States is going to permit McDill Field, Turner Field, Robins Air Force Base, Fort Benning and others down there to be dismantled. I do not believe you are going to tolerate their being dismantled. That kind of argument, so far as I am concerned, is purely void of reason. It is not the kind of argument which appeals to reason.

Another thing, if the gentleman will indulge me, I am astounded over the argument that segregation is illegal. Segregation is not illegal per se. Segregation is only illegal when it infringes upon the 14th amendment and discriminates against creed or color. It does not

say you can deny every segregationist in that area all of his civil rights, and that is what an order of this kind would do.

In other words, referring to those boys down there in our section, it is pretty hard on them to be told they cannot associate with white people, that they cannot pick the people they want to associate with. By the way, I think they are going to have a hard time enforcing any such order as that. After all, white people have civil rights too.

My people are quite disturbed about a statement that was made by Mr. McNamara in his report. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] and myself read this with much dismay and with much sorrow because in his report he said that "damage to military effectiveness from offbase discrimination is not less than that caused by offbase vice."

My people are not prepared to accept that, and we do not believe it.

Of course, we have had fun poked at us. We have been called the Bible country. We appreciate that compliment because every time these boys who denounce us get scared and in serious trouble they come over and hop in bed with us. They believe in the Bible then.

We do not believe that segregation is in the same category as vice. We are sorry for anyone who does. We doubt the wisdom of such people.

We appreciate the military installations down South, and we think we are entitled to them because we have always made full contribution to the defense of America.

You know, Gen. Courtney Hodges was the first man to enter Germany in World War II. He happened to be from my district. I do not think anybody objected to him being the first man to go into Germany. I do not know that anyone objected to the fact that probably one of the greatest heroes in the Korean war was a little segregationist who lived in my district by the name of Luther Story. He weighed about 125 pounds, but he killed about 150 North Koreans before the North Koreans killed him.

We just do not believe that being a segregationist undermines character. We think it is a sad day in America when anyone would make such a statement.

Mr. Speaker, I know what it is to be discriminated against. We have been discriminated against many, many times.

Every southerner understands what it means. You know, my mother taught me if I could just understand that nobody owed me anything, I would be surprised how wonderful people are and how kind they are. You know, I was born white. My people participated in the American Revolution. I never went to college. Eighth grade is as far as I ever went, because there was nobody particularly interested in helping a white boy go to college. We might as well face that real fact. But, anyway, they gave me a blessing no other country in this world could give me. If I were a fourth-class citizen, I would get down on my knees and thank God every night for the privilege of being a fourth-class

citizen in this great country called America. A fourth-class citizen here has more privileges and rights than a first-class citizen in any other country on the face of this earth.

The people down South do not want to make the slightest contribution toward losing that. We are for our country and expect to support it with all our souls.

I thank you, sir, and I appreciate your indulgence.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the order of the Secretary of Defense and the accompanying letters and also to include the Gesell report.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I will be delighted to yield to the dean of my delegation, the distinguished chairman of the District Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate my colleagues, the gentleman from South Carolina, Congressman RIVERS; the gentlemen from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER and Mr. HÉBERT], on the forceful manner that they have called to the attention of the House the unreasonable and seemingly unwarranted directive recently issued by the Secretary of Defense. I doubt seriously if any directive issued by Mr. Khrushchev could vitally affect more people and have a more drastic effect on future generations than the directive under discussion today.

After reading the history of the authors of the report, which recommended to the Secretary of Defense to take this drastic action, I think the Congress and the Armed Services Committee should take a second look and stop all pending legislation until this matter can be called to the attention of all the people of the United States. This order or directive places the military in a political role, which, in my opinion, was never intended by our forefathers and the framers of the Constitution. This directive goes much further than the subject of integration and segregation, as it completely changes our military system by creating a spy system within the military.

No one within the sound of my voice could ever believe that we would be living in an era that directives of this magnitude could be issued by the Executive without the sanction of the lawmaking body of the United States. This directive will vitally affect the lives and promotions of all military officers in our Armed Forces to the extent that I am certain some of our finest officers will sooner or later refuse to serve under this type of dictatorship.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues for yielding to me a few minutes on this vital subject.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the gentleman from South Carolina would yield to me in order that I can report to the House that I have received the following telegram from Birmingham, Ala., of this date, addressed to me, which reads as follows:

Urgently request you speak out against the destructive Defense Department order July 26 on civil rights which threatens removal of military bases near segregated communities. This order gives military base commanders authority and encouragement to declare off limits to base personnel communities where segregation is practiced. All Alabama awaits your reply.

Signed John Grenier, chairman, Republican executive committee of Alabama.

This is my reply, Mr. Speaker, to Mr. Grenier, chairman of the Republican executive committee of Alabama:

Am pleased to know that you and the Republican State committee are willing to join me in protesting the Defense Department's directive for military installations. You will encourage me immensely if you would communicate with Mr. Halleck, Republican minority leader, and other staunch Republican integrationists in Congress and thus assist the Alabama delegation in thwarting the civil rights bill. With your effective assistance, certain Republican Senators could be prevented from insisting on civil rights legislation which so many other Republicans are supporting. We would be most pleased to have an outspoken statement from you as a Republican, to be distributed to the press, to the effect that you as a Republican and the Republican Party are opposed to civil rights legislation as we of the Alabama Democratic delegation have opposed it throughout the years. Further, I would appreciate your informing me as to how many Republican Members of the House you have contacted by telegram and how many of these Republicans have replied and indicated how they will vote on the civil rights legislation which the Republican Party is supporting to the extent of its ability.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted, I include at this point the order of the Secretary of Defense and the accompanying letters:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE NEWS RELEASE, JULY 26, 1963

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, as requested on June 21, 1963, has reported to the President following his review of the recommendations of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces.

In his memorandum, Secretary McNamara states that he has issued a directive stating Department of Defense policy with respect to off-base discrimination.

Copies of both the Secretary of Defense Memorandum to the President dated July 24, 1963, and the directive referred to in this memorandum are attached.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., July 24, 1963.

Memorandum for the President.

On June 21 you sent me a copy of the initial report of your Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces and asked that I review the document and report on the recommendations within 30 days. This memorandum responds to that request.

In its year of work the Committee observed racial imbalances and vestiges of racial discrimination within the Armed Forces them-

selves. Nevertheless, the Committee found that in the main, racial equality is a reality on military bases today. The Department of Defense will eliminate the exceptions and guard the continuing reality.

It is to the Department's off-base responsibilities that the Committee has devoted the bulk of its report. In eloquent terms the Committee has described the nature and pervasiveness of off-base discrimination against Negro servicemen and their families, the divisive and demoralizing impact of that discrimination, and the general absence of affirmative, effective action to ameliorate or end the off-base practices affecting nearly a quarter of a million of our servicemen.

Our military effectiveness is unquestionably reduced as a result of civilian racial discrimination against men in uniform. The Committee report has made this point with great clarity. With equal clarity it demonstrates that the Department of Defense has in the past only imperfectly recognized the harm flowing from off-base discrimination. That imperfect recognition has in turn meant the lack of a program to correct the conditions giving rise to the harm.

The Committee report contained recommendations for such a program. Consistently therewith I have issued a directive explicitly stating Department of Defense policy with respect to off-base discrimination and requiring:

Preparation of detailed directives, manuals, and regulations making clear the leadership responsibility both on and off base and containing guidance as to how that responsibility is to be discharged.

Institution in each service of a system for regularly monitoring and measuring progress in this field.

We are in the process of establishing a staff element within my office to give full time to such matters.

While the foregoing is in accord with the recommendations of the Committee, the details of the program necessarily will be found in the manuals and regulations to be issued as a result of my directive.

The initial Committee report contained many specific recommendations on recruitment, assignment, promotion, techniques for eliminating on- and off-base discrimination, housing, education, and recording of racial data. Many of these have been or will be put into effect, but some require more study and on a few we have reservations. These will be discussed further with the Committee.

The recommendations on sanctions do require special comment. The Committee suggests using a form of the off-limits sanction when, despite the commander's best efforts with community leaders, relentless discrimination persists against Negro servicemen and their families.

Certainly the damage to military effectiveness from off-base discrimination is not less than that caused by off-base vice, as to which the off-limits sanction is quite customary. While I would hope that it need never be put in effect, I agree with the Committee that a like sanction against discrimination must be available. It should be applied, however, only with the prior approval of the Secretary of the Military Department concerned.

The Committee also suggested the possibility of closing bases near communities where discrimination is particularly prevalent. I do not regard this as a feasible action at this time.

In your letter transmitting the Committee report you wrote that "Discriminatory practices are morally wrong wherever they occur—they are especially inequitable and iniquitous when they inconvenience and embarrass those serving in the armed services and their families."

Guided by those words and the report of your Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, the military departments will take a leadership role in combating discrimination wherever it affects the military effectiveness of the men and women serving in defense of this country.

ROBERT S. McNAMARA.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DIRECTIVE

Subject: Equal opportunity in the Armed Forces.

Reference: Department of Defense Directive No. 5120.27, "Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower)," June 7, 1963.

I. POLICY

It is the policy of the Department of Defense to conduct all of its activities in a manner which is free from racial discrimination, and which provides equal opportunity for all uniformed members and all civilian employees irrespective of their color.

Discriminatory practices directed against Armed Forces members, all of whom lack a civilian's freedom of choice in where to live, to work, to travel, and to spend his off-duty hours, are harmful to military effectiveness. Therefore, all members of the Department of Defense should oppose such practices on every occasion, while fostering equal opportunity for servicemen and their families, on and off base.

II. RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Office of the Secretary of Defense:

1. Pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of Defense and the provisions of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) is hereby assigned responsibility and authority for promoting equal opportunity for members of the Armed Forces.

In the performance of this function he shall (a) be the representative of the Secretary of Defense in civil rights matters, (b) give direction to programs that promote equal opportunity for military personnel, (c) provide policy guidance and review policies, regulations and manuals of the military departments, and (d) monitor their performance through periodic reports and visits to field installations.

2. In carrying out the functions enumerated above, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) is authorized to establish the Office of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Civil Rights).

B. The military departments:

1. The military departments shall, with the approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower), issue appropriate instructions, manuals and regulations in connection with the leadership responsibility for equal opportunity, on and off base, and containing guidance for its discharge.

2. The military departments shall institute in each service a system for regularly reporting, monitoring and measuring progress in achieving equal opportunity on and off base.

C. Military commanders: Every military commander has the responsibility to oppose discriminatory practices affecting his men and their dependents and to foster equal opportunity for them, not only in areas under his immediate control, but also in nearby communities where they may live or gather in off-duty hours. In discharging that responsibility a commander shall not, except with the prior approval of the Secretary of his military department, use the off-limits sanction in discrimination cases arising within the United States.

III. IMPLEMENTATION

Not later than August 15, 1963, the military departments shall forward for the ap-

proval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) an outline plan for implementing this directive.

IV. EFFECTIVE DATE

This directive is effective immediately.

ROBERT S. McNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, I also include at this point the report, with accompanying letter, which I have referred to known as the Gesell report:

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON
EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN THE
ARMED FORCES,
Washington, D.C., June 13, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith the initial report of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces covering the work of the Committee during its first year of existence.

This report considers problems of equal opportunity affecting Negro military personnel on and off base within the United States. The recommendations emphasize matters which the Committee believes should receive the immediate attention of the Secretary of Defense. The Committee is available to consult as to any plan of action which the Department of Defense proposes to put into effect to meet the specific matters covered by this initial report.

Discrimination in the Reserve and National Guard and problems of equal opportunity affecting Negro military personnel serving in overseas areas have been under intensive study. A further report covering these matters will be completed soon.

Yours respectfully,

NATHANIEL S. COLLEY.

ABE FORTAS.

GERHARD A. GESELL,

Chairman.

LOUIS J. HECTOR.

BENJAMIN MUSE.

JOHN H. SENGSTACKE.

WHITNEY M. YOUNG, Jr.

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN THE ARMED FORCES—INITIAL REPORT, EQUALITY OF TREATMENT AND OPPORTUNITY FOR NEGRO MILITARY PERSONNEL STATIONED WITHIN THE UNITED STATES, JUNE 13, 1963

I. INTRODUCTION

This initial report, covering the work of the Committee since its appointment in June 1962, considers certain matters involving equality of treatment and opportunity for Negro military personnel stationed within the United States.

The Committee has been actively exploring the two questions it was directed to consider, i.e.:

"1. What measures should be taken to improve the effectiveness of current policies and procedures in the Armed Forces with regard to equality of treatment and opportunity for persons in the Armed Forces?"

"2. What measures should be employed to improve equality of opportunity for members of the Armed Forces and their dependents in the civilian community, particularly with respect to housing, education, transportation, recreational facilities, community events, programs, and activities?"¹

The Committee has held frequent sessions of 2 to 3 days' duration. During these sessions discussions were held with installation and other commanders, representatives of the Department of Defense and the services, officials of interested Federal agencies, and

others.² Committee members have traveled to a number of military bases and have interviewed officers and enlisted personnel of all ranks. In addition, information has been gathered through questionnaires and complaints received from servicemen.

The Committee has devoted its efforts to formulating general policies and recommendations and has not conducted detailed hearings and investigations into the merits of individual specific claims of discrimination. The Committee's inquiries have been courteously received with full cooperation.

II. THE INTEGRATION AND PARTICIPATION OF THE NEGRO IN THE ARMED FORCES

Prior to 1948, the Negro had little or no opportunity in the Armed Forces. His skills and even his ability were a matter of debate. He was officially segregated, if not excluded; his duties were limited and his ability to serve his country in time of need was minimized or ignored. Such official policies no longer exist, and, in the main, the conditions which accompanied them have disappeared. Negroes have made military service their career in increasing numbers. They are formally integrated and have served well in both officer and enlisted ranks in times of war and peace.

It is desirable at the outset to review how this change occurred. In July 1948, President Truman, by Executive Order No. 9981, made the following declaration of principle which has since been applied throughout the Armed Forces:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the President that there shall be equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the armed services, without regard to race, color, religion or national origin. This policy shall be put into effect as rapidly as possible, having due regard to the time required to effectuate any necessary changes without impairing efficiency or morale."

On this occasion, President Truman appointed a committee to advise how this policy could best be implemented. As a result of the Executive order and the work of that committee, with continuing emphasis by succeeding administrations during the subsequent years, the Armed Forces were gradually integrated, and recognition was given to the ability of Negroes to train for, and serve in, all capacities.

This is the first general policy review of questions of equality of treatment and opportunity in the Armed Forces since that committee completed its work approximately 13 years ago. It is well to keep in mind the vast changes which have occurred since that time. Not only have there been dramatic developments in the field of racial equality, but under the stress of international events and technological developments the composition and mission of the Armed Forces have substantially changed. While steps taken pursuant to President Truman's Executive order were essential first ones in dealing

² The principal organizations providing information and assistance to the Committee, apart from the Department of Defense and the Services, have been the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing, the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, the Department of Justice, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Housing and Home Finance Agency (especially its component, the Federal Housing Administration), and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. The Commission on Civil Rights has been especially helpful in furnishing factual information for study by the Committee. Generally, other agencies have furnished published information. None of these organizations bear any responsibility for the conclusions or recommendations of this Committee.

with racial problems in the Armed Forces, it is wholly appropriate now to consider what further must be done to assure equality of treatment and opportunity for all qualified military personnel in the light of present-day conditions.

Any consideration of problems pertaining to equality of treatment and opportunity for Negroes in the Armed Forces must emphasize the vast scope and complexity of the Military Establishment. As of September 30, 1962, there were 2,674,000 men in uniform stationed at home and abroad. Of these, approximately 1,900,000 were stationed in the United States. Within the 50 States alone, there are 1,145 military installations to which 100 or more military personnel are assigned, and some 88,000 military personnel are assigned to many smaller installations in the United States. These installations are scattered throughout the 50 States.

There are no quotas or other forms of limitations on the recruiting of Negroes or on their assignment to career fields. All written policies governing advancement and promotion through both enlisted and commissioned ranks are nondiscriminatory in character.

The number of Negroes in the Armed Forces has increased since President Truman's Executive order was issued in 1948. Nevertheless, while about 11 percent of our population is Negro, it is significant that only 8.2 percent of all military personnel is Negro. The following table graphically demonstrates the disparities between the overall Negro population percentage and the percentages of enlisted and officer personnel found in each service:

Negro personnel as percent¹ of all personnel,
1949-62

Percentage of Negroes in national population.....		11.0
Army:		
Enlisted:		
1949.....	12.4	
1954.....	13.7	
1962.....	12.2	
Officers:		
1949.....	1.8	
1954.....	3.0	
1962.....	3.2	
Navy:		
Enlisted:		
1949.....	4.7	
1954.....	3.6	
1962.....	5.1	
Officers:		
1949.....	0	
1954.....	.1	
1962.....	.2	
Air Force:		
Enlisted:		
1949.....	5.1	
1954.....	8.6	
1962.....	9.1	
Officers:		
1949.....	.6	
1954.....	1.1	
1962.....	1.2	
Marine Corps:		
Enlisted:		
1949.....	2.1	
1954.....	6.5	
1962.....	7.7	
Officers:		
1949.....	0	
1954.....	.1	
1962.....	.2	

¹ To the nearest $\frac{1}{10}$ of 1 percent.

As these figures show, Negro participation in officer ranks is still very small for all the services. A breakdown of the current number of Negroes and their relative percentage in both commissioned and enlisted ranks, shown in the following tables, reveals that substantial progress must yet be achieved.

¹ Letter from President dated June 22, 1962.

TABLE I.—Statistics on Negro commissioned officers¹

Rank	Navy	Number and percent of Negro personnel in each rank							
		Army		Navy		Air Force		Marine Corps	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Generals (all types).....	Admirals (all types).....	0	0	0	0	1	0.29	0	0
Colonels.....	Captains.....	6	.11	0	0	6	.14	0	0
Lieutenant colonels.....	Commanders.....	117	.95	3	.03	67	2.54	0	0
Majors.....	Lieutenant commanders.....	424	2.47	17	.14	124	.60	0	0
Captains.....	Lieutenants.....	1,532	5.21	88	.35	615	1.74	7	.17
1st lieutenants.....	Lieutenants (junior grade).....	650	4.33	57	.39	317	1.56	16	.44
2d lieutenants.....	Ensigns.....	421	2.26	29	.22	170	1.45	9	.28
Total officers and percentages.....		3,150	3.2	174	.24	1,300	1.24	32	.21

¹ 1962 data for all services. The Air Force figures include only officers assigned to duty in the 48 States of the continental United States. All other figures are complete and worldwide in scope.

TABLE II.—Statistics on Negro enlisted personnel¹

Grade	Number and percent of Negro personnel in each grade							
	Army		Navy		Air Force		Marine Corps	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
E-9 (highest).....	76	2.97	22	1.80	32	0.83	5	0.71
E-8.....	586	5.72	89	1.22	140	1.67	19	.31
E-7.....	3,143	7.64	984	2.42	616	2.51	142	2.12
E-6.....	10,496	12.65	2,843	4.43	2,115	4.19	417	3.98
E-5.....	21,892	16.28	5,370	6.23	10,287	9.33	1,490	8.65
E-4.....	21,133	12.20	6,771	6.59	14,321	12.47	2,653	9.08
E-3.....	26,385	11.90	7,502	5.11	11,505	9.26	3,101	8.14
E-2.....	10,836	10.58	5,396	5.22	6,951	10.23	3,727	8.01
E-1 (lowest).....	8,466	11.15	1,431	4.77	597	17.17	1,787	7.55
Total enlisted members and percentages.....	103,603	12.20	30,408	5.22	46,564	9.1	13,351	7.59

¹ 1962 data for all services. The Air Force figures are drawn from certain selected commands, and represent about 76 percent of all Air Force enlisted personnel. All other figures are complete and worldwide in scope.

The Armed Forces have made an intelligent and far-reaching advance toward complete integration, and, with some variations from service to service, substantial progress toward equality of treatment and opportunity. By and large, military bases reflect a clear pattern of integration. Segregation or exclusion of Negroes from barracks or other on-base housing facilities is not allowed. Military messes and all other on-base facilities are open to all personnel without regard to race. Negro personnel serve with whites in almost all types of units and at all unit levels. Negroes command white and Negro troops. Although the distribution is quite uneven, as will appear, Negroes have been placed in virtually all of the numerous job specialties and career fields which exist in the various services.

The committee feels, however, that the urgency of the remaining problems faced by Negro military personnel requires that this initial report be rendered at this time, so that corrective action may begin without delay. The headlines of recent weeks highlight this urgency. The great progress made is not enough. Negro military personnel and their families are daily suffering humiliation and degradation in communities near the bases at which they are compelled to serve, and a vigorous, new program of action is needed to relieve the situation. In addition, remaining problems of equality of treatment and opportunity, both servicewide and at particular bases, call for correction. National policy requires prompt action to eliminate all these conditions. Equal opportunity for the Negro will exist only when it is possible for him to enter upon a career of military service with assurance that his acceptance and his progress will be in no way impeded by reason of his color. Clearly, distinctions based on race prevent full utilization of Negro military personnel and are inconsistent with the objectives of our democratic society.

III. IMPROVING THE PARTICIPATION OF THE NEGRO IN THE ARMED FORCES

A. There is need to make greater efforts to attract qualified Negroes

All services are making strenuous efforts to attract and hold personnel. Only the Army still relies to some extent on the draft, but all branches of the Armed Forces report difficulty in recruiting qualified personnel of all races. As the statistics previously presented disclose, the participation of the Negro in the Armed Forces is less than the percentage of Negroes in our total population.

Negroes are only now coming to realize that opportunity is available in the Armed Forces. Undoubtedly, the glaring lack of opportunity which existed not so many years ago and the limited progress which Negroes have as yet made to higher ranks have, in part, produced this result, as have other inequalities and conditions confronting Negro military personnel off base. Moreover, continuing educational disadvantages make many Negroes unavailable for certain types of job opportunities in the Armed Forces.

The means by which individuals are influenced to enter the services are, of course, important. While methods differ in each service, there is, at the present time, little recruiting directed toward Negroes and insufficient awareness on the part of recruiting officers of special matters which would be of interest to potential Negro personnel.

For example, of the illustrative photographs in the occupational training guide of one service, the only Negro shown is an enlisted man, in kitchen garb in the steward field, where he appears working with a uniformed, white enlisted man. In general, Negroes rarely appear in recruiting literature, and then almost never on the cover together with other personnel or in the more appealing action shots.

Service programs to attract personnel properly emphasize special educational backgrounds and technical training, a need resulting from the increasing complexity of military operations. Unless Negroes with such aptitudes are encouraged to enter the services, there is the danger that the Negro least attractive to private industry and other career fields—men not always in a position to take full advantage of the opportunity offered by the services—will enter the Armed Forces.

Turning from the general problem of attracting Negroes to the Armed Forces to the particular question of officer selection, it should be noted at the outset that officers are obtained by the services from several sources. For instance, there is direct commissioning of persons with special skills, including doctors, dentists, and certain others.

In addition, the services obtain officers through the respective Academies, officer candidate programs, and, in significant numbers, from ROTC programs. Negroes are currently represented at all of the Academies—14 at West Point, 10 at the Naval Academy, and 15 at the Air Force Academy—and the other programs and sources are all offering Negroes for officer training. Participation of Negroes in these programs and services is discussed below in the section of this report dealing with educational opportunities.

Additional Negro officer participation can be achieved only by attracting qualified candidates through improved opportunity for Negroes in the military service. It should be noted that the standards one must meet to become an officer are necessarily high and that the military is competing for skilled personnel with other employers who can often offer greater material rewards to Negroes and whites alike.

B. Recommendations for attracting qualified Negroes

In order to increase the presently insufficient flow of qualified Negroes into the Armed

Forces, techniques and procedures to attract persons should be carefully reexamined to insure that they do not operate to reduce the entry of qualified Negroes into the service. The problems here do not appear to be ones of an affirmative discrimination encouraged by official service policies. Rather, the condition results from a lack of adequate attention to, and review of, several aspects of the personnel selection process. The services should initiate a more informed solicitation of colleges having substantial numbers of Negro students, develop literature appealing to Negroes and make wider use of Negro officers in recruiting assignments. Special efforts should be made to find and recruit Negroes with the special aptitudes the services now require and affirmative steps should be taken to insure that no recruiting personnel, consciously or unconsciously, channel Negroes to particular career fields, disregarding their aptitudes.

To increase the pitifully small number of Negro officers, energetic efforts must be made to raise the number of Negroes in the Academies and in all other programs which supply officers for the services.

Finally, the services should continually review all aspects of personnel selection procedures and their operation, to minimize the possibility of discrimination, especially discrimination by individuals in positions of responsibility at all service levels.

C. There is need for continuing reappraisal of assignment patterns

The assignment of an occupational classification to an enlisted man, shortly after he enters military service, is usually one of the most significant actions affecting his entire service career. It will have an obvious bearing upon his training and duty assignments, and upon his earnings outlook, as well, since the more technical specialties normally offer greater opportunities for grade advancement and related benefits. Initial classification action normally occurs during basic training. The bases for such classification are the results of detailed aptitude testing, an evaluation of pertinent training, work experience and interests, and a personal interview. Actual assignments to particular schools or specialties are also influenced by available quotas and changes in skill requirements.

There have been a number of complaints from Negro military personnel at particular bases to the effect that discrimination exists as to duty and career field assignments. Since many factors enter into assignment decisions, the merits of these complaints are difficult to determine without exhaustive inquiry. Statistics do show that on a servicewide basis, Negroes are to be found assigned to virtually all occupational areas.

However, there is some evidence of a disproportionate grouping of Negro enlisted personnel in the service area. For example, one out of every five Negroes in the Navy is in the food service career field, along with a substantial number of Filipinos. The heavy proportion of Negroes in this career field undoubtedly reflects the policy, now abandoned, of assigning Negroes only to occupations such as food service and other support-type activities.

To some extent, unevenness of assignment represents the cumulation of individual preferences. In any event, the bunching of Negro military personnel in any particular category, for whatever reasons, operates as a brake upon advancement because only a limited number of promotion vacancies are available in any particular career specialty.

Conversely, Negro participation in most technical career fields is slight, though relative participation appears to be increasing. Such fields include, for example, electronics and crafts in the Navy, and electronic maintenance in the Air Force. These patterns appear to have improved in the case of more

recent entrants into service, reflecting the impact of policies designed to provide equal treatment and opportunity for Negroes in the Armed Forces. The improvement has been dramatic in the Navy and Marine Corps, although, it is evident that some difference in relative occupational distribution persists. The trend toward equal occupational distribution has resulted in an increasing proportion of Negroes in the white collar skills and in many of the more technical specialties.

Many of the Negroes in the Navy and Marine Corps are still grouped in assignments which perpetuate the image of the Negro as a menial or servant in respect to the total activities of these services, and it will take some time before the more recent assignment trends rectify this discrepancy.

Service policies governing the assignment and advancement of military personnel find their reflection in the atmosphere of each particular base. Where assignments in any substantial way appear to reflect the relegation of Negro personnel to particular activities or where there is an unexplained absence of Negro officers in significant duty assignments, the posture of the base as a whole is unavoidably one of inequality of treatment and suggests to Negro personnel that there is a lack of opportunity. In some instances, of course, such patterns are created unconsciously since the services generally assign personnel to particular bases without regard to race. As a result, the representation and assignments of Negroes on a particular installation may be quite inconsistent with the pattern of the particular service as a whole.

Since the number of Negro officers in the Armed Forces is very small, there are still relatively few Negro officers at most installations, and the commands and headquarters are often overwhelmingly white. Several installation commanders expressed the view that a greater proportion of Negro officers would be helpful to the morale of the installation as a whole.

D. Recommendations for improving assignment patterns

Because of the importance of the assignment of an occupational classification to a new enlisted man, the procedures affecting such assignment, as well as their results, must be carefully and regularly reviewed to see whether they operate to insure equality of treatment and opportunity for Negro military personnel. When new Negro personnel or applicants are interviewed, they should be made fully aware of the variety of opportunities available before being required to express preferences for career fields. Special effort should be made to recognize potential capacities of Negroes at the time of recruitment and at other appropriate times, and to encourage their entering, with proper vocational assistance, into career fields which match latent skill.

In addition, continuing efforts must be made to place Negro personnel in as many special and technical career fields and positions of troop command as possible, in order to afford Negro personnel wide training and insure the fullest utilization of available talent. In this regard, the disproportionate bunchings of Negro personnel in certain service career fields should be reexamined, these personnel retested, carefully advised about other fields for which they are trainable, retrained accordingly and reassigned.

Although the Committee does not feel competent to recommend specific procedures for assuring the participation of Negro officers at base and regional headquarters in all sections of the country, it is advisable to point out that informal efforts to minimize Negro assignment to certain bases, however well motivated, are undesirable.

E. There is need to improve procedures affecting promotions

The slight Negro participation in higher noncommissioned and commissioned ranks, indicated in tables I and II above, suggests strongly that Negroes, at least in the past, have not enjoyed equality of treatment and opportunity in the Armed Forces. In any event, this pattern acts to deter other Negroes from choosing the Armed Forces as a career.

Generally, advancement in the noncommissioned ranks is based, among other things, upon the recommendations of commanding officers, and involves board actions of various kinds as well as certain written examinations. None of the higher noncommissioned officer ranks can be achieved without long periods of duty in the service and there are many Negroes who have not yet served the minimum time required. Satisfaction of minimum requirements does not, however, assure promotion since the number of openings available are limited by the necessities of the military organization and may be smaller than the number of men meeting minimum requirements.

Selection for promotion from among qualified personnel is based on value judgments formed from a review of the entire experience of those qualified for advancement. There is at the present time no system within any of the services for periodic review of noncommissioned officer promotions in order to investigate and eliminate the possibility that elements of racial bias may have been operative in the selection or rating of candidates at installation and other levels where crucial decisions affecting a man's career are made.

Each of the services has established a system for selecting officers for promotion by action of specially appointed boards of senior officers. While there are variations, the systems have much in common. All services seek to maintain high standards and are faced with very substantial attrition due to legislation and other factors which limit the number of officers that may hold a particular rank at a given time. Efforts have been made by all of the services to establish fair promotion criteria. In the nature of things, however, it is inevitable that many officers fall of promotion. Competition is extremely keen and minor differences in experience, training and personality may be decisive as between individual candidates.

One factor affecting the advancement of Negro officers has been the emphasis given by the services to specialized educational backgrounds in selecting candidates for promotion. The more limited educational opportunities available for Negroes, until recent years, have, therefore, operated to their disadvantage in the promotion selection process.

Seniority, too, plays a vital part in the officer promotion system. Indeed, promotions are possible only after minimum prescribed lengths of service. For example, under present conditions, it normally takes approximately 16 years of service as an officer to be eligible for promotion to lieutenant colonel in the Army, Air Force, or Marine Corps, or to the corresponding rank of commander in the Navy. Since the full participation of the Negro in the Armed Forces is of recent origin, there are relatively few Negroes with the requisite seniority. Studies show, for instance, that although 3.2 percent of all Army officers are Negroes, only 1 percent of the officers with 20 years or more service are Negroes. While this fact may explain the existence of so few high ranking Negro officers, it does not eliminate the need for all personnel concerned with recruitment, assignment and promotion to be ever mindful of the history of discriminatory practices from which this situation arose and of the

desirability of closing the gap as quickly as possible.

The ability of competent Negroes to succeed is all important. Nothing will do more to encourage the able Negro to enter military service as a career than tangible proof, as yet almost entirely lacking, that Negro officers can receive equal recognition and opportunity for advancement with whites. Actual examples of Negroes who have achieved major positions of responsibility in the Armed Forces will be worth thousands of words devoted to claims that no barriers exist.

Several problems have come to the Committee's attention concerning significant details in the machinery of officer promotions. The personnel folders reviewed by promotion boards, in the case of all the services, contain a photograph of the officers under consideration and, in the case of some of the services, contain forms having racial designations. Thus, the officer's race is brought sharply to the attention of the promotion board. There do not appear to be adequate reasons for having photographs or racial designations in the materials reviewed for promotion purposes. The presence of this information raises serious questions whether individual members of a promotion board, intentionally or otherwise, might discriminate on the basis of race.

The number of Negro officers who have served on boards concerned with officer promotions is very small. This follows from the fact that the members of such boards in all services are normally colonels (or the Navy equivalent, captain) or higher ranking officers, and, as table I, above, indicates, the number of Negroes who have attained these ranks is extremely small. In fact, in the Navy and Marine Corps, no officers have attained these ranks. So long as promotion selection is made primarily by white officers, questions as to the impartiality of these boards will continue to arise.

Officers serving on promotion boards are selected with care and take an oath demanding objectivity, but no particular effort is made to determine whether an officer serving on a promotion board, because of his background and personal experience, has a conscious or unconscious bias. Experience with this delicate and intangible problem in commercial organizations suggests that, on occasion, bias exists which can be disclosed by specific inquiry and attention to the individual's past performance.

F. Recommendations for improving promotion procedures

In view of the numerous complaints of discrimination in enlisted promotions and the slight participation of Negroes in the higher NCO ranks, the services should initiate, on a spot check basis, periodic inquiries into the operation of enlisted promotion procedures, particularly to the higher NCO ranks.

To minimize the possibility that conscious or unconscious discrimination on the basis of race or color may affect the impartiality of the officer promotion system, photographs and racial designations in the folders reviewed by promotion boards should be eliminated. Every opportunity should be taken to appoint Negro officers to serve on promotion boards, in normal rotation. Techniques for assuring that all promotion board members are free from conscious or unconscious racial bias should be developed. Wherever possible, officers chosen to serve on promotion boards should be chosen from those who have had more than casual experience serving with Negro officers and enlisted personnel. To the extent that similar situations pertain in the enlisted promotion system, like steps should be taken there.

A final comment: No system is valid if the standards used to make decisions, no matter how objectively applied, are such as to operate unfairly against any group of persons.

Accordingly, the services should each periodically review their standards for promotion, selection and assignment to make certain that latent ability is always properly measured and utilized.

IV. ELIMINATING REMAINING ON-BASE DISCRIMINATION

A. The present lack of communication between Negro personnel and commanders causes discrimination to fester

Reference has already been made to the highly successful program of the Armed Forces to bring about full integration and to the progress made toward equality of treatment and opportunity. More is required. Many of the remaining problems result from the lack of communication between Negro military personnel and the command echelon at bases.

Equality of treatment and opportunity is not the responsibility of any particular official or office in any of the services. Rather, responsibility is servicewide, in the sense that a general policy has been defined by broad directives. As a result, no machinery exists at any particular base by which a given officer is specifically charged with continuing responsibility in this area. There is no satisfactory method of handling complaints. Conditions conducive to discriminatory practices are often not even known to commanders. The Negro serviceman may complain to his immediate superior but it is rare that these complaints reach the attention of the base commander or members of his immediate staff. As problems become severe, they may or may not receive attention at one or more echelons in the command. In sum, there is no affirmative and continuing effort to monitor race relations problems on base.

An important byproduct of the Committee's work has been a new awareness, on the part of many of the commanders of bases visited, of the necessity for greater efforts to eliminate remaining obstacles to equality of treatment and opportunity in the Armed Forces. For example, on visits to bases, Committee members noted a number of discriminatory practices. Such practices were often remedied forthwith when brought to the attention of the base commander by Committee members. This illustrates the value of expanded communications between Negro military personnel and base commanders. Means must be found to keep base commanders informed of such conditions as they develop. It is clear to the Committee that only by fixing responsibility and establishing some means for monitoring these matters, base by base, can problems of discrimination, which will inevitably arise from time to time, be cured effectively and promptly.

At the present time, the absence of an effective procedure for dealing with complaints has led Negro personnel to complain to Congressmen and to various private groups such as the NAACP, and to broadcast letters, sometimes anonymous, to individuals and groups interested in racial matters. The investigation of these letters through the traditional Inspector General or Department of Defense channels is often fruitless. These authorities are not geared to handle such problems and too much time elapses, making it difficult to ascertain the facts.

There exists in the minds of many Negro personnel the fear that they will be subject to criticism and reprisal if they raise matters of this kind. Procedures must be developed which eliminate this fear and encourage them to present their complaints. Merely stating that reprisals are forbidden is not enough.

Some complaints will allege that a specific individual has suffered discriminatory treatment of some kind. Such complaints, involving matters relating to a single person, such as failing to be promoted, cannot ordinarily be investigated without disclosing the iden-

tity of the aggrieved individual. This is not true, however, where the complaint discloses a discriminatory condition on base, such as a segregated NCO club. Such conditions can be investigated and eliminated without the need for identifying a particular complainant.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that prompt correction of what may appear on the surface to be minor examples of discrimination will contribute substantially to morale. Such actions will also serve to keep the standard of conduct which national policy has decreed before all individuals on the base.

B. Recommendations for improving communication with commanders

In order to improve the processing of complaints at the base level, procedures must be established which will encourage Negro personnel to present complaints of discrimination while eliminating the risk that they will be subject to criticism or reprisal for so doing. In order to accomplish this, an officer should be designated at each base to receive such complaints. This officer must have free access to the base commander or his deputy for the purpose of communicating and discussing complaints of discrimination. Commanders at bases must, of course, be held personally responsible for the effectiveness of the system and for conditions on the base. Discriminatory conditions may exist even where few complaints are made, and the commander should be held accountable to discover and remedy such conditions.

All personnel, officer and enlisted, should be free to contact the officer designated to receive complaints at any time, without the consent, knowledge, or approval of any person in the chain of command over them. Communications between servicemen and this officer should be privileged and service regulations should prohibit the disclosure of such communications or the identity of the complainant without the serviceman's consent.

The officer designated to receive such complaints should be carefully chosen to insure that he is sensitive to problems of discrimination. The confidential nature of his duties in this area should be thoroughly explained to him and others, and he should be provided with a detailed manual of instructions. In view of his role as a confidential counselor, consideration should be given to the designation of the local legal assistance officer as the officer to receive such complaints, but the base commander should be free to designate the officer best qualified for such duties, regardless of the officer's other duties. However, the officer so chosen must not be so burdened with other duties that he cannot effectively deal with complaints presented to him; he should be so situated that servicemen can contact and consult him in privacy; and he should be independent and free from intimidation by any person in the performance of his duties.

Under this system, all base personnel should be repeatedly and periodically advised of the identity of the complaint officer, and further advised of their right to present complaints. Service regulations should forbid attempts to discourage the presentation of such complaints or reprisals against complainants, and all personnel should be advised that such attempts, in violation of these regulations, will subject them to disciplinary action.

Such day-to-day efforts to discover and eliminate examples of discrimination at the base level should be checked and supplemented by periodic field visits from personnel from the Department of Defense who are skilled and sensitive in handling problems of discrimination and whose full-time energies are devoted to such problems. In this way, commanders' efforts can be measured. In addition, servicemen should be free, if they choose, to present their complaints to

such visiting personnel and to contact the Department of Defense office to which such personnel are assigned if they so desire.

C. Examples of remaining on-base discrimination and recommendations for their elimination

Members of the Committee received complaints from Negro personnel concerning particular conditions existing at specific bases. These complaints were received orally during base visits and by letters from servicemen. The Committee has not had the time or the resources to conduct specific investigations into such complaints, nor did the Committee conceive that this was the role assigned to it.

Personal observations and interviews have, however, pointed to discriminatory conditions which do exist at some bases.³ These can be remedied and would appear to be of sufficient general consequence to be mentioned here, although conditions such as those discussed below are not the only ones which may exist nor are they prevalent on every base.

The Committee anticipates that if a better system of communication for dealing with racial problems suggestive of discrimination is established on base, and specific matters found on bases, such as those mentioned below, are given intelligent attention, many of the principal sources of irritation which reflect on morale, military efficiency and opportunity would be eliminated.

1. NCO and Service Clubs Require Careful Continuing Attention

One of the principal sources of difficulty arises in connection with the operation of on-base service and NCO clubs. The number and program of these clubs vary from base to base. Generally, they provide a place for gathering, refreshment, entertainment and occasional dances. There is sometimes more than one NCO or service club on a base. At some bases, due to pressures brought by white personnel or other factors, forms of segregated service clubs have developed in practice. For example, the majority of Negro servicemen may gravitate to one club and white servicemen to another. Commanding officers have permitted this condition to be imposed by the wishes of a minority of white personnel and have not taken sufficient affirmative steps to encourage utilization of all clubs by all personnel who desire to do so.

At some service clubs, it is customary for the command, through professional or volunteer hostesses, to arrange for girls to come to the base for a dance or other entertainment. Although such service clubs are used by whites and Negroes alike, there are instances when too few or no Negro girls are brought to the base, thus creating unnecessary tensions. There is also evidence that on occasion civilian hostesses have imported onto the base from the civilian community attitudes which are inconsistent with Department of Defense policy. One of the most successful service clubs is that at an Army base in the South, operated by a very able Negro hostess, which attracts local volunteer workers and servicemen of both races.

These problems are not necessary and should be eliminated without delay. To do this, commanders should take affirmative

³ Disturbing patterns of civilian employment at some military bases, both in the Federal civil service and in clubs, exchange facilities and other non-appropriated fund activities, have come to the attention of the Committee during its study. Since discrimination in Federal civilian employment is under continuing review by the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, these patterns have been called to the attention of that body.

action to insure that there is no de facto segregation or discrimination at any of these club facilities. In addition, Negro girls should be secured for dances, and greater care should be taken in the selection and training of hostesses and other civilian personnel operating service clubs.

2. Military Police Assignments Require Review

Another area of fairly common complaint involves the use of military police of all services on base, at the base gate, and on patrols sent from the base into nearby communities. At some bases Negro military police have not been used at the base gate because of possible objection by members of the white civilian community. At others, there are instances in which wholly Negro patrols are sent into Negro areas, but not into white areas, while integrated patrols are not used for off-base assignments. These problems are particularly sensitive ones because of the status and authority of the military police.

To the extent numerically possible, regular military police patrols should be assigned on a racially integrated basis, and there should be no distinctions based on race in any type of military police assignment. Sufficient numbers of Negro personnel should be included in military police units to permit such assignment policies to be effectuated. National and defense policy on integration should be clearly spelled out to personnel undergoing military police training and to those who train and supervise military police.

3. Base-Sponsored Activities Must Adhere to National Policy

The Department of Defense and the services have prohibited the use of their names, facilities, activities or sponsorship by any employee recreational organization practicing racial discrimination. However, policies have not been established concerning the participation of bands, sports teams, choirs, and the like, in activities off base. For example, no directive specifically prohibits the removal of Negro members from bands, choirs, marching units, or other military groups representing the base at off-base functions, where such removal is sought or suggested by community representatives.

Many base commanders on their own initiative have refused to permit groups from a base to participate outside the base in events where elimination or segregation of Negro personnel would be required because of civilian attitudes. This has been a very healthy and desirable action. To remove Negro members from bands and choruses, as has been done on occasion, or from any other service activity in response to outside pressures, creates an indefensible form of discrimination within the services.

Base commanders themselves have frequent opportunities to attend gatherings of local groups, as speakers or in other semiofficial capacities. A number of these groups both practice segregation and support local segregation policies. Such attendance may serve a legitimate and useful function in furthering objectives of the services.

Where commanders limit their community activities to civic groups that exclude Negroes and favor segregation—as is often the case—they fail in their mission. The commander must not appear, by his speeches to such groups and his acceptance of awards from them, to condone conditions which are offensive to his men and injurious to the efficiency of his command.

To assure that these off-base functions do not undermine the atmosphere of equality developed on the base, all military commanders should be instructed to follow the lead of those who have refused to permit their personnel to participate in base-controlled activities outside the base where elimination or segregation of Negro personnel is sought. While commanders' discretion

must guide their own attendance policies, they should be sensitive to avoid attending any function if such attendance might seem an endorsement of discriminatory civilian attitudes.

4. Freedom of Association and Expression Must Be Preserved

Another example of the influence which off-base civilian attitudes have on base is reflected in the efforts of some commanders to discourage interracial association by military personnel off base and to urge compliance with all forms of local segregation requirements. In some cases, it has been officially suggested, in effect, that friends segregate themselves off base in order to avoid local objections. In one case, it was reported that military police at the base gate systematically warned personnel that white and Negro personnel leaving the base together in private automobiles should not enter town together. In other cases, personnel have been advised to comply with local segregation policies without any protest, and have even been told that expressions of their views concerning such local policies may result in disciplinary action against them.

These actions by some commanders, restraining freedom of association and expression, are misguided and should be terminated.

5. Segregation in Transportation and Schoolbuses Must Be Eliminated

A number of bases utilize local transportation facilities which run with some frequency between the base and the local community. Some of these local operators practice segregation. In a number of instances, buses, while required to integrate during the period the bus is on base property, enforce a segregated pattern of seating immediately upon leaving the installation. Conversely, troops traveling to the base in segregated patterns may change seating only upon arrival at the base. In other instances, taxis which refuse Negroes transportation are permitted to serve the installation. Thus, servicemen are carried to and from the base in a segregated pattern wholly inconsistent with the existing pattern of integration on base.

There are few schools on military bases for dependents living on base. None of these schools serve all such dependents. As a consequence, dependents living on base are sent to local public and, sometimes, private school systems. Where these public school systems are segregated, different transportation services are sometimes provided for Negro and white students. As a consequence, during the school year separate buses for Negro and white children arrive and depart from a base daily. The white and Negro children live and play together on base and may have gone to school together on base. The enforced separation and differentiation which the segregated schoolbus system sharply exhibits is inconsistent with other conditions on base and is often the only example of on-base segregation. By appearing even in this fashion to support a segregated school system, the Military Establishment is lending support to a basically unconstitutional, and therefore, unlawful, condition.

These and any other examples of discrimination in transportation serving the base should be eliminated. Agreements should be sought with bus and taxi companies willing to provide nondiscriminatory transportation for servicemen. If such agreements cannot be promptly obtained, the services should provide other forms of transportation to terminate this indignity.

In addition, the services should make every effort to have local school authorities discontinue segregation of all schoolbuses traveling to the post without delay. If such efforts should in any case be unsuccessful, immediate provisions should be made for transporting these children in military vehicles or under contractual arrangements

with other carriers. This will entail some difficulty and expense, but the clear national policy of on-base integration requires it. Moreover, such action will daily carry to the civilian community a demonstration of the services' conviction that all such discrimination must disappear.

V. ELIMINATING THE SERIOUS OFF-BASE DISCRIMINATION BY CIVILIAN COMMUNITIES AFFECTING THE MORALE OF NEGRO MILITARY PERSONNEL AND DEPENDENTS

A. Civilian communities near bases often segregate and discriminate against Negro military personnel

The hundreds of military installations within the United States cannot exist in isolation from surrounding civilian communities. The reasons are obvious and need be only briefly covered.

Military family housing on base is, generally speaking, assigned to eligible personnel on the basis of seniority. Such housing is not sufficient, in most instances, to house more than about one-half the eligible married personnel. At many bases there is relatively little on-base housing. Therefore, it is quite usual for many of the married personnel to live off base. Statistics from the Department of Defense indicate that there are within the United States approximately 405,000 families residing in various types of off-base community housing, in communities near the service members' places of duty.

As far as schools are concerned, the overwhelming majority of school-age dependents of military personnel use the local public school system, whether they live on or off base.

A family residing on or off base utilizes many of the normal community facilities for shopping and recreation. While the services have attempted in some degree to provide recreational opportunities on base—and there are, among other things, service clubs, swimming pools and theaters found in some of the larger bases—the limited and institutional character of these arrangements does not satisfy the needs of the military personnel. Apart from the natural desire of military personnel to exist free from command supervision, many families reside sufficiently far from the base to make on-base facilities of limited utility.

Although the Supreme Court has declared that laws requiring segregation of public school or other public facilities are unconstitutional, the Committee's studies have disclosed that a very substantial number of communities neighboring military bases practice various forms of segregation. Segregation is found in varying degrees throughout the United States. In some communities local laws require segregation; in others the condition derives from custom and the wishes of the local population. The pattern of discrimination and segregation is, of course, particularly noticeable in the southern communities, but there are substantial variations from community to community and State to State. Forms of discrimination appear in many northern communities. Discrimination in housing is almost universal. Some bases established in States such as the Dakotas have confronted forms of segregation and discrimination which have much of the same rigidity found in certain southern communities.

In addition to its personal examination of conditions in certain communities, the Committee requested the services to supply information indicating prevalence of segregation in communities neighboring to bases. Studies made by the Army and Navy or certain of their domestic installations and activities illustrate the typical pattern with which the Committee is concerned. The following table containing this information is illuminating; less complete analyses by the Air Force and Marine Corps indicate that their personnel confront similar patterns.

TABLE III.—Segregation of public facilities in communities adjacent to military installations

Types of segregated public facility	Number of surveyed installations and activities with such segregated facilities ¹		Number of personnel stationed where facilities are segregated		Percentage of surveyed installations and activities with segregated facilities	
	Army	Navy	Army	Navy	Army	Navy
Public schools.....	48	143	178, 109	58, 500	24	25
Restaurants and bars.....	68	238	257, 893	110, 000	34	43
Theaters.....	63	223	232, 301	105, 000	31	40
Swimming pools.....	19	226	178, 201	102, 000	9	40
Golf courses.....	38	164	190, 931	82, 000	19	29
Beaches.....	10	203	123, 502	90, 000	5	35
Bowling alleys.....	32	194	205, 501	103, 000	16	35
Libraries.....	10	149	130, 179	28, 000	5	9
Public transportation.....	4	47	41, 001	22, 000	2	8
Hotels, motels.....	12	252	205, 618	141, 000	6	45
Churches.....	23	163	127, 402	70, 000	11	29

¹ The Army survey for this table covered 201 installations and activities, while the Navy survey covered 559. Each installation and activity surveyed had 100 or more military personnel assigned to it.

B. Community segregation and discrimination adversely affects service morale

A Negro officer or serviceman is, like all military personnel, subject to orders. On short notice he may be transferred to any base. This dislocation of his affairs is one of the disadvantages of military service. The time allowed is limited and orders are immutable.

When a Negro officer or serviceman is transferred to a base where the neighboring community practices substantial forms of segregation and discrimination, he immediately faces very special and difficult problems. Assuming, as is often the case, that he must live off base, he must look for a house or an apartment; he must then arrange for the schooling of his children; he must find transportation between home and base. In short, he must obtain for himself and his family food, shelter, and recreation in what to him is necessarily a new and unfriendly community. In making this transition he gets little help from the base or the community. He must cope with the problems as he finds them, on short notice.

Discrimination in housing confronts him immediately in most sections of the country. Private housing in many parts of town is not available. Many real estate agents will have nothing to do with him. He is forced to that part of town and type of housing occupied by Negroes. Here in many cases are structures well below acceptable standards, expensive, dirty, dilapidated—in all respects undesirable. Often Negro housing areas are farthest from the base. Almost always the available segregated housing is below the standard available for white military personnel. Frequently little or no housing is available and space is at a premium. After one or two nights sleeping in his family car or at an expensive Negro motel (if he can find one) he takes whatever turns up.

Schools are his next concern. Here again patterns of segregation often exist. Although he wears the uniform of his country, his dependents may be forced into segregated schools. In some communities near bases these schools are well below standards, overcrowded, distant from the base and otherwise undesirable. Whatever the quality of the schools, and school conditions do of course vary, his children, like himself, are again set apart, contrary to their wishes.

Usually the Negro officer or serviceman has few friends in the community where he is sent. He and his family must build a new life, but many doors are closed outside the Negro section of town. Drugstores, restaurants and bars may refuse to serve him. Bowling alleys, golf courses, theaters, hotels and sections of department stores may exclude him. Transportation may be segregated. Churches may deny him admission. Throughout his period of service at the particular base he is in many ways set apart

and denied the general freedom of the community available to his white counterpart.

Many of these Negro military personnel are well educated, specially skilled and accustomed to home communities relatively free from discrimination. All of them have enjoyed the relative freedom from distinctions drawn on the basis of color which prevails on military bases. To all Negroes these community conditions are a constant affront and a constant reminder that the society they are prepared to defend is a society that deprecates their right to full participation as citizens. This should not be.

Letters from Negro military personnel bring these conditions into sharp focus. Visits which members of the Committee made to bases and their surrounding communities have served to give them special emphasis. Interviews with Negro military personnel reflect their gravity and the need for prompt action.

Complaints which the Committee has received, some in interviews and some written, show that for some Negro families, the pressures of community discrimination prove too great to bear. Homes are broken up by these conditions as Negro families coming from parts of the country which are relatively tolerant of color differences find themselves facing a situation which is both new and frightening. For them, the clock has turned back more than a generation. To protect their children and to maintain some degree of dignity they return home, and the husband is left to work out his service obligations alone. Other families never attempt to venture into these conditions in the first place. Under either of these circumstances the Negro serviceman becomes consumed with the frustration of separation and the desire for transfer. And whether his family is with him or not, the indignities suffered in the community place a load upon his service career affecting both his interest and his performance.

The impact of community discrimination is not solely upon those who have families. Such discrimination creates another demoralizing condition, affecting all military personnel. On base many of the artificial barriers caused by race disappear as Negro and white personnel work, eat, and sleep together. Friendships develop between Negro and white officers and servicemen. Normally these relationships would carry over into moments of liberty and recreation. But many communities do not tolerate relations between Negroes and whites. Leaving the base, they may not be able to ride the bus into town together, attend a movie, go bowling, get a coke at a drugstore or a beer at a bar or, indeed, even stroll through a public park. This sharp taboo which the civilian community seeks to impose is particularly intolerable and its effects unusually severe in view of the easy, normal relationships which develop on base under existing military

policy. The contrast makes the discrimination more biting and affront more serious. Conditions such as these cause deep resentment among Negro and many white personnel.

The isolation caused by this type of blatant discrimination is felt keenly by the increasingly large group of Negro personnel whose education and training make the facilities available in the Negro areas of many communities unacceptable. There are many Negroes in the Armed Forces who simply will not patronize the usual places of public recreation and accommodations available to Negroes in typical segregated communities. Judged by standards to which they have been accustomed at home, these places seem both shabby and disreputable. They will not accept them merely because no alternative is available. Their efforts to find forms of recreation and pursue cultural interests consonant with their background go unrewarded because of the barriers placed in their way by community attitudes.

It is not surprising, but most discouraging, to have to report that there are bases where Negro personnel confront such intolerable conditions off base that almost any device will be employed to effect a change in duty assignment. Applications for transfer,⁴ infractions of rules and a general contempt for the "system" are apt to appear. The effect on service morale and efficiency is apparent. The Committee's inquiries, including interviews with many base commanders, made it clear that the accomplishment of the military mission of a base confronted with such conditions is measurably impaired. There was general agreement among base commanders that the morale of both white and Negro troops suffers in the presence of such indignities and inequities. A practical program for dealing with off-base discrimination against Negro military personnel and their dependents is urgently required.

C. Base commanders lack adequate instructions and generally ignore off-base discrimination

The focal point of any practical approach to this most pressing problem is the base commander.⁵ He represents the military in the area. It is his duty to be concerned with the welfare of those under his command. He is in a better position than higher echelons to identify the particular discrimination forms prevalent in the community neighboring his base. On his shoulders should fall the primary responsibility for solving local problems.

The record of base commanders in dealing with such problems has not been impressive. Their failure in this regard stems from a number of causes.

While the failure can be explained by the absence of specific directives requiring affirmative programs, in part it stems from the attitudes and training which most base commanders bring to their job. As a group, they do not believe that problems of segregation

⁴In order to maintain maximum utilization of manpower, the Services generally deny transfers to Negro servicemen when such transfers are requested upon the sole ground that they and their families are suffering racial discrimination in the communities where their places of duty are located. Exceptions may be made for particularly severe cases.

⁵At some bases, there are commanders senior to the person designated as the base commander. Where this is true, the attitudes of the senior commander are naturally given great weight by the base commander. In such situations, the considerations discussed in the context of the base commander's functions apply with equal force to the role of this senior commander located at the base.

and racial discrimination in the local community should be their concern. Base commanders express this view in various ways: That the authority of the base commander ends at the gate, that it is not his job to rearrange the social order, that it is not part of the military mission to change community attitudes, that any pressure would be misunderstood and merely stir up trouble, that questions of this kind should be left to the courts, that military personnel are traditionally nonpolitical and should not involve themselves in controversial questions.

The failure stems also from the nature of assignments to the job of base commander. Such assignments are for a limited tour of duty, often between 2 and 3 years. Rarely does a man serve as a base commander more than once. The base commander naturally looks upon his job as an opportunity to exercise military command on a substantial scale, thus providing important experience as he moves up the promotion ladder. Quite naturally he conceives of his job as overwhelmingly military in character, his mission being to develop the units and troops under his command to peak efficiency. While he has a multitude of duties, many of these may be delegated or subordinated to the priority which he feels must be given the strictly military aspects of his job, the aspects most familiar to him. His course of training as an officer has not been such as to bring him into contact with literature and experience in the field of equal opportunity. He operates without the guidance of persons experienced with such problems.

The typical base commander understands that he is expected to complete his limited tour of duty without disturbance. The problems with which he might become concerned in attempting to improve treatment of his troops off base are emotionally surcharged and controversial, as well as difficult to solve. He will not venture into this area without specific instructions.

The attitudes and background of the base commander influence the manner in which he utilizes the fairly well-established procedures by which commanders discuss certain types of problems with the neighboring civilian community. The various services' instructions concerning community relations suggest working through some sort of committee or council. The civilian members of such a group are often designated by the chamber of commerce, Rotary Club, or other civic group, or by officials of the local governments, and rarely are Negroes represented. The base is represented by the base commander and certain officers designated by him.

The principal function of the committee is to develop a smooth-working relationship on certain matters of obviously common concern, such as relations with local police authorities. Base commanders are instructed by directives, quite properly, to recognize the public-relations aspect of their jobs, to encourage parades and troop participation in civic affairs, and generally to project before the community a favorable image of the base and the service. It has not been the practice for these community relations committees to concern themselves with racial matters. Indeed, in most communities where there is a substantial Negro population and serious forms of discrimination exist, the leaders of the Negro community are not represented on the committees, nor are whites who are mindful of these problems. The commander, moreover, selects no Negro personnel to represent the base. As a result, the base commander has little or no contact with local discrimination problems.

The pattern which the Committee has observed is clearly one of inaction by base commanders in the face of serious discrimination affecting the morale and military efficiency of members of their commands. But while the base commander represents his

service and the Department of Defense locally, it would be unfair to ascribe to him sole responsibility for the policy of inaction. If he has failed to pursue an active program, it is largely because no higher command has directed him to do so, provided him with guidance in developing a program, or assured him that he would be given support if his affirmative actions should incur the disfavor of the community.

It is true that the Department of Defense, in recognition of the off-base problem, has made some limited moves in the direction of improving conditions. Military police, for example, are not permitted to be employed on behalf of local authorities to support enforcement of racial segregation or other forms of discrimination. Where civilian authorities initiate legal action against military personnel arising out of the enforcement of segregation or discrimination policies, limited legal assistance may be provided on an ad hoc basis to assure that such personnel are afforded due process of law.

In the field of housing, a recent Secretary of Defense memorandum now provides that private housing leased by the services for assignment to military personnel may be obtained only where the lessor agrees that the services may assign it without discrimination. In dealing with the problem of segregated schools, the services are cooperating with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Justice in a program designed to desegregate schooling in certain communities by constructing on-base schools and withdrawing payments made to local schools for educating dependents living on base.

These are, of course, policies for dealing with rather well-defined, specific problems. It is also important to consider direct instructions to bases giving general policies for attacking problems of discrimination. The existing instructions are found in the so-called Gilpatric memorandum, issued to all branches of the service by the Deputy Secretary of Defense on June 19, 1961, and reissued thereafter by each of the services, which reads in part, as follows:

"1. The policy of equal treatment for all members of the Armed Forces without regard to race, creed or color is firmly established within the Department of Defense.

"2. Therefore, in those areas where unsegregated facilities are not readily available to members of the Armed Forces in adjacent or surrounding communities, it is the policy of the Department of Defense to provide such facilities on military installations to the extent possible. In addition, local commanders are expected to make every effort to obtain such facilities off base for members of the Armed Forces through command-community relations committees."

The policy announced by the second paragraph of this memorandum has not been carried out. While copies of this memorandum were distributed widely in the services, there was no well-developed plan for carrying out the program outlined in these general terms, and the words "to the extent possible" vitiated its effectiveness. Except in the Navy, the policy has not been incorporated in any of the relatively permanent types of directives which are referred to by those in the field for guidance in developing base policies. Equally serious, no service has issued detailed regulations or manuals implementing the policy, nor has any systematic effort been made to determine what, if anything, base commanders were doing to carry out its letter or spirit. Indeed, the great majority of base commanders interviewed were unaware of the existence of the policy. These procedures are fairly typical of the way in which most other policies in this area have been handled.

Apart from the Gilpatric memorandum, no directive or policy of any service specifically assigns to base commanders the responsibility

for attempting to eliminate problems of discrimination in surrounding communities, where such problems affect the morale and military efficiency of members of their commands. The service literature dealing with community relations has not in the past discussed the problem; apparently no higher command has censured base commanders for policies of inaction; no effort has been to identify and commend commanders who have made efforts to solve such problems; no one has suggested to base commanders that their achievements in dealing with such problems will be considered in rating their performance of duty and in promotion selection. It is not surprising, therefore, that the base commander, without instruction, experience or technical support, keeps his emphasis solidly on the military aspect of his mission. While some commanders assert that they have quietly urged desegregation "behind the scenes" and in the course of social contacts, few, if any, have regularly and systematically sought to solve problems of discrimination.

Despite the general climate of inaction, the Committee has seen some evidence of occasional efforts by individual base commanders to deal with off-base discrimination problems, efforts which have met with some success. One commander encouraged enactment of an equal accommodations law; another has attempted to desegregate multiple housing units; others have placed considerable emphasis on breaking color lines in sports contests in which the base is involved. Occasionally, local auditoriums have been thrown open to all servicemen in the face of an established pattern of exclusion and segregation. Efforts have been made to open up cultural events in communities to Negro personnel or to permit attendance at sports events, with nonsegregated seating. While, in many instances, in communities where segregation is practiced, segregated military police patrols are used—an undesirable practice—there has been some effort to use mixed military police patrols in white and Negro areas. Some commanders have been able to arrange desegregated transportation between the base and the nearby community, contrary to local practice. At least one commander started a program of meetings and discussions with local Negro civil rights leaders.

The examples given above are the rare exception, rather than the rule, but they offer an indication of the advances which a positive effort can achieve.

D. Recommendations for an urgently needed program

1. The Defense Department and the Services Must Redefine Responsibilities, Establish Goals and Provide Detailed Instructions

While any worthwhile efforts to eliminate off-base discrimination must center on the functions of the base commander, a redefinition of responsibilities at all levels of command in this field is an essential preliminary. It should be the policy of the Department of Defense and part of the mission of the chain of command from the secretaries of the services to the local base commander, not only to remove discrimination within the Armed Forces, but also to make every effort to eliminate discriminatory practices as they affect members of the Armed Forces and their dependents within the neighboring civilian communities.

As a part of this process of redefinition, a different concept of the base commander's functions in the racial field must be evolved. Interviews with base commanders have led the Committee to conclude that commanders desire more explicit instructions and clarification of their responsibilities in this regard. These commanders, concerned with morale factors, increasingly feel the need to act. Before they act, they need to have their responsibilities defined. They

need more explicit orders and more detailed directives. These should be provided.

2. Commanders' Performance Must Be Rated, Monitored and Supported

Redefinition is, however, not enough. There is need for a continuing program in this area, a program which must be imaginative and persistent in order to achieve the desired equality of treatment and opportunity. It must be made clear to base commanders and others concerned with these problems that they will be measured in terms of their performance. A regular system of monitoring and reporting on progress should be instituted. It should be made clear that officers showing initiative and achievement in this area will enhance their performance ratings and obtain favorable consideration for promotion and career advancement. It is especially important that such officers be assured that they will not run the risk of official disfavor for their efforts and that they will receive the support of all echelons of command if their programs are attacked by local interests.

In implementing the program to eliminate off-base discrimination against military personnel, considerable care should be taken to insure that the policies of the Department of Defense are disseminated to lower echelons by the services in relatively permanent media of the type maintained for continuing reference by those responsible for operating military bases.

But it is not sufficient merely to state in directives, of whatever type, the substance of the foregoing policy. There has been a great failure of communications to bases of the attitudes and policies of the Department of Defense concerning discrimination. It will be necessary to emphasize and reemphasize that progress is required, and that a constant showing of serious, intense effort is the minimum performance accepted. While this attitude must be instilled in base commanders, it must also be part of the command philosophy of the many superior commanders who assign base commanders to duty, assess their performance, and necessarily influence their attitudes.

3. Command Training Programs and Manuals Should Treat All Aspects of Discrimination Problems and Solutions

Still other steps should be taken to insure that a sense of responsibility for problems of off-base discrimination replaces the prevalent notion that matters outside the gate are of no concern to the base commander. The history of Negro participation in the Armed Forces and the problems which he confronts in the services must be emphasized and made a definite part of the curriculum at all levels of officer and command training. The services must insure that men reaching the position of base commander are familiar with the requirements of the Constitution and the history of the Negroes' struggle to achieve equality of treatment and opportunity. In addition, it would be beneficial for base commanders to attend regional and interregional seminars or conferences where discussions of techniques and results are featured. Base commanders and higher commands should be made aware of other Federal agencies which work with problems of discrimination and directed to cooperate with such agencies and to seek their technical assistance and advice.

Base commanders should also be provided a carefully prepared manual, which will guide their activities in this as yet unfamiliar area and fill some of the gaps in their experience and training.

4. Base Commanders Must Establish Biracial Community Committees and by This and Other Means Lead Efforts to Reduce Discrimination

An active program for eliminating off-base discrimination demands the creation of a

wholly different working relationship between the commander and the local community in which discrimination is practiced. Solving such problems should be the means at his disposal in seeking solutions. One of the means base commanders should use to solve problems of discrimination is a committee of base and community representatives. But satisfactory results cannot be obtained by relying on the types of committees which have heretofore existed. Generally, these committees have represented a part of the white community, but not the community as a whole.

In the future the installation commander should be required to appoint such a committee in order to bring together leaders of both the white and Negro communities. He is in the best position to do this. Care should be taken to include individuals experienced and concerned with problems of racial equality, as a recent Navy instruction has noted, and to insure that the Negro members are those who are not, by virtue of their job or position, subservient to white interests. Both white and Negro military personnel should participate.

The committees should function as working committees, identifying problem areas in the community and working toward their solution with the guidance and help of committee members and with technical assistance from experts when appropriate. It will be necessary to establish specific objectives and a timetable against which results can be measured. Problems of housing will prevail everywhere, but exclusion of Negro military personnel from theaters may be the most pressing problem in one community, while exclusion from restaurants is the principal aggravation in another. Various types of recreational facilities may have special local significance because of their proximity to the base, the lack of adequate on-base facilities or other considerations. It will be necessary to move from objective to objective and these objectives will differ from community to community.

Each community has its own special traditions and history. In some, attitudes are more entrenched than in others. It is significant, however, that base commanders who have genuinely undertaken to accomplish progress in this area have met some degree of success, even in communities where feelings are strong. Similarly, the progress of the national USO program to eliminate segregation in all its local facilities, discussed later in this report, shows that serious effort can produce results.

It is important to emphasize that the base commander's concern should be that of correcting forms of discrimination which interfere with the morale and efficiency of members of his command. The pattern the community chooses to follow as to its own civilians cannot be accepted as the pattern which must be imposed upon men in uniform or their dependents, when that pattern is detrimental to military morale and efficiency. The significant tradition of non-involvement by military authorities in local political matters will be unimpaired if base commanders limit their concern to problems affecting the morale and efficiency of members of their commands.

It is the Committee's judgment that many communities are awaiting leadership and direction. Proprietors of local establishments and others who must live and work in the community may understandably hesitate to urge a change in existing customs. However, the enormous growth of relatively permanent military installations, scattered throughout the country and economically important to the communities which surround them, enables local commanders to supply some of the necessary leadership. The base commander not only enjoys an independence which permits him

to do so; he can also point to the successful program of equality of treatment and opportunity which exists on his base and to the economic dependence of the community upon the base. The base commander should emphasize his concern for morale and the policy of the services concerning off-base discrimination in conferences with individuals, in his work with the local committee, and in public expressions of his views. Such an approach, stressing troop morale and efficiency, should lead patriotic citizens to join together, where their business interests are common, to find an appropriate solution.

5. Where Efforts of Base Commanders Are Unsuccessful Sanctions Are Available and Should Be Employed

It is important to consider what further steps may be necessary where efforts to achieve progress by persuasion and discussion are unsuccessful.

Litigation, brought in the name of the Federal Government, to open some types of public establishments to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents is one possible avenue for achieving integration. But even in those cases in which such litigation offers some hope of eventual success, it is piecemeal and time consuming at best.

A more satisfactory approach must be developed. Segregation and other forms of discrimination in facilities in a given locality, detrimental to the morale of Negro personnel at a neighboring military base, must cease. The commander should, of course, attempt by means available to him—community committees, persuasion, emphasis of the base's importance to the local economy—to eliminate such practices. In situations in which these efforts are unsuccessful, the commander should develop a plan under which military personnel of all races would be permitted to patronize only those facilities which receive his express approval. One of the requirements for such approval should be a guarantee from the proprietor that the establishment will be open to all servicemen and their dependents without regard to race or color, and that all patrons will receive equal treatment. Qualifying establishments might be issued a display placard or decal.

Approval of an establishment is not, of course, the final step. There must be procedures for dealing with complaints that approved establishments have not fulfilled their guarantees, and for withdrawing approval if such complaints are substantiated.

Should all other efforts fail, the services must consider a curtailment or termination of activities at certain military installations near communities where discrimination is particularly prevalent. While compelling military considerations must prevail, it is often possible to conduct certain activities at any one of a number of locations. Where this is true, alternative communities' attitudes and practices should be carefully weighed. Such relocation of activities is particularly important at bases that play an important role in the training of new recruits or officers or in the orientation of representatives of foreign governments. The objective here should be preservation of morale, not the punishment of local communities which have a tradition of segregation.

In this context, one further comment is appropriate. The Armed Forces have, in the past, unfortunately not given attention to the important morale factors presented in off-base communities at the time that new installations are opened or changes made in the deployment of forces as between bases.

Where tactical considerations make a variety of sites eligible for consideration, the military decision should, among other things, strenuously emphasize the necessity of obtaining from the communities involved explicit guarantees against the continuation or establishment of patterns of discrimination

against members of the Armed Forces and their dependents. At these moments of decision the economic well-being of the community will serve as a potent influence toward assuring the conditions necessary to maintain morale and efficiency.

6. Officials Charged With Responsibility for Equality of Treatment and Opportunity On and Off Base Should Be Appointed in the Defense Department and the Services

It is not within the province of this committee to detail the administrative steps which are obviously necessary to carry out the type of program that has been outlined. Some general recommendations in this regard are, however, indicated.

It will be necessary to establish offices in each service to monitor developments and to provide assistance. Trained individuals must be in frequent contact with the bases involved. Overall policies must be guided by an official within the Department of Defense whose full-time responsibility is the program for assuring equality of opportunity and treatment for servicemen. This official should have a full-time, biracial staff skilled in dealing with deprivations of equality, and should, in addition, have access to consultants who have broad experience in dealing with racial discrimination. Procedures must be devised to bring the base commander into close working relationship with other Federal bodies concerned with problems in this area, and with local groups working to eliminate forms of discrimination. All of the resources of the Federal Government should be made available to him and brought to bear on the intelligent solution of specific problems.

VI. EFFORTS OF THE USO TO ELIMINATE SEGREGATION AND DISCRIMINATION

It is appropriate at this juncture to comment briefly on some recent developments affecting the United Services Organization, commonly known as the USO. The USO, which operates some 139 clubs in the United States, is a voluntary civilian agency established for the purpose of assisting the Armed Forces. It does so by providing recreational and entertainment facilities and programs for servicemen in various communities. Operating on a nonprofit basis, it collects its funds largely through private donations in a number of communities throughout the United States. No Federal funds support the program within the United States. Quite naturally, the USO has a close working relationship with the Department of Defense, which is represented on its board of governors.

In January 1963, the USO board of governors determined to implement more aggressively a policy, long established by the USO, designed to assure operation of all its facilities without distinctions based on race, color or national origin. The USO is now in the process of adjusting its program and devising methods to make maximum service possible on a nonsegregated basis to all members of the Armed Forces. It has determined that it will not sponsor, operate or finance anything other than integrated USO facilities in any community after 1963.

This new policy involves various adjustments at clubs in 20 communities located chiefly in Florida, Georgia, Texas, South Carolina, and Virginia. Since January a number of clubs have integrated and established new programs. The Department of Defense and the commanders at the installations affected have agreed to cooperate with the USO in carrying out its program. As a result of these measures, it is expected that all local USO clubs will be operating on an integrated basis by the end of the year. This Committee has been in close touch with the USO throughout this program and commends its efforts, which it will continue to observe in the forthcoming months.

VII. THE UNAVAILABILITY OF SUITABLE HOUSING FOR NEGRO MILITARY PERSONNEL AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Representatives of the services are unanimous in characterizing undesirable family housing conditions as the most serious problem affecting the morale of military families of all races. Some measure of the gravity of this problem is suggested by a complete 1962 Department of Defense survey which shows that of the 487,408 military families not living on military installations, 181,635 live in quarters which are below service standards in some fashion.⁶ Bad as the situation is for all personnel, it is much worse for Negroes who face discrimination in housing throughout the United States. Unfortunately, the Department of Defense is not at present acting with vigor or sensitivity in this area.

The full scope of housing problems encountered by Negro personnel off base cannot be determined from available figures. These figures are based on an annual questionnaire on family housing which does not include questions identifying the race of the family or the nature of the neighborhood in which the family lives. Neither does the questionnaire inquire into difficulties stemming from discriminatory off-base housing practices. Modification of this questionnaire to develop such information is essential if Negro housing problems, as an important element of overall housing problems, are to be adequately assessed. In planning Government owned or controlled housing, the information developed from the modified questionnaire should be fully utilized to insure that estimates of the availability of housing in the community and standards for determining the adequacy of such housing gave appropriate weight to discriminatory housing practices.

If this is done, construction of additional Government-owned or controlled housing units at installations where housing problems are severe can be properly planned to help alleviate the problem of discrimination in housing. Any new units should, of course, be occupied on an integrated basis as other military housing is now occupied.

Furthermore, in order to provide a fair opportunity for all servicemen eligible for on-base housing to obtain such quarters, it may be desirable in some instances to assign on-base housing by allotting blocks of housing to certain specific enlisted grades, as is now done occasionally.

That little has been done at the base level to increase the amount of housing available to Negro personnel reflects the absence of any helpful policies or guidance from the services or the Department of Defense dealing with this problem. While discrimination in housing is not susceptible of easy solution, there are a number of steps which, if utilized, can bring improvement in the off-base housing situation.

Some of these steps will be informal in nature. For example, base housing officials and base commanders should stimulate interest among private builders in developing multiple units available without regard to race. Equally important are concerted efforts to develop and maintain lists of private housing available without regard to

⁶ Of these 181,635 families, 74,250 families live in housing which is substandard because of the condition of the dwelling or inadequate size for the family unit. An additional 27,284 families live at a distance from the base which is considered excessive by Department of Defense standards, and 80,101 live in housing whose cost exceeds the allowance for quarters paid the serviceman. The first figure given does not include 23,859 families who desire to live near the duty station of the service member, but cannot because of the unavailability of adequate housing.

race, by means of a canvass of units available in the community. Such lists, kept current and open to all personnel, would help to avoid the embarrassment and wasted effort which results when each Negro serviceman seeking housing has to rely on his own investigation and efforts.

Other steps of a more formal nature should also be vigorously pursued. The leased housing program currently available to the Services has, in the past, been generally limited to providing housing for personnel assigned to jobs whose tactical significance required them to live near their place of duty. Such housing can now be obtained for personnel not holding tactical positions. Under this program, privately owned units are rented by the service and assigned as public quarters to military personnel, who then forfeit their quarters allowance. The advantages of such a program include both utilization of the private housing market and speed and flexibility in adapting to changing conditions. This program should be expanded and applied more vigorously in tactical and in nontactical situations, where necessary, to minimize the effects of discriminatory housing practices. While current directives require that the lessor consent to nondiscriminatory assignment, it will naturally be necessary for the services to insure that the housing to which Negroes are assigned is not in substandard neighborhoods.

Section 810 of the National Housing Act has recently provided for FHA insurance of multiple-family housing to be constructed on the basis of military need. However, the number of units currently authorized is far too small to have any significant effect on Negro housing problems. This program, too, should be enlarged and made more flexible. Here, again, the agencies of government responsible for approving construction of this so-called "810" housing should weigh, with other considerations, the incidence of discrimination in housing near bases.

New housing, to be insured by the Federal Housing Administration, will be subject to the mandatory nondiscrimination provisions of the recent Executive order on equal opportunity in housing. The services should insure that lists of such housing are made easily available to all personnel at the base level. Any discrimination in this housing should be promptly reported by the base to the FHA, the Department of Justice and the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing for proper action.

As an essential part of a meaningful program, base commanders will have to utilize their good offices and those of other involved Federal Agencies, as directed in the Executive order, at every opportunity, in order to promote the abandonment of discriminatory practices in housing.

Some States and local communities prohibit discrimination in certain types of housing. For example, at least 17 States, including California, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania, have laws to this effect. Information on such requirements, including the agency of the State charged with their enforcement, should be made accessible to base commanders and housing officers, who should be responsible for utilizing procedures available through such agencies for eliminating discrimination in housing.

The inexperience of base housing officers in attacking discrimination problems makes it necessary that rather detailed regulations and manuals be prepared, outlining the steps to be taken and the avenues to be explored. In discussing recommendations for a vigorous program, the Committee remarked on the need to impress upon responsible officials that serious, continued effort in dealing with equal opportunity matters is required. Those remarks apply with equal force here.

VIII. EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR NEGRO MILITARY PERSONNEL AND DEPENDENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Many military personnel are stationed at locations where segregation is practiced in the schools of the nearby community. This condition is not only unlawful under the Constitution but it operates against the military program of equal treatment and opportunity and is inconsistent with the patterns of integration which exist on base.

TABLE IV.—Segregated public schooling serving children of service personnel

	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
Number of installations or activities (with 100 or more assigned military personnel) in areas where public schools are segregated.....	48	143	4	53
Number of military personnel assigned to such installations and activities.....	178,109	58,500	47,956	159,691
Percentage of all service installations of this size in such segregated-school areas.....	20	25	5	18

There are probably about 200,000 to 210,000 school-age dependents, including perhaps between 15,000 to 20,000 Negro children, of the military personnel assigned to those bases referred to in table IV above. Usually the majority of school-age dependent children attend off-base schools. Negro military personnel expressed deep resentment about school segregation to the Committee during its visits. One letter reported that a serviceman had decided to send his wife and child home, leaving the serviceman alone at a base more than a thousand miles away, to avoid segregated schooling. Undoubtedly, others have done likewise.

The Federal Government has already begun steps to ease the problems. Where children living on base attend off-base locally operated schools, such schools in some cases receive Federal financial assistance. The determination of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that segregated schools do not provide suitable education for military dependents living on base will result in the establishment of a number of schools onbase, with a consequent withdrawal of students and funds from the schools of the community. These on-base schools, which can under existing law serve only children living on base, leave untouched the needs of the large numbers of military dependents who must live off base. Federal financial assistance is also being furnished in some cases to schools serving dependents who live off base, but whose parent works on base; the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has determined that such payments must, under current law, be continued despite segregation in the schools receiving payment.

Suits initiated by the Department of Justice in the name of the United States, now pending in the courts, will, if successful, compel the integration of other schools serving military dependents, including dependents who live off base. If the right of the United States to bring such suits is upheld, the burden of supporting desegregation suits can be lifted from the shoulders of individual Negro servicemen. But such litigation is by nature long drawn out and piecemeal.

The children of our military personnel should not be compelled to wait. Their needs are immediate and should receive more attention. Legislation requiring desegregation of all public schools receiving Federal assistance which serve dependents of military personnel is urgently needed. As public schools are desegregated—through such legislation, through litigation, through efforts of the base commander, or by other means—local commanders should insure that children of Negro military personnel are promptly placed in such recently desegre-

gated schools. In accomplishing this, the full power and influence of the base commander and of the service should be placed squarely on the side of Negro parents as they attempt to overcome the administrative barriers which often accompany desegregation. Token integration is only a first step toward satisfactory progress; efforts must not be considered successful until dispersion of children of Negro military personnel within the local school system is complete.

The extent to which segregated public schooling exists in communities neighboring military installations is suggested by the following statistics.

There are several aspects of military education programs conducted in, by or through civilian schools which also require comment. A variety of opportunities exist by which an enlisted man or officer may improve his education and hence enhance his opportunity for advancement. Efforts have been made by the Armed Forces to provide this education to Negro personnel as well as to others. However, some of these programs involve direct agreements or contracts between the services and segregated secondary schools or institutions of higher learning. For example, some of the Army's junior ROTC and National Defense Cadet Corps units are located in segregated secondary schools. All of the services have ROTC units and fully subsidized professional education programs in segregated institutions of higher learning. These arrangements should not be continued. There is no readily apparent reason why similar arrangements to afford the types of education here involved cannot be made with institutions which have desegregated. Fortunately, the number of segregated institutions participating in military education programs is not so large for any service that the recommended alterations of programs should cause serious difficulties.

The services also have programs designed to permit full-time college attendance by personnel who need only a semester or a year of college work to qualify for a degree. Some personnel involved in this program are attending segregated institutions. To require these personnel to complete their work at a college other than the one previously attended would cause complications because of the difficulty of transferring credits and the different curricula involved. The Committee does not feel that those limited, special situations need be altered. It does not follow, of course, that personnel with no record of prior attendance at a segregated college should be permitted to complete their degree requirements there when integrated colleges are available.

In addition to these programs all of the services subsidize in part so-called off-duty education programs. Many service personnel

afford themselves the advantages of such programs. However, some cannot because of segregation policies at certain institutions. At a few bases, where only white schools are available for this program and yet sufficient numbers of Negro personnel would participate if they could, integrated courses have been arranged on base for all personnel. These examples are highly commendable, and this practice should be required wherever similar segregated conditions exist together with sufficient numbers of interested Negro and white personnel. This practice should result in continuing minimization of use of segregated institutions in the off-duty program.

There are occasions, however, when courses are not arranged because of the limited number of Negroes present. While these determinations are administrative in character and are in no way intended as a form of discrimination, the Committee feels that under no circumstances should any Negro desiring to improve his education be prohibited from doing so because of the unavailability of schools. The very lack of such opportunities will keep Negroes from moving into technical and other non-service occupational areas as mentioned earlier in this report. Where it is not feasible to establish on-base courses, and off-base schooling is not available, Negroes desiring additional education should be freely given the opportunity for transfer to or temporary duty at other locations.

There are compelling reasons for the Committee's recommendations regarding service educational programs involving segregated civilian institutions. First, of course, service funds should not be provided for these programs to State-controlled schools conducted in a manner offensive to a clear constitutional requirement, particularly one so oft-pronounced. Second, officer and enlisted personnel should not be trained in an environment which fosters among its members a policy opposite to, and at loggerheads with, that of equality of treatment and opportunity for all military personnel. To produce men trained for leadership under such conditions will make the job of correcting current problems more difficult for years to come. Finally, of course, Negro personnel who desire to partake of these educational opportunities should not be barred from doing so, for if they are, their careers and usefulness will be stunted to that extent.

In summary, then, as Armed Forces operations have become more complex, the importance of education of military personnel has been accentuated. This trend will undoubtedly continue. Full utilization of available talent—Negro or otherwise—demands that education programs contain no features which limit the opportunities of any personnel.

IX. RECOMMENDATIONS INVOLVING RACIAL DATA

All of the services have, in one form or another, an indication of each serviceman's race. This information is usually obtained at the time a man enters the service and accompanies his personnel file, together with other basic data such as educational history, experience, etc. While the Committee believes that the presence of racial information in promotion files is undesirable for the reasons indicated elsewhere in this report, it has been handicapped in its work by an almost complete absence of current statistical reports which would permit measurement of such elementary matters as recruitment, promotion or assignment of Negroes. Such information is lacking in a readily available form at the installation level in many cases, as well as at major command and headquarters levels generally. Special questionnaires and detailed statistical studies undertaken by the services provide the basis for this report. A substantial

amount of time and money have been required to develop them.

The entire problem of racial statistics is a controversial one because they can be used both for proper and improper purposes. It is the Committee's opinion that sufficient controls on such data can be devised to insure that they are used only for proper purposes. Accordingly, with such controls, the services should provide for the maintenance of centralized racial data which may be availed of under special circumstances to measure progress in achieving the equality of treatment and opportunity which national policy requires. Racial entries should not be maintained in records which accompany the servicemen, or on other records routinely available to those who rate, assign or promote personnel.

It is essential as Negroes are increasingly recruited into the Armed Forces, that their assignments be consistent with their skills, and that they receive appropriate recognition through promotions. The process has been, and presumably will be, gradual, although far greater acceleration is required than has been exhibited in recent years. Only with the availability of informative statistical information, subject to constant and penetrating review by the appropriate officials, will it be possible to determine, except through great expenditure of time and money, whether the desired progress is being achieved. Such statistics also will point up special areas within this general field which require attention.

X. ASPECTS OF DISCRIMINATION UNDER FURTHER STUDY

This initial report covers a substantial portion, but not all, of the work assigned to the Committee. Three specific areas are now under intensive study and will be the subject of a further report. These involve problems of segregation and discrimination in the National Guard and the Reserves and problems of inequality of treatment and opportunity affecting Negroes at installations overseas. In addition, consideration must be given to areas of possible discrimination and inequality of treatment affecting individuals of other races and creeds serving in the Armed Forces.

While pursuing these matters to completion, the Committee will maintain close contact with the Department of Defense and the Armed Forces on matters covered by this report. The services are reviewing existing procedures and policies, and there is every prospect that affirmative action will be taken in many of the areas suggested. As these and other steps are taken, their effectiveness will be measured by the Committee during its tenure.

The Committee is mindful that the Armed Forces are an ever-present symbol of our democracy. Both at home and abroad, they must be leaders rather than followers in establishing equal opportunity. To the extent they practice and preach equality without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin, they provide a standard by which communities at home may measure their own conduct and against which citizens of other lands may judge our adherence to the principles of equality we advocate.

Respectfully submitted.

NATHANIEL S. COLLEY,
ABE FORTAS,
GERHARD A. GESELL,

Chairman.

LOUIS J. HECTOR,
BENJAMIN MUSE,
JOHN H. SENGSTACKE,
WHITNEY M. YOUNG, Jr.

Attest:

LAURENCE I. HEWES III,
Committee Counsel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

THE GESELL REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. WAGGONER. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the statement of the gentleman from Alabama who just left the floor. The discussion we have had here today was not concerned with past or future civil rights legislation. It had to do with a Defense Department directive which went beyond, as I explained in my remarks earlier, the equal opportunity assurance for all citizens which we as Republicans have always supported from the time of our first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. WAGGONER. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. LAIRD. By injecting past or future civil rights legislation into this debate I would remind the gentleman from Alabama that he is doing considerable damage to a fair discussion of the Gesell report. He has not served his cause well today by bringing up this important but irrelevant topic.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I withhold the point of order temporarily.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I want to try, if I possibly can in a few minutes—and if possible I do not intend to take all this time reserved for a special order today—to place in proper focus the one question that is involved in these special orders today, and that is, this is not just a matter of segregation and integration, nor is it a partisan issue. Surely by now you all know I do not play partisan politics. God forbid.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAGGONER. I had rather not at this time, sir, unless you insist. I should like to make this statement first to pinpoint the question at hand. I will be glad to yield in a few moments.

There is one question involved, as far as I am concerned, with regard to the implementation of the Gesell report. And that is: not whether the Secretary of Defense or the President of the United States has any authority to do anything about segregation by desegregating military bases or not. But the question paramount in my mind and the only question is this. Have the President of the United States and the people who compiled the Gesell report and, in turn, one of his appointed officials, the Secretary of Defense, attempted to misuse the military for a purpose which was never intended? That is the question I want to discuss and the light in which I want to discuss the Gesell report.

Perhaps I made a mistake at one point in distributing my newsletter when I

called to the attention of the people in the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana the fact that ultimately by implementing this report the question of segregation or desegregation or integration—whatever you want to call it—would be involved. But there is one question: Are the military branches of service going to be misused by implementing this report?

And I want to begin, Mr. Speaker, by asking unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain news stories, newspaper editorials, letters of transmittal from the Secretary of Defense to the Department of Defense, and other material which is pertinent and relevant to the Gesell report and its implementation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a copy of hearings before the Committee on Armed Services of the U.S. Senate of the 87th Congress, 1st session, on Senate Resolution 191, which was a resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to study the use of military personnel and facilities to arouse the public to the menace of the cold war. I turn to page 16, and I find that Senator SMITH asks the then and now Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, a question with regard to the use of military personnel in the armed services in arousing the public to the menace of the cold war. This was in 1961:

What do you do to prevent this and what do you plan to do in the future to prevent it?

Secretary McNAMARA. If I may, in passing, suggest that when we use the word "politics" or "political" and we may have done it erroneously, we have tried to use it synonymously with "partisan politics." Its dictionary definition is not quite that, but that is the way we use it, and using it in that sense I believe we should prohibit military officers from participating in partisan politics, and we should prohibit partisan politics from affecting the promotion of an officer.

To the best of my knowledge I have not approved any promotions based on or affected by partisan politics. I know that the military services, in screening officers, on the active lists for promotion, are very, very careful and follow what in some ways are almost excessively rigid and rigorous rules to insure that merit rather than any other influence is the foundation of the promotion.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I would certainly join with the others who have commended the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] and his colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], on their presentation of this matter to the Members of the House today. I am sure that as we have all observed the rather large number of Members of the House present and participating in the discussion we realize that this is a problem which is bearing heavily on the minds and hearts of the Members of the House of Representatives.

It seems to me that the gentleman in reading the testimony of the Secretary of Defense before the Senate last year has brought out something which might well be commented upon here. The Secretary, as I understand it, is saying that the Defense Department could not permit partisan political instructions to be given by military personnel nor their decisions affected by partisan considerations.

I think that as we have witnessed the discussion here today on this subject we have seen that Members of the House do not approach a serious matter of this sort on a partisan basis, because on both sides of the aisle and from every section of the country we have heard the Members of this body express consternation as to the recent action of the Secretary of Defense, and more particularly the action of the so-called Gesell Committee.

Many of us have had the privilege of serving in the various branches of the Defense Department during World War II. Many Members of the House have served in the several branches of the service. I am sure that those of us who were privileged to serve in time of emergency look back upon it as one of the really wonderful experiences of our life, one where we were given an opportunity to stand up for those things which have stirred the souls of men in this country since it was established.

I hope that the splendid discussion which the gentleman is bringing to us with the help of the other gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] will stir again in the hearts of Members of this body a dedication to the service of their country and preserving those features of it which have made it great.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] in bringing out some of the tactics that are being used, such as carrying around income tax returns to use in some mysterious way in local communities, has brought our attention to something we, during World War II, would have stood on any corner and argued with the Russians, that it would never happen in this country. But, as this distinguished and outstanding Member of the Congress says, not only is this true but if challenged, he can document it.

I say to you, gentlemen of the House and particularly my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, I think a great service has been rendered to this country today in exposing here some of the things that are going on which if not stopped, and if not stopped immediately will destroy democracy more quickly than any external force will ever bring about its destruction.

I thank my colleague for giving me an opportunity to make these comments.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, may I, too, compliment and commend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] as well as the gentleman from South Carolina and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]. Our colleague, the

gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER], has rendered a real service by making public the implications and the serious nature of the proposed order some days ago, which now is becoming fact. It has been my privilege since I have been a Member of the Congress to serve many years on various military appropriations subcommittees. I was on the Subcommittee on Navy Appropriations during World War II. I would like to say here, in my study of history, it has always been a great danger to any country when it got its economy tied to military expenditures, its politics dominated either by the military or by military spending. It has always been a serious threat to any nation when the military got to where it was spending far more than all the rest of the budget. Throughout history we have learned that he who has great power usually finds some place to use it. These truisms have been behind the fall and destruction of many of the great powers of the world throughout history, and you might say, the main ones.

In addition to that, one other thing that has led to the destruction of so many nations is the fact that instead of trying to have their defense establishment—strong as can be, for the defense of their country, they have had mercenary soldiers using their funds in foreign lands to get someone else to do the defending of their country, which is what they should do for themselves. We do this today. May I say, in recent years on this floor I have pointed out many times that we have about let military spending be the dominant voice in everything that goes on around us. No longer is it the Public Works Civil Functions Subcommittee to which local communities go for back home spending. Now it is a military establishment, with its huge spending which all seek for local pump priming. Now almost every section attempts to get a defense establishment in the area. We are spending something like 60 percent of our entire national budget for what is called defense, much of it not real defense at all. In this report and in these directives we see the use of naked power of that expenditure being used internally to try to force social change, to destroy private business, local rights and using Federal funds to do it. Economic power is the instrument of dictatorship just as much as troops or marshals.

The next time, and if we keep up on the same road that we are going, it will not be a question of which State gets a \$6.5 billion TFX contract or which contractor gets it or which Congressman or Senator gets the money spent in his district, if we go the way we are going, you will see this Nation, like the nations to the south of us in Central America and South America, with the military the dominant political factor in the country and in politics. Here, too, we will have revolution and military coups on the order of Iran, Cuba, and so forth. And, also in the same breath, how can we say that our objective is having a real effective fighting force, if at the time we say that it is to be used to promote the sociological ideals or ideas or the politi-

cal ramifications of some party that might be in power.

May I say to my friend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] that my colleagues and I who represent districts of the State of Mississippi in the Congress have just gotten back from Mississippi where we had gone to vote. We have not had an opportunity to bring together this afternoon the voluminous material which I have gathered as a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with these appropriations for defense which show that more and more we are getting away from the ideas that the military is solely for the purpose of providing for defending our country, but getting into the position of deciding how we divide the pie, how we spend our money, where we promote productivity, where we are going to give contracts with which to buy materiel which we do not need to use in places where we have no right to be anyway, and now, seeing how the military can be used to tear down, to force domestic change, all to the destruction of our Nation.

This report culminates a series of steps whereby the powers that be—and here it happens to be the Secretary of Defense—use the power of the purse, the power of the draft, the power of the military in the name of the Commander in Chief, use these things that are said to be needed to defend our country, in reality to destroy everything which we claim Russia would destroy. But let me say that I have letters from the President on down with reference to the things that will be coming up soon which do affect the internal affairs, the private business of every American and these requested actions will not represent just a simple law, because behind it would be the use of Federal troops to the limit. You will recall that I presented here some months ago the orders issued in sending 28,000 troops to the University of Mississippi before the final order of the court, and after federalizing the State militia, our only State law-enforcement body.

Mr. Speaker, we destroy ourselves at home. We do to ourselves what it is charged Russia would do to us.

We see our leaders using troops, economic pressure, the courts, the marshals, and all the rest, all, in the final analysis, being steps to a complete dictatorship.

I commend again my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, JOE WAGGONNER, for making public this report and these directives. I hope it will wake up the American people before these actions destroy all freedom, all those great principles on which this Nation was formed.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

Before yielding further, may I set the stage a little further in order to show what the proper role of the military is and what is really at the crux of this entire thing? I refer now to the hearings on the same Senate Resolution 191 of the 87th Congress, page 28, where Senator CANNON is asking the same Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, another question, or at least is referring to a state-

ment that Mr. McNamara had previously made on this occasion. He says:

I would also like to comment again on your statement where you say we do not permit Defense Department personnel, civilian or military, to advance either side of a partisan or political issue, nor do we place the Defense Department stamp of approval on a viewpoint which is not settled national policy.

I ask the Members of the House these questions: Is this the same attitude the Secretary is adopting today with the Gesell report? Is he now ordering every member of the military service to advance one side of a political issue? Is he not placing the Department of Defense's stamp of approval on one side of an issue that is being considered right now in the Halls of Congress? By what right does he decide a national policy before the decision is made by this and the other body?

Now I go to page 95 of the same report where hearings were being held on this same resolution and we have some extracts from an interview with Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara on the NBC television program "Today," originating in New York and Washington, February 17, 1961.

Mr. Martin Agronsky says:

Mr. Secretary, you have been on both sides of the fence, in industry and Government and that's why I think you are uniquely equipped to answer this question: Former President Eisenhower in his farewell message warned the Nation about the increasing—and, as he put it—the dangerous power of the military-industrial complex in our country to influence thought and opinion, and thereby jeopardize America's liberty—

And that is the same thing about which the gentleman from Mississippi has just spoken—

Now, do you share that concern of Mr. Eisenhower and are you doing anything about it if you do share it?

To which Mr. McNamara replied:

I would share his concern, Martin, if I thought that either I or any of my key officials in the Defense Department or any of the senior military or civilian officials in the Defense Department were likely to subordinate our desire to act in the national interest to the special interest of any one group, including ourselves or the contractors of the Department.

I ask you, my colleagues of the House, does the Secretary of Defense still share that same opinion which he expressed on that occasion? I say to you without reservation that, in implementing the Gesell report, he has refuted what he professed the role of the military to be in answer to the questions of Martin Agronsky in 1961 before a nationwide television audience.

There are some who will say this is not their problem. Believe me, my colleagues, it is your problem. Let me urge you to join this fight now to free the military from this unconstitutional role.

I urge you to join this fight now lest you find yourself without any answer when someday you are sure to be asked, "Why did you keep silent, when you knew the truth?" Under these conditions, I cannot remain silent.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] and I thank him for yielding to me and for taking this time.

I agree with the gentleman it is not a question of integration or segregation. It is a question of putting a political twist or use of our armed services to which it has not been put before, this business of calling upon military commanders to go out and become leaders of the community where they happen to be stationed to promote one particular philosophy.

I appreciate very much the gentleman's service and the service he has rendered the House in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand an analysis by General Almond, commander of the 77th Division under General MacArthur in Korea, who has analyzed this report. He has had a tremendous amount of experience in the armed services and I am proud he lives in my district. I understand that he lost a son in the Korean conflict.

I commend the gentleman for his diligence in this matter.

I include as part of my remarks the following excerpts from the analysis made by General Almond:

EXCERPTS OF ANALYSIS AND COMMENTS ON THE INITIAL REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN THE ARMED FORCES

(Made by Edward M. Almond, Lieutenant general, U.S. Army, retired, July 25, 1963)

I. INTRODUCTION

The initial subject report dealing with equality of treatment and opportunity for Negro military personnel stationed within the United States has been carefully reviewed by the undersigned and it is believed that the average objective reader of the report would be struck by the dictatorial recommendations, the vagueness of many charges and the bias whereby the Committee making the report to the President clearly shows that it is willing to go to any limit to insure integration in its most complete degree and this without regard to the effects that it may have on the balance of the Armed Forces which constitute between 85 and 90 percent of our military services.

II. OUTSTANDING CHARACTERISTICS OF THE REPORT

1. It proposes to deny essential information to promotion boards in the military services (pp. 24 and 25, photographs).
2. It demands in the name of "equal opportunity" a higher percentage in Negro promotions rather than education, age in service, and the more fundamental consideration of merit (p. 20).
3. It seeks integration "for the amalgamation of the races" and not merely to secure equal opportunity and use of skills (see pp. 34 and 35).
4. It invokes responsibilities and makes demands on post and area commanders by coercive methods to force integration on civilian communities by "threat and blackmail."
5. It encourages and recommends the establishment of an agency whereby accusation of "discrimination" may be made by secret testimony without the person accused being given the source of the accusation.
6. It quotes injustices repeatedly but at the same time admits that the Committee

verified very few and many times none of the facts.

7. It draws many inferences loosely and in general terms, even to the extent of challenging the integrity of responsible military leaders.

8. It does not envisage a real evaluation of the individual Negro based on merit but repeatedly speaks of opportunities and "latent" skills inherent in the Negro.

9. It recommends a "spy system" to be called monitoring with an especially sympathetic monitor throughout the range of troop levels in order to report on responsible commanders as to how they carry out their functions.

10. It strongly recommends that those responsible for integrating Negroes among white elements of commands be given to understand that such accomplishments will redound to the credit of the author of such plans for the purposes of furthering his promotion.

11. It emphasizes repeatedly that Negroes should operate without reference to race and that there should be no record of blood or race on the Negroes' record of services. Later on in the report it complains of the inability to determine what cases there are which have been committed against the Negroes, since it has no way of determining from the military record whether the individual is a Negro or not. It goes on further to claim that the absence of such a record has cost untold time and money to accumulate such information for the purposes of the report.

12. Signers of the report are: Nathaniel S. Colley; Abe Fortas; Gerhard A. Gesell, Chairman; Louis J. Hector; Benjamin Muse; John H. Sengstacke; Whitney M. Young, Jr.; Laurence I. Hewes III, Committee counsel.

Three of the members of this Committee are Negroes and the other four have a long career as racial agitators working with the ADA, ADL, and the NAACP. Not a single member appears to have a practical and objective approach to the subject of integration. From some of the recommendations made, it is apparent that the Committee is willing to go to any length to discredit the commander who does not meet the integration criteria that the Committee sets up and to institute a spy system which places the post commander in a thoroughly discredited position.

13. The immaturity of this Committee is established by its reference to the several Inspector General's Departments of the Armed Services which have been known for careful analyses and unblemished integrity since the beginning of the organization of all of our Armed Forces—Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps; this report would dispense with the Inspector General handling anything that has to do with integration and would set up a monitoring service with a special appointee who would handle such cases. The Communist Soviets have such a system and have had since the beginning of the Russian Revolution in 1917. He is known as a "political commissar," whose business it is to watch all military commanders and to report to another agency on their manner of performance of duty. The effrontery of this Committee to propose such a departure from the system of integrity of such long standing in the military services is shocking and revolting.

14. This whole report is reminiscent of the experiences of the undersigned when he was the commander of the 92d Division and had so many problems to confront him in various phases of training and in combat from the period of September 1942 to August 1945. One of the most notable problems was that of promotion. Negro advocates of rapid promotion had no hesitancy in recommending that a percentage of Negroes comparable to the Negro population strength of the United States should obtain in all promotions in the

92d Division. They complained bitterly when white officers who had commanded companies in training for as much as a year were promoted to the next grade and Negro lieutenants who had just joined the unit or had had only 3 or 4 months' service were not promoted percentage-wise.

15. Needless to say, such complaints were taken with the validity that they deserved but this instance is cited to show that nothing has changed in the nature of those who are determined to integrate the Armed Forces and determined to secure what is called "equal rights and opportunities" for skills and abilities. It seems never to have occurred to the authors of such projects that there may be a slight difference between the average white and the average Negro in his ability to absorb information and to deliver a satisfactory performance. It is a known fact that during World War II it required in training 3½ to 4 times as much ammunition expenditure on the part of Negroes as compared to whites in order to secure a reasonable comparison of weapons performance in firing.

16. The undersigned has interviewed three different post commanders since reading this report and the meddlings and directives and complaints that are foisted upon post commanders are little short of tragic. This report if put into effect will do more to damage the morale of the military services than anything that could be devised.

EDWARD M. ALMOND,
Lieutenant General,
U.S. Army (Retired).

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an analysis by General Almond.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONER. I thank the gentleman, and say without reservation there are very few people who wear the military uniform today who do not object to the military being used in this manner.

Again, I go a little further. I hold in my hand copy of hearings before the Special Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, 87th Congress. It has to do with military cold war education and speech review policies. I refer to pages 8 and 9 of these hearings and to a statement by then Secretary of Defense Lovett. He speaks directly to the question of the role of the military service in Government.

Secretary Lovett said:

Any examination of the appropriate role of the military in our Government must conclude, I believe, that the separation of the military and civilian functions is not only well established by custom and implicit in our Constitution itself but also that the subordination of the military to civilian authority is specifically established by the provision of the Constitution which makes the President the Chief Executive and the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

From this separation has grown one of our great national military traditions: That the military should be nonpolitical and that career military officers should stick to their demanding profession and take no part in partisan activities or become involved in discussions of our political issues. This well-established tradition, which has grown more important in this century, should, in my opinion, apply equally to the civilian heads of these departments while in office for many

of the same reasons which apply to the military personnel.

I now refer to page 19 of the hearings and to a statement by Adm. Arleigh A. Burke and what he had to say about the role of the military, as follows:

The involvement of the military in these discussions, as citizens with responsibilities equal to those of other citizens, can only remain proper, however, so long as matters of purely partisan politics are avoided. That area, every military man I know would agree, is off limits to the man in uniform.

Then I refer to page 178 of the same hearings and to a statement by Gen. Thomas D. Wright, as follows:

It seems to me that the key to both these problems lies in the maintenance of the sound and historic fact that our Military Establishment is subordinate to the civil administration and that it is an instrument of policy and not a formulator of public opinion. This seems to me to be fundamental to our whole system of government and to preserve our way of life it must continue so. Let us not forget that license opens the door to abuse and that even freedom in some respect can become a two-edged sword.

My friends, if these statements were acceptable to the Department of Defense in 1961 and 1962, why should they not be acceptable to the Department of Defense today?

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

Mr. WAGGONER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. First I would like to congratulate and commend our colleague from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER] and also our colleagues from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] and from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] for arranging the time today to bring to the attention of the Congress and the country the contents and extent of this horrible directive.

This matter broke a few weeks ago at a time when I was absent from the Hill due to illness. On returning in recent days I have attempted to familiarize myself with the report and the directives.

I am deeply shocked to find that the executive branch of our Government is diverting the serious mission of the Department of Defense and is now using it for the purpose of molding the social and political life not only of the country but of the military itself. This is bound to affect the morale of our servicemen and to lower the standard of our national defense.

It is most disturbing to me that we are rapidly getting away from the basic principles of government and playing politics with every thought, move, and consideration. It is disturbing that ours is becoming a government of directives, a government of Executive orders, and a government of Executive dictation. We are no longer what we used to be and that which was intended to be, a government of laws. Instead we are a government of men. We have not completely reached the point of dictatorship but 2 more years equivalent to the past 2 will put us there, completely and absolutely.

The Congress of the United States, which has the constitutional authority of molding the laws which control our society has, through Executive orders

and directives, and legislating by our judiciary, been relegated to a position of insignificance. If we do not take appropriate action to recapture the powers accorded to the Congress by the Constitution, then representative government in the United States will soon be at an end.

The country is disturbed. The people are looking to this body to assert itself and to stop this headlong drive toward dictatorship. The debate which these gentlemen from Louisiana and South Carolina have stimulated today will also stimulate the interest of the people in this country in returning us to the kind of government which is set forth in the basic law of our land, the Constitution.

Again I want to congratulate my friends the gentlemen from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER and Mr. HÉBERT], and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

I would like to associate myself with their effort, and their remarks. They have rendered a fine service, one which we appreciate and one which I know the country appreciates.

Mr. WAGGONER. I thank the gentleman.

After being aware of the hearings which have been held in the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, I felt, I suppose, quite at ease in that the role of the military had been placed in its proper perspective and was understood and acceptable to everyone. I suppose I rocked along with some degree of relaxation until the morning of June 23, 1963, when there appeared in the Washington Post a news story under the United Press International dateline which was entitled "Report Suggests Closing Bases Where Discrimination Abounds." This is the first indication I had that something was really in the wind, and this was the story which prompted me to do some research to find out what was really involved. I want to read this news article to you:

[From the Washington Post, June 23, 1963]
REPORT SUGGESTS CLOSING BASES WHERE DISCRIMINATION ABOUNDS

A White House Committee yesterday recommended that the armed services consider shutting down military bases near cities where race discrimination is widespread if other measures do not halt the practice.

President Kennedy referred the report to Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and asked for a report within 30 days on this and other recommendations to promote equality in the services.

The Chief Executive said the report showed significant progress in the 15 years since former President Harry S. Truman ordered desegregation in the military.

But he agreed with the Committee that much remains to be done, especially in eliminating practices that cause inconvenience and embarrassment to servicemen and their families in communities adjoining military bases.

AGREES WITH SPIRIT

The President said he agreed with the spirit of the proposals and called on residents of cities near military bases to open up public accommodations and housing to Negro servicemen.

The report, prepared by a seven-man committee under the direction of Gerhard A. Gesell, said discrimination was a problem in promotions and assignments. But it said

the worst problem was off-base segregation which adversely affects service morale.

Calling for new leadership by the Defense Department in promoting racial equality, the report recommended that base commanders form biracial committees to deal with segregation in towns adjoining military sites.

It suggested that the commanders may order soldiers to boycott establishments in these cities that discriminate in service to Negroes and their families.

END OF ACTIVITIES

"Should all other efforts fail," the report said, "the services must consider a curtailment or termination of activities at certain military installations where discrimination is particularly prevalent.

"Such relocation of activities is particularly important at bases that play an important role in the training of new officers or in the orientation of representatives of foreign government," the report said.

The report also declared that the Armed Forces have not given enough attention to off-base community practices when new installations are opened or troops shifted between bases.

The military leaders should take this into consideration and get guarantees from the communities before deciding to locate a base, it said.

"At these moments of decision the economic well-being of the community will serve as a potent influence toward assuring the conditions necessary to maintain morale and efficiency," it said.

That morning, after reading this news story I went directly to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], and others of the Committee on Armed Services of the House and told them that there was something which spelled trouble for the military, trouble for this Government, was in violation of every democratic principle of this country, was a sweeping change in the historic role of the military, and that we had better find out what it was.

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

Mr. WAGGONER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my personal appreciation to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER] for being the first to inform the Members of the House of the Gesell report and of the dangers inherent in that report and its possible implementation. It was upon receipt of the letter to which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER] referred earlier and which he addressed to the various Members of Congress that I first became aware of the fact that this report had been issued, and had been referred to the Department of Defense with the request for the comments of the Secretary as to how it should be implemented. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER], in his letter, requested all of us who were of a like mind to join with him in contacting the Secretary of Defense to register as vigorous a protest as we could against this challenge to the concept of the separation between the civilian and the military aspects of our Government.

Upon receipt of that letter I joined with Mr. WAGGONER in registering a protest with the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] a question with relation to something that the gentleman from Iowa brought up a few moments ago. On page 31 of the so-called Gesell report, the report relates to the commissars that are to be set up at each one of the military bases and installations who are to receive reports from personnel at the installations, and in so doing bypass the chain of command.

This statement appears at page 31:

Communications between servicemen and this officer—

That is the commissar—

should be privileged and service regulations should prohibit the disclosure of such communications or the identity of the complainant without the serviceman's consent.

The gentleman from Louisiana in the course of his remarks a few moments ago made reference to somebody by the name of Yarmolinsky as being the author of the Secretary of Defense's directive.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] took the floor when yielded to by the gentleman from South Carolina and praised Mr. Yarmolinsky's devotion to the cause of humanity, or some such. My question is, Suppose the Committee on Un-American Activities were to issue instructions that people were to report to them charges arising in our country concerning communism and in the investigation of the charges the defendants were not to be confronted with witnesses. I wonder if Mr. Yarmolinsky and the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] would give such an enthusiastic endorsement to that proposition on behalf of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. HÉBERT. I must say to my good friend from Alabama that these two gentlemen to whom he has referred must answer for themselves. I am not competent at all to answer that question. However, I would make this observation, that those individuals in that segment of American society who are loudest and most vociferous and most meticulous in attacking the Committee on Un-American Activities on the allegation that the accused is not faced by the accuser are to be found for the most part in the camp of those who would put out this directive.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. That is my understanding. As a matter of fact, my sketchy knowledge of Mr. Yarmolinsky is that he opposes the Committee on Un-American Activities on the ground, so he says, that they do not provide people who are charged with Communist activities with confrontation by the witnesses against them.

Mr. HÉBERT. I may say further to my distinguished friend from Alabama, and as referred to by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], that the three services have rejected for the better part this concept of putting the military in the police business in a particular community, and with particular reference to this secret searching for information has rejected the idea on the proposition that it already has a Solicitor General to whom anybody in the service can go, and the conservation of

the Solicitor General with that individual is privileged.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have been following the remarks very carefully because we have been referring for some time to the Gesell report. I want to compliment the gentleman for calling this to the attention to the Members of the House. I think it is a very fine service that has been rendered to the Nation here by our distinguished colleagues on the House Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] and the gentleman from South Carolina Mr. [RIVERS].

May I point out to the Members of the House that very shortly after I heard of this report the Secretary of Defense was called upon to place a city and a town in my congressional district off limits. I am sure because of the widespread publicity that many of you know the Secretary of Defense at that time said that this would not be done. I communicated with Secretary McNamara and told him that certainly in the light of the publicity that had been given to the Gesell report I thought my people and the American people were entitled to know what was the policy of the Defense Department with regard to declaring civilian communities near military bases to be off limits. I think the gentleman from Louisiana knows and I want the Members of the House to know that the reply I got was a copy of the memorandum or press release of the Secretary of Defense with regard to the implementation of the Gesell report.

Now I have no idea except as it has been explained here today what the policy of the Defense Department is, and I think we have every right to assume, as my very able colleagues have pointed out, that the Gesell report will be fully implemented if not at this time then at some time in the future.

May I say in just another moment of the gentleman's time, that I have only been here in the House a little over 2½ years, but I have three of the largest and greatest military installations in my district, the Marine Corps Base at Camp LeJeune, the Marine Corps Air Station at Cherry Point, the Seymour-Johnson Air Base at Goldsboro. The military bases have employed thousands of my people and are employing them today. But I think without exception I can say that the great majority of the people in the Third District of North Carolina likewise have supported the military effort in eastern North Carolina. I am as concerned as my colleague, Congressman LENNON, who represents Fort Bragg and Pope Field, with what we see is now going on, not on military bases but in the civilian communities which we represent. We are not able to tell them what the policy of the Defense Department or our Nation is except to refer them to the Gesell report which we have been talking about here this afternoon. I can only say in joining my colleagues that it was

my impression since I came here I have tried to support the Department of Defense in every appropriation on every piece of legislation in every manner, and I was only representing the overwhelming and unanimous opinion of the people of my district.

The gentleman made the point and has raised the question, that we wonder if the military is defending our Nation. I must say there is a grave question in my mind and in the minds of many of my people, that they have quit defending and have gone to offending and that the Nation under which we live shall suffer. I thank my colleague for yielding.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. HÉBERT. I just wanted to answer the question, if my colleague will permit me, about the directive by the Secretary. The full implementation of this directive must come from the services by August 15. That does not give much time and it does not make much difference how it is implemented but it will be implemented in such places and according to the language of the directive.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I will clarify that further as I go along.

But, if my colleagues will permit me, may I go one step further before yielding again to my colleagues.

Becoming aware of what I thought were the evil effects of the recommendations of the Gesell report, I tried, in a thumbnail sketch, to reduce it to its minimum. I prepared this newsletter which I hold in my hand, a newsletter which each of you gentlemen received at your offices in the regular mail. In it I gave you in brief the detailed recommendations of this report. I am going to insert this newsletter in the RECORD, but here I am going to recite briefly some of the attitudes and recommendations of the report I condensed in my newsletter. This is what I had to say back then, nearly a month ago, to you and to the people of my congressional district and to all the daily newspapers in the United States—the weekly publications and the weekly newspapers of my State and to other news media.

These are not exact quotations from the report but are, rather, condensations that were necessary because of the limited space available in my newsletter. They are, however, correct interpretations of what is written on these pages:

Pages 14 and 15 of the Gesell report state that they recommend that more recruiting be directed toward Negroes to correct the "insufficient flow" of Negroes into the services and to increase the "pitiful small" number of Negro officers.

Page 17 says that Negroes should be located in jobs throughout the services regardless of their individual preference in order to have a few everywhere and in all positions.

Page 25 says that on promotion boards—there should be more Negro officers because white officers are "consciously or unconsciously"—however, that might be—discriminating against Negroes in promotions.

Pages 30 and 37 of the report say that special officers should be appointed—with biracial staffs—on every base to handle all complaints of Negroes.

Page 29 says that complaints are to be encouraged.

Can you imagine—encouraging a member of the military to complain?

Page 34 says that more Negro girls are to be brought on bases for social functions and fewer girls who believe in segregation.

They simply state that nobody should be invited on bases who had attitudes contrary to the Department of Defense policy.

Page 35 says that Negro hostesses should be considered rather than white.

Page 36 says that military police patrols used in neighboring communities should be integrated.

Page 41 says that segregated buses should be boycotted.

Pages 37 and 65 say that base commanders should appoint biracial committees in the communities to break down segregation practices.

Page 38 says that civic clubs should not be joined if they are segregated.

I wonder if that applies to lodges as well.

Page 39 says that the past policy of complying with local segregation policies should be terminated.

Page 35 says that the practice of Negroes gravitating to one base service club and whites to another should not be permitted, even though this might be of their own choosing.

Mr. Speaker, we are even losing the right to choose our personal associates in off-duty hours.

Page 78 suggests a method for getting around local segregated housing by leasing homes in the name of the Government and moving Negroes in.

You have not heard that mentioned here today.

Page 85 says that ROTC units should be canceled in segregated schools.

We have two in Louisiana and they are both located in my congressional district.

Page 62 says that the efforts of officers to bring about integration should be constantly reviewed and rated. Promotions should be based on their initiative and accomplishments in this field.

I will have more to say about that later.

Page 52 says that the traditional function of the base commander and senior officer to run a military establishment and maintain good community relations by staying out of local controversies is misguided and should be stopped. They should be encouraged to lead the way to full integration.

Page 79 says that military personnel should be allowed to patronize only those local establishments which are integrated and have the express approval of the base commander.

In the report the word "only" is underlined.

All others should be placed off limits. Approved stores should display placards or decals on their windows and doors to show they have been approved by the military. This gives the base com-

mander life-or-death control over the economic life of the community and also the right to subject to military discipline all servicemen, their wives and children who shop at other stores of their own choosing.

Page 70 says that should all these efforts fail to bring about integration, the services must consider curtailing or terminating activities at these installations.

Believe me, my friends, I am not talking about segregation and integration. I am talking about changing the role or mission of the military.

And, in closing this newsletter to my constituents I said as follows:

These, I repeat, are only brief summaries of some of the points contained in this infamous report. It brazenly calls down the threat of blackmail upon the populace. I do not, and I do not believe the people of the Fourth District yield to blackmail. The military branches were created for the defense of our Nation, not as instruments to enforce so-called social reforms.

That is the only issue involved in the implementation of this Gesell report, regardless of what our respective beliefs might be on the question of segregation and integration. Where does the role of the military start and end? Does the military have any authority to invoke social reform outside the gates of military establishments?

The sorriest aspect of this report is the damage it will do to the serviceman and his family. Communities have always gone out of the way to receive these men and their families and make them welcome for the duration of their residence away from their homes. This report, when implemented, will make the serviceman and his family, through no fault of their own, walking symbols of civil disobedience. It will make the proud uniform of our country into a shabby coat of political vote grubbing. It will debase this honorable career and turn the friendly relations now enjoyed by a base and community into one of hostility and resentment.

I have strongly protested the implementation of this report to the President, to the Secretary of Defense, the House Armed Services Committee, and the Secretaries of each of the branches of service. I will continue to exert every human pressure against this ill-advised and socialistic scheme. Its advocates still will not or cannot see that pure equality is pure communism.

My complete newsletter follows:

JOE D. WAGGONER REPORTS

The attention of the Nation is focused on the civil rights question. It is the No. 1 issue before the Congress and the public; the No. 1 topic of conversation; the No. 1 story in the press and on television.

The integration question is the sum total of many different considerations, each of which would require the space of this newsletter to discuss in even the briefest terms. On each of these developments, I have spoken and acted with all the strength at my command. I have discussed this subject with the President, with his closest advisers, with my colleagues in the House and Senate and with civilian leaders, each time in an earnest effort to halt this assault on the rights of the States to govern themselves and the rights of the individual to choose his own associates. Last Friday, July 12, I appeared before the House Subcommittee on the Judiciary, which is conducting hearings on the current civil rights proposals. To date, 166 civil rights bills have been introduced, the majority by the Republican Mem-

The most recent development in the integration assault is the publication of a report which is, without question, the most sweeping attack on the separation of the races since the Black Monday decision of the Supreme Court. It is not available for public distribution, but I have obtained a copy and, in the belief that every man and woman in the United States should know its contents, would like to discuss it briefly in this newsletter.

It is the work of a seven-man civilian committee appointed by the President in June of 1962 and is known as the Gesell report, after the name of the chairman, Gerhard Gesell, Washington attorney. The committee is named the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces and the title of this initial report is "Equality of Treatment and Opportunity for Negro Military Personnel Stationed Within the United States." It is obvious, from the first page to the last, that the true subject is not "equality" but "preferential treatment." The report was forwarded by the President to the Secretary of Defense at the Pentagon where indications are it is already regarded by the branches of the service as the "bible," even though it was supposedly submitted only as a report and not a directive.

These are a few of the attitudes and recommendations contained in its 93 pages:

More recruiting should be directed toward Negroes to correct the "insufficient flow" of Negroes into the services and to increase the "pitifully small" number of Negro officers.

Negroes should be located in jobs throughout the services regardless of their individual preferences in order to have a few everywhere and in all positions.

Promotion boards should have more Negro officers on them because white officers are "consciously or unconsciously" discriminating against Negroes on promotions.

Special officers should be appointed (with biracial staffs) on every base to handle all complaints of the Negroes.

Such complaints are to be "encouraged."

More Negro girls are to be brought on bases for social functions and fewer girls who believe in segregation.

Negro hostesses should be considered rather than white.

Military police patrols used in neighboring communities should be integrated.

Segregated buses should be boycotted.

Base commanders should appoint biracial committees in the communities to breakdown segregation practices.

Civic clubs should not be joined if they are segregated.

The past policy of complying with local segregation policies should be terminated.

The practice of Negroes gravitating to one base service club and whites to another should not be permitted, even though this might be of their own choosing.

Methods are suggested for getting around local segregated housing by leasing homes in the name of the Government and moving Negroes in.

ROTC units should be canceled in segregated schools.

The efforts of officers to bring about integration should be constantly reviewed and rated. Promotions should be based on their initiative and accomplishments in this field.

The traditional function of the base commander and senior officer to run a military establishment and maintain good community relations by staying out of local controversies is misguided and should be stopped. They should be encouraged to lead the way to full integration.

Military personnel should be allowed to patronize only those local establishments which are integrated and have the express approval of the base commander. All others should be placed off limits. Approved stores should display placards or decals on their

windows and doors to show they have been approved by the military. This gives the base commander life-or-death control of the economic life of the community and the right to subject to military discipline all servicemen, their wives and children who shop at other stores of their own choosing.

Should all these efforts fail to bring about integration, the services must consider curtailing or terminating activities at these installations.

These, I repeat, are only brief summaries of some of the points contained in this infamous report. It brazenly calls down the threat of blackmail upon the populace. I do not, and I do not believe the people of the Fourth District will yield to blackmail. The military branches were created for the defense of our Nation, not as instruments to enforce so-called social reforms.

The sorriest aspect of this report is the damage it will do to the serviceman and his family. Communities have always gone out of the way to receive these men and their families and make them welcome for the duration of their residence away from their homes. This report, when implemented, will make the serviceman and his family, through no fault of their own, walking symbols of civil disobedience. It will make the proud uniform of our country into a shabby coat of political vote grubbing. It will debase this honorable career and turn the friendly relations now enjoyed by a base and community into one of hostility and resentment.

I have strongly protested the implementation of this report to the President, the Secretary of Defense, the House Armed Services Committee and the Secretaries of each of the branches of service. I will continue to exert every human pressure against this ill-advised and socialistic scheme. Its advocates still will not or cannot see that pure equality is pure communism.

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

Mr. WAGGONER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, recently we have witnessed a stream of civil rights directives, orders, and maneuvers emanating from our Military Establishment. I commend the gentlemen from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER and Mr. HÉBERT] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] for securing time this afternoon to call this unprecedented action to the attention of the Congress and the Nation.

The latest and most sweeping rights directive from the Pentagon, as has been pointed out, authorizes the commander of a military base, with the approval of the Secretary of his service, to mark business establishments in neighboring communities "off limits" in cases of alleged discrimination.

Forbidding off-base patronage of private business by servicemen and their dependents amounts to a Pentagon-ordered economic boycott. And, to use the military—supported by our tax dollars—to violate local laws and customs and to force integration amounts to economic blackmail.

The July 26 directive is based on a recommendation of the Gesell Committee report. This report also suggested closing military bases in communities where racial discrimination is particularly prevalent. Secretary of Defense McNamara has said he does not regard this as feasible "at this time."

Mr. Speaker, have we reached the point where our national security and

defense will be based not on military and geographic effectiveness but on who is served in what restaurant?

If the threat of closing bases in segregated areas is carried out, our armed services would be employed as a political tool to attain social reforms. Clearly, this is not the proper province into which our military should move, for traditionally the armed services have remained aloof from the political arena.

Mr. Speaker, the recent Defense Department directive is a blatant effort to force integration of private enterprise by Executive order. It is part of a massive pattern of Federal coercion, and comes at a time when Congress is being pressured to place additional and more dangerous civil rights tools in the hands of our executive branch for the purpose of forcing integration of the races.

In view of these unprecedented developments, I am today introducing a resolution that calls for an investigation by the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives of the formulation, contents, and appropriateness of the initial report of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces entitled "Equality of Treatment and Opportunity for Negro Military Personnel Stationed Within the United States."

Such an investigation, in my opinion, would bring to light information that should be carefully analyzed and considered by the Congress and the American people.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing my appreciation to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], for bringing to the attention of the House, and I hope the Nation, this matter of such grave importance. I may say that I share the grave concern of my colleagues over implementation of the so-called Gesell report and the effect it will have on the morale of our Armed Forces.

I have no military bases in my district, but that fact certainly does not leave me without great concern and apprehension over this report and order being used in connection with one of the social problems of our country.

I would like to say that a most disturbing question has been raised in the thinking and statements of those who are on the Armed Services Committee and those who know the ways of the military, and that is: What is the future role of the military in this country? Will it continue as it has done in the past to gloriously protect this country and its citizens or will it be transformed into a sociological arm of the Government in implementing policies which the Executive Department desires to carry out? I think that is a far-reaching question that needs some answers.

Again I would like to commend the gentleman for the great service he has

done in bringing this matter to our attention and for the diligent work he has performed in analyzing the Gesell report.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman.

If I may proceed for a moment, I would like to bring to the attention of the House that on July 15, 1963, I addressed a letter to each of you, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1963.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Earlier this week, I sent to each Member and each Senator, a copy of my monthly Newsletter describing in brief the contents of the initial report of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, entitled "Equality of Treatment and Opportunity for Negro Military Personnel Stationed Within the United States."

This report, called popularly the Gesell report, was, according to news stories, sent by the President to the Secretary of Defense for his recommendation. Following that recommendation, the President was to have issued a policy decision. However, a statement signed by Secretary McNamara and dated July 16, states that "this Department is implementing the recommendations" contained in that report.

On the surface, the issue in point appears to be integration, but these proposals far transcend that subject. If enforced, the recommendations in this report open the door to military control of the civilian sector and strike at the heart of the democratic system.

The attached letter has been sent, not only to the members of the Armed Services Committees, but to the President, the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the branches of service.

The urgency of this matter prompts me to address each of you individually to ask your assistance in seeing that the recommendations of this report not be implemented. I earnestly request that you read the attached letter and, for the reasons I have given in it, join me in protesting and preventing these proposals being put into effect.

Sincerely yours,

JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

But I suppose, being a southerner from Louisiana and not having been here very long, there are some who would not believe my letter was anything other than a southerner protesting about the possibility of integration, and this letter was not too well read.

I included this letter, which went also to all Members of the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1963.
To All Members of the Senate and House
Committees on Armed Services.

GENTLEMEN: The initial report of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, entitled, "Equality of Treatment and Opportunity for Negro Military Personnel Stationed Within the United States," has come to my attention.

After a thorough study of the recommendations it makes, I am gravely concerned over the changes it proposes to bring about in the traditional role of the military and, in particular, in the role of the base commander.

As the report states, the traditional role of the military has never been one concerned with rearranging the social order; leaving all such matters to their proper place in the hands of the civilian and their courts;

remaining nonpolitical and aloof from controversial community problems. The past practice of this attitude is, without serious question, responsible for the fact that, in the main, the military has enjoyed exemplary relations with the communities in which they are located.

This report decrees that, in following this time-honored tradition, base commanders have been failures and that adherence to these policies should cease.

To so depart from this tradition and to assume the mantle of arbiter of social mores and the customs and laws of the community, is to recede from the established military mission and engage in controversies which can only and rightly be settled by the courts.

The report recommends, among other things, that complaints be privileged, complainants anonymous, that star chamber proceedings be insinuated into the military, and that any man accused of any wrong not be allowed to face and question his accuser. This is an intolerable injustice and must not be condoned.

The report recommends that members be encouraged to complain. This is a posture unfitting the dignity of the military and of any man in its uniform.

The report states that compliance with local and State laws on segregation is misguided "and should be terminated." This is an open invitation to military revolt against civil authority. Regardless of any man's personal attitude against any duly certified law, it cannot be in the best interests of the Nation to urge him to violate that law; and most certainly not while he is in the uniform of his country. This is in direct opposition to customary military discipline and respect for authority.

The report delves deep into psychological factors that are not the concern of the military or any person other than the individual himself. It recommends, as but one example, discouraging men from seeking the social company of their own race in their off-duty hours. This is meddling in the private and social relations of the individual and an invasion that is intolerable anywhere except in a police state.

The report recommends giving authority to base commanders to tell the serviceman, his wife and children, whether or not they can patronize, in their off-duty hours, the corner drugstore, the theater, or the restaurant of their own choosing. Again, no man and no group has the right to assume such dictatorship over the private rights of another.

To assume so is to defy every democratic tradition this Nation has ever followed and extends Federal power over the mind and actions of the citizen to a degree never before dreamed of. The report even attempts to control the subconscious mind of the serviceman.

The most disturbing aspect of this report is the damage it will do to the innocent serviceman and his family if the recommendations it contains are implemented.

This report would turn the blameless serviceman and his family into walking symbols of military disobedience of civil authority. It would debase the honorable career of service to our country and turn the friendly relations now enjoyed between base and community into hostility and resentment.

The military forces of this Nation must not be deviated from their role as guardians of our country and pressed into service to enforce any social ideology.

Although this report concerns itself with integration, if it is implemented, who can say what ideology or what philosophy or what political theory may not be treated in the same manner tomorrow.

I urge that such a course not be taken and that the proposals of this report not be put

into effect. I ask that you give earnest consideration to the gravity of the condition this report would bring about if implemented.

Sincerely yours,

JOE D. WAGGONER, Jr.

I am inserting in the RECORD at this point the memorandum for the President from the Secretary of Defense dated July 24, 1963:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, July 24, 1963.

Memorandum for the President:

On June 21 you sent me a copy of the initial report of your Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces and asked that I review the document and report on the recommendations within 30 days. This memorandum responds to that request.

In its year of work the committee observed racial imbalances and vestiges of racial discrimination within the Armed Forces themselves. Nevertheless, the committee found that in the main, racial equality is a reality on military bases today. The Department of Defense will eliminate the exceptions and guard the continuing reality.

It is to the Department's off-base responsibilities that the committee has devoted the bulk of its report. In eloquent terms the committee has described the nature and pervasiveness of off-base discrimination against Negro servicemen and their families, the divisive and demoralizing impact of that discrimination, and the general absence of affirmative, effective action to ameliorate or end the off-base practices affecting nearly a quarter of a million of our servicemen.

Our military effectiveness is unquestionably reduced as a result of civilian racial discrimination against men in uniform. The committee report has made this point with great clarity. With equal clarity it demonstrates that the Department of Defense has in the past only imperfectly recognized the harm flowing from off-base discrimination. That imperfect recognition has in turn meant the lack of a program to correct the conditions giving rise to the harm.

The committee report contained recommendations for such a program. Consistently therewith I have issued a directive explicitly stating Department of Defense policy with respect to off-base discrimination and requiring—

Preparation of detailed directives, manuals and regulations making clear the leadership responsibility both on and off base and containing guidance as to how that responsibility is to be discharged.

Institution in each service of a system for regularly monitoring and measuring progress in this field.

We are in the process of establishing a staff element within my office to give full time to such matters.

While the foregoing is in accord with the recommendations of the committee, the details of the program necessarily will be found in the manuals and regulations to be issued as a result of my directive.

The initial committee report contained many specific recommendations on recruitment, assignment, promotion, techniques for eliminating on- and off-base discrimination, housing, education and recording of racial data. Many of these have been or will be put into effect, but some require more study and on a few we have reservations.

These will be discussed further with the Committee.

The recommendations on sanctions do require special comment. The Committee suggests using a form of the off-limits sanction when, despite the commander's best efforts with the community leaders, relentless discrimination persists against Negro servicemen and their families.

Certainly the damage to military effectiveness from off-base discrimination is not less

than that caused by off-base vice, as to which the off-limits sanction is quite customary. While I would hope that it need never be put in effect, I agree with the Committee that a like sanction against discrimination must be available. It should be applied, however, only with the prior approval of the Secretary of the Military Department concerned.

The Committee also suggested the possibility of closing bases near communities where discrimination is particularly prevalent. I do not regard this as feasible action at this time.

In your letter transmitting the Committee report you wrote that "Discriminatory practices are morally wrong wherever they occur—they are especially inequitable and iniquitous when they inconvenience and embarrass those serving in the Armed Services and their families."

Guided by those words and the report of your Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, the military departments will take a leadership role in combating discrimination wherever it affects the military effectiveness of the men and women serving in defense of this country.

ROBERT S. McNAMARA.

I ask for inclusion of a document entitled Department of Defense Directive, dated July 26, 1963, which further establishes the sequence of events. Also included is my letter to the editors of every daily newspaper in the United States, with which I transmitted my newsletter and other pertinent information concerning the Gesell report. My letter is dated July 31, 1963, and was my second mailing to all these newspapers.

Also I include herewith a sampling of the critical news stories and editorials from various newspapers. The first is from the Elyria, Ohio, Chronicle of July 19, 1963, flaying this report entitled, "Congressman Says Unpublished Report 'Socialist Scheme'"; from the Kinston, N.C., Free Press of July 19, a story entitled, "Louisiana Congressman Wants To Halt Military Action"; from the Times-Picayune of New Orleans, a news story of Friday, July 26, 1963, entitled "Orders Pushing Officers in Civilian Areas Is Fear," and of Saturday, July 27; an editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune dated July 30, 1963, entitled, "Radical Takeover of Defense Establishment"; and an editorial from the Chattanooga News-Free Press of Thursday, August 1, 1963, entitled "How Military Dictatorship Comes," condemning the military aspects of dictatorship inherent in this; a column contained in the Washington Star on Friday, August 2, by David Lawrence entitled, "The Military and Social Reform," condemning the implementation of this Gesell report; and a news story from the Washington Evening Star of August 2 which shows the boundaries of the States now and is going to halt sales of arms in Africa because of their racial beliefs.

The matter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DIRECTIVE—EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN THE ARMED FORCES

I. POLICY

It is the policy of the Department of Defense to conduct all of its activities in a manner which is free from racial discrimination and which provides equal opportunity for all uniformed members and all civilian employees irrespective of their color.

Discriminatory practices directed against Armed Forces members, all of whom lack a civilian's freedom of choice in where to live, to work, to travel and to spend his off-duty hours, are harmful to military effectiveness. Therefore, all members of the Department of Defense should oppose such practices on every occasion, while fostering equal opportunity for servicemen and their families, on and off base.

II. RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Office of the Secretary of Defense:

1. Pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of Defense and the provisions of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) is hereby assigned responsibility and authority for promoting equal opportunity for members of the Armed Forces. In the performance of this function he shall (a) be the representative of the Secretary of Defense in civil rights matters, (b) give direction to programs that promote equal opportunity for military personnel, (c) provide policy guidance and review policies, regulations and manuals of the military departments, and (d) monitor their performance through periodic reports and visits to field installations.

2. In carrying out the functions enumerated above, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) is authorized to establish the Office of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Civil Rights).

B. The military departments:

1. The military departments shall, with the approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower), issue appropriate instructions, manuals, and regulations in connection with the leadership responsibility for equal opportunity, on and off base, and containing guidance for its discharge.

2. The military departments shall institute in each service a system for regularly reporting, monitoring and measuring progress in achieving equal opportunity on and off base.

C. Military commanders: Every military commander has the responsibility to oppose discriminatory practices affecting his men and their dependents and to foster equal opportunity for them, not only in areas under his immediate control, but also in nearby communities where they may live or gather in off-duty hours. In discharging that responsibility a commander shall not, except with the prior approval of the Secretary of his military department, use the off-limits sanction in discriminating cases within the United States.

III. IMPLEMENTATION

Not later than August 15, 1963, the military departments shall forward for the approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) an outline plan for implementing this directive.

IV. EFFECTIVE DATE

This directive is effective immediately.

ROBERT S. McNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 31, 1963.

DEAR EDITOR: The Nation urgently needs the good offices of your newspaper to make the story of the infamous Gesell report known. The very keystone of all democratic principles depends on halting the implementation of this report.

This is not—and I repeat—this is not, as it appears on the surface, an integration issue. The question far transcends that issue. The issue is: shall the civilian sector control the military or shall the military control the civilian. It is that simple. It is that basic.

Attached you will find a copy of my newsletter No. 6, a copy of which was sent to you

2 weeks ago. That newsletter deplored the consideration of the Gesell report. Now that the Secretary of Defense has ordered the implementation of the recommendations of the report, I have issued the attached three-page summary of the devastation that must now follow his actions. Coverage in the Shreveport Journal and Times, in the area which I represent, as well as other newspapers around the country has been extensive. Coverage is now spreading rapidly to other parts of the State and Nation. As but one example, you will find attached a reproduction of the first two articles in a lengthy series planned by the New Orleans Times-Picayune, the largest newspaper in this southern area.

Again, I urge you to study this material and, if you agree that the basic role of the military has been violently warped by this report, join in the fight to see that the order to implement the Gesell report be rescinded.

Sincerely,

JOE D. WAGGONNER, Jr.

RELEASE OF REPRESENTATIVE JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR., DEMOCRAT, OF LOUISIANA, FOURTH DISTRICT, FRIDAY, JULY 26, 1963

The announcement by the Secretary of Defense that implementation of the infamous Gesell report will begin immediately can only be compared to the actions of the evil Benjamin Butler or Thaddeus Stevens. The Nation cannot survive the assault of another Stevens or Butler. These times call for the calm deliberation of Louisiana's Judah P. Benjamin if we are to face another round of Reconstruction days.

Without conscience and with total disregard for the honorable history of the military services of this Nation, he has, with a single stroke of a poison pen, created a military dictatorship over the personal affairs of every man and woman in service and every man and woman who lives within an undetermined number of miles from any military base in the United States.

In a memorandum to the President, dated July 26, he shed mountainous waves of crocodile tears because he had not done more in the past to bring about social reforms on military bases and in communities nearby and, in humiliating supplication, begged forgiveness and promised to do better immediately.

The appointment of an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Rights, whose duty will be to enforce integration of the races, is a rank insult to the honor roll of men and women who have served and died in the military service for the noble causes of our Nation's past. To mass the military now, as he has done, for an assault on the social habits and practices of the citizenry, borders on the racist insanity of the Nazi Gestapo.

No authority exists in the Constitution, or by virtue of any law ever passed by the Congress or by inference on any page of American history, to give the President or the Secretary of Defense the right to dictate to the people of this country whom they may associate with in the privacy of their homes, their businesses or their churches.

This memorandum from the Secretary of Defense not only gives the Armed Forces that right, it goes even further: the memorandum commands that it be done.

The implementation of the Gesell report brings this Nation to the brink of military dictatorship.

The Nazi battlecry was, "Today, Europe. Tomorrow, the world." The battlecry of those who would rule by executive order is: "Today, social reform. Tomorrow, your mind."

Free America cannot, must not, tolerate this tearing down of the barrier that stands between the civil and military. If the civil-

ian loses this control of the military, there can be no freedom left in the land.

In an effort to alert the United States to the violence the Gesell report would do to our democratic traditions, I mailed a summary of it to every daily newspaper in the country and to every Member of the Congress. Sadly, too few have been aroused to the danger. Too many see only the issue of integration and not the incipient threat to the foundation and the keystone of all that made this Nation secure and free.

I urge every American to bring every conceivable pressure to bear on the President and the Secretary of Defense to see that this memorandum is rescinded. The communications media must join in this fight. These are perilous times. The sunshine patriot and the summer soldier must stand now if we are to survive.

We are standing on the threshold of national oblivion. Heretofore, it has been the hour of midnight. With the enforcement of this document, we will have come to zero-zero-zero-one.

Dawn may find that this Nation has not survived.

At this very moment, the Senate is being asked to approve a plan to stop certain vital phases of our military preparedness in the nuclear field. We are told in the preamble of the proposed Test Ban Treaty that this Nation's policy is total disarmament. At the same moment, our mortal enemies, Russia and Red China have never, in their histories, been more dedicated to and capable of our total annihilation.

The Secretary of Defense must share in the responsibility for these policies.

The Secretary has on occasion, in the past, displayed remarkable talent and ability, though at times, misguided.

But, if it is his concept of his position of director of this Nation's defenses that the United States can emerge from the hour of its gravest peril in all history by disarmament and by devoting our military forces to the task of forcing social reforms on our own citizens, then the time has come to question his qualifications to continue in that office and to ask for his resignation.

This, I now do.

[From the Elyria (Ohio) Chronicle-Telegram, July 19, 1963]

CONGRESSMAN SAYS UNPUBLISHED REPORT "SOCIALIST SCHEME"

(By Don Miller)

A blistering attack on use of U.S. defense organizations to achieve social reforms was unleashed in Washington, D.C., yesterday by U.S. Representative JOE D. WAGGONNER, Jr., Democrat, of Louisiana.

Misuse of the military has stemmed from the unpublicized Gesell report to President John F. Kennedy, the legislator charged.

The Gesell report was one made to the President and forwarded by him to the Secretary of Defense.

The report is named after Gerhard Gesell, a Washington attorney and chairman of a seven-man civilian committee named by the President in June 1962.

The committee is known as the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces.

Its initial report has been labeled "Equality of Treatment and Opportunity for Negro Military Personnel Stationed Within the United States."

The Gesell report, although its provisions actually are being implemented in the Armed Forces today, has not been made public nor have copies been provided to news media, Representative WAGGONNER declared.

But quoting chapter and verse from a copy of the 93-page report which he procured, the 44-year-old Louisiana Representative, now in his second congressional term, blasted the Gesell report as "infamous."

It "brazenly" calls for blackmail of the populace; is "an ill-advised and socialistic scheme; and calls for the Government to act to destroy private enterprise," WAGGONNER angrily declared.

"It is obvious from the first page to the last," the legislator declared, "that the true subject is not 'equality' but 'preferential treatment'."

The report, which calls for far-reaching changes in the role of military base commanders and in matters ranging from military recreation to housing, got its first public scrutiny Wednesday.

WAGGONNER mailed, to every daily newspaper in the country, a copy of his July legislative newsletter, airing details of the report.

And the report, he declared, "is, without question, the most sweeping attack on the separation of the races since the Black Monday decision of the Supreme Court."

Efforts currently are being made to determine cost of the President's Committee in its 13 months of activity so far; costs of its transportation; and whether the transportation was by commercial or Government carrier, the Louisiana Congressman said.

"My efforts here are to alert the people," he said. "Not to the problems relating to segregation, but to misuse of the Military Establishment to accomplish social reforms."

The Congressman was particularly bitter about the proposed change in role of commanders of military bases.

These, he said, long have been ordered to remain out of local controversies stemming from communities near military installations.

"Now they are told to get in the middle of them," WAGGONNER said.

ECONOMIC SANCTIONS

Base commanders would, under the Gesell report, impose economic sanctions on private business establishments in near-base communities where they did not agree to serve anyone, regardless of color, WAGGONNER charged.

The report calls for the base commander to have decals or placards displayed in windows of establishments which have his approval. Those not having this approval would be declared off limits. And servicemen using such establishments could be subject to discipline for disobeying orders.

Along with this local pressure from a base commander, which "gives the base commander life-or-death control of the economic life of a community," WAGGONNER said, the report calls for curtailment of an installation's activities or for its complete removal from an area where efforts to achieve complete integration fail.

The economic weapon poses a "blackmail" threat to private businesses, the Congressman claimed, adding, "The military branches were created for the defense of our Nation, not as instruments to enforce so-called social reforms."

A spokesman for the Office of Public Affairs in the Department of Defense told the Chronicle-Telegram yesterday the report was made public June 22, by Pierre Salinger, the President's press secretary.

IN NAME ONLY

It was made public in name only Representative WAGGONNER had indicated.

The Defense Department spokesman confirmed WAGGONNER's statement about economic sanctions against off-base establishments not cooperating in the integration program.

The report recommended establishment of biracial community relations committees by base commanders to help in eliminating discriminatory practices in off-base communities.

Should lesser efforts fail, the Defense Department spokesman said, the Gesell report recommended base commanders develop

plans "whereby military personnel would be permitted to patronize only those places which achieve his express approval."

WAGGONNER said he can cite specific cases to show the Gesell report, which already is regarded by service branches as "the Bible," is in process of implementation.

"Even though," he wrote in his legislative newsletter, "it was supposedly submitted only as a report and not a directive."

OFFICER PROMOTIONS

Under the report even officer promotions can hinge on how active a military officer is in "initiative" and "accomplishment" in bringing about integration, the Congressman said.

The report, he said, calls for grading and monitoring of a commander's performance in bringing about integration. Reading from the report itself, WAGGONNER noted it calls for making clear to officers that "showing achievement in this area can enhance their performance ratings and achieve for them favorable consideration for promotion and for career advancement."

One section of the report urges that the Government lease homes in the name of the Government, then move Negroes in, thus "getting around local segregated housing," he said.

WAGGONNER declared a committee went to Shreveport, La., Tuesday, to discuss with people there, at Barksdale Air Force Base, some phase of the integration picture as it involves the military.

The group was met by radio, TV, and newspaper personnel, "much to their surprise," WAGGONNER said. "They didn't know anyone was coming to meet them."

NOT SECRET

The Congressman from Plain Dealing, La., said committee spokesmen, asked about the Gesell report, declared it was not secret.

They admitted, however, they could give no copies to the newsmen.

And where could they get them?

"They were told they could get it from the President," WAGGONNER said.

WAGGONNER, who served on the Louisiana State Board of Education before entering Congress, and who is a businessman engaged in wholesaling of gasoline, aired other controversial parts of the Gesell report.

It calls for, he said:

More Negro recruiting to correct the "insufficient flow" of Negroes into the services and to increase the "pitifully small" number of Negro officers.

Locate Negroes in jobs through the service, regardless of personal preference, to have a few everywhere and in all positions.

More Negro officers for promotion boards.

Special officers on every base to handle Negro complaints.

Encouraging of such complaints.

Bringing more Negro girls to bases for social functions.

Negro hostesses to be considered rather than white.

Integration of military police patrols.

Boycotting of segregated buses.

Appointment by base commanders of biracial committees in the communities to break down segregation practices.

Refusal to join civic clubs which are not integrated.

Termination of past policy of complying with local segregation policies.

Not permitting practice of Negroes gravitating to one base service club and white to another, even though this might be of their own choosing.

Cancelling of ROTC in segregated schools.

The points he has listed, WAGGONNER said, are the major points made within the Gesell report.

Since the report has been kept under wraps even though not classified as secret, and copies have not been made available to

the press, the Congressman today is seeking to reproduce it in wholesale quantities.

Every newspaper which received his legislative newsletter will receive a copy of that 93-page report, he declared firmly.

"I will continue to exert every human pressure against this ill-advised and socialistic scheme," WAGGONNER declared. "Its advocates still will not or cannot see that pure equality is pure communism."

He charged it would turn the uniform "into a shabby coat of political vote grubbing. It will debase this honorable career (the military-ed.) and turn the friendly relations now enjoyed by base and community into one of hostility and resentment."

SORRIEST ASPECT

"The sorriest aspect of this report," he added, "is the damage it will do the serviceman and his family."

Communities, he said, have always gone out of their way to welcome and receive these service families. But the Gesell report, when implemented, "will make the serviceman and his family walking symbols of civil disobedience."

WAGGONNER said Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara had made statements published in yesterday's Washington Post which were ambiguous, but indicated the Gesell report already was in the process of being placed into effect.

"I consider he was referring to the Gesell report," WAGGONNER said.

Barksdale Air Force Base itself, near Shreveport in Bossier Parish, contains a situation backing his claim that preferential treatment is being sought for a very small group, the Congressman declared.

There, Negro students of junior and senior high school age number no more than 20, he said, while the base has a total population of about 8,000 military personnel.

WAGGONNER also chuckled over one portion of the Gesell report.

The committee declared it believes presence of racial information in a serviceman's file "is undesirable."

Yet, it added, "It has been handicapped in its work by an almost complete absence of complete statistical reports which would permit measurement of such elementary matters as recruitment, assignment or promotion."

"If they can't identify them they can't give them preferential treatment," WAGGONNER quipped.

[From the Kinston (N.C.) Free Press]

LOUISIANA SOLON WANTS TO HALT MILITARY ACTION

WASHINGTON.—Representative JOE D. WAGGONNER, Jr., Democrat, Louisiana, has asked the House-Senate Armed Services Committee to stop implementation of a presidential committee report dealing with equality of treatment for Negro military personnel.

The report was made by the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces and was entitled "equality of treatment and opportunity for Negro military personnel stationed within the United States."

The Congressman told the committee that it was his understanding that the report was sent by the President to Defense Secretary Robert McNamara for his recommendation.

Following that recommendation, the President was to have issued a policy decision.

However, a statement signed by McNamara and dated July 16 said that the department was giving consideration to implementing the recommendations in the report.

"After a thorough study of the recommendations it makes I am gravely concerned over the changes it proposes to bring about in the traditional role of the military and, in particular, in the role of the base commander," WAGGONNER said in a letter to the Committee.

"The most disturbing aspect of this report is the damage it will do the innocent serviceman and his family if the recommendation it contains are implemented," WAGGONNER continued.

The Congressman said the report recommended that complaints be privileged, complainants anonymous, and that any man accused of any wrongdoing not be allowed to face and question his accuser.

He said the report recommended that servicemen be "encouraged" to complain, particularly if they are Negroes who feel they are receiving unfair treatment.

The report stated that compliance with local and State laws on segregation is misguided "and should be terminated," he said.

He said the report recommended that servicemen be discouraged from seeking the social company of their own race in off-duty hours and that more Negro girls should be encouraged to attend USO dances.

"This is meddling in the private and social relations of the individual and an invasion that is intolerable anywhere except in a police state," WAGGONNER said.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, July 26, 1963]

THE GESELL REPORT—ORDERS PUSHING OFFICERS IN CIVILIAN AREAS, IS FEAR—ORDERS NOT LIMITED TO ON-BASE CONDITIONS

Commanders of U.S. military installations who have not received them soon will be receiving orders to go to the front in a battle in which they heretofore have taken little part: The battle for complete racial integration.

Their concern under these orders will not be limited to on-base conditions but will extend also into the off-base, or civilian area.

These are conclusions of Members of the Congress and others in high places in Washington who have had the opportunity to study the initial report by the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces—generally called the Gesell report.

Representative JOE D. WAGGONNER, Jr., of Louisiana's Fourth District, considers that the implementation of the report—already ordered by Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense—will transcend the subject of integration. This implementation, he has informed his colleagues, will open the door to military control of the civilian sector and strike at the heart of the democratic system.

TEAM TO BILOXI

Secretary McNamara, the Times-Picayune has learned, already has undertaken implementation of the report on the Mississippi gulf coast. He recently sent a team to Biloxi with instructions to assist the base commander at Keesler Field to develop a plan for effecting changes in the communities near Keesler "to bring about an improvement in conditions * * * as they affect Negro airmen and their dependents."

Members of the visiting team were instructed that if they should receive any inquiries from members of the press that they should reply: "Maj. Gen. C. H. Childre, Assistant Deputy Chief of Air Staff for Personnel, arrived at Keesler Air Force Base today for the purpose of conferring with Maj. Gen. John S. Hardy, base commander, on the subject of off-base discrimination affecting Negro airmen and their families. General Childre was accompanied by Mr. Alfred B. Fitt, who was made available by the Office of the Secretary of Defense to assist in the discussion with base officials."

Under the Gesell report recommendations, the base commander of a military establishment is described as being in excellent position "to identify the particular discrimination forms prevalent in the community neighboring his base." The report says further. "On his shoulders should fall the

primary responsibility for solving local problems."

This means, say critics of the report, that the Department of Defense will have base commanders rather than local civilian governments solving off-base problems.

OFFICERS ASSURED

According to the language of the report, the base commander's performance in achieving integration in areas near his base "must be rated, monitored and supported."

"It should be made clear that officers showing initiative and achievement in this area will enhance their performance ratings and obtain favorable consideration for promotion and career advancement," the report continues. "It is especially important that such officers be assured that they will not run the risk of official disfavor for their efforts and that they will receive the support of all echelons of command if their programs are attacked by local interests."

This means, say critics of the report, that the administration proposes to promote officers who effectively force local communities to integrate and to hold back or demote officers who do not concern themselves with disregarding wishes or sentiment of communities near their bases.

TEXT IS GIVEN

Here is the text of the statement by Representative WAGGONER regarding the Gesell report and its implementation:

"The attention of the Nation is focused on the civil rights question. It is the No. 1 issue before the Congress and the public; the No. 1 topic of conversation; the No. 1 story in the press and on television.

"The integration question is the sum total of many different considerations, each of which would require the space of this newsletter to discuss in even the briefest terms. On each of these developments, I have spoken and acted with all the strength at my command. I have discussed this subject with the President, with his closest advisers, with my colleagues in the House and Senate and with civilian leaders, each time in an earnest effort to halt this assault on the rights of the States to govern themselves and the rights of the individual to choose his own associates. Last Friday, July 12, I appeared before the House Subcommittee on the Judiciary, which is conducting hearings on the current civil rights proposals. To date, 166 civil rights bills have been introduced, the majority by Republican Members.

"The most recent development in the integration assault is the publication of a report which is, without question, the most sweeping attack on the separation of the races since the Black Monday decision of the Supreme Court. It is not available for public distribution, but I have obtained a copy and, in the belief that every man and woman in the United States should know its contents, would like to discuss it briefly in this newsletter.

"EXCERPTS SHOWN

"It is the work of a seven-man civilian committee appointed by the President in June of 1962 and is known as the Gesell report, after the name of the Chairman, Gerhard Gesell, Washington attorney. The Committee is named the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces and the title of this initial report is, 'Equality of Treatment and Opportunity for Negro Military Personnel Stationed Within the United States.' It is obvious, from the first page to the last, that the true subject is not 'equality' but 'preferential treatment.' The report was forwarded by the President to the Secretary of Defense at the Pentagon where indications are it is already regarded by the branches of the service as 'the Bible,' even though it was supposedly submitted only as a report and not a directive.

"These are a few of the attitudes and recommendations contained in its 93 pages:

"More recruiting should be directed toward Negroes to correct the insufficient flow of Negroes into the services and to increase the pitifully small number of Negro officers.

"Negroes should be located in jobs throughout the services regardless of their individual preferences in order to have a few everywhere and in all positions.

"Promotion boards should have more Negro officers on them because white officers are 'consciously or unconsciously' discriminating against Negroes on promotions.

"SPECIAL OFFICERS

"Special officers should be appointed (with biracial staffs) on every base to handle all complaints of the Negroes.

"Such complaints are to be 'encouraged.'

"More Negro girls are to be brought on bases for social functions and fewer girls who believe in segregation.

"Negro hostesses should be considered rather than white.

"Military police patrols used in neighboring communities should be integrated.

"Segregated buses should be boycotted.

"Base commanders should appoint biracial committees in the communities to break down segregation practices.

"Civic clubs should not be joined if they are segregated.

"The past policy of complying with local segregation policies should be terminated.

"The practice of Negroes gravitating to one base service club and whites to another should not be permitted, even though this might be of their own choosing.

"Methods are suggested for getting around local segregated housing by leasing homes in the name of the Government and moving Negroes in.

"ROTC units should be canceled in segregated schools.

"The efforts of officers to bring about integration should be constantly reviewed and rated. Promotions should be based on their initiative and accomplishments in this field.

"The traditional function of the base commander and senior officer to run a military establishment and maintain good community relations by staying out of local controversies is misguided and should be stopped. They should be encouraged to lead the way to full integration.

"BRIEF SUMMARIES

"Military personnel should be allowed to patronize only those local establishments which are integrated and have the express approval of the base commander. All others should be placed off limits. Approved stores should display placards or decals on their windows and doors to show they have been approved by the military. This gives the base commander life-or-death control of the economic life of the community and the right to subject to military discipline all servicemen, their wives, and children who shop at other stores of their own choosing.

"Should all these efforts fail to bring about integration, the services must consider curtailing or terminating activities at these installations.

"These, I repeat, are only brief summaries of some of the points contained in this infamous report. It brazenly calls down the threat of blackmail upon the populace. I do not, and I do not believe the people of the Fourth District yield to blackmail. The military branches were created for the defense of our Nation, not as instruments to enforce so-called social reforms.

"The sorriest aspect of this report is the damage it will do to the serviceman and his family. Communities have always gone out of the way to receive these men and their families and make them welcome for the duration of their residence away from their homes. This report, when implemented, will

make the serviceman and his family, through no fault of their own, walking symbols of civil disobedience. It will make the proud uniform of our country into a shabby coat of political vote grubbing. It will debase this honorable career and turn the friendly relations now enjoyed by base and community into one of hostility and resentment.

"I have strongly protested the implementation of this report to the President, the Secretary of Defense, the House Armed Services Committee and the Secretaries of each of the branches of service. I will continue to exert every human pressure against this ill-advised and socialistic scheme. Its advocates still will not or cannot see that pure equality is pure communism."

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, July 27, 1963]

THE GESELL REPORT—COMPLAINTS OF ALLEGED INJUSTICE AIM OF REPORT—NEGROES IN SERVICES MAY BE "ENCOURAGED"

Negro members of the Armed Forces in the future will be encouraged to complain of alleged racial injustices—but their complaints anonymous, and the person accused will not be allowed to face and question his accuser.

This is one of the recommendations contained in the initial report of "The President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces"—generally called the Gesell report.

In a letter to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, President John F. Kennedy praised the report and said its recommendations "merit your prompt attention."

The 93-page report concerns itself with both on-base and off-base situations.

OFFICER LEAD URGED

Concerning the military, it makes recommendations concerning enlistment procedures, assignment and promotion practices and suggests that base commanders in the military establishment take the lead in the march toward complete racial integration on and off the base.

U.S. Representative JOE D. WAGGONER, Jr., of Louisiana's Fourth District, asserts that the report's recommendations concerning complaints represent "a posture unfitting the dignity of the military and of any man in uniform."

Provisions that the identity of the complainant remain anonymous and that the accused not be allowed to face the accuser, he says, "is an intolerable injustice and must not be condoned."

The Gesell report asserts that because many Negro personnel fear criticism and reprisal if they raise matters of alleged racial injustice, "procedures must be developed which eliminate this fear and encourage them to present their complaints."

ASKS RECORD CHANGE

It points out that some complaints, such as failing to be promoted, cannot ordinarily be investigated without disclosing the identity of the individual.

At the same time, the report recommends that:

"To minimize the possibility that conscious or unconscious discrimination on the basis of race or color may affect the impartiality of the officer promotion system, photographs and racial designations in the folders reviewed by promotion boards should be eliminated."

It also urges that Negro officers should be appointed to serve on promotion boards, in normal rotation, at every opportunity.

A further recommendation in this area is that all officers chosen to serve on promotion boards "should be chosen from those who have had more than casual experience serving with Negro officers and enlisted personnel."

ENCOURAGE COMPLAINTS

The encouragement of complaints is part of the report's plan to expand communications between Negro servicemen and base commanders.

Implementation will occur by the designation at each base of an officer to receive complaints, but even at bases where only few complaints are made, base commanders will still be held accountable "to discover" conditions.

The officer designated to hear complaints "must not be so burdened with other duties that he cannot effectively deal with complaints," the report suggests.

Concerning racial designations in service records, the Gesell report states that the problem of racial statistics is controversial, but that "sufficient controls on such data can be devised to insure that they are used only for proper purposes."

WOULD END RACE NOTES

Racial entries should not be maintained in records which accompany the servicemen, the report recommends, or on other records routinely available to personnel who rate, assign or promote personnel.

Periodic reports are urged on how the Negro serviceman and implementation of the recommendations are progressing, because such statistics will point up special areas, within this general field which require attention.

The report asserts that there is a need to make greater efforts to attract qualified Negroes, and it says recruiting should be directed toward them.

It recommends that colleges having substantial numbers of Negro students should be solicited; that literature appealing to Negroes should be developed and wider use of Negro officers in recruiting should be made.

URGE USE IN TECHNOLOGY

On assignments:

Special efforts should be made to recognize the potential capabilities of Negroes when they enlist "and at other appropriate times."

Efforts should be made to place Negroes in "as many special and technical career fields and positions of troop command as possible," and the "disproportionate bunchings" of Negroes in certain career fields "should be re-examined, these personnel retested, carefully advised about other fields for which they are trainable, retrained accordingly and reassigned."

Secretary McNamara, the Times-Picayune has learned, has already undertaken implementation of the Gesell report at the Air Force installation at Biloxi, Miss.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times Picayune, July 30, 1963]

THE GESELL REPORT—RADICAL TAKEOVER OF DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT

Elsewhere in this issue appears the first installment of the full text of the so-called Gesell report, which calls for virtual transformation of the armed services of the United States into an instrument of domestic socio-political pressure.

Reprinting of this text follows a series of articles in which we believe the gist of these radical recommendations was fairly summarized; and of pertinent news stories which disclose that their major implementation already is underway.

This attempt to degenerate the military services and their installations, and through them the very bedrock of national security, is a matter that addresses itself primarily to the people, and sections of this Nation, whose interests in their integrity and single-minded purpose are greatest numerically and proportionately, at stake.

This fact—or charge—can perhaps be appreciated by them only by a careful study of the means proposed, or in the making, for reorientation of the warp and woof of the

Military Establishment, to make it revolve about a single issue or problem—integration, segregation—in national controversy.

The techniques outlined for achieving this represent, in a certain wry sense, a masterpiece of blueprint (we understand the authorship should be credited to a member of the planning committee rather than to Chairman Gerhart Gesell, of Washington, who otherwise may take and get all the credit he deserves).

Though independent thought even in a free country can, unfortunately, devise the same methods for prostitution of a vital national institution, the preparation here can be compared, with reference not to objectives but to thoroughgoing painstaking detail, with outlines for corruption, intimidation and takeover of the military institution by Nazi, Fascist, and Communist elements, elsewhere on the globe.

To add to the single national issue at present involved in this abomination of cleverness, a group of issues more or less entwined, forming a pattern of upheaval and reform, calls only for hack artists, to fill in and embellish the brushwork of the talented (mayhap unwitting) pioneer.

With education, interstate commerce, much intrastate commerce, and other institutions and rights, already subservient, by one form of fiat or another, to this same single present issue, the further addition of armed force should not be, to the interested, appraising eye, a surprising development or ambition. From slow growth of a pattern in stages which can be watched, to kaleidoscopic riot, dizziness, confusion—and finally—is a process, recorded both in modern and ancient history.

The Gesell report's preparation began a little more than a year ago. We will have something to add later concerning the general circumstances under which President Kennedy initiated it. To say at this point also that the supposed subject of study, "Presidential Commission on Equal Opportunities in the Armed Forces," turned out to be a misnomer, is the least of the criticisms applicable to the matter.

Rumors or reports relative to proposed abandonment or transfer of military bases, without regard to national security concerns, or to suppose logic and pertinence in military planning, emerged during about the past month.

There seems to have been a considerable degree of hush-hush about the report's delivery to the White House; the Presidential review, complimentary comment, and transmittal to Secretary McNamara; the details of intramilitary and extramilitary coercion, etc. It seems Louisiana and other southern Congressmen who had wind of the matter pleaded in vain against directives that have followed (or are held in abeyance only because they are not yet "feasible," or because coercion conceivably could make them unnecessary). For our part, we were unable to obtain a copy of the 93-page blueprint in time to present more than one of a series of analyses, before the Defense Secretary's orders came through.

Congressman WAGGONER is to be congratulated for his services to the U.S. public in baring the report and its more or less obvious implications. Congressman HÉBERT is among those who think Mr. McNamara (despite his expression of acquiescence and agreement) had his orders from the White House. In any case, the content and significance of this extraordinary encroachment would be no less had the plans, intentions, and handling been open and above-board throughout.

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) News-Free Press, Aug. 1, 1963]

HOW MILITARY DICTATORSHIP COMES

On three recent occasions, the American people have seen the regrettable action of two

Presidents violating the Constitution, and their oaths of office to uphold it, as they used Federal troops as armies of occupation to force their will upon the people of our Nation. And now we are seeing the use of the military in a new role, as a "social" weapon to force integration upon communities around military bases.

The armies of occupation marched in Little Rock, Oxford, and Tuscaloosa despite the Constitution's article IV, section 4, which provides for such action only upon request of the legislature or Governor of the State affected. The application of military pressures for integration has been embodied in directives providing for private establishments which do not bow to the will of the Kennedys on integration to be declared "off limits" to military personnel.

And Senator BARRY GOLDWATER has called attention to what he has described as "police state" methods employed by Attorney General Bobby Kennedy in sending a delegation around to areas having military bases to apply pressure on private individuals to bring their personal property into line with the Kennedy philosophy.

The creation in the Department of Defense of the post of "Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Rights" smacks of the political commissars who are assigned to Soviet troop units to enforce a pattern of political doctrine.

Senator GOLDWATER has correctly told the Senate that the misuse of the military sows the seeds for military takeover in our country. This may seem foreign to some, but in Germany Hitler did not impose his nazism in one horrible swoop but by a swift erosion of customary forms. We wonder how the German people ever tolerated the Nazi police state, sometimes falling to realize that it crept up on them and was imposed in all its terror and force before many realized what had happened.

Our military forces are provided for the defense of our Nation against its enemies. It is not established to change the social patterns of any community or to deny Americans their constitutional rights to their own property and free choices within the law. Yet the Kennedy administration has resorted to arms and the power residing in the existence of armed forces to dictate to the American people in a manner repugnant to all those who uphold personal liberty and destructive to the freedom of our Nation.

Senator GOLDWATER's warning is particularly significant since he is not a southerner and does not speak as a champion of segregation. He is a major general in the Air Force Reserve. In the Arizona Air National Guard he was a leader in providing for desegregation of its personnel that being his personal conviction of the best action to be taken in his State by the people of his State. With that background, Senator GOLDWATER comes now to challenge the dangerous methods of the Kennedy dictatorship, to warn against the misuse of military power, to give notice to the American people of the danger that is thrust upon them when military power becomes a dominant and dictating instrument of partisan political expediency.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Aug. 2, 1963]

THE MILITARY AND SOCIAL REFORM—SENATE AND HOUSE ATTACKS ON PENTAGON DIRECTIVE ON RACIAL BIAS ARE REVIEWED

(By David Lawrence)

It seems incredible that, with all the denunciation that Americans have heaped on the Soviet Union for indoctrinating their troops with the social and political ideas of communism, the people of the United States should be reading this week in their newspapers about speeches in the Halls of Congress alleging that the Kennedy administration is trying to use the armed services to propagate its doctrines of social reform.

Senator STENNIS of Mississippi, Democrat, is a high-ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and chairman of its Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee. In a speech to the Senate on Wednesday, he cited the directive which has been issued by the Secretary of Defense ordering commanders at military bases to declare "off limits" any businesses or areas where any racial discrimination may occur. The Senator said in his speech:

"It is now proposed that the military profession itself be utilized as a driving force in the establishment of a new social and political order which involves race relations and individual associations in off-base areas surrounding our Military Establishments.

"This new and previously unheard-of mission is designed to shape our military force as an instrument for social reform and can only result in irreparable injury to the military profession. In addition, it is a grave and serious challenge to the long-established and traditional concept of complete separation of the military from all political matters and activities.

"Paragraph C (of the directive) places clear and heavy responsibility upon the military commander in the field of social reform. It provides:

"Every military commander has the responsibility to oppose discriminatory practices affecting his men and their dependents and to foster equal opportunity for them, not only in areas under his immediate control, but also in nearby communities where they may live or gather in off-duty hours."

Not long ago, the Secretary of Defense had to revise an Air Force directive which was construed as encouraging soldiers when out of uniform to participate in racial "demonstrations." It is not yet clear how much of the Defense Department's influence still remains a factor in the activities of soldiers off duty who are in sympathy with the "demonstrations."

Senator STENNIS not only calls attention to the economic coercion involved in using military commanders to determine what places of business shall be patronized but he says the new directive brings into play the factor of influence in promotions. Senator STENNIS declared that the new directive "will affect the promotion and career advancement of officers affected" and that he could not conceive of any step "which would be more destructive of officer morale." He quoted from a presidential commission's report which proposed that officers "showing initiative and achievement" in this activity "will enhance their performance ratings and obtain favorable consideration for promotion and career advancement."

Senator GOLDWATER of Arizona, Republican, joined with other Senators on Wednesday in denouncing the directive. He recommended that the Senate Armed Services Committee conduct an investigation of the Pentagon committee which, he said, had gone to military bases around the country "with complete dossiers on every businessman" in the surrounding communities, including "every figure the committee can get out of the income-tax returns" filed with the Internal Revenue Service. He declared: "I think this goes much further than what we are talking about here today; namely, the threat of a military takeover should things change in this country and we find that the military commanders have become used to running politics and the social life of the community—I do not care where it is. It goes further than a discussion of the civil rights question."

"Militarism" is a term used to refer to military men who usurp power to control civilians, but there seems to be no word except possibly "politics" to define efforts by civilians to use the military to carry on

social-reform programs. Senator STENNIS said:

"This may only be the beginning. If political activity is condoned and encouraged in this field, the President some day may not be able to extricate the military from other political activity that would follow."

Representative HÉBERT of Louisiana, Democrat, on the same day denounced an order by which the Federal Government will withdraw contracts for the civil defense adult education program if a State doesn't sign on the dotted line an agreement against "discrimination." He declared that "what can't be done by the law and under the law is done by executive order or by departmental directive."

Mr. HÉBERT is chairman of a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee which had been holding extended hearings on a civil defense fallout shelter program. He declared that his statement concerning executives' usurpation was based on principles underlying governmental operation and not on the merits of the discrimination problem itself. He added:

"I have a deep conviction that the very integrity of the Congress is involved here. And this integrity is being constantly compromised by what I consider capricious and unwarranted assumptions of legislative power by the executive branch."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Aug. 2, 1963]

UNITED STATES TO HALT SALE OF ARMS IN AFRICAN RACIAL PROTEST

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., August 2.—The United States announced today it is banning by the end of 1963 the sale of all weapons and military equipment to South Africa because of that country's racial segregation policies.

The embargo was disclosed by U.S. Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson in a speech before the United Nations Security Council. He spoke after Ghana's Alex Quaison-Sackey had denounced South Africa as an outlaw and asked the Council to consider expelling it from the United Nations.

Mr. Stevenson told the Council the United States already had banned the sale of military equipment that might be used by South Africa to enforce its racial apartheid policies and is now ready to make such a ban complete.

He said the ban could not become fully effective before the end of the year because of existing commitments, including the sale of air-to-air missiles and torpedoes for submarines.

RACIAL POLICIES ASSAILED

Mr. Stevenson denounced South Africa's racial policies as "an evil business" and declared:

"My country will support efforts to bring about a change in South Africa."

So far, he said, efforts of the United Nations "have yielded no tangible results. There has been forward motion, indeed, there has been retrogression, calculated retrogression."

He called the apartheid policies "abhorrent."

Mr. Stevenson urged that the Council try to bring about the change through measures of peaceful settlement rather than through coercion.

FAVORS U.N. ACTION

He made no specific proposal, but said the United States has looked with favor on the appointment of a special U.N. representative who would exercise his own ingenuity in seeking a solution.

An African committee was reported working on two resolutions for submission to the Council on the theory that if one does not pass, the other one might.

Diplomats said one resolution would call on U.N. members to embargo arms shipments to South Africa.

African, Asian, and Latin American delegates expressed belief it would be possible for this resolution to be adopted. But one European delegate said he thought it would be difficult.

ADOPTION DOUBTFUL

The second resolution reportedly would call on U.N. members to carry out 1961 and 1962 General Assembly resolutions against apartheid.

Only some Africans claimed this resolution could get the seven votes necessary for adoption. Other diplomats generally doubted that. Nobody would predict a veto in either case.

A full economic and diplomatic boycott would be the effect of any proposal asking U.N. members to carry out the Assembly's apartheid resolutions. The 1961 resolution urged "collective action" to force an end to that policy. The 1962 resolution asked U.N. with South Africa, including diplomacy, trade, shipping, and aviation.

African delegates said they believed a resolution or resolutions would be turned in Monday or Tuesday. A vote was expected by Thursday.

Secretary of State J. Rudolph Grimes of Liberia told the Council yesterday it would call on U.N. members "to honor their commitments reached last autumn" in the General Assembly.

Of the present 11 Council members, Britain, France, and the United States voted against the Assembly resolution. It was adopted, 67-16, with 63 abstentions. Three other present Council members, Brazil, Norway, and Venezuela, were among the abstainers.

Mr. Grimes said the Council, in asking for implementation of that resolution, should call especially on countries selling weapons to South Africa. He said South Africa had gotten arms factories from Britain, jet fighters and tanks from France, and troop transport planes from the United States. He said it obtained capital from Britain, the United States, France, West Germany, and the International Bank.

Also, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Tulsa Tribune, talking about the strange Gesell report. Also a byline story from the Dallas Morning News entitled, "Storm Brewing on McNamara Policy" on August 4, 1963 condemning the Gesell report. Also an editorial from the Shreveport Journal of July 8, 1963 headed "A Shameful Military Directive."

The matter referred to follows:

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune, Aug. 2, 1963]

THE STRANGE GESELL REPORT

The hottest item in American Government today is a peculiar report put together in secret by a committee appointed in June 1962, ostensibly for the purpose of improving conditions for Negroes in the armed services. The question now has risen: Was this really an effort to use the power of the armed services to force social changes outside the bases? We will be hearing a lot about the Gesell report.

The report was compiled by a committee of three Negroes and four white men, headed by Gerhard A. Gesell, Washington lawyer. It was sent to the Defense Department after being initiated by the President and his brother, the Attorney General. Such initiating is tantamount to an order. The report has never been officially published. Copies of it, however, are in the hands of Congress.

Among the recommendations contained in its 93 pages are:

More recruiting should be directed toward Negroes to correct the insufficient flow of Negroes into the services and to increase the pitifully small number of Negro officers.

Special officers should be appointed with biracial staffs on every base to handle all complaints by Negroes. Such complaints are to be encouraged.

More Negro girls are to be brought on to bases for social functions and fewer girls who believe in segregation. This seems to mean that commanding officers should inquire about the sentiments of white girls and bar them from dances if they are not ardent integrationists.

The practice of Negroes gravitating to one base service club and whites to another must not be permitted.

Officers should not join segregated civic clubs. Local segregated housing must be broken by leasing homes off base in the name of the Government and moving Negroes in.

Military personnel should not be allowed to patronize any except integrated business establishments which have the express approval of the base commander. All other businesses should be off limits.

Where these efforts fail to bring about general integration in nearby communities the U.S. Government should consider curtailing or closing the military establishments.

And—the efforts of officers to bring about integration should be constantly reviewed and rated. Promotions should be based on their initiative and accomplishments in this field.

Well, that gives you an idea of the Gesell report.

It would make the Armed Forces of the United States agencies to push social and political theories beloved by the Kennedy brothers. It would base promotions, not upon the military ability of American officers, but upon how readily officers lent themselves to these aims.

More ominous, yet, is the charge by Senator GOLDWATER that a Pentagon committee, headed by Assistant Defense Secretary Alfred B. Fitt, has been touring the South, armed with tax figures about southern businessmen which could only have been obtained from the Department of Internal Revenue. Is this an attempt to blackmail? The Defense Department denies it has used such figures, and the Senator has demanded an investigation.

We think the Gesell report is a tragedy. We think it is so intemperate and overreaching that it will set the cause of Negro GI's back. It will do violence to the morale in the armed services.

But, worst of all, it seeks by devious means to impose the power of the Federal Government upon individuals, even dates to the enlisted men's dances. It goes so far as to deprive the soldier of the right of voluntary companionship in the interest of a social theory. It would locate military bases, not according to defense necessities, but according to the prevailing social attitudes of the surrounding countryside.

It is a perfect example of what happens when ends, political or social, are deemed to justify any means.

We need a clear expression from John Kennedy and his brother as to whether they are prepared to enforce the Gesell report as the law of the land.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Aug. 4, 1963]

CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM—STORM BREWING ON McNAMARA POLICY

(By Robert E. Baskin, chief, Washington bureau of the News)

WASHINGTON.—The Nation's military establishment—traditionally kept separate from civilian affairs—is now being employed to carry out the Kennedy administration's civil rights program in local communities.

A storm is brewing in Congress over this issue.

So far, despite a number of speeches in both Houses, the Nation as a whole appears uninformed and largely indifferent to serious constitutional questions raised by recent actions of the Defense Department.

If all present readings are correct, the military is now going to be used to implement Presidential views without congressional action and against the wishes of the people in many communities which will be affected.

An alert freshman Congressman from Louisiana, Representative JOE D. WAGGONER, JR., was the first person to put the spotlight on a drastic new civil rights policy by the Pentagon.

On July 12 WAGGONER, who represents the northwest Louisiana 4th District, right on the Texas border, disseminated to every daily newspaper in the country and his congressional colleagues his views on what is known as "the Gesell Report."

In June 1962 President Kennedy appointed a Washington lawyer, Gerhard Gesell, to head a special committee—four white and three Negroes—to examine "equal opportunity in the Armed Forces."

The committee has now unburdened itself with a report, and in the wake of it Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has issued a directive carrying out many of the recommendations.

The Gesell report recommended these policies by the Defense Department, as spelled out by WAGGONER:

More recruiting should be directed toward Negroes to correct the "insufficient flow" of Negroes into the services and to increase the "pitifully small" number of Negro officers.

Negroes should be located in jobs throughout the services regardless of their individual preferences in order to have a few everywhere and in all positions.

Promotion boards should have more Negro officers on them because white officers are "consciously or unconsciously" discriminating against Negroes on promotions.

Special officers should be appointed (with biracial staffs) on every base to handle all complaints of the Negroes.

Such complaints are to be "encouraged." More Negro girls are to be brought on to bases for social functions and fewer girls who believe in segregation.

Negro hostesses should be considered rather than white.

Military police patrols used in neighboring communities should be integrated.

Segregated buses should be boycotted. Base commanders should appoint biracial committees in the communities to break down segregation practices.

Civic clubs should not be joined if they are segregated.

The past policy of complying with local segregation policies should be terminated.

The practice of Negroes gravitating to one base service club and whites to another should not be permitted, even though this might be of their own choosing.

Methods are suggested for getting around local segregated housing by leasing homes in the name of the Government and moving Negroes in.

ROTC units should be canceled in segregated schools.

The efforts of officers to bring about integration should be constantly reviewed and rated. Promotions should be based on their "initiative" and "accomplishments" in this field.

The traditional function of the base commander and senior officer to run a Military Establishment and maintain good community relations by staying out of local controversies is misguided and should be stopped. They should be encouraged to lead the way to full integration.

Military personnel should be allowed to patronize only those local establishments which are integrated and have the "express approval" of the base commander. All others

should be placed off limits. Approved stores should display placards or decals on their windows and doors to show they have been approved by the military. This gives the base commander life-or-death control of the economic life of the community and the right to subject to military discipline all servicemen, their wives, and children who shop at other stores of their own choosing.

Should all these efforts fail to bring about integration, the services must consider curtailing or terminating activities at these installations.

On July 26 Secretary McNamara issued his directive. Although it did not go as far as the Gesell report proposals, it is still regarded by many in Congress as a drastic innovation in the relationship between military bases and their nearby communities.

To carry out its program McNamara appointed Albert B. Fitts as a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense on Civil Rights. Fitts' post is just below the sub-Cabinet level and does not require Senate confirmation.

The McNamara directive said in its policy statement:

"Discriminatory practices directed against Armed Forces members, all of whom lack a civilian's freedom of choice in where to live, to work, to travel, and to spend his off-duty hours, are harmful to military effectiveness.

"Therefore, all members of the Department of Defense should oppose such practices on every occasion, while fostering equal opportunity for servicemen and their families, on and off base."

The Army, Navy, and Air Force are directed to issue manuals on how to handle communities and are told "to institute in each service a system for regularly reporting, monitoring and measuring progress in achieving equal opportunity on and off base."

There was one noticeable restraint, however. While authorizing off-limits decrees against segregated establishments, McNamara's directive does not allow base commanders to issue such decrees. They can come only from the service Secretaries.

But base commanders are still left with the responsibility of trying to carry out desegregation in nearby civilian communities.

As Congressman WAGGONER noted in a letter to all members of the House and Senate Armed Services Committee, "The traditional role of the military has never been concerned with rearranging the social order, leaving all such matters to their proper place in the hands of the civilians and their courts, remaining nonpolitical and aloof from controversial community problems."

WAGGONER describes the Gesell report as an assault on the civilian establishment comparable to Gen. Benjamin Butler's rule over New Orleans in the Civil War and Thaddeus Stevens' activities in Washington in the Reconstruction.

"The Nation cannot survive the assault of another Stevens or Butler," WAGGONER declared.

The Gesell report and McNamara's directives now have stirred up a hornet's nest in Congress, and the Senate heard a good many words on the subject one day last week.

Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, a high-ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, described the Pentagon action as "an economic bludgeon with which a businessman could be hit over the head."

"There has been no mandate of the Congress on that point," he declared, "and no law has been passed with respect thereto."

STENNIS asserted that the directive will place the military "in the mainstream of swirling political currents and, unless rescinded, will keep them there for years to come."

The Senate debate was enlivened by the participation of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, who reported that the new civil rights deputy, Fitts, has been

traveling around military bases "in the preliminary efforts to get the commanding officers to act in a way commanding officers have never acted before."

GOLDWATER said Pitts was armed "with complete dossiers on every businessman," including income tax data.

"It started in the Attorney General's office," GOLDWATER asserted, "they have used the full force of the Internal Revenue documents."

GOLDWATER said these procedures make possible "a military takeover" of the country with military commanders becoming accustomed to "running politics and the social life of the country."

(The Justice Department has denied that it is involved in the military desegregation program.)

The Gesell report and the resultant McNamara order are not the only things in the Pentagon that are bothering southern Congressmen these days.

Southerners on the House Armed Services Committee are indignant over an administration decision to withhold funds for civil defense adult education programs in States which do not sign integration pledges. Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Democrat, of Louisiana, has stalled a civil defense authorization bill because of this edict.

Congressional power has waned steadily since the Roosevelt administration, but Congress still has one very great weapon—the power to appropriate.

Southerners holding key positions on the Senate and House Appropriations Committees can make things pretty difficult for those in the executive department who try to preempt congressional authority.

But, in the case of the military, there is another important factor. The Senate Armed Services Committee is headed by Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, and the like committee in the House is ruled by the veteran Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia.

RUSSELL already has denounced the Gesell report and the McNamara order. VINSON certainly does not view these matters with approval. There can be some stormy days ahead in both committees.

[From the Shreveport (La.) Journal, July 8, 1963]

A SHAMEFUL MILITARY DIRECTIVE

There is a lot of hypocrisy and deceit in the U.S. Air Force directive authorizing off-base demonstrations for racial integration by enlisted personnel.

A news dispatch from Washington Saturday revealed that the Pentagon had announced major Air Force commands have been advised that off-duty servicemen may participate in desegregation demonstrations.

The news dispatch, a UPI release, said the Pentagon revealed a "guidance memo" had been sent to the Air Force with the statement that the military "had no power to prevent a person from exercising his constitutional rights if there is no involvement of the service nor violation of laws or regulations."

A directive issued from headquarters, Continental Air Command, U.S. Air Force, Robins Air Force Base, Ga., contained this specific message "for the guidance of all concerned":

"Some commanders have raised the question of Air Force policy on the participation of members of the Air Force in demonstrations. Our policy is that no Air Force member will be restricted from demonstrating as a private citizen as long as (1) it is done during off-duty time, (2) the demonstrators wear civilian clothes, (3) there is no imminent danger of injury to Air Force personnel or damage to Government property as a result of this demonstration."

In other words, the Air Force seems to be telling its members that it is all right for them to disguise themselves as civilians, go

into nearby communities, demonstrate as they please and cause as much damage or injury as they please—so long as there is no damage or injury to Government property or personnel. It may be presumed, therefore, that the Air Force is not concerned with any damage or injury that its members, masquerading as civilians on "off-duty" time, might inflict upon private property or private citizens.

It is a shame that any section of the Air Force would lend itself to such hypocritical, deceitful pronouncements.

It is a greater shame that an arm of our national defense should find so little to do in its assigned field that it must devote its time to directives concerning demonstrations calculated to disturb the peace of American communities.

Mr. Speaker, there are, at the last count, 1,145 military bases or other military installations scattered all over the United States. They are close to almost everyone, and some of them affect you. Since there is no geographical limitations set forth in this report I submit that every area of the United States is covered by the recommendations. Let me give you a few illustrations of military establishments within what could be said to be a reasonable distance of major cities in the United States: Fort Dix, Philadelphia-Trenton-Camden complex; Lowry Air Force Base and Fitzsimmons General Hospital, Denver; Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kans.; Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah; Fort Knox, Louisville, Ky.; Fort Lewis, Tacoma, Wash.; Fort Benjamin Wood, Indianapolis, Ind.; Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.; McClellan Air Force Base, Mather Army Depot, Sacramento; Minot Air Force Base, Minot, N. Dak.; Mountain Home Air Force Base, Boise, Idaho; Castle Air Force Base, Merced, Calif.; Lockburne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio.

In the few moments left me, I would like to stress these few and brief points and urge with all the sincerity at my command that every Member of this body consider them carefully.

I maintain that by his Executive order implementing this report, the President has assumed all the authority he and the Attorney General have requested in the civil rights bill as far as the public accommodations section is concerned.

I submit that the statement in this report which the Secretary of Defense has ordered implemented that obedience to local laws on segregation should be stopped is nothing short of inciting to riot. It makes no difference how much the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, Mr. Yarmolinsky or Mr. Gesell may not agree with these laws, they are still laws and in full force.

In urging the military to break down local customs, the door is thrown wide open to use the military in the future to "instruct" the people in the "error of their ways" in not supporting some future President or some future political ideology.

Page 19 of the Gesell report says, and I quote:

Special effort should be made to recognize potential capacities of Negroes.

I read no statement in this report that special efforts should be made to recognize potential capacities of white men.

This is a rank example of preferential treatment; not equal opportunity.

The fact that the promotion of officers responsible for achieving integration is, in the future, to be based in part on how successful he is in bringing about integration, makes it mandatory that he show favoritism and preferential treatment to all Negroes in order to achieve a good rating. I call your attention again to the statement of Secretary McNamara which he made on September 6, 1961, which I quoted earlier:

I believe we should prohibit military officers from participating in partisan politics, and we should prohibit partisan politics from affecting the promotion of an officer.

I suggest that the Secretary has a short memory or else one that conveniently releases him from any previous stands that prove inconvenient later.

Finally, I read on page 53 of the Gesell report this statement:

The base commander naturally looks upon his job as an opportunity to exercise military command; he conceives of his job as overwhelmingly military in character, his mission being to develop the units and troops under his command to peak efficiency.

You would imagine that, at this point, would follow the statement that, in following this concept, the base commander was absolutely correct.

However, the conclusion of the Gesell committee is that, in so doing, the base commander is a failure.

This is not just Barksdale Air Force Base and the surrounding communities in my district but yours as well. And if we can use the military today for social reform, who is to say that it will not be used at some future date by some misguided individual for political reform?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER] has expired.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER], and also the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], and the other distinguished members from the State of Louisiana and wholeheartedly endorse their condemnation of the infamous Gesell report and all efforts to implement the same.

As the gentleman well knows, I have met with them and other concerned Congressmen to discuss the rash of illegal and unconstitutional executive directives which are presently being issued in defiance and contravention of the will of Congress. Of course, the Gesell report and its subsequent directive from the Secretary of Defense are the most reprehensible and contemptible of all such Executive orders.

As I join my colleagues in condemnation of these directives which not only threaten our military position, and the very constitutional basis of our Government, I likewise pledge to them my abiding support for any measures which they

may recommend for the halting of such directives and returning the constitutionally granted power to the Congress.

THE GESELL REPORT: THE REAL FACTS

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. **STRATTON**. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I differ with the distinguished ranking Democratic member of the great Committee on Armed Services on which I have the privilege to serve, my good friend, Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. And it is not often that I differ with the distinguished chairman of one of our distinguished subcommittees, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT]. We have over the years in our committee, I think, developed a somewhat nonpartisan and nonpolitical approach to matters of military concern which has made our committee somewhat unique in this body. But as a member of this committee and one who is deeply concerned with the morale and the efficiency of our armed services, and with the basic implementation of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, I feel that even at this late hour, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to set the record straight and to put forward here some of the real facts with regard to this document which has been the subject of such a one-sided discussion on this floor for the past 3 hours.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that having sat through the debates on yesterday when Members of this House were vying with one another in their concern over civil rights, it is a little hard to believe that this is the same body today, because Members, particularly those on the Republican side of the aisle, were standing up to associate themselves with the position taken by our friends from the South. Those were the same Members who said yesterday that their interest in civil rights was so deep. Of course, others said that sudden interest was only a transient one. Apparently these latter were right, because the bloom seems suddenly to have faded from the civil rights rose—and in less than 24 hours at that.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we ought to understand exactly what this Gesell report is, because there have been some rather strong statements made here about it in the past 3 hours.

We have been told that this is the beginning of SS troops in America. We have been told that this was the opening wedge for police state commissar programs in America. We have been told that we may have passed the point of no return in undermining the morale and efficiency of our armed services. We have been told that we are putting the military up to their necks in politics at every base in the United States. And we have been told that henceforth promotion is going to be based on color alone rather than competence.

I am not surprised that Members who have not had an opportunity to follow these matters or even to read the direc-

tive of the Secretary of Defense or to read the Gesell report itself should be concerned over these charges because if any of these charges were even remotely true this would indeed be a matter of greatest concern for anyone associated with the armed services.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is really no secret that we have been concerned for many years with eliminating discrimination and segregation in the armed services of the United States, and by Executive order, if not indeed by action of this Congress, distinguished Presidents in the past have felt that men and women in the services ought to be treated equally regardless of their race, their creed, or their color.

President Truman put forth an Executive order back in 1948, Executive Order 9981, calling for equality of treatment and opportunity in the Armed Forces. We did not collapse as a nation as a result of this order. The armed services did not degenerate. Grass did not grow in the streets, and SS troops did not march in the corridors.

Later on, in June of 1961, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gilpatric, issued a memorandum on equality; but I do not recall that there were any viewings with alarm on this floor. We recognized then that the elimination of inequality meant that individual Army commanders should have a responsibility for trying to prevent discrimination in the facilities that were available around military bases as well as on the bases themselves.

Mr. **HEBERT**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **STRATTON**. I wish I could yield to my distinguished friend, but my friend and his associates had 3 hours. I have 1 brief hour to straighten out the record. We did not interrupt the gentleman's presentation.

Mr. **HEBERT**. That is perfectly all right. I will ask for time after the gentleman has finished his remarks.

Mr. **STRATTON**. I would like to have an opportunity to develop additional facts on this important subject, so that those who are listening can have an opportunity to see what the real picture is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are, as I see it, in the midst, and I do not believe anyone is unaware of this fact, of a social upheaval in this country. Whether we like it or do not like it, there has been a deep upheaval here in America and a demand on the part of our Negro citizens for equality of treatment. This Congress is confronted with this social upheaval today and we are, in my judgment, going to do something about it. We are going to pass constructive civil rights legislation in this Congress. We are not, I might add, going to do it on a piecemeal, half-baked basis, as we were urged to do on yesterday.

I do not think anybody who understands what is going on in this country and in this world today could possibly expect the President of the United States to do anything else than to try to find ways and means in which this basic American spirit of equality could be further implemented in every facet of our Government.

That is the basis for the Gesell report, and that is all there is to it.

The President called upon a distinguished group of citizens to develop a study of exactly what the status of our quest for equality of treatment was in the armed services at this time. If he had not been concerned about this problem, we would, I think, have felt that he was not doing his job properly.

And soon, the 22d of June 1962, the President wrote to Mr. Gesell.

As the letter shows, he pointed out to Mr. Gesell that the Department of Defense had made great progress since the end of World War II in promoting the equality of treatment and he said that it is appropriate now, however, to make a thorough review of the current situation both within the services and in the communities where military installations are located to determine what further measures may be required to assure equality of treatment for all persons serving in the Armed Forces.

The President indicated that he was establishing an independent body of distinguished citizens on the most effective action that can be taken to cope with the problem, and he stated that he was establishing a committee on equality of opportunity in the Armed Forces and asked Mr. Gerhard Gesell to serve as chairman of that committee.

Now this Gesell Committee was asked to include in its consideration of the general problem of equality of opportunity the following specific questions:

1. What measures should be taken to improve the effectiveness of current policies and procedures in the Armed Forces with regard to equality of treatment and opportunity for persons in the Armed Forces?
2. What measures should be employed to improve equality of opportunity for members of the Armed Forces and their dependents in the civilian community, particularly with respect to housing, education, transportation, recreational facilities, community events, programs and activities?

Mr. Speaker, that is the specific frame of reference of the so-called Gesell report. There is nothing unusual and nothing startling about it, and I am surprised that Members of this House should think that it is out of order for the President to inquire about matters such as these as Commander in Chief.

The suggestion has been made that this was a strange body and that somehow these individuals were not competent. I would like to invite the attention of the House to some of the distinguished pedigrees of the members of this Committee.

Mr. Gesell, for example, was a member of the Committee of Investigation on the Pearl Harbor Attack from 1945 to 1946. He has had considerable experience in Government. He has had some concrete experience in the operation of the military. He graduated from Yale and was a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission and was technical adviser to the Commission and special counsel of the Special and Temporary National Economic Committee. He is also a member of the distinguished law firm of Covington & Burling, in the city of Washington.

Mr. Nathaniel Colley, of Tuskegee Institute, a second member of the Committee, was a captain in the U.S. Army from 1942 to 1946.

Mr. Abe Fortas, distinguished attorney was at one time Under Secretary of the Interior, from 1942 to 1946, and as adviser to the U.S. delegation to the United Nations at San Francisco in 1945 and London in 1946. He was visiting lecturer on law with the rank of professor at Yale University.

These members were not dragged up from out of the backyard, as some have tried to suggest in the past 3 hours. They are able and distinguished citizens.

There is for example, Mr. Louis J. Hector, a graduate of Phillips Andover Academy, 1933; Williams College, 1938, Christ Church, Oxford, 1939; Assistant to the Under Secretary of State, 1944; member of the firm of Hector, Faircloth & Rutledge, Miami, Fla., from 1956 to 1957.

Mr. Hector was also a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board and served with the Office of Strategic Services in combat in China in 1945.

Then we have Mr. Benjamin Muse of Manassas, Va., a Foreign Service officer for 14 years, from 1920 to 1934, and a lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Army from 1942 to 1946.

Next is Mr. John Sengstacke of Hampton Institute, Va. He was vice president and general manager of the Robert S. Abbott Publishing Co., and was a recipient of the Two Friends Award of the National Urban League.

Next is Mr. Whitney Young, Jr., who is a national director of the National Urban League in the great city of New York in my home State.

Mr. Speaker, these are the people listed on this Gesell report. These are the people who examined this vital question of equality. They came from all sections of our country.

Well, now, the Gesell report was submitted to the President, Mr. Speaker, and we have had some portions of it read here today. This is a report that has examined the current status of equality of opportunity in the armed services today and in the communities surrounding our armed services bases. It has made a number of concrete recommendations, as people of this caliber would who have these concerns at heart and who would be operating on a commission from the President of the United States in these difficult and challenging days, would want to make. They analyzed the facts and they came up with recommendations of their own.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States had this to say to the chairman of that committee after his report had been submitted:

I appreciate the intensive and constructive effort that you and the other members of the Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces have given to one of the Nation's most serious problems. As your initial report suggests, the Armed Forces have made significant progress in eliminating discrimination among those serving in the defense of the Nation. Your inquiry indicates, however, that much remains to be done, especially in eliminating practices that cause inconvenience and embarrassment to servicemen and their families in communities

adjoining military bases. Your recommendation should have the immediate attention of the Department of Defense. I have asked the Secretary of Defense to report to me on your recommendations within 30 days.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the President also wrote to the Secretary of Defense with regard to this same report:

Because of my concern that there should be full equality of treatment for all military personnel, regardless of race or color, I appointed a committee to study the matter in June of 1962. An initial report of that committee is transmitted with this letter for your personal attention and action.

We have come a long way in the 15 years since President Truman ordered the desegregation of the Armed Forces. The military services lead almost every other segment of our society in establishing equality of opportunity for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, can anybody properly object to that kind of inquiry? Can anybody stand up and object, when the Presidents says, "A great deal remains to be done," in dealing with discrimination and inequality in our Armed Forces.

Further quoting from the letter:

As the report emphasizes, a serious morale problem is created for Negro personnel when various forms of segregation and discrimination exist in communities neighboring military bases. Discriminatory practices are morally wrong wherever they occur and they are especially inequitable and iniquitous when they inconvenience and embarrass those serving in the armed services and their families. Responsible citizens of all races in these communities should work together to open up public accommodations and housing for Negro military personnel and their dependents. This effort is required by the interests of our national defense, national policy, and basic considerations of human decency.

And, then the President's letter to the Secretary of Defense concludes with the final sentence:

I realize that I am asking the military community to take a leadership role but I believe that this is proper. The armed services will, I am confident, be equal to that task. In this area as in so many others, the U.S. infantry motto, "Follow Me," is an appropriate guide for action.

Mr. Speaker, can anybody object to that approach? Can anybody really maintain that the President is off base because he wants to protect the morale and efficiency of our armed services, or because he wants to eliminate those forms of segregation and discrimination which are not only "morally wrong" but which inconvenience and which disrupt the opportunity of our men in uniform to serve their flag and their uniform to the full extent of their ability?

Yes, it would be pretty hard to argue that point, Mr. Speaker. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, we in the North have been particularly well aware that when it comes to the location of our military bases there has been a very substantial number of them located in the Southern States of our country. I have not always subscribed to this particular decision, that because they do not have snow in most of these Southern States, that all of our bases should therefore be put in one geographical basket. I have been a little bit concerned that perhaps some of our military people were not having the best possible opportunity to

harden themselves against some of the challenges that they may be meeting in some parts of the world without having the opportunity of being trained at places like Camp Drum in upper New York.

The young men who go to these southern bases, Mr. Speaker, are young men who come from New York, from New England, from New Jersey, and Michigan, and all over the country, to these bases located in the southern section of our country. I think we have a certain responsibility to them, to remember the kind of background and social environment they came from.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Defense received this document from the President. He acknowledged it on the 24th of July, 1963, in a letter in which he comments that the committee found that in the main racial equality "is a reality" on military bases today. He continues:

The Department of Defense will eliminate the exceptions and guard the continuing reality.

It is to the Department's off-base responsibilities that the committee has devoted the bulk of its report. In eloquent terms the committee has described the nature and pervasiveness of off-base discrimination against Negro servicemen and their families, the divisive and demoralizing impact of that discrimination, and the general absence of affirmative, effective action to ameliorate or end the off-base practices affecting nearly a quarter of a million of our servicemen.

Here is a real point, Mr. Speaker: He goes on to say:

Consistently therewith, I have issued a directive explicitly stating Department of Defense policy with regard to off-base discrimination and requiring—preparation of detailed directives, manuals and regulations making clear the leadership responsibility both on base and off base and containing guidance as to how that responsibility is to be discharged—institution in each service of a system for regularly monitoring and measuring progress in this field.

Now we have heard a lot of talk here today about spies and G-men, Mr. Speaker, but if you are administering a program you are not much of an administrator if you do not find out how your program is progressing. So the Department is monitoring it to find out whether the orders sent down by the Secretary are really being carried out.

And then finally the Secretary says:

We are in the process of establishing a staff element within my office to give full time to such matters.

He does not necessarily agree to put into effect all of the recommendations of the Gesell report. The Secretary of Defense has used this report as a guide to the directive which he has himself issued. That directive simply indicates to each of his commanders in each of the three uniformed services that they have a responsibility to do what they can to eliminate discrimination, not only on base but off the base. But the Secretary is sympathetic with the objective of the report, as he concludes:

The military departments will take a leadership role in combating discrimination wherever it affects the military effectiveness of the men and women serving in the defense of this country.

What is wrong with that? Since when have military commanders not had any concern with what goes on off the base if it affects the military efficiency of their troops? Since when have they had to stop exactly within the limits of the base itself? Anybody that has ever had anything to do with the armed services knows they have not stopped at the precise limits of the base. Anybody that has ever lived near a base knows perfectly well that there is a close and continuing relationship between the military base and the surrounding areas; and as my good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana well knows, this relationship has been one which has been tremendously beneficial economically to those who set up their stores and their emporiums and their opportunities for entertainment on the steps of military bases. Yes, over the years the military commander has been an important part of the economic life of the military base community. I know, I have a small base in my own district, and I know that the commander of that base is one of the most respected members of the chamber of commerce, and we are delighted to have that base in our area. If there has ever been anything in the surrounding area that has bothered him, he sat down with the other members of our community and has discussed it, usually on a man-to-man, voluntary basis.

Why back during World War II we had certain cases of rent-gouging in some of our bases, with servicemen and their wives and families being made fair game for unscrupulous landlords. Did the base commander say, "We could not go over the line; traditionally we have been restrained within the limits of the base and to go outside of the base would be to violate our Constitution and bring the SS troops into it"? Of course he did not. He sat down with the responsible leaders of the particular community and he said, "Look, we have to get a little help. We have to have some cooperation here and have the mayors and the chambers of commerce do something about this rent gouging. And that situation was dealt with. We have had other similar cases where, because of the quality of the entertainment provided, let us say, as the gentleman from Louisiana has already mentioned, there have been conditions which have seriously impaired the health and efficiency of members of the armed services of the United States. Did our military commanders hesitate then and say, "Well, gee, we cannot do anything about this venereal disease problem? If these fellows are all going to come down with disease, that is just too bad, but we cannot step over the line"? Of course they did not say that. If they could not eliminate these places on a voluntary basis, after a little discussion with the civilian authorities—and more often than not that is what really worked—then they took the final, ultimate sanction of putting these establishments off limits. Where an establishment has been enjoying the patronage of the military, day after day, month after month, and week after week, I do not think that there was ever a more effective device for bringing

about some changes in the quality of the entertainment of that establishment desired by the military commanders than to place those places off limits for awhile and deny them the business of thousands of service personnel. Those places got cleaned up then in a hurry. We have seen this happen in one city after another. Nobody ever objected to that kind of action, and nobody ever said the armed services did not have a responsibility to protect the morale, health, and efficiency of their forces off their own base area.

That is exactly the same responsibility today, and there is not a single thing in this directive, issued by the Secretary of Defense, that goes a single iota beyond what has already been done time and time again in the past. That is all that is involved here. But we have today a new type of situation that exists in many parts of our country which is impairing the morale, the efficiency, and the effectiveness of our armed services, just as much as it was impaired by rent-gouging or by impure influences that existed in the past. And I mean segregation and discrimination. Any Commander in Chief that did not recognize it and did not do something about it would certainly not merit the confidence and support of the American people.

Let us get this thing into perspective, Mr. Speaker. This is all that the Gesell report involves. We are trying to eliminate those things which impair the efficiency of a substantial segment of our armed services. Young men who come from my State of New York, for example, or from other Northern States and come down into Louisiana or North Carolina or South Carolina and find that they cannot even go outside the base and go to a hotdog stand and sit down with a fellow of a different color and have a hotdog or a Coke, or that they cannot even go into a drugstore and get an aspirin—what effect is this strange treatment likely to have on their morale? These boys are drafted into the service, usually at a relatively tender age. Maybe they have not been away from home before. There are adjustments enough, as we all know, in getting into military service in the first place under any circumstances. But when you put them in this whole new kind of framework, and this wholly strange new life, to which they have never been subjected before, and then insist that this is the condition under which they are going to have to live, this kind of discrimination and humiliation, what do you think this is going to do to their morale and their efficiency?

I think we have a tremendous responsibility here, Mr. Speaker, and I am proud of the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense for recognizing that responsibility and for carrying it out so effectively. Now we are told that this is a blackmail approach. As I said, military commanders are a part of the economic life of the community in which the base is established, one of the most important parts of that economic life. They can sit down and accomplish a great deal on a voluntary basis. And if they say, "Look, the kind of things that have been going on

around here are impairing the efficiency of my troops, and we feel that you have got to make some changes if we are going to continue to let our young men go out and spend their dollars in your establishments," I know darn well that you are going to find a lot of changes made by your local businessmen. They do not want to lose that profitable service business.

What we have got to do is to recognize this responsibility and suggest to the base commander that he has just as much responsibility in this field as he does in eliminating any other practices that would impair the morale and efficiency of his troops. And that is what this directive is doing and what it is supposed to do and that is all it is doing. It is supposed to be carried out on a voluntary basis, and I am sure a great deal can be accomplished on a purely voluntary basis. But if you do not have some sanction somewhere in the picture, then a lot of people are going to ignore the voluntary appeal. That is commonsense too.

So we have the sanction that says that if you still do not get compliance, if you have a relentless discrimination that refuses to permit Negro servicemen to buy a coke or a beer or something in stores which still make money on white boys, then the ultimate sanction against them is to place those establishments that insist on discrimination off limits. But the Secretary of Defense also made clear that this action, that ultimate sanction, cannot be imposed without the concurrence of the particular service Secretary concerned. Let's be clear about that one, too. So the idea is that hopefully this problem can be resolved and will be resolved by people who recognize that if they are going to profit from the money that is paid by Uncle Sam to servicemen, certainly they have some responsibility to deal with servicemen in uniform on an equal basis and without instituting a kind of discrimination which should have no place in our armed services and no real place in our country. You cannot have equality on the base, Mr. Speaker, and discrimination off the base.

There is no inherent right of anybody to make money off the armed services. Nobody has the inherent right to run a business that is a whole lot more profitable than it otherwise would be simply because the U.S. armed services happened to locate next door to him. If this fellow wants to benefit from the armed services installation, certainly he has some responsibility to cooperate with the policies of those services; and I am sure that if we could get the facts presented properly on this directive all reasonable, fairminded people would recognize what is involved and we would not have to listen to the kind of charges that were made here earlier on this floor as to all of the dire consequences involved. In fact I do not think we would have any serious problem in getting this kind of compliance.

This is what the Defense Department has done. This is all they have done. This seems to me to be a perfectly necessary and perfectly responsible and perfectly commendable way to

deal with a very serious social problem. I think we would be highly critical of the President of the United States in fact if he had not done what he has done with the Gesell report.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I shall yield in a minute, if the gentleman will allow me.

Mr. COHELAN. I hope the gentleman will discuss some of the specific items in the directive.

Mr. STRATTON. I want just to include a couple of items in the RECORD, if I may, and then I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

We have heard the charge made that representatives of the Department of Defense, armed with income tax dossiers, were walking up and down the streets in certain communities. I raised this question with the Secretary of Defense and a representative of the Secretary responded to me today. I should like to read a part of that letter and then I will ask that this be included in the RECORD, together with some other documents that I want to include.

DEAR MR. STRATTON: You have inquired about charges recently made that I have complete dossiers on every businessman near our southern military bases, with the facts and figures in these dossiers having been drawn from Federal income tax returns.

The charge is wholly in error. The facts of the matter are these:

From June 30 to July 5 and on July 16 and 17 a six-member team headed by a Representative of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower), visited military bases at or near Biloxi, Columbus, and Greenville, Miss., Mobile, Ala., and Shreveport, La. I joined the group on the evening of July 1 and returned to Washington on the evening of the third.

The purpose of the visits was to gather current accurate information from several bases in connection with the response of this Department to the President's letter of June 21 transmitting the initial report of his Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, commonly called the Gesell committee.

At each base the sole function of the team was to gather information respecting the base, the community and base-community relations, including the nature and degree of off-base segregation affecting Negro military personnel and their dependents. The team was not armed "with complete dossiers on every businessman" nor did it compile same in the course of the base visits, nor does such a dossier exist today, insofar as this Department is aware, with respect to every or any of the businessmen in the communities mentioned above.

There are two other paragraphs in this letter which I will not bother to read, but the letter is signed by Alfred B. Pitt, Deputy Assistant Secretary (Civil Rights) Designee, in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. I will include the full document at the end of my remarks.

Let me make just one other comment, that the statement was made that somebody other than Mr. Gesell had written the Gesell report. That charge was not documented, neither were any of the other charges that were made here. But let me say that my information is that Mr. Gesell, who has a great deal of extensive experience in investigations and in writing reports in connection with the

Pearl Harbor investigation, actually wrote his own report himself.

Mr. Chairman, we have a basic and profound social upheaval facing us here in America today. If this country is going to weather this upheaval, as I am sure we are going to weather it, then men of good will, regardless of where they may live, in the South or in the North, when all has been said and done, are going to have to sit down and try to find some constructive solution to this problem, some way in which we can genuinely eliminate discrimination and second-class citizenship. When all the steam has evaporated, then perhaps the responsible and forward-looking leaders in our southern as well as northern States will recognize that nothing is really going to be accomplished just by trying to perpetuate those conditions which impair the efficiency and morale of the armed services or by trying to warm over old embers. Perhaps then they will join in trying to find a constructive way to eliminate these conditions so that we can continue to have the greatest armed services on the face of the earth.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at the end of my remarks the Executive order issued by the President of the United States in 1948; the memorandum from the Secretary of Defense dated June 19, 1961; the letter of the President of the United States establishing the Gesell Committee; the letter of June 21 forwarding the Gesell report to the Secretary of Defense; the memorandum of the Secretary of Defense to the President dated July 24; the Defense directive dated on the 26th of July; and the letter to which I referred earlier.

I also ask unanimous consent to include following that the analysis of the members of the Gesell Committee from which I quoted a moment ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KASTENMEIER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. STRATTON. Now I am happy to yield to my colleague the gentleman from California, and I apologize for taking so much time.

Mr. COHELAN. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from New York for this point-by-point development of the genesis of this very excellent report on equality of treatment and opportunity for Negro personnel stationed within the United States. I am most pleased to associate myself with his remarks. I would like to say at this point in the RECORD that in due course I will have further comment to make on this particular subject. But I would like to mention one or two things of my personal knowledge in connection with the Gesell report which, I believe, are pertinent.

The gentleman has gone into detail in discussing the background of committee members responsible for the Gesell report. Among those is the name of a very distinguished Californian presently serving on the Board of Education of the State of California, Mr. Nathaniel Colley. I can assure you that the presence

of this distinguished gentleman's name on the report adds great weight, in my mind, to the conclusions that were drawn by the committee. Mr. Colley is an outstanding citizen and leader in California and I am honored to count him as an associate in many worthy civic causes and as a friend.

Mr. Speaker, there is overwhelming evidence to show that the recommendations and the findings of this report are correct and that strong measures should be taken.

I am very proud of the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense for having proceeded in this forthright and intelligent manner.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard some outraged protests this afternoon against efforts of the Department of Defense to safeguard the morale of American servicemen. We have especially heard the claim that it is a terrible thing even to suggest the possibility that an establishment conspicuously practicing discrimination might be put off limits. I am reminded of a true story which took place at a base which I shall leave unnamed.

A prominent hotel in the community involved announced that it would refuse service to enlisted men. The military commander of the base responded by announcing that the hotel involved would henceforth be off limits to all his personnel, officers, and enlisted men alike. For, he pointed out, it was entirely contrary to American tradition to regard one class of American as second-class citizens compared to another class. After a while the hotel involved relented and has been serving all our military people, enlisted and officers alike, ever since. So the idea that one might place a business practicing discrimination off limits is not an unprecedented one, and I do not think anyone would seriously argue that discrimination among American servicemen of different colors is any more consistent with American traditions and concepts of first-class citizenship than discrimination among American servicemen as between enlisted and officer personnel. Nor can anyone seriously question that those demoralizing conditions have a direct effect on morale and fighting spirit. If a place of business could properly be put off limits on grounds of discriminating among servicemen by refusing service to enlisted men, I do not see why similar action prompted by other forms of discrimination should be regarded as so unthinkable.

As this story and as numerous other stories indicate, base commanders have long felt and long been held responsible for taking actions to improve the morale and to win fair treatment for our servicemen in the communities around bases. Our constitution is colorblind, as are our service regulations. If it is proper for a commander to take action to protect his men from discrimination as between officer and enlisted personnel, I don't think anyone would deny that it is equally proper for military commanders in the Navy, and in the Air Force and in the Army, to make every reasonable effort to alleviate conditions of discrimination and unfairness against service-

men under their command, regardless of race, color, or creed.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the fine presentation that has been made in the matter of the Secretary's directive this afternoon. I think he has outlined the situation. I think he has given the background of that directive that certainly ought to be in the Record.

Mr. Speaker, a violent attack has been made on the Gesell report and the directive of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara. The bitterness of the attack spread to the inflection and spelling of the name of the good and dedicated public servant who was alleged to have prepared the directive for the Secretary of Defense. The provincial un-American intolrances which have been placed into the record are self-explaining—and self-defeating.

As a Representative of a northern district, I have file cabinets full of sad and despairing letters describing the cruel conditions of Negro military service in the South. I hope that the McNamara directive—regardless of who counseled its preparation, will help make military service more tolerable in the South.

As a matter of fact, I think it is time for the Congress to reexamine the reasons why the military departments have concentrated the military bases throughout the South.

There are sound and perhaps overwhelming reasons to relocate the military training facilities closer to the concentration of available manpower. The cold damp weather of winter in Mississippi or Georgia or the Carolinas is no more pleasant or conducive to military training than is winter with a little snow in Illinois, Pennsylvania, or Ohio. Locating military bases closer to the source of supply will be equivalent to a moderate pay increase to those thousands of young men who must face the costly expense of travel between home and the military base.

As a matter of fact, we have surplus public land, 21,427 acres at the former site of the Ravenna Arsenal in northeastern Ohio, which would make a splendid military base conveniently located and easily accessible to railroads, highways, and turnpikes. The adjacent community will happily provide services and accommodations to anyone and everyone who may need them. Ohio would be pleased to have the economic benefit of the millions of dollars which would be spent near such an establishment.

Military training will be more effective and productive in a community atmosphere which cherishes and welcomes the activity. Training under these circumstances and in this atmosphere will produce better defense and happier trainees.

I therefore urge that we reinvestigate our Military Establishment and restudy the reasons why military bases were established and continue to be operated in communities where they are not welcome and where their efficiency is drastically impaired.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity to join my colleague on the House Armed Services Committee in complimenting the gentleman from New York for taking the time necessary to respond to some of the questions that were presented to the House earlier this afternoon. I would like to say that I share his views and I also share his apprehension in assuming a position contrary to that of some of our senior colleagues on the committee.

Mr. Speaker, opponents of equal treatment for all Americans serving in the Armed Forces object to the Defense Department directive of July 26. That directive calls upon every military commander "to oppose discriminatory practices affecting his men and their dependents and to foster equal opportunity for them, not only in areas under his immediate control, but also in nearby communities where they may live or gather in off-duty hours.

It is charged that this is a brand new concept which imposes burdens on the military which are no concern of theirs and which will embroil them in political controversy. The facts of the matter are that the concept is not new nor is the concern irrelevant nor is the task political.

On July 26, 1948, President Truman ordered integration of the Armed Forces. That order has been carried out with great skill and success by all the military departments. There is no racial discrimination on military bases. Men live and eat and work and train and fight together for their country, no matter what their color and no matter what their background. Integration works, and it is a reality in the Defense Establishment.

It is not a reality outside of military bases. Men and women wearing their country's uniform are ordered into communities where some of them cannot find a hotel, a restaurant, a movie theater, a bowling alley, a lodging house, or a lunch counter which will admit them. They cannot rent a decent house or apartment. They cannot sit in vacant seats in buses. They cannot obtain off-duty education. Their children cannot go to accredited schools. They cannot play in the playgrounds, or sit down in the libraries. These conditions affecting service people and their families are the reality for nearly a quarter of a million Americans in uniform.

Long ago it was recognized that off-base racial discrimination damages military morale and military effectiveness. It is a divisive force, for its consequences are that men who work together on base—and teamwork is the essence of military effectiveness—cannot associate off base. It is a demoralizing force, because the humiliations, insults and indignities heaped by civilian communities on Negroes in uniform make them doubt their own worthiness, embitter them and cause separations of families unwilling to bear the conditions I have mentioned.

Recognizing the damage that such discrimination can do, the Defense Depart-

ment on June 19, 1961, directed local commanders to make every effort to obtain unsegregated off-base facilities for members of the Armed Forces. This has been the normal, established policy for over two years now. All the military departments have followed it, and there is nothing revolutionary at all about it.

Take the Army, for example. On September 6, 1961, it sent a message to all commands saying, in part:

In furtherance of [the equal opportunity] policy, local commanders are expected, through command-community relations committees, to make continuing efforts toward obtaining unsegregated facilities off base for members of the Army.

Like instructions were issued in the Navy and Air Force.

So much for the charge that the July 26 defense directive was something new and surprising.

If not revolutionary, does it nonetheless require commanders to assume an irrelevant burden? What is irrelevant in asking military commanders to worry about the welfare of their men, and to take steps contributing toward high morale and military effectiveness? That is exactly what commanders have been expected to do ever since there have been armies. Our commanders are trained from the day they enter service to put the welfare of their men first, for this is how effective fighting units are built.

And just what is the off-base lot of the Negro serviceman, which some among us say is not the concern of his commander. Take a typical married career soldier who happens to be a Negro ordered to report to a southern base. In the first place he leaves his wife and children behind because he knows they cannot be sure of a place to eat or of a place to sleep at night during the trip, and that when the trip is over there will in most cases be no hotel and no motel where his family can stay while the search goes on for permanent housing.

Quite often there will be no decent permanent housing open to that Negro serviceman's family. This circumstance alone, not to mention an unwillingness to subject children to segregated schools, means that many families are separated during the whole period of the father's assignment in the South.

So the serviceman makes the trip alone, driving nonstop to his new post. Inside its boundaries he is treated with complete equality. The instant he leaves the post he is treated with complete inequality. He cannot go anywhere with his fellow soldiers who happen to be white, because there is no place which will admit them so long as he is part of the group. In some towns he will not even be permitted to go on the public sidewalks in company with a white soldier, or to enter the same waiting room in the railroad station, or to share a taxi with him, or to sit next to him on the bus.

So he does not go to town with his white friends. He goes alone, or only in company with other Negroes. When they get to town there is no place to go, or no fit place to go. The movies—even the drive-ins—the restaurants, the taverns, the parks, the golf courses, the bowling alleys—all of these are denied to the Negro wearing his country's uniform.

In every aspect of off-base housing, education, transportation, and recreation he receives separate and unequal treatment. He cannot even take a correspondence course from the State university.

This sort of grinding, humiliating, persistent discrimination does incalculable damage to the inside of a man. When it is imposed on a Negro in uniform it is particularly inequitable and iniquitous, for he is serving where his own Government has sent him. He has no choice; he goes because there is a military requirement for his presence.

The whole point behind Secretary McNamara's directive is that the military requirement is made more difficult to meet, and military effectiveness more difficult to obtain, precisely because of the impact of off-base discrimination.

Finally, the charge is made that Secretary McNamara's directive puts military commanders in the position of dictating to civilian communities on what is essentially a civilian matter.

Let us acknowledge at once that military commanders are accustomed to working with civilian communities in the interests of their men.

We all accept the idea that a base commander should seek decent treatment for his men in nearby communities—at least so far as his efforts go toward obtaining housing, or schooling, or transportation, or volunteer workers for service clubs and USO's, and matters of that kind. But evidently some people think it improper for a commander to seek equal treatment for all his men, as if their needs were somehow different because the color of their skin is different, or that if it is proper to treat them equally on base, it somehow becomes improper to seek equal treatment for them off base. I submit that there is no such distinction. There is no impropriety about equality, and there is no impropriety in seeking it.

Over the years military commanders have forbidden their men to swim in polluted waters, to eat in unsanitary restaurants, to deal with crooked merchants, and to patronize establishments where gambling and prostitution flourish. Over the same period commanders have worked with civilian authorities to end such conditions in communities near bases. There was and is no charge that such efforts meant a political takeover by the military, because it was clear they were only seeking to protect their men and in turn enhance the fighting effectiveness of the units under their command. So it is with the effort to end racial discrimination affecting American servicemen.

To characterize the July 26 directive as an attempt to thrust military commanders into a political role misses the mark entirely. The commanders are not being asked to bring about changes in civilian customs except as they bear directly on the welfare and effectiveness of men and women in uniform.

This is in the very highest traditions of the Military Establishment. Our military commanders have shown great leadership in achieving equality for all Americans on base. In so doing they

have provided the very best and most gratifying proof that equality can be transformed from a word into a reality. I am quite confident that in seeking decent treatment for their men off base as well, those same commanders will again demonstrate that there is no need to fear equal treatment for all those who serve in the defense of our Nation.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I too want to congratulate our good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] upon putting into perspective an important issue that has been raised in this House today.

Mr. Speaker, if I might make a comment or two, I would say that our friend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] condemns the use of the Armed Forces for what he describes as a political purpose, regardless of what that purpose may be. Well, I disagree with this, Mr. Speaker. I think it is wrong. I say that it does make a difference when the purpose is the maintenance of a standard of democracy which includes equality of treatment and opportunity for all those who serve in the country's defense.

Are we to take the position that an instrumentality of the United States should remain neutral on the proposition of democracy? I think not, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] asks that we remember the name of Adam Yarmolinsky; that it was he who wrote the Defense Department directive; that it is he, with satanic zeal, who would bring about integration in our Military Establishment.

Mr. Speaker, does that make this man less of an American? If so, the patriotism of a vast majority of Americans must be in serious question. I know Mr. Yarmolinsky and I have known him for a number of years. I would not do him the disservice of defending him or answering for him in this circumstance. As a human being and as a citizen of this Republic, he needs no defense. Period.

Mr. Speaker, there has also been reflection cast upon the President's Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Services. It has been said that their recommendations could have been anticipated simply on the basis of the composition of the Committee membership. Perhaps so, Mr. Speaker, but I ask the question again, does this make the members of that Committee any less American? In fact, Mr. Speaker, what are these recommendations, what are these findings?

First, the Committee found that in the main racial equality is a reality on military bases today, but it went on and pointed out the pervasiveness of off-base discrimination, and it characterized this as divisive and demoralizing and said that the general absence of affirmative, effective action to ameliorate or end the off-base practices, affecting nearly one-quarter million of our servicemen, was in fact hurting the effectiveness of our fightingmen today.

Is there justification for these findings, Mr. Speaker? How far do we have to

go, how hard do we have to be beaten over the head to admit the plain facts of everyday life? We know there is discrimination, we know this discrimination hurts the effectiveness of the American fighting man.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] would have us believe that the Defense Department directive would undermine the ability of our military forces to recruit, to retain trained people in our fighting forces, that it would, as he said, undermine the fighting effectiveness of our Armed Forces. To this I say "balderdash." This proposition cannot be supported.

Can it be seriously propounded that steps to improve equality of treatment and opportunity in our armed services or anywhere else in our American society is pernicious, that it damages the morale of our men, our fighting men, that it undermines the principles upon which our Republic was founded? I think not, Mr. Speaker.

It has been said that the issue before us is not civil rights but, rather, the propriety of directing the power, the authority of our Military Establishment to eliminate off-base discrimination. I think this may well be true. My response must be that the time has come for both executive and legislative action to erase discrimination, that our national conscience can no longer brook delay. The further fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that few, if any, of those who have spoken against this directive and against this policy are going to vote for a civil rights bill in this or any other session of the Congress. So while it is all very well to say that this issue goes to the question of the proper use of Federal authority and has nothing to do with civil rights, surely there is more than a passing coincidence in the fact that those who have spoken against the proposition incorporated in the directive almost to the man are against any form of civil rights, while those who have defended the directive are active supporters of equality of citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman for his forceful statement.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with the other documents previously included the full text of a letter from Mr. Albert B. Fitt, Deputy Assistant Secretary (designate) for Civil Rights.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER No. 9981, JULY 26, 1948

ESTABLISHING THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EQUALITY OF TREATMENT AND OPPORTUNITY IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Whereas it is essential that there be maintained in the armed services of the United States the highest standards of democracy, with equality of treatment and opportunity for all those who serve in our country's defense:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, by the Constitution and the statutes of the United States, and as Commander in

Chief of the armed services, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the President that there shall be equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the armed services without regard to race, color, religion or national origin. This policy shall be put into effect as rapidly as possible, having due regard to the time required to effectuate any necessary changes without impairing efficiency or morale.

2. There shall be created in the National Military Establishment an advisory committee to be known as the President's Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Services which shall be composed of seven members to be designated by the President.

3. The Committee is authorized on behalf of the President to examine into the rules, procedures and practices of the armed services in order to determine in what respect such rules, procedures and practices may be altered or improved with a view to carrying out the policy of this order. The Committee shall confer and advise with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, and shall make such recommendations to the President and to said Secretaries as in the judgment of the Committee will effectuate the policy hereof.

4. All executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government are authorized and directed to cooperate with the Committee in its work, and to furnish the Committee such information or the services of such persons as the Committee may require in the performance of its duties.

5. When requested by the Committee to do so, persons in the armed services or in any of the executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall testify before the Committee and shall make available for the use of the Committee such documents and other information as the Committee may require.

6. The Committee shall continue to exist until such time as the President shall terminate its existence by Executive order.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 26, 1948.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., June 19, 1961.

Memorandum for the Secretary of the Army,
the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary
of the Air Force.

Subject: Availability of facilities to military personnel.

1. The policy of equal treatment for all members of the Armed Forces without regard to race, creed, or color is firmly established within the Department of Defense.

2. Therefore, in those areas where unsegregated facilities are not readily available to members of the Armed Forces in adjacent or surrounding communities, it is the policy of the Department of Defense to provide such facilities on military installations to the extent possible. In addition, local commanders are expected to make every effort to obtain such facilities off base for members of the Armed Forces through command-community relations committees.

3. Military police may be used to quell affrays when military personnel are involved but military police will not be employed on behalf of local authorities to support enforcement of racial segregation or other forms of racial discrimination.

4. Legal actions by civilian authorities against members of the Armed Forces growing out of enforcement of racial segregation or other forms of racial discrimination will be carefully monitored by local commanders. As circumstances warrant, military legal assistance may be provided to assure that members of the Armed Forces are afforded due process of law.

ROSSELL GILPATRICK,
Deputy.

JUNE 22, 1962.

GERHARD A. GESELL, Esq.,
Union Trust Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GESELL: The Department of Defense has made great progress since the end of World War II in promoting equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the Armed Forces. The military services can take justifiable pride in their outstanding accomplishments in this area over the past 10 years.

It is appropriate now, however, to make a thorough review of the current situation both within the services and in the communities where military installations are located to determine what further measures may be required to assure equality of treatment for all persons serving in the Armed Forces.

There is considerable evidence that in some civilian communities in which military installations are located, discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, or national origin is a serious source of hardship and embarrassment for Armed Forces personnel and their dependents.

In order that I may have the benefit of advice for an independent body of distinguished citizens on the most effective action that can be taken to cope with the problem I am establishing a Committee on Equality of Opportunity in the Armed Forces, and I ask that you serve as Chairman of the Committee.

The Committee will include in its consideration of the general problem the following specific questions:

1. What measures should be taken to improve the effectiveness of current policies and procedures in the Armed Forces with regard to equality of treatment and opportunity for persons in the Armed Forces?

2. What measures should be employed to improve equality of opportunity for members of the Armed Forces and their dependents in the civilian community, particularly with respect to housing, education, transportation, recreational facilities, community events, programs, and activities?

The Secretary of Defense will make all necessary facilities of the Department of Defense available to the Committee for carrying out this important assignment.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., June 21, 1963.

HON. ROBERT S. McNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Because of my concern that there be full equality of treatment and opportunity for all military personnel, regardless of race or color, I appointed a Committee to study the matter in June of 1962. An initial report of my Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces is transmitted with this letter for your personal attention and action.

We have come a long way in the 15 years since President Truman ordered the desegregation of the Armed Forces. The military services lead almost every other segment of our society in establishing equality of opportunity for all Americans. Yet a great deal remains to be done.

As the report emphasizes, a serious morale problem is created for Negro military personnel when various forms of segregation and discrimination exist in communities neighboring military bases. Discriminatory practices are morally wrong whenever they occur—they are especially inequitable and iniquitous when they inconvenience and embarrass those serving in the armed services and their families. Responsible citizens of all races in these communities should work together to open up public accommodations and housing for Negro military personnel and their dependents. This effort is required

by the interests of our national defense, national policy and basic considerations of human decency.

It is encouraging to note that the continuing effort over the last 15 years to provide equality of treatment and opportunity for all military personnel on base is obviously having far-reaching and satisfactory results. The remaining problems outlined by the Committee pertaining to on-base conditions, of course, must be remedied. All policies, procedures and conditions under which men and women serve must be free of considerations of race or color.

The Committee's recommendations regarding both off-base and on-base conditions merit your prompt attention and certainly are in the spirit that I believe should characterize our approach to this matter. I would hope your review and report on the recommendations could be completed within 30 days.

I realize that I am asking the military community to take a leadership role, but I believe that this is proper. The armed services will, I am confident, be equal to the task. In this area, as in so many others, the U.S. Infantry motto "Follow Me" is an appropriate guide for action.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., July 24, 1963.

Memorandum for the President.

On June 21 you sent me a copy of the initial report of your Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces and asked that I review the document and report on the recommendations within 30 days. This memorandum responds to that request.

In its year of work the Committee observed racial imbalances and vestiges of racial discrimination within the Armed Forces themselves. Nevertheless, the Committee found that in the main, racial equality is a reality on military bases today. The Department of Defense will eliminate the exceptions and guard the continuing reality.

It is to the Department's off-base responsibilities that the Committee has devoted the bulk of its report. In eloquent terms the Committee has described the nature and pervasiveness of off-base discrimination against Negro servicemen and their families, the divisive and demoralizing impact of that discrimination, and the general absence of affirmative, effective action to ameliorate or end the off-base practices affecting nearly a quarter of a million of our servicemen.

Our military effectiveness is unquestionably reduced as a result of civilian racial discrimination against men in uniform. The Committee report has made this point with great clarity. With equal clarity it demonstrates that the Department of Defense has in the past only imperfectly recognized the harm flowing from off-base discrimination. That imperfect recognition has in turn meant the lack of a program to correct the conditions giving rise to the harm.

The Committee report contained recommendations for such a program. Consistently therewith I have issued a directive explicitly stating Department of Defense policy with respect to off-base discrimination and requiring:

Preparation of detailed directives, manuals, and regulations making clear the leadership responsibility both on and off base and containing guidance as to how that responsibility is to be discharged.

Institution in each service of a system for regularly monitoring and measuring progress in this field.

We are in the process of establishing a staff element within my office to give full time to such matters.

While the foregoing is in accord with the recommendations of the Committee, the details of the program necessarily will be

found in the manuals and regulations to be issued as a result of my directive.

The initial Committee report contained many specific recommendations on recruitment, assignment, promotion, techniques for eliminating on- and off-base discrimination, housing, education, and recording of racial data. Many of these have been or will be put into effect, but some require more study and on a few we have reservations. These will be discussed further with the Committee.

The recommendations on sanctions do require special comment. The Committee suggests using a form of the off-limits sanction when, despite the commander's best efforts with community leaders, relentless discrimination persists against Negro servicemen and their families.

Certainly the damage to military effectiveness from off-base discrimination is not less than that caused by off-base vice, as to which the off-limits sanction is quite customary. While I would hope that it need never be put in effect, I agree with the Committee that a like sanction against discrimination must be available. It should be applied, however, only with the prior approval of the Secretary of the military department concerned.

The Committee also suggested the possibility of closing bases near communities where discrimination is particularly prevalent. I do not regard this as a feasible action at this time.

In your letter transmitting the Committee report you wrote that "Discriminatory practices are morally wrong wherever they occur—they are especially inequitable and iniquitous when they inconvenience and embarrass those serving in the armed services and their families."

Guided by those words and the report of your Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, the military departments will take a leadership role in combating discrimination wherever it affects the military effectiveness of the men and women serving in defense of this country.

ROBERT S. McNAMARA.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DIRECTIVE

Subject: Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces.

Reference: Department of Defense Directive 5120.27, "Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower)," June 7, 1963.

I. POLICY

It is the policy of the Department of Defense to conduct all of its activities in a manner which is free from racial discrimination, and which provides equal opportunity for all uniformed members and all civilian employees irrespective of their color.

Discriminatory practices directed against Armed Forces members, all of whom lack a civilian's freedom of choice in where to live, to work, to travel and to spend his off-duty hours, are harmful to military effectiveness. Therefore, all members of the Department of Defense should oppose such practices on every occasion, while fostering equal opportunity for servicemen and their families, on and off base.

II. RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Office of the Secretary of Defense:

1. Pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of Defense and the provisions of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) is hereby assigned responsibility and authority for promoting equal opportunity for members of the Armed Forces.

In the performance of this function he shall (a) be the representative of the Secretary of Defense in civil rights matters, (b) give direction to programs that promote equal opportunity for military personnel, (c) provide policy guidance and review pol-

cies, regulations and manuals of the military departments, and (d) monitor their performance through periodic reports and visits to field installations.

2. In carrying out the functions enumerated above, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) is authorized to establish the Office of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Civil Rights).

B. The military departments:

1. The military departments shall, with the approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower), issue appropriate instructions, manuals and regulations in connection with the leadership responsibility for equal opportunity, on and off base, and containing guidance for its discharge.

2. The military departments shall institute in each Service a system for regularly reporting, monitoring and measuring progress in achieving equal opportunity on and off base.

C. Military commanders:

Every military commander has the responsibility to oppose discriminatory practices affecting his men and their dependents and to foster equal opportunity for them, not only in areas under his immediate control, but also in nearby communities where they may live or gather in off-duty hours. In discharging that responsibility a commander shall not, except with the prior approval of the Secretary of his military department, use the off-limits sanction in discrimination cases arising within the United States.

III. IMPLEMENTATION

Not later than August 15, 1963, the military departments shall forward for the approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) an outline plan for implementing this directive.

IV. EFFECTIVE DATE

This directive is effective immediately.

ROBERT S. McNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense.

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN THE ARMED FORCES

1. Members of the Committee are Chairman: Mr. Gerhard A. Gesell; members: Mr. Nathaniel Colley, Mr. Abe Fortas, Mr. Louis J. Hector, Mr. Benjamin Muse, Mr. John Sengstacke, Mr. Whitney Young, Jr.; Counsel: Mr. Lawrence Hewes III.

2. Biographical summaries:

Mr. Gerhard A. Gesell, Covington & Burling, Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C. Phillips Andover Academy, 1928; Yale, A.B., 1932; Yale, LL.B., 1935; Securities Exchange Commission, Washington, 1935-40; technical adviser to Commission, 1940-41; special counsel for Temporary National Economic Committee, study of legal reserve life insurance companies; member of Covington & Burling since 1941; member, Committee on Investigation Pearl Harbor Attack, 1945-46; American and District of Columbia Bar Associations; American Law Institute; coauthor: "Study of Legal Reserve Life Insurance Companies, 1940," "Families and Their Life Insurance, 1940."

Mr. Nathaniel Colley, 10th Street, Sacramento, Calif. Tuskegee Institute, A.B., 1941; Yale, LL.B., 1948; teacher, Tuskegee Institute, 1941-42; U.S. Army (captain), 1942-46; lawyer (own firm), 1949-62.

Mr. Abe Fortas, 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. Southwestern College, A.B., 1930; Yale, LL.B., 1933; assistant professor of law, Yale, 1933-37; assistant chief, legal division, AAA, 1933-34; assistant director, Corporate Reorganization Study, Securities and Exchange Commission, 1934-37; consultant, 1937-38; assistant director, Public Utilities Division, 1938-39; General Counsel, Public Works Administration, 1939-40; Director, Division of Power, Department of Interior, 1931-42; Under Secretary of the Interior, 1942-46; member law firm, Arnold, Fortas & Porter, Washington, D.C.; Acting General

Counsel, National Power Policy Committee, 1941; member of board of legal examiners, Civil Service Commission, 1941-43; President's Committee To Study Changes in Organic Law of Puerto Rico, 1943; adviser to U.S. delegation to U.N., San Francisco, 1945, London, 1946; visiting lecturer on law, rank of professor, Yale, 1946-47; director, Federated Department Stores, Inc., Festival Casuals, Inc.; member, Federal and American Bar Associations; Order of Colif; Omicron Delta Kappa; associate editor of journal, Psychiatry; trustee, William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation.

Mr. Louis J. Hector, Hector & Faircloth, Alfred I. Dupont Building, Miami, Fla. Phillips Andover Academy, 1933; Williams College, B.A., 1938; student, Christ Church, Oxford, England, 1939; Yale, LL.B., 1942; attorney, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., 1942-43; Assistant to Under Secretary of State, 1944; private practice, 1946-47; president, Hector Supply Co., Miami, 1948-55; member of firm, Hector, Faircloth & Rutledge, Miami, 1956-57; member, Civil Aeronautics Board, 1957 to present; vice chairman, board of trustees, Miami Public Library; director, Dad Co. Research Foundation; served with OSS in China, 1945.

Mr. Benjamin Muse, Manassas, Va. Trinity College and George Washington University, 1914-16, 1919-20; Foreign Service officer, 1920-34; U.S. Army (lieutenant colonel), 1942-46; research consultant, Southern Regional Council, Inc., Atlanta, 1959 to present.

Mr. John H. Sengstacke, South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. Hampton Institute, Va., BS, 1933; vice president and general manager of Robert S. Abbott Publishing Co., publishers of Chicago Defender and Tri-State Defender, 1934-40; president, editor and publisher, Chicago Defender, 1940 to present; member, board of trustees, Bethune-Cookman College, Daytona Beach, Fla.; board of directors, Virgin Islands Corp.; recipient, Two Friends Award, National Urban League, 1950; Hampton Alumni Award, 1954.

Mr. Whitney Young, Jr., executive director, National Urban League, 14 East 48th Street, New York, N.Y. Kentucky State College, BS, 1941; Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1942-43; University of Minnesota, M.A., 1947; dean, School of Social Work, Atlanta University, 1954-60; executive director, National Urban League, 1960 to present.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, Washington, D.C., August 7, 1963.

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. STRATTON: You have inquired about charges recently made that I have complete dossiers on every businessman near our Southern military bases, with the facts and figures in those dossiers having been drawn from Federal income tax returns.

The charge is wholly in error. The facts of the matter are these:

From June 30 to July 5 and on July 16 and 17 a six-member team headed by a representative of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower), visited military bases at or near Biloxi, Columbus, and Greenville, Miss., Mobile, Ala., and Shreveport, La. I joined the group on the evening of July 1 and returned to Washington on the evening of the 3d.

The purpose of the visits was to gather current accurate information from several bases in connection with the response of this Department to the President's letter of June 21 transmitting the initial report of his Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, commonly called the Gesell Committee.

At each base the sole function of the team was to gather information respecting the base, the community and base-community relations, including the nature and degree of off-base segregation affecting Negro military

personnel and their dependents. The team was not armed with "complete dossiers on every businessman" nor did it compile same in the course of the base visits, nor does such a dossier exist today, insofar as this Department is aware, with respect to every or any of the businessmen in the communities mentioned above.

As part of the fact gathering process, the team did in several instances obtain information from base officials with respect to the more important businesses in the area, all of which information was already known to the base officials or was maintained routinely by the local chamber of commerce.

However, neither my activities nor those of anyone acting under my direction nor, so far as I am aware, those of any person in the Department of Defense, have, directly or indirectly, been based upon, or have included access to information gained from, corporate or individual tax returns or any return or report required to be filed with any governmental agency.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED B. FITT,
Deputy Assistant Secretary (Civil
Rights) Designee.

THE GESELL REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KASTENMEIER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I do apologize to the House for holding them in session this long. But I am compelled to take this time as the only alternative I have in order to keep the record straight.

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], as you know, who preceded me refused to yield to me. It is perfectly obvious why he refused to yield to me and yielded only to those who were in accord with his point of view. It is obvious the reason the gentleman did not yield was because he did not want to be exposed on the inaccuracies, misrepresentations, and misinterpretations he was placing in the RECORD on the matter under discussion.

Since I was refused the opportunity by him of asking him pertinent questions and asking him for the evidence and the basis of his statement, I find myself with this alternative of having to take the time now, and for this I again apologize to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I am now making be placed immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] in order that the RECORD may be coherent and in chronological order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KASTENMEIER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, as to the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] and the other gentlemen, let me first say I hope I am more gracious than some of them were.

Mr. Speaker, I am not charging anybody with being un-American. I have the greatest respect for the difference of opinion of those who disagree with me. I think many of these people in their

zealous patriotism, misguided though as I think it is, I still think they are patriots and real Americans. No real American is no less patriotic than I am, and I am sure the gentlemen from Ohio, who are my friends, did not mean to impugn my patriotism or that of any other Member who disagrees with them as being un-American. I am sure they did not mean that.

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

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. I am sure that the gentleman knows full well that I have nothing but the highest regard for him personally. Our views do differ. But most certainly I did not mean to give any such impression, and if I did, I apologize for it with respect to the character of the gentleman and his essential good qualities.

Mr. HÉBERT. I know that and that is the reason I am saying what I am saying, because I know the gentleman did not mean it. But the gentleman used the word "un-American" and it could be misinterpreted.

Mr. Speaker, I first wanted the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], to yield when he was referring to the fact that this was nothing unusual, the issuing of these orders; that it goes back to the time of President Truman's integration of the military forces, and indicated that these orders have come out from time to time. No one is in disagreement nor has anyone challenged the right of President Truman at that time to issue these orders. No one challenges now the right of the military to integrate. No one challenges that. But the impression could well be left that these are usual things.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the gentleman some questions but I notice that he has left the floor; he did not remain to be questioned. I want to ask him when in our American history has the military been ordered to interfere in local communities and use sanctions against them. He cannot name one because there has never been an occasion in which this has occurred. There is one inaccuracy.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York dwelt a great deal upon about what happened in his native city with reference to rent gouging. Rent gouging occurred all over the country. Certainly, it was settled on a voluntary basis. Never has the military been authorized to use sanctions.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman referred to bistros. I do not know whether he used that word but he indicated it in reference to conditions of vice. Certainly, my own community which encompasses a large military area, has these places, bistros or bawdy houses—because we in Louisiana are not without sin and, certainly, we in Louisiana who enjoy Bourbon Street which is located in my district are not naive. But we have never objected to any place that contributed to the breaking down of the morals, the breaking down of the morals of a man in uniform, we have never objected to that place being placed off limits. But I do object, and strenuously

object, to placing these operations in the same category and let them be characterized in the same category with respectable business people, respectable hotels, respectable restaurants. I do not think it is fair.

Mr. Speaker, I condemn the Secretary for using that language.

Now, another question was brought up, again which was another inaccuracy. The question was brought up about statements being made about dossiers and a letter was read from Mr. Fitt. I want Mr. Fitt to ask me to give him the documents. I will tell you, gentlemen, right here are the documents and they are stamped by the Department of Defense for "official use only."

I do not make statements when I cannot prove them. Let Mr. Fitt ask me for them and I will give them to him. He will not ask for them.

I said that the Defense Department has dossiers, little black books, if you please, in their possession, on leading citizens in Mississippi, and I repeat that now. Further than that, they have evaluations of economies in the various areas where bases are located.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to Mr. Yarmolinsky. I, perhaps, have met Mr. Yarmolinsky. I may have or may not. I do not know. I have heard about him, and I certainly would not impugn his patriotism or his Americanism. He has what I think is a sataniclike zeal to force these things upon an unwilling people.

Mr. Speaker, I have been told a story during the Cuban crisis that we did not know where we were going, whether we were going to war or not or whether we were going to be involved in a nuclear holocaust.

I want to tell you something about Mr. Yarmolinsky. I would not repeat except I repeat it on good authority. He was down in Florida and he ordered the troops integrated in certain hotels that the military had rented. He was informed that the Negroes did not want to be integrated. He said he did not give a damn whether they wanted to be integrated or not, that they would be integrated. If that is not true Mr. Yarmolinsky can deny it. But those are the things I am talking about.

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

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. Is it not policy in our Armed Forces that there shall be no discrimination between Negroes and whites?

Mr. HÉBERT. That is correct. Nobody denies that is the policy. But I am saying the Negroes did not want to be billeted with the white troops down there.

Mr. ASHLEY. If it is policy, whether the Negroes want it or not, that does not enter into it. Maybe I do not like fish on Friday, but if they are serving fish that is what I eat. Is it not true they were bringing large numbers of troops to Florida at this time? Does the gentleman in his high position on the committee mean to tell me Negroes, whites, or any other soldier should have the choice as to where he is to be billeted?

Mr. HÉBERT. Certainly not. It is a convenience, and that is not for the convenience of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. But I do not want to get into an argument on segregation.

I might say to the gentleman that a little segregation is being practiced right now. I want to say to the gentleman that right now on the desk of somebody in the Department of Defense are orders to all commanders not to send Negroes to Iceland.

Mr. ASHLEY. I think that is wrong. We must have a little segregation.

Mr. HÉBERT. We cannot be a little bit pregnant.

Mr. ASHLEY. I agree with that.

Mr. HÉBERT. In that same office are orders to commanders not to send Jews to Egypt and Saudi Arabia. It looks like the Defense Department is talking out of both sides of its mouth. On the one hand they are using the military to enforce these orders. Perhaps the chameleon is of a different hue.

I just want to set the record straight. Let me say to the gentleman from Ohio, both gentlemen from Ohio, I am sure they are well schooled in the military role. I have only served on the Armed Services Committee for 21 years. Up to this time I have never known that the location of a military base in this country was to be based on segregation. This is the first time I have ever heard that suggestion made. I thought we were all Americans, white, black, red, yellow, brown, all to be defended. But I learn now that this concept is changed, and only those who believe in integration are to be defended by their comrades.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HÉBERT was allowed to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.)

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I refer particularly to my good friend [Mr. VANIK]. I associate myself with him and urge that his plan be put into effect. That is, let us have a reevaluation of why our military bases are at their present location. I would welcome that. Of course, he does not know, not being knowledgeable of military activity, that the softest spot in this country right now susceptible to nuclear attack since the Cuban crisis is an assault on the belly of the South.

He does not know that the gentleman from South Carolina and myself have been fighting this fight for a long time; that the United States is unprotected—unprotected from Corpus Christi on the Texas coast up to Norfolk, Va.

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

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes. Certainly.

Mr. ASHLEY. Is the gentleman saying that this lack of protection has led him to conclude that there should be a diversification of our military installations and the overwhelming preponderance of these bases and facilities that exist in the South should be shifted in part to the North? Because, if so, I want to tell him as a Member of Congress whose district has suffered from an in-

stallation in recent months being closed down that I would have to welcome this and tell him that I stand ready to pick up any military bases that might be available.

Mr. HÉBERT. I think the gentleman obviously continues to misunderstand me. What I have said is the soft underbelly of the South is not protected, in retrospect, compared to the entire country. We need more defense in the South.

Mr. ASHLEY. Protection of the bases and facilities that exist in the South?

Mr. HÉBERT. No. I am not talking only about bases but the Nike-Hercules, and I am sure the gentleman, who is familiar with military operations, knows about that. I do not have the time to continue too long and I do not wish to ask for another extension of time, but I want to say that the whole defense of the country is pitched on an attack coming over the polar icecap from the north. However, since Cuba has come into effect, this has brought up as a possibility the thought of what can happen with an attack coming from the south and with other Communist countries being there. That is what I am talking about. However, if any base exists in the South which does not exist for a military purpose, I will be the first to move it out.

I want to say this: I have a study going on in New Orleans, in my district, to consolidate the military bases, because I think it is economical and proper so to do. So I am not provincial and I am not talking out of both sides of my mouth, but I just want this record to be straight.

I think it most interesting, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that all of this hue and cry, and heart bleeding, and bloodletting, is being expended for these poor people who are being discriminated against and it is said that this is hurting the morale of our forces. The morale of our forces in the Pentagon has never been lower among the military. I am wondering what the gentlemen who do not understand our language or comprehend our words would say when I say to them that every one of the three military services opposes this operation. Who can be better qualified to talk for himself than the man in uniform? The only sections that they approve of are the sections related to what goes on on base. Now, I have no argument at all about what goes on on base. I have no argument at all. They are supposed to integrate. Again I do not complain about integration with white and white and black and black. I do not know whether my friend from Ohio knows it, but there is more discrimination among blacks than there is among whites. A light-skinned boy does not like a black-skinned boy down south. They are social outcasts and separate one from the other. So let us face the facts and stop this heartbleeding business. Nobody is a bigger friend of the Negro than I am. I am from the Deep South. My district is divided 50-50 between Negro and white. I am the only southerner who has a field representative in my district who is a Negro. Do you know I nominated a Negro to the Air Academy and to the Military Academy and said nothing about

it? Because it is right. I believe in equal opportunity. So I do not want to get involved in this race thing. I want the House to believe exactly what I said today. I am more concerned about the principle of Presidential Executive orders than I am concerned about the race issue, because if we continue to be a constitutional form of government, with Congress in power and directing the country in its policies, I will have no sleepless nights, but these nights I sleep very little because of the situation, seeing what is happening to my country and the type of government in which I believe and the Government I was advised to live under and which I have grown up under.

So, Members of the House, again I extend my apologies for keeping you this long, but I think it is important that I not let the record stand on an inaccurate, shaky basis. It is important that I bring this to your attention in order to keep the record straight. Again renewing what I have said, I do not want to be involved in a segregation or integration contest. I am only interested in preserving what I believe to be the constitutional right of this Government. In the matter of Executive orders, let me say just this to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: A very wise and prudent man damned the issuance of Executive orders as being immoral and destructive of our democratic processes of government. Was he a partisan? Was he suspect? That man's name was Woodrow Wilson.

COMMENTS ON SPEECH BY EDWIN P. NEILAN, PRESIDENT, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB AT NOON TODAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States is a great and powerful business organization—indeed, the largest business organization in the country.

It will come as a great shock to the American people that the president of this organization now reveals that he considers representative government a system of political bribery, regards the Congress of the United States as an institution of immorality, and conceives the American people to be mobs of unworthies interested only in bread and circuses and voting, not for the political candidates who deserve the votes, but voting only for the biggest briber.

Yes, I am shocked that there should be a man of such vast ignorance and unlimited ill will heading this great organization. It is unbelievable that a man in this high position would say such things, but he has said these things, and more, in a prepared speech which he delivered today before the National Press Club in Washington, D.C.

The great American dream of an opportunity for all and for democratic self-government is to this man only a nightmare. He would have America not a land of opportunity and the Ameri-

can Government not a government by and for the people. He dreams, I judge, of some ideal society in which all the attention of government and all the government subsidies will go to business and there are no consumers to buy the products and services of business.

It would be my suggestion that this gentleman be deported to some Fascist country where he can enjoy the ways of life and the high morality he dreams about. Ideally he should deport himself to some bushman tribe where there are no taxes, no debt, no public services, and no government which might be tempted to govern for the benefit of the people. He could then run around in his breech clout, a garment completely suited to his intellect, and shoot poison arrows at his neighbors. Obviously, he hates the American people and he hates America.

Let me give to this body this gentleman's description of the American voter and then ask whether the Members recognize the character of the American people from this man's description of them. He says:

The voter doesn't support the candidate who deserves support; he casts his vote for the biggest briber.

"Seduction by subsidy" he calls it, and likens the morality of Members of Congress who vote for such measures as the area redevelopment bill to the morality revealed by the Profumo scandal and the trial of Dr. Ward.

Now consider our problems as this expert sees them. He says:

Members of Congress find themselves under almost intolerable pressures from their voters to get more and more Federal handouts.

He adds:

Make no mistake; these pressures impair the effectiveness of our Congressmen and Senators to the point where they have less and less time to give adequate attention to our real national interests and the national problems involved.

During my 35 years in public life in Congress I have found the American voters' patriotism and concern for good government at least equal to this gentleman's, and their generosity toward their neighbors, and their faith in their neighbors, a great deal superior to his.

What are the real national interests and the real national problems involved as this gentleman sees them? We are left to wonder. Apparently this gentleman perceives no national problems and no national interests except cutting Federal spending; that is, spending that is beneficial to the people—he does not suggest cutting any direct subsidies to business—and turning all of our problems back to the local communities.

He damns as corrupt all votes for the mass transit legislation and, at the same time, all support of area redevelopment for the depressed areas of the country. The fact that over the past 20 years some 20 million people have moved from the farms and small town communities into the great cities and created the problems of urban transportation, air pollution, slum clearance, juvenile delinquency and all that, is beyond his scope. He would give no help to the cities, and he would give no help to the depressed areas to

help them create jobs so the people could stay home.

Frankly, I do not think that this man's views reflect the views of most American businessmen, or of most of the local chambers of commerce. I have had many telegrams and letters from local chambers of commerce supporting the area redevelopment bill, the piece of legislation which this gentleman singles out to illustrate his idea that the American political system is really one of bread and circuses.

More than that, the local chambers of commerce in the distressed areas are more often than not the local groups who have initiated and are running the area redevelopment programs. As a matter of record, over 500 members and officers of local chambers of commerce are serving on local development committees, helping run this program. Are these the "bribers" that the president of the chamber is talking about, his own local businessmen?

It is interesting to me that the kind of mentality and economic ignorance displayed by the president of the U.S. Chamber never finds any objection to the many billions of dollars of taxpayers' money being spent for economic development abroad. This is the kind of mentality which looks upon economic development at home as new and unwanted competition, but looks upon loans abroad as providing juicy subsidies whereby business can unload goods in some foreign land.

Yes, we are supporting economic development abroad—in every country of the world outside of the Iron Curtain countries, through at least half a dozen different agencies. AID, the Loan Development Fund, and the Export-Import Bank are all 100 percent American-financed. In addition, we are putting billions of dollars into international agencies such as the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank, for making economic development loans abroad. But no American citizen, and no American community, is eligible even to file an application with any of these agencies for economic development in the distressed areas here in the United States. It is puzzling to me that some people who find no objection to lending and spending billions of dollars for economic development abroad, seem to think that the world will come to an end if we lend and spend a half billion dollars, over the next 3 years, to give our own distressed areas an opportunity to create new private enterprises and permanent new jobs.

Although the U.S. Chamber has not discovered it, the area redevelopment programs are now a local responsibility. Under the law, the local citizens must take the initiative for starting and operating these programs. This is not a Federal handout. It is, in the best American tradition, a loan of "seedcorn" money to enable our neighbors to produce a crop, or to build a factory and produce the goods that the American people need and want.

I for one hope that the American spirit of helping people help themselves will never die; and I do not believe that

it will die. I do not believe, either, that the American people will ever reject representative government, or that they will replace their ideals and economic good sense with dreams of a closed and shrinking economy such as the president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States dreams about.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency for calling attention to this speech of Mr. Neilan. I have here the Associated Press report on this speech which was delivered at the Press Club today. It says:

Edwin P. Neilan, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, asserted today that the spoils system in the Federal Government is "more sophisticated, more sinister, than ever before."

He said there is a public scandal in Federal spending and voters in many cases have turned their Congressmen into "bagmen."

"Bagman" is a term used to describe a person who picks up collections for racketeers.

Neilan, a Delaware banker, delivered a stinging attack on Federal spending in general, and on the area redevelopment program in particular, in a National Press Club speech. He said Federal spending has been used as a bribing power to buy votes.

This is perhaps the most irresponsible language I have ever heard used by any official of a distinguished organization like the chamber of commerce. We in this Chamber in the House of Representatives and in the other body frequently have disagreement. We have fundamental disagreement on philosophies. We have great debates here, but I do not think we necessarily have to become disagreeable in our disagreement. I am distressed when I see the president of a large organization, perhaps the largest single organization in the country, representing businessmen who come here day in and day out to confer with their Congressmen and with their Senators about problems in their own particular communities, using such language. I do not think that these businessmen who come here to the Nation's Capital to discuss their problems with their Federal representatives and the Federal Government would subscribe to his description of "bagman."

I also wonder if Mr. Neilan would use that same description of Members of Congress who in a few days, I hope, certainly in a few weeks, will be called upon to revise our archaic tax structure. From the reports I see in the press, there is a great deal of sympathy being shown in the bills being discussed before the Committee on Ways and Means, recognizing the fact that if our free enterprise system is to survive we will have to have some tax relief. These are the men and women here in the House who will have to write this bill and enact it into law. I wonder, if we who recognize the fact that these American businessmen must get some relief in the tax structure, whether Mr. Neilan would also describe us then as "bagmen"—collectors for racketeers.

The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has an illustrious record in this House. I think he has done a great service to this country by calling this speech to our attention. I believe Mr. Neilan owes the Congress a public apology. I think Mr. Neilan ought to hear from the thousands upon thousands of American businessmen who belong to chambers of commerce all over America and who have benefited directly or indirectly from this area redevelopment program. I do not know of a single community in America that has rejected the program. On the contrary, every Member of Congress, I would say, has heard at some time either from communities in his own district or communities in his State that want the program expanded.

Secretary of Commerce Hodges certainly reacted to Mr. Neilan's speech in a correct manner when he pointed out that Mr. Neilan is doing an injustice to the more than 100,000 Americans who already have gotten jobs and today are providing a living with dignity for their families, for their children, through this program. I wonder if these 100,000 Americans who have been restored to earning a gainful living for their families would share Mr. Neilan's description that Congressmen are bagmen collecting for racketeers. Is he then saying that the American people are racketeers? Is that what the distinguished president of the chamber of commerce is trying to tell the American people? I believe the individual members of the chamber of commerce, the businessmen who have seen the efforts and the results of programs like this area redevelopment program, bring results in their areas should protest; they are the ones who ought to make their protests heard to their newly elected chairman. Certainly they ought to demand from him more discreet words than to describe Members of Congress as bagmen.

Mr. Neilan certainly has every right in the world to point out where he thinks the conduct of Congress is erroneous or improper. He has the right to point to those bills to which he opposes, as the chamber of commerce has done for many years. Indeed, he has a duty to do this. But I doubt if all the American people will accept with very good grace this kind of name calling by a man from an organization that day in and day out has dealings with Congress here on the Hill. I shall watch with interest the reaction to Mr. Neilan's speech by the Republican Members of Congress who have supported some of these programs and are now categorized as bagmen.

I wish again to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] for bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, for calling the attention of the House to the speech made this afternoon by Mr. Neilan. It is regrettable that the cham-

ber of commerce would, on the one hand, have one voice that speaks one way here in Washington, when, on the other hand, the record of this Congress, the record of all its committees, is replete with the testimony and the pleas of hundreds of representatives of chambers of commerce all over the country who have begged and pleaded for some kind of Federal assistance or Federal participation in vital programs.

How is it that the chamber of commerce can have one voice here in Washington as represented by these statements made by Mr. Neilan and have still another voice as evidenced by the statements made by countless other members of chambers of commerce who have joined hands and urged the individual Members of Congress to fight with every strength possible for something in which they have had a very important local interest?

As I noted the other day, Mr. Speaker, there have been very glowing reports as far as the business community is concerned for the second quarter of 1963. It is interesting to note that these reports fail to give proper credence and credit to two vital steps that were taken during the course of this administration on the behalf of business. They are:

First, the new depreciation allowances, the schedules that were provided by the Treasury Department last year, and second, the passage of the investment credit by the Congress last year.

We have taken \$2.2 billion out of the Public Treasury through these two actions and have distributed these moneys among the businesses and enterprises of this country. If Mr. Neilan's speech reflects the attitude of the business community to these two generous acts which have meant so much to the profit sheets of the corporations of this country, it certainly is a mark of ingratitude, we are certain, according to the records, that almost \$2½ billion of the current Federal deficit are the result of the two tax breaks that have been given to the business community; one was the passage of the 7-percent investment credit by this Congress last year and the other, by the action of the administration in providing more liberal depreciation schedules.

I think we ought to make the record clear and let the causes of the deficit be known. We must let it be clearly understood that the business community itself has received the maximum advantage and benefit from these two actions of this administration.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

This speech is an attack on representative government. It is an attack on the Congress as an institution. It borders on subversion.

CONGRATULATIONS TO PRESIDENT AND MRS. KENNEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, just a little while ago the First Lady of the land, Mrs. John F. Kennedy, gave birth

to a 4 pound 10½ ounce baby boy. I am sure that all of my colleagues here in the House on both sides of the aisle join me in wishing the First Family the very best in their new joy. I am sure that not only our entire Nation but the whole world will rejoice in this very pleasant news.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in 70 years that an occupant of the White House has given birth to a child. The last time this event happened was on September 9, 1893, when Mrs. Grover Cleveland had a baby.

I am sure we can all agree that Mrs. Kennedy is a most lovely mother, the President is a handsome father, their two children, Caroline and John are wonderful little children, and that we wish the First Family the best of happiness in this very, very fine moment.

There is one tiny distressing note that we pray will not be serious. The doctors have indicated it is not serious. The little baby boy has developed a respiratory ailment and has been taken to Boston Children's Memorial Hospital. I am sure that the prayers of the entire Nation and the world go to the First Family, that this little new heir of the Kennedy family will grow into a fine, strong, and healthy young man.

Mrs. Pucinski and I extend to President and Mrs. Kennedy our sincerest best wishes and our earnest prayer for their newest son's good health.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to say, as dean of the Louisiana delegation of the Congress, that I join the gentleman in extending our heartiest felicitations and congratulations to President and Mrs. Kennedy. We wish all of them well, and particularly the newborn baby.

May I ask the gentleman a question? Where was the child born?

Mr. PUCINSKI. At Otis Air Force Base Hospital.

Mr. HÉBERT. In an Air Force hospital?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes.

Mr. HÉBERT. I just wanted to call attention to the fact that the Air Force beat the Army this time.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mrs. Kennedy was rushed to the base hospital in a helicopter. It happened very suddenly. The President was in his office at the White House. He flew in a helicopter to Andrews and then was rushed to the Otis Air Force field. For the second time in his life, the President had to learn by telephone of the birth of a child in his family. The President was en route to Otis at the time when they had to notify him that the youngster was born. You will recall, he also learned by telephone in 1960 of the birth of his first son.

Mr. HÉBERT. Since we have been on a military subject this afternoon I want to direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that this has been quite a contest between the Air Force and the Army. As a matter of fact, several days ago one high-ranking Army official said, "You can get your bets down that the baby

will be born at Walter Reed Army General Hospital." It looks as though the Air Force moved a little faster; they were a little closer by.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the distinguished and able gentleman from Illinois in congratulations to the President and First Lady. I came to this Congress with the President. We were among the three or four youngest Members of this great body. So I am keenly interested, and I do join the gentleman in congratulations and best wishes and in expressing the earnest hope that the baby will be absolutely healthy and the respiratory ailment will be corrected.

Mrs. Dorn and I wish to extend our best wishes to President and Mrs. Kennedy and their newly born son.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Republican Members I would like to express to Mrs. Kennedy and the President our congratulations upon the birth of another son. I certainly express the hope that this child will be in the best of health.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. The entire country is very happy at this blessed event. I think it is almost 70 years since a President and his wife were blessed with an event of this kind while that Chief Executive was occupying the White House. Is my recollection correct?

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I congratulate the President and Mrs. Kennedy. Also, Mrs. McCormack and I wish for Mrs. Kennedy and the baby every happiness. We know the joy and happiness this event has brought to the President and Mrs. Kennedy and their loved ones. This blessed event brings happiness to all Members of the House of Representatives, in fact, of both branches of Congress, and the people of the United States.

May I express my appreciation to the gentleman from Illinois for taking the time to make the remarks he did, and to other Members for their participation in these congratulations.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. I, too, would like to join the other Members of the House present this afternoon in expressing our best wishes to the President and Mrs. Kennedy on the birth of another son. I share the concern as to his condition. I wish for them everything that is good.

I think it might be proper to comment here, in view of the quite controversial

discussion we have been having this afternoon, that in the midst of it all, the President and his wife have gone about the job of bringing into being another good soldier for the United States of America.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am the only Member present at the moment from North Carolina, but I want to join the distinguished gentleman from Illinois in congratulating our President and Mrs. Kennedy on the birth of their son, and to wish all of them an abundance of good health and happiness for many years to come.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A TAX BREAK FOR HOMEOWNERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, there is much talk these days about tax reductions, reforms, and tax law revisions. The Ways and Means Committee has been working relentlessly for months shaping a tax bill which I trust will provide justifiable reductions and correct existing inequities. I hope we have a bill that will not only provide much-needed relief, but will serve as an effective stimulant to our economy.

While considering the ways that this goal can be accomplished, I trust that the committee will give its every evaluation to the tax problems of the homeowner. I strongly feel that it is high time this segment of our society was given a tax break and that any program of tax reform, to be equitable and meaningful, must include consideration for those who own their own homes. We must recognize the fact that homeowners and their expenditures are a mainstay of our economy.

In this respect, I call to the attention of this House three bills I have introduced which would provide long overdue, reasonable, and much-deserved tax relief for the homeowner. I urge my colleagues to support these bills and I appeal to the committee to thoroughly review them with the view of including their provisions in its forthcoming recommendations for tax law revisions.

The bills I propose would, I believe, give the homeowner an incentive to keep his residence from deteriorating and would also serve to maintain high standards in residential neighborhoods and thus sustain property values. When the homeowner spends his hard-earned money to make an improvement on his residence, it is only fair that this contribution be recognized in our tax laws, for it reduces the need for the use of

public funds to rehabilitate run-down areas and maintains the high standards of a community from which the locality benefits directly.

The first—H.R. 2407—of these three bills would give to the homeowner the same general right to claim depreciation of his property that is now enjoyed by owners of properties used for trade or business or held for the production of income.

A depreciation allowance for privately owned homes, based on a reasonable value and estimated life of the residence, would fill a long-felt need. It is time that the Federal tax laws recognize that the homeowner faces costly problems of wear and tear and obsolescence. This bill would go a long way in dispelling the present discrimination against some property owners that prevail in our present tax laws.

Under this bill, the basis for depreciation on which exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence could be allowed, would be determined on the adjusted basis provided in section 1011 in dealing with the gain on the sale or other disposition of property but with these exceptions:

(a) the basis of a residence or any part thereof acquired from a decedent within the meaning of Section 1014(b), or acquired by gift, would be the same as it would be in the hands of the decedent or the donor, as the case may be, or the last owner by whom it was not acquired from a decedent or by gift, and

(b) the basis, however determined, shall be reduced by an adjustment for exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence to the extent sustained prior to January 1, 1962, either by the taxpayer or any decedent or donor with respect to whose basis the taxpayer's basis is determined.

In this bill, the principal residence shall be deemed owned by the taxpayer if legal or beneficial ownership of the property is vested in the taxpayer. In the case of property held by one individual for life with the property going to another individual after his death, the deduction shall be computed as if the life tenant were the absolute owner of the property. In the case of property held in trust or in an estate, the depreciation deduction under this section shall be allowed to the individual who is permitted to occupy the property and who uses the property as his principal residence.

I would like to point out some statistics available from Government sources that demonstrate the need for this bill. These statistics stress the present high rate of private home starts, all of which add immeasurably to the need for providing householders with the same depreciation allowances hitherto covering only industrial and commercial property. In 1961, new construction of residential nonfarm units totaled over \$22 billion, as against only \$10 billion for new industrial starts in the same year. For the New York City metropolitan area alone, this amounted to some 96,000 units.

According to the Bureau of the Census in its 1960 "U.S. Census of Housing," only 74 percent of the U.S. housing can be said to be in sound condition. Taking 74 percent as the national figure, this leaves 7.8 percent in deteriorating condition and 18.2 percent in dilapidated

condition. Surely, these conditions are large enough and deplorable enough to warrant their alleviation through the type of legislation I outlined above.

I believe that my bill, H.R. 2407, would not only bring needed relief to most of our taxpaying householders, but it would also be a real influence in helping to improve some of the housing conditions prevailing in the United States. The repeal of this unfair tax discrimination against homeowners will enable them to spend more dollars for home improvements, furniture, and so forth, and this would greatly assist our expanding economy by increasing consumer expenditures.

The second bill to which I would now like to direct the attention of my colleagues is H.R. 2408 which would amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to exclude from gross income the gain realized from the sale of his principal residence by a taxpayer who has attained the age of 60 years.

This would help meet an ever-increasing problem. At present many homeowners over 60 years of age would like to dispose of homes that are too big or too much of a burden for them now that their children have grown and married but they are afraid to make a move because of the heavy capital gains tax they must pay. It seems to me that those who have raised families and made important contributions to our way of life as decent citizens should be entitled to an exemption from taxes on the sale of homes.

Similar legislation is being considered by the Ways and Means Committee in the form of the Baker bill—H.R. 1764. I would like to point out the difference between my bill and the tentatively adopted Baker bill. His proposed legislation would only affect householders who are 65 years old and older, whereas my bill would affect a taxpayer who has attained the age of 60. I believe that the lower age suggested in my bill has much to recommend it. Today many people who live in private homes have older children who are either married or live away from home for some other reason. With the younger marriages of today, with many young people going away to school, and with the increased independence of our younger people, many couples in their late fifties and early sixties find themselves living alone in a large house that once was filled with children. These people would like to sell their homes and move into smaller dwellings, but they refrain from doing so because of the huge tax bite of the Government. I commend the concept of the Baker bill, but I feel that with the younger marriages of today, the eligibility age of 60 years for the exclusion is much more in tune with the realities of life.

The third bill I would like to mention briefly is H.R. 2409, a measure designed to allow a tax deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements to his residence and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing.

The allowance for deduction provides for the ordinary and necessary expenses

paid during the taxable year for the repair or improvement of his residence. The deduction allowed to the taxpayer under this section shall not exceed \$750 for any taxable year.

The proposed gains to the economy from these bills are great. For too long now the homeowner has been passed over by legislation and forgotten by his friends. We must act now to help the homeowner who is the backbone of our economy. We can aid our lagging economy by aiding him. There has been a great deal of emphasis on remedial tax reform or tax cuts to spur the national economy. The bills that I have introduced to benefit the homeowner would certainly meet this criterion, for I am sure that it would spark a tremendous nationwide program of home repair, improvement and modernization. Any direct tax loss to the Government resulting from the three bills I have introduced would be more than compensated for by maintaining property values and by the upsurge in the building and allied industries that would result. Beyond these considerations is the fact that the homeowner deserves a tax break from the Government. For too long he has been the forgotten man in the tax picture.

I trust these bills will be given the full consideration they deserve, and that their provisions will meet with overwhelming approval.

POULTRY EXPORTS

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words at this time about the American poultry industry which, as many of us realize, will be facing a severe international test in the weeks to come.

The record of American poultry exports by now should be familiar. Exports to Europe rose continually from 1957 to 1962, and last year reached 271 million pounds. Then, however, the European Common Market raised its import duties from 4.5 to 13 cents per pound, thus reducing our share of the market by roughly two-thirds. From \$60 million worth of exports in 1962, we are faced with an estimated drop to only \$15 million for this year.

It is obvious that the American chicken and those who depend upon him for economic well-being have been the victim of protectionism. The precipitate elevation of duties and obstructions against American poultry is nothing more than a naked attempt by the Common Market countries to promote their poultry industry at the expense of ours. There can be no other reason than this for such a drastic blow at a commodity as well received on the Continent as the American broiler.

Accordingly, I am quite relieved to see that our State Department is finally

taking action in this matter. Yesterday's announcement that hearings will be conducted to consider increased U.S. duties on Common Market products comes only after long and continued complaints from domestic producers.

Certainly, I disapprove as much as the next man any spiral of reprisal and counterreprisal that might ensue from this situation. However, our only guarantee that our products will not be subjected to unfair discrimination resides in the willingness of the administration and the State Department to afford us protection.

It is my hope that the hearing announcement itself will suffice to show the Common Market that we intend to assert our rights, and that, accordingly, reprisals here against European products will not be necessary. If need be, however, I earnestly hope our negotiators will not fail to take whatever steps may be necessary to restore poultry to its rightful share of the world market and to take whatever action reasonable equity demands to assure that our friends abroad understand that we shall not allow our industries to be victimized and that we do not intend to sit by idly while other nations ignore their solemn obligations.

AMERICAN TRAGEDY, KENNEDY STYLE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the great American tragedy of this day is the total failure of President Kennedy to furnish able leadership for the Nation. As a result of the vacuum in leadership from the White House, a confused and hysterical domestic policy which has resulted in a breakdown in respect for law and order and the institution of mob violence throughout the country, and no foreign policy, the United States faces its greatest hour of peril.

The Kennedy administration must bear full responsibility for the arrogant march of Communist aggression which has steadily increased since January 20, 1961, and has made the possibility of war almost inevitable. Under the timidity of the Kennedy policies we are about to sign a test ban treaty which will further weaken our defenses at a time when it is almost certain our enemy is stronger than we are in nuclear power; we are unilaterally cutting back our weapons and weapons systems so as not to provoke our enemy; we look in shame at the Berlin wall where men, women, and children have died for the crime of seeking freedom; we use the might of the United States to protect a Cuban dictator whose hands are stained with the blood of the innocent, and I could go on and on.

Mr. Speaker, Congress and the American people must be awakened to what is

happening to this Nation at the hands of the Kennedy administration. That there is some hope that the people are being aroused is indicated in the following editorial "Anatomy of Leadership," from the August 5 edition of the Dallas Morning News. Let us hope and pray that other editors in other areas will have the courage to expose the failures of the administration and the dangers these failures present:

ANATOMY OF LEADERSHIP

In a speech at the National Press Club, Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman, who negotiated the recent test ban agreement in Moscow, warned that failure of the Senate to ratify the treaty would result in the loss of U.S. leadership of the world.

Mr. Harriman may have his own novel definition of leadership, but if he is using the word in its traditional, commonly accepted sense, we wonder just how much the United States stands to lose. To lead normally means to show the way, to command, to direct, to guide, to advance and to attract a large and loyal following. Regrettably, we haven't been doing very much of that lately.

On the same day that Harriman spoke, his colleague, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, abstained from a crucial U.N. vote in favor of a resolution condemning and imposing an arms embargo on our NATO ally Portugal. Nor did he have the courage to use the veto to kill this radical move sponsored by the Afro-Asian nations and supported by the Communist bloc. Unwillingness or fear to take sides is hardly a good example of leadership.

A few days earlier, three American GIs were killed by Communist snipers in Korea. The incident brought a mild diplomatic protest, but no tough warning that any recurrence of such murder will be punished. Is this leadership?

And in Havana, at a 26th of July rally, Premier Fidel Castro ordered the American Embassy building and grounds seized—an act unprecedented in modern diplomatic history. Though the Swiss, who occupy our Cuban Embassy, refused to budge, there was not even a word of protest from Washington. Castro was allowed to demonstrate for all to see that the most powerful country in the world would suffer an indignity that no other nation would tolerate. Is that leadership?

One of the strongest symbols of American leadership for more than a century was the Monroe Doctrine, which proclaimed that we would protect nations within this hemisphere from meddling by nations outside this hemisphere. The Soviets now are firmly entrenched in Cuba and the Monroe Doctrine is dead. What is worse, Khrushchev has his own Monroe Doctrine which proclaims that none must interfere with his Cuban satellite—and we don't seem to be disputing it.

No wonder Khrushchev can boast that his "peaceful coexistence" strategy is a better and faster means of burying Western civilization than the more violent tactics advocated by the Red Chinese. No wonder Castro is able to boast that: "Cuba is not the last, but only the first Socialist revolution in the (Latin American) continent."

These boasts are a challenge which can only be met with leadership, if they are to be turned aside. To qualify as genuine leaders, we must stop deserting our allies, stop abandoning our citizens, begin protecting our property, quit embracing our enemy and, most of all, recognize that the contest for leadership in this world is not a popularity contest where the nicest and meekest nation becomes the victor.

Mr. Harriman would do his country a greater service if he would worry less about losing world leadership and more about using it.

ARA—A SECOND LOOK, PLEASE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the junior Senator from New Hampshire, with understandable pleasure, inserted in the daily RECORD yesterday, p. A4992, an RAD Newsletter reprint of an editorial by a distinguished northern New Hampshire publisher, Judge Frederick Harrigan, of Colebrook, N.H.

Our junior Senator praised Judge Harrigan for his assessment of RAD and his nonpartisan and altogether independent judgment. Judge Harrigan's editorial and accompanying news story, both of which were inserted in yesterday's RECORD, were published last April 29.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, am a great admirer of Judge Harrigan. I wish to join with the junior Senator from New Hampshire in praising the publisher of the Colebrook News & Sentinel.

This outstanding weekly newspaper proudly carries on its masthead the motto "Independent But Not Neutral." As a regular reader of this fine publication, I can state with authority that its editor, Judge Harrigan, is a man of wit, wisdom, and perception. Not easily fooled by the wiles of politicians, bureaucrats, or slogans, Judge Harrigan's editorials reflect a refreshing independence of thought and creative originality. His editorials reflect his brilliance as a scholar, perception as a lawyer, and his wisdom as a judge.

I regularly read Judge Harrigan's paper and I think that the RECORD should show that on Wednesday, July 24, 2 weeks prior to yesterday's insertion in the RECORD, the Judge again commented on ARA and RAD. In view of the fact that his paper is apparently not regularly read by all of his admirers here in Washington, I thought it would be of interest to my colleagues to have the benefit of his additional, nonpartisan, and altogether independent views.

One can only wonder if the RAD Newsletter will again reprint the Judge's thoughtful editorial which follows:

RAD CAN STILL BE A POWER

Speaking of things political, and emanations from politicians, we are a little put out at all the weeping and wailing over the defeat of the administration's area redevelopment bill in Congress. The high-powered publicity purveyors of the Kennedy regime immediately went to work to make us think that this was practically condemning "eligible" (i.e., depressed) counties like Coos to some kind of eternal poverty. A lively name-calling session ensued with Democratic Governor King and Senator McIntyre assailing Republican Senator Cotton and Representatives Cleveland and Wyman for voting against the thing.

Well, we've been exposed to RAD just once, and some weeks back did a long piece on it for this paper. We thought and still think it a darn good idea that a fine responsible group of citizens from all over Coos County

are putting some real thought into what can be done to improve the county's economic picture. But we expressed distress, even then, that there seemed to be quite so much emphasis on a Federal handout for this and a Washington "approval" of some kind for that, in connection with virtually every project before the group.

Personally, we belong to the school of thought that believes if Coos County is going to pull up its socks economically, it will have to do it primarily by its own efforts and with private capital it either possesses or can attract. There is no reason in the world why this fine RAD group can't chug right along, perhaps even better than before, with the promise of Washington pie-in-the-sky out of the picture. We hate to sound cynical, but there is just the possibility that quite a lot more may get done quite a lot faster without a clutch of beaming bureaucrats and politicians shoving each other around trying to get into the limelight each time some forward step is taken for the county.

I commend Judge Harrigan's forthright statement. As the Judge says, if the north country of New Hampshire is going to pull up its socks economically it will have to do it primarily by its own efforts. This is an important truth. Most of the new industry and most of the economic development worthy of note anywhere in New Hampshire has been a result of "do it yourself" groups, working hard at the local level. The soothing promises of faraway bureaucracy eventually will deaden local and individual initiative which is still our country's greatest resource and our greatest hope for continuing economic development and full employment.

New Hampshire people are proud of the fact that when things need doing we like to do them ourselves. As Judge Harrigan suggests:

Quite a lot more may be done quite a lot faster without a clutch of beaming bureaucrats and politicians shoving each other around trying to get into the limelight each time some forward step is taken for the county.

OPPOSE TAX CUT IF SPENDING NOT CUT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, by a ratio of 4 to 1 west central Illinois citizens oppose a tax cut if Federal spending is not cut, according to 17,310 replies received in my 1963 survey of home district opinion. This is significant in view of the upcoming tax reduction bill.

The survey shows heavy opposition—ranging from 2 to 1 to 7 to 1—to new spending proposals and mandatory farm controls, and strong support—the ratio was 7 to 1—for action to assure a non-Communist government in Cuba.

By 22 to 1 those responding supported a proposal to require secret-ballot approval by union members before a union can call a strike.

This is my third annual survey. Questionnaires were mailed to names selected at random from telephone directories.

This year's response is the largest yet and comes directly from about one-tenth of the adult population of the 20th Congressional District.

In all, 17,310 replies were tabulated, and most of them were marked as being from husband and wife. This means they reflect the views of 25,000 to 30,000

adults—or about 10 percent of the adult population. The 1960 census showed 282,404 adults.

Final tally—Representative Paul Findley's 1963 survey of home district opinion—20th District Illinois

	Yes	No	No opinion	Total responses	Percent yes	Yes-no ratio
Should the United States do whatever is necessary (even to the point of military action) to assure a non-Communist government in Cuba?	13,681	1,896	1,712	17,289	79	7-1
Should income taxes be cut if Federal spending is not cut?	3,253	13,134	916	17,303	18	1-4
The new budget calls for about \$5,000,000,000 for foreign aid. Do you approve?	1,887	14,358	1,057	17,302	10	1-7
The President proposes \$5,300,000,000 (over 5 years) in new Federal spending for schools (including teacher salaries). Do you approve?	5,717	10,656	914	17,287	33	1-2
Should secret-ballot approval by union members be required before a union can call a strike?	15,776	723	793	17,292	91	22-1
The President proposes a 5,000-member corps (known as the Domestic Peace Corps) to work in community social problems. Estimated annual cost: \$20,000,000 to \$30,000,000. Do you approve?	3,173	12,853	1,280	17,306	18	1-4
Do you favor compulsory acre-and-bushel control of farm production (similar to that in the upcoming wheat referendum)?	1,924	13,197	2,189	17,310	11	1-7

PHILIP L. GRAHAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, when a man of inherent value and worth dies, mankind's store of human virtue does not necessarily diminish. By his example, a good man extends and enlarges the reservoir of good will. But it is unfortunately true that when an active, constructive, and successful man dies, humanity is robbed of the benefit of his energy, his genius, and his labor. Unless his works can be perpetuated, they are too frequently dissipated and lost.

In the case of Philip L. Graham, this loss must not take place. His remarkable career as a publisher touched so many people, affected so many events and raised the standards of his generation to such a marked degree that its influence should continue.

The goal which Philip L. Graham set and achieved for the Washington Post was an expression of his own high personal standards.

The Post is an independent newspaper fixed with a love of liberty, capable of indignation over injustice, and aware of the destiny and responsibility of America as a world leader.

This was an emphasis on "quality" which is so necessary and so rare in a nation and in a time too often preoccupied with "quantity." I should like to see this spirit kept alive in America.

For that reason I propose the memorial to Philip L. Graham—and there will be one—should take the form of a vessel to convey his message to the future. I would hope that a Philip L. Graham Memorial would be a program to reward the industry and objectivity of members of the working press by providing them fellowships to study in depth and at leisure in the areas of government, economics, foreign affairs, and the arts. Other programs of this sort exist, but surely the field is not preempted nor overcrowded. After such an experience a reporter or an editor, a feature writer or a cartoonist, or any other member of the press would return to his desk with renewed determination to gain the highest levels

of personal achievement in the American press. If such a memorial is projected, I should be proud to lend it all the support of which I am able.

ELIMINATION OF AIRCRAFT NOISE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the most comprehensive and far-reaching legislative proposal yet to be offered in either body of Congress dealing constructively and equitably with the serious and growing problem of aircraft noise. This bill, for the first time, will establish within the Federal Aviation Agency an Aircraft Noise Abatement Service whose sole responsibility shall be, first, to develop a workable measuring system for correlating the intensity and quality of aircraft noise with the distress to people on the ground caused by such noise; second, to develop quieter aircraft through research and development in the fields of airframe and powerplant design, and in the field of vertical takeoff and landing equipment for aircraft; third, to develop a comprehensive body of knowledge concerning methods and devices for aircraft noise abatement, including but not limited to, mechanical devices such as noise suppression devices for aircraft engines and ground baffle systems, procedural techniques applied through air traffic control systems such as preferential runway systems and greater ascent and descent angles for aircraft, and administrative procedures for aircraft noise abatement through local zoning regulations and airport site selection; and fourth, to consolidate and coordinate current research data from all sources relating to aircraft noise abatement.

Following the research directed by this bill:

The Administrator shall, with due regard to safety and economic feasibility, establish such rules and regulations as may be necessary to require the maximum utilization of aircraft noise abatement techniques and devices determined by the Administrator to be of practical application.

For these purposes there would be authorized in fiscal year 1964 an appropriation of \$20 million.

The advent of the jet age, while bringing great advances has also brought with it the terrifying and abrasive noise that disrupts the peace and quiet of millions of airport neighbors throughout the country.

Aircraft noise has caused serious and frustrating problems, not only in my congressional district in Queens County in New York State, but elsewhere on Long Island in New York, as well as in Pittsburgh, Atlanta, San Francisco, Chicago, Newark, Denver, Seattle, Dallas, San Diego, St. Louis, Miami, Los Angeles, and Boston.

At the present time, 47 additional cities are receiving turbojet service, which is potentially capable of threatening community tranquillity. They are: Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Anchorage, Alaska; Annette, Alaska; Baltimore, Md.; Charlotte, N.C.; Cincinnati, Ohio—Covington, Ky.; Cleveland, Ohio; Columbus, Ohio; Dayton, Ohio; Des Moines, Iowa; Detroit, Mich.—Willow Run; Detroit, Mich.—Metropolitan Wayne County; El Paso, Tex.; Fairbanks, Alaska; Fort Lauderdale, Fla.; Fort Worth, Tex.; Houston, Tex.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Jacksonville, Fla.; Juneau, Alaska; Las Vegas, Nev.; Memphis, Tenn.; Midland, Tex.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Mobile, Ala.; Nashville, Tenn.; New Orleans, La.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Salt Lake City, Utah; San Antonio, Tex.; San Juan, P.R.; Spokane, Wash.; Tampa, Fla.; Tulsa, Okla.; Tucson, Ariz.; Washington, D.C.—Dulles; Windsor Locks, Conn.; Louisville, Ky.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Phoenix, Ariz.; Portland, Oreg.; Birmingham, Ala.; Honolulu, Hawaii; Kansas City, Mo.—Municipal; Orlando, Fla.—McCoy Air Force Base; West Palm Beach, Fla.; and Omaha, Nebr.

By 1967 the FAA anticipates that the following 57 communities will also be receiving turbojet service, in addition to propeller plane service, and then they, too, will be exposed to the jet noise problem: Akron-Canton, Ohio; Albany, N.Y.; Amarillo, Tex.; Austin, Tex.; Billings, Mont.; Binghamton, N.Y.; Boise, Idaho; Charleston, S.C.; Cold Bay, Alaska; Colorado Springs, Colo.; Columbia, S.C.; Cordova, Alaska; Corpus Christi, Tex.; Fresno, Calif.; Greensboro-High Point, N.C.; Greenville-Spartanburg, S.C.; Gustavus, Alaska; Harrisburg, Pa.; Hous-

ton, Tex.—new; Huntsville, Ala.; Jackson, Miss.; Kansas City, Mo.—Mid-Continent; King Salmon, Alaska; Knoxville, Tenn.; Kodiak, Alaska; Little Rock, Ark.; Los Angeles, Calif.—new; Lubbock, Tex.; Melbourne, Fla.; Newport News, Va.; New York, N.Y.—new; Norfolk, Va.; Oakland, Calif.; Ontario, Calif.; Raleigh-Durham, N.C.; Reno, Nev.; Richmond, Va.; Sacramento, Calif.; San Diego, Calif.—new; Shemya Island, Alaska; Shreveport, La.; Sitka, Alaska; Stockton, Calif.; Syracuse, N.Y.; Terre Haute, Ind.; Toledo, Ohio; Wichita, Kans.; Wilkes-Barre-Scranton, Pa.; Youngstown, Ohio; Buffalo, N.Y.; Hilo, Hawaii; Providence, R.I.; Rochester, N.Y.; St. Croix, V.I.—Alexander Hamilton; San Jose, Calif.; Chicago, Ill.—Midway; New York, N.Y.—LaGuardia.

Unfortunately, the true dimensions of the problem of aircraft noise are not always fully appreciated. Those persons who do not live near airports are, of course, not likely to be aware of the problem. Nevertheless, aircraft noise is a national problem and one that warrants national concern and attention.

Not only have citizens throughout the entire country had their right of privacy violated, but public institutions have also been subjected to airplane noise intrusions.

Teachers, for example, complain of frequent interruptions in the classroom because of aircraft overhead. A survey of 11 schools in the vicinity of O'Hare International Airport serving Chicago found there were 750 interruptions per school during a 2-week period.

Numerous clergymen have reported that they have had to suspend their sermons or services until noisy aircraft have passed.

Physicians have stated that post-operative patients and those recovering from heart attacks have a more difficult and hazardous recuperation if their ears are assailed repeatedly by noisy aircraft.

It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that we mark the streets near our hospitals with signs warning "Hospital—Quiet"; police will ticket the motorist who wantonly blows his horn in a posted quiet zone, yet a plane can shatter this healing serenity, and many people believe that nothing can or should be done.

These are but a few examples of the human values that are destroyed by aircraft noise.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, no one would suggest that it is not in our national interest to foster aviation advances and technological development.

A national air transport system is a settled matter of public policy. But the threat to the system posed by excessive aircraft noise is a real one. For example, consider the airport operator. The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in March 1962 in the case of Griggs against Allegheny County has apparently rendered airport operators potentially liable for taking private airspace rights in connection with aircraft noise disturbances. There are said to be some 1,200 suits pending in the courts as a consequence of this decision. Airport operators are understandably reluctant to extend or build new runways because of

their potential liability. In Pittsburgh, a new runway is not in use because the airport owner fears the impact of the Griggs decision. It is obvious, therefore, that aircraft noise seriously threatens the airport operator and thus can retard the development of the national air transport system.

There are two major reasons why there has been so little accomplished in the field of aircraft noise abatement. First, whether because of a failure of a clear-cut congressional mandate or a lack of interest or understanding, the responsible Federal officials have not established effective standards against which the performance of the airplane industry would be measured. Secondly, there has been a failure to adequately coordinate, promote, finance, and sponsor research in the field of noise abatement.

To illustrate the rather unusual and offhand way in which Federal officials have tended to minimize the problem, the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board has testified that "anxiety psychosis" is the cause of community displeasure with aircraft noise. The Administrator of the FAA has said:

We [Americans] are more anxious as a people, and anxious people are more easily irritated people.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that more research and less psychiatry is needed here in Washington.

I have no wish, Mr. Speaker, merely to add to the length of the statute books. If the FAA displayed more concern for the problem of aircraft noise and more zeal in dealing with it, there would be no need for specific legislation. But through the years the FAA has exhibited doubt as to its degree of responsibility for abating aircraft noise. My bill would make it clear that the FAA is expected to pursue research, and based on the findings, to promulgate rules to achieve aircraft noise abatement.

Mr. Halaby, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, one of the pioneers of this jet age, has taken the position that the problem of aircraft noise, in relation to his other responsibilities, is not a very significant one—that the FAA has done all that can be done at the present time. The fact is that his agency has programed less than \$1½ million for noise abatement research while it recommends an expenditure of \$1 billion for a supersonic jet transport.

Naturally, he attempts to minimize the problem of aircraft noise abatement. His primary job is to see that commercial and private planes land and take off speedily and safely. The ear-splitting racket these landings and takeoffs may entail are by no means his chief interest, nor should they be. Yet these machines were made for man, not the reverse. If outrageous aircraft noise in hundreds of communities is the price that must be paid for a few minutes clipped off an airlines schedule, then I say that that price is too high.

Fortunately, we need not pay such a premium on progress. Considerable research is being done on the problem of aircraft noise, some even by the FAA, and the outlook is not hopeless.

With a more concentrated and better coordinated research and development effort, we can lick the problem of excessive aircraft noise. What is needed, though, is some central focus for the work that is being done, some technical followthrough to assure that all leads are explored vigorously so that quieter aircraft may be developed.

How can we expect a quick solution to this problem when there is no central coordination for the research work of the many agencies that are dealing with some aspect of this problem? They include the FAA; Bureau of Standards; National Science Foundation; NASA; Department of Defense; National Academy of Science—National Research Council; American Acoustical Association; the air carriers; the airframe manufacturers; the aircraft engine manufacturers; National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council and State and local governments.

The FAA is the logical and responsible agency for the effective coordination of the work that these groups are doing. These many research programs will no doubt come to a quicker and more fruitful conclusion if there is greater coordination of effort and exchange of information and experience.

It is noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, that there exists no national standard for maximum permissible levels of aircraft noise. Setting such standards is left in the hands of local and State units of government. In my opinion, not all possess the technical competence to make such judgments. Even if they were competent in this field, the resulting hodge-podge of disparate standards would be intolerable. The result of this regulatory vacuum is to keep the airlines dominant and the public confused. If they are framed at all, the rules regarding tolerable aircraft noise levels are framed to fit the amount of noise created by the planes in current use; the regulations are not tailored, as they should be, to the amount of noise that is tolerable to the individual or community.

The New York Port Authority, for example, has set a standard of 112 Perceived Noise Decibels at three and one-half miles from the point of takeoff. In comparison, Niagara Falls has a decibel rate of 110. There is risk of permanent damage to the human ear when it is exposed to 120 decibels.

The lack of a national standard for tolerable aircraft noise is especially inconsistent with the history of commercial aviation in the United States. Congress has long recognized that the problems of aviation are national problems. The existence of the CAB and the FAA, the availability of Federal grants for airport development, the frequently expressed goal of a cohesive and coordinated national air transportation system—need more evidence be cited?

Congress has also recognized, that the ordinary citizen, who may never go aloft, nevertheless has rights with respect to air transportation. Section 307(c) of the Aviation Act of 1958 authorizes and directs the Administrator to prescribe air traffic rules and regulations governing

the flight of aircraft for the protection of persons and property on the ground. Surely the abatement of aircraft noise is within the scope of that statutory grant of authority and responsibility.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that only research will bring a solution to the problem of excessive aircraft noise. Military requirements are producing so-called VTOL aircraft—that is, planes able to achieve vertical takeoff and landing. The Army has a jet known as V2-11, which is of this type, as will be the TFX. Planes of this type, if adapted to commercial requirements, would virtually eliminate the problem. There are other possibilities that may prove to abate much aircraft noise. Dr. Spiridon Sucui of General Electric, a major producer of jet engines, believes it possible to design a new jet engine that would create a "sonic block" to eliminate "compressor whine" upon landing. Moreover, present engines and airframes could be adapted to make them considerably quieter. For example, elevating wings of jet aircraft to the top of the fuselage would permit planes to take off in stronger crosswinds, using preferred runways. Increasing the thrust of commercial jet engines would enable these craft to climb out of earshot more quickly.

I am confident that methods, devices, and designs can be developed that will mean quieter aircraft at stable acquisition and operating costs. We must, therefore, make the comprehensive, coordinated research and development effort that would be authorized by this bill. We can cut down the noise level around our airports. We can prevent sleepless nights for those living nearby and a deterioration of their property values. Enactment of this bill is the answer.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Alliance for Progress stands as a symbol of hope for millions of people in our hemisphere. The Alliance offers help for those who would help themselves. The progress we have already made, the renewed hope that has been generated, and the friendship we have won through the Alliance is amply illustrated in the following editorial from a Colombian newspaper. It is significant that this editorial appeared on July 4, a day when we celebrate our liberty. It is now a day when the people of this hemisphere celebrate the anniversary of hope for freedom from the burdens of poverty:

FESTIVAL OF DEMOCRACY

The national day of the United States, celebrated today, the Fourth of July, is, in truth, the day of democracy. This is because the United States, which not only achieved its own liberty, the right of its own people to govern themselves, to live in peace and

to progress in accord with their material and spiritual capacities, but also, after its historic action, through its noble example and with its efficient help, has encouraged other peoples and other nations to enjoy permanently these same benefits. And so democracy, as an ideal doctrine, as a system of government, as a way of daily living which knows no frontiers, can join jubilantly in the commemoration of this glorious date of the North American people.

The celebration of its National Day sees the United States at the head of a universal movement for peace, for respect of human rights, for equality among men, for progress and collective well-being, and consequently, opposed to other systems of governments and of life practiced by other governments which seek to impose them—even by force—on the rest of humanity.

The United States, assured the operation of democracy in its vast territory—because there laws and the Constitution are sacred—and having achieved solid bases for progress in all fields, has been working energetically in the past decades for the consolidation of peace in all the world. And this peace cannot be a reality so long as the peoples do not enjoy a standard of living which will balk the eternal demagogues and the ambitious men who underestimate their peoples. The United States has placed a great part of its economic, social and military potential at the service of the noble cause of peace and human welfare.

The actual President, John F. Kennedy, not only has followed the path of his predecessors, but has extended the benefits of this notable policy to sectors which until now have been forgotten or little regarded. And besides new treaties, and the new accords that give form to this assistance and mutual defense, President Kennedy has practiced a policy of personal diplomacy, in the course of which he has visited Latin America, and, during the last 10 days, Europe.

The Alliance for Progress constitutes another of the positive evidences of how the Government and the people of the United States are working to make real all the literature that we have written during many years exalting our brotherhood as "peoples born to liberty as fruit of the same sacrifice."

For this reason, the Alliance for Progress is neither gift nor grant, but a tool, a fortunate opportunity for the peoples of Latin America, utilizing the help of the United States and their own resources, to seek the progress and social well-being which, in the end, constitute the principal objectives of democracy.

OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, during a discussion on the floor of the House yesterday of the oil import program, statements were made on several occasions that there is no relation between the problems of crude oil and residual fuel oil insofar as imports are concerned.

I will admit, Mr. Speaker, that the problems are different in nature and in scope but to say, as some Members of the House did yesterday, that they are unrelated and one problem can be considered without relation to the others is contrary to what I have been told on

a number of occasions by men conversant with the domestic oil industry.

In this connection, it is interesting to recall that the Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association, which speaks for the vast domestic oil producing industry in that great State, has taken a position completely contrary to that expressed on the floor yesterday by the gentleman from Texas, as well as several Members from New England.

In a publication entitled "U.S. Oil Import Policy and Monopoly," and dated February 1962, one section is headed "Why Independents Have Residual Oil in Proposed Oil Import Policy." One sentence in this article particularly caught my attention.

Many observers believe—

This official publication of TIPRO stated—

that the effort to separate oil independents and coal interests is in reality the most effective means of defeating import legislation.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I wish at this time to insert in the RECORD the statement on the close relationship between crude and residual oil as contained in this official statement of policy by TIPRO.

WHY INDEPENDENTS HAVE RESIDUAL FUEL IN PROPOSED OIL IMPORT FORMULA

Inasmuch as residual fuel oil is a relatively uneconomic product so far as the domestic crude oil producer is concerned, and such imports are widely believed to compete only for markets supplied by coal, why do domestic oil independents oppose decontrol and seek to have residual fuel oil included in any new oil import program?

Some importing company officials have gone so far as to accuse independents of hurting oil's cause by joining forces with a competitor fuel—coal.

In answer, independents stress that they share with the New England Consumer Council, and consumers everywhere, a desire to have on hand plentiful oil supplies at all times. We support no measure which would create an artificial shortage of any oil products in order to confront the consumer with the necessity of using competitor fuels. But a policy of decontrol is not necessary to achieving a policy of allowing for ample imports.

In the first place, the "desirable stock" figures supplied by the Nation's oil importers themselves show that there is not and has not been a shortage of residual fuel oil, even though some importing companies appear to encourage this impression among consumer groups. Any supply difficulties arise not out of insufficient quantity available, but rather out of the allocation procedure under the present quota system. Each company with fuel oil customers naturally seeks import quotas high enough to enable it to supply potential customer requirements without having to acquire the surplus supplies held by other companies. To solve this problem of quota allocation, some importers prefer to insist on the easy route of decontrol.

Second. Argument that residual fuel oil is uneconomic from domestic sources is not entirely valid, when considered as a byproduct. Some 60 percent of the residual fuel oil used in America still comes from domestic crude, which provides a daily market for domestic crude of about 900,000 barrels that can be economically furnished at the present crude price structure. Moreover, the steady decrease in yield of resid from domestic crude has not improved U.S. crude prices. On the contrary, since 1957 there has been an ap-

proximate 17-cent-per-barrel crude price cut, while we yielded about a quarter of a million barrels of the resid market to foreign oil.

Third. The whole national security basis for import controls—to maintain accessible supplies in time of emergency—applies no less to residual fuel products than to imported crude. If any petroleum product is decontrolled, or left out of any new import restraint program altogether, the whole purpose of the program would undoubtedly be weakened. Additionally, decontrol might render meaningless the present prohibition against rerefining residual fuel oil imports into higher products.

Fourth, there is the secondary effect on domestic producers of any temporary residual fuel oil price break resulting from decontrol—not to mention injury to importing companies and the economics of source countries, particularly Venezuela. New England consumers, having been led to believe that decontrol would result in a sharp price drop, might insist on it—to the detriment of the importing companies and source countries which helped along this “consumer” pressure. Domestic producers, who still supply more than half of the Nation’s residual fuel oil, would find their income cut as well on some 10 percent of their total market for domestic crude.

Finally, there is admittedly the practical political consideration of an “alliance” between those in Congress concerned with the welfare of both the oil and coal industries. Many observers believe that the effort to separate oil independents and coal interests is in reality the most effective means of defeating import legislation. Numerous so-called oil States are primarily coal States, and separate legislative proposals by oil producers and coal would lose desperately needed congressional support for both groups. A united “domestic fuels industry” stand, on the other hand, cannot be ignored, and the executive department will quickly recognize the necessity of dealing with such a force in order to get its foreign trade bill through.

Another interesting statement in this same TIPRO article is entitled “The Residual Fuel Saga of Refinery ‘A,’” which clearly sets forth the interests of domestic refiners in maintaining residual fuel oil import controls.

I wish to include this statement in my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

THE RESIDUAL FUEL SAGA OF REFINERY “A”

Refinery A is purely hypothetical. It is a refinery owned by a major American oil company that imports both crude and residual fuel and purchases domestic crude from independents.

Each day last year it refined 60,000 barrels of purchased domestic crude and 40,000 barrels of the company’s imported crude. It averaged a yield of 90 percent in nonresidual fuel products and 10 percent in residual fuel.

This year, as it had in recent years, refinery A cut its residual fuel yield by 1 percent—from 10 percent to 9 percent, or approximately 1,000 barrels daily. Already overstocked with nonresidual products, the refinery had then to reduce its total runs by most of the 1,000 barrels daily to compensate. It refused to make the total refinery cutback indicated, hoping for more sales and trying to keep its high import quota, which is based on its refinery input. Meanwhile, its importing parent, together with other importers, were allowed to increase their residual fuel quotas by 1,000 barrels daily to meet the increased “need” created when refinery A reduced residual yields.

Who lost the 1,000 barrels daily in order to keep the balance? Were crude import quotas cut 1,000 barrels daily to absorb any

of the loss? Was the loss shared by the importing refinery and the domestic crude producers? Or is it obvious to all that under present regulations the domestic crude producers suffered the total loss of market.

While the refinery’s crude imports even contributed 40 percent of the reduced domestic residual fuel yield in the first place, then imports were not called upon even to share the 1,000 barrel loss to imported residual fuel.

This, then, is the sage of refinery A. Little wonder some importing companies want present regulations continued with only one significant change—complete decontrol of imported residual fuel. This would mean intensification of the process by which American international oil companies increase their total imports, including residual fuel, at the direct expense of their domestic producer competitors.

CRISIS FOR COTTON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, all segments of our economy are awakening to the importance to them of stabilizing our cotton industry through passage of the Cooley bill, H.R. 6196. Farmers and industrial employees presently remote from direct connection with cotton in any form would feel the effect if the cotton industry is pinched out of existence, as is threatened if we do not pass this bill. Present cotton farmers would be forced to put their lands into competition with other agricultural production. Cotton industrial workers would be forced into other industries where labor surpluses presently exist.

I am glad to report that there is growing recognition of the impact of the cotton problem on other segments of our economy. Another evidence of this is a telegram I have just received from Mr. J. C. Baten, secretary of the International Chemical Workers Union No. 97, in Fresno, Calif. It read as follows:

FRESNO, CALIF.

Hon. B. F. SISK: The International Chemical Workers Union Local 97 is urging you to support the Cooley bill H.R. 6196. In an area where high unemployment is prevailing, we believe H.R. 6196 would help this situation and give the farmers a break they so badly need for fair competition. It would give economy a boost all over the United States therefore this union is in full support of bill H.R. 6196.

J. C. BATEN.

SEMINAR ON MUSIC EDUCATION

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, one of the major fields of concern to all of us interested in strengthening the arts and humanities is that of music education. A very significant seminar on music education, supported by the Office of Education as a part of its cooperative research program, has recently been completed at Yale University. This seminar, I believe, will serve as a focal point in the expansion and improvement of music education in our schools throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD at this time an article by Mr. Eric Salzman appearing in the New York Times, July 7, 1963, covering some of the significant results of this unique meeting.

This seminar on music education is an example of the type of development and use of our artistic brainpower which is possible and which could be supported to a much greater extent under the provisions of my bill, the Cultural Development Act of 1963, introduced on January 9 of this year—H.R. 324. When I read of the results of such a far-ranging meeting of minds, possible perhaps only through the support and encouragement of an agency of the Federal Government such as the U.S. Office of Education, I am more than ever convinced of the need for such legislation as I have proposed.

This beginning has been made in the field of music. However, much remains to be done in the other arts as well if we are to bring to bear our best artistic resources on our programs of education and participation in the arts.

TEACHERS UNDER FIRE

(By Eric Salzman)

A long and loud vote of no confidence in American public school education was offered last month at a conference of distinguished musicians and teachers held under the sponsorship of the Federal Government.

The conference, or seminar on music education, was held at Yale University in the last 2 weeks of June. It was a remarkable meeting of representatives of every aspect of American musical life and activity who came together with the aim of evaluating and reevaluating American musical education in the primary and secondary grades.

If the initial premises and prognoses were negative, the results of the conclave were not. Somehow, the congruence of a variety of vastly differing musical backgrounds, minds, points of view, and approaches produced clear outlines of new concepts of music teaching designed to involve children in genuine and profound musical experiences.

The impulse for the seminar came from, of all places, the President’s Office of Science and Technology; the event was financed by the U.S. Office of Education. The prototypes for the meeting can be found in the fields of science and mathematics. The Sputnik Age found American basic scientific education still in the age of Euclid and Newton; distinguished scientists and mathematicians, working through the prestige and good offices of the Government, have since brought about an educational revolution from the primary grades on up. Now, for the first time, it was being asked whether similar reforms were not needed in one of the arts and the answer was emphatically in the affirmative.

The 30 participants in the seminar included a large group of composer-educators and composer-performers (Lukas Foss, Leon Kirchner, Edward T. Cone, Otto Luening,

Henry Brant, Lionel Nowak, Howard Boatwright, Gid Waldrop, and from the jazz field, Billy Taylor and Mercer Ellington), performers (Adele Addison, Norah Greenberg, Milton Katims), critics, theoreticians, musicologists and ethnomusicologists.

There was agreement that American public school music education had its bright spots and positive achievements. The high technical quality of band, orchestra, and choral performance was often cited and individual examples of excellent educational achievement were brought forward.

The general situation across the country however, was found to be very poor; in most schools, in the elementary grades, untrained classroom teachers are charged with the responsibility of giving children the basic musical skills which the teachers themselves do not possess, and the means and equipment provided for the purpose of accomplishing this hopeless goal are almost invariably inadequate and antimusical.

POINT OF UNANIMITY

Interestingly enough, there was almost no conflict on these points between the educators and the "practicing" musicians. The educators were convinced of the magnitude of the problem and of the need for close contact between the living world of musical creation and performance just as the practicing musicians were sensitive to the need for close involvement in the educational process from the lowest grades.

If the 12 days of panels, papers, discussions, section meetings and plenary sessions produced any ideological divisions at all, it was primarily between those who wanted to place the principal emphasis on the great Western tradition of the last two centuries and the strong group who felt that it was at least as important to broaden our musical and educational horizons to include early Western music, non-Western music, recent avant-garde developments including electronic music as well as nonconcert music of all types.

A great deal of emphasis was put, not only on children's performance activities, but also on creativity; there was wide agreement as to the importance of a program designed to foster creative musical expression from the earliest grades as a means of building and training basic musicality in every child.

The importance of student involvement and activity at every level of the educational process was a constant theme of the discussions. The experience of live music was also stressed and, in this connection, it was urged that solo performers and chamber ensembles be brought into the schools on an in-residence basis similar to that already used in the Ford Foundation's composers-in-residence program.

The work of the seminar was only a first step. Its conclusions will be described in a report to the Office of Education to be made by Claude Pallsca, who is associate professor of the history of music at Yale and director of the seminar. The report will serve both as a mandate and a guide for the work of a followup committee that will have the responsibility of finding ways of implementing these ideas in practical terms.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 101, on a motion to recommit

H.R. 5171, authorizing GSA to coordinate purchase and maintenance of data processing equipment for Federal agencies, I was absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

BRACERO PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, proponents of the bracero program often point out that domestic workers can replace braceros at any time they want to do so. It is left unsaid that American workers often cannot get job offers which are attractive enough to cause them to want jobs held by the braceros.

Under Secretary of Labor Henning pointed this fact out in a recent statement before the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor. Mr. Henning noted:

The simple fact is that under the present system the employer can refuse to offer to domestic workers the same terms and conditions that he is required to offer alien workers. If the domestic worker refuses to accept the job at less favorable terms, the employer is permitted to bring in Mexican workers who are then afforded the very terms and conditions which were denied to our own workers.

The Department of Labor opposes extension of Public Law 78 unless it is amended to rectify such faults as I have just pointed out. Mr. Henning said of Public Law 78, and I agree with him—"It is a wretched law that should be buried."

RESIDUAL OIL RESTRICTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KASTENMEIER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, once again I join in the congressional debate on residual oil restrictions. Time after time in the past 4 years this topic has been debated in this House. Time after time my colleagues from New England and other areas of this country have pleaded for elimination of residual oil restrictions, and time after time our efforts have been thwarted by the coal bloc.

We are talking today about a policy which is being continued ostensibly to help the coal industry, but which, in fact, has little if any effect upon the coal industry. We are talking about a program which is intended to strengthen the American economy but which, in fact, is severely hindering the growth and competitive position of many industries, particularly in New England. We are talking about a program which is being justified on grounds of national security but which, in fact, is endangering our national security.

The coal industry, Mr. Speaker, argues that a relaxation of residual oil restric-

tions would cause even further unemployment among coal workers. They are unwilling to recognize that the cause of increased unemployment lies here at home: automation, increased use of diesel fuels especially by the railroads, at the expense of the coal industry, and a general loss of a retail fuel market. Those who would argue for tightening of these residual oil restrictions to protect the coal industry do not realize that coal is too expensive in New England and that, rather than turning to coal as an alternative, fuel consumers would probably choose natural gas or some other fuel oil which is cheaper than coal. And, finally, those who are so concerned about protecting coal, to the extent of calling for the removal of coal import restrictions in Europe, a move which would hurt the European economy, are not concerned that the American restrictions on residual oil are damaging our own economy.

These restrictions are causing serious concern in New England. The fuel consumer in our region pays approximately 27 cents more per barrel than his foreign competitor. This is costing New England industries almost \$20 million every year. If residual oil restrictions were tightened, the result would be a loss of jobs for thousands in New England, many times more than might be put back to work in the coal mines.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn my attention to the administration's decision to continue these restrictions. By these actions the administration has challenged the studied judgment of its own adviser Edward McDermott who, as Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, conducted a study to determine whether the national security provision of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 would justify continuation of restrictions. His conclusions are unequivocal and to the point. I quote from the report's conclusion:

Western Hemispheric sources have predominated in the imports of residual fuel oil to the United States. Substantial reliance on this area for an important component of residual fuel oil needs contributes to the achievement of long-term hemispheric goals for the promotion of economic, political, and social progress. At the same time this use of those petroleum resources is compatible with national defense requirements, current and contemplated.

An inevitable conclusion of this investigation is that the imposition of tighter residual fuel oil controls than those now in effect would be inconsistent with national security objectives. Such action could not contribute in any important degree to the security of fuels for the United States itself or in the broader context of its international security obligations. A more drastic import control program would impose serious economic, political, and social burdens within the Western Hemisphere where it is essential that progress be achieved. That the national security investigation reveals the Western Hemisphere is a suitable source for such imports would accentuate the unfortunate repercussions which would follow the imposition of tighter controls.

Under Secretary of State George Ball has questioned the continuation of this program. He said:

The doubts about the oil import program have caused and continue to cause problems

in our relations with friendly nations, not only our principal petroleum suppliers but with our trading partners generally. They have constituted a special weakness in our ability to respond effectively to foreign friends who seek sincerely to understand our security requirements. It has been particularly difficult in the case of residual fuel oil to relate, with any effectiveness, the framework of our restrictions to clearly demonstrate national security needs.

In light of these considerations, Mr. Speaker, may I again add my voice to the chorus of those who seek the relaxation of residual oil restrictions.

DELAWARE'S SUPERB BEACH-FRONT RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ARE ONLY 120 MILES FROM THE WHITE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. KASTENMEIER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, Delaware's beaches and recreational needs have found a sympathetic and perceptive champion, and the citizens of the First State have gained an able and brilliant spokesman, in George Kennedy, the white-bearded patriarch of the Evening Star newspaper of Washington, D.C.

A gentle savant, George Kennedy yesterday wrote his famous Rambler column on the importance to the citizens of Delaware, of Washington, D.C., and of the Nation at large, of acquiring for public park and recreational purposes the 500 acres of excess beach-front land at Fort Miles Military Reservation, Del.

I am pleased to include yesterday's column as part of my remarks for the information of my colleagues and those from coast to coast who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD including those officials of the Federal Government who will make the final decisions regarding the disposal of Federal property in Delaware, large portions of which were originally ceded by the State to the Federal Government without reimbursement.

Perhaps 500 acres in Texas, Alaska, or some other State of huge size might not seem of great importance but in Delaware 500 acres looms very large indeed. In fact, it has been said from time to time, in a spirit of jest, that Delaware consists of three counties at low tide, and only one at high tide. Thomas Jefferson, who was fond of the First State, was struck by its diminutive and compact size, and called it a jewel among the States.

In Delaware, because of its small land area, and the fact that it is an established summertime host to the Nation, 500 acres means all the difference in the world.

George Kennedy understands this, and, I have reason to think, so do a growing number of those Federal officials who must make the final decisions regarding the disposition of these 500 precious acres of beach-front property at Fort Miles Military Reservation in Delaware.

The President himself has shown his own concern in this matter on a number of occasions and, I feel sure, in view

of this, that the final decision will be favorable to Delaware.

How could it be otherwise with such good and wise friends and champions as the First State has always had from Thomas Jefferson's era to our own?

George Kennedy's column follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Aug 6, 1963]

THE RAMBLER IS ALL FOR DELAWARE

(By George Kennedy)

REHOBOTH BEACH, DEL.—As you approach this ideal Atlantic beach resort—where the splash of the surf is heard under the murmuring pines—the highway signs say:

"Delaware, the First State."

That's right. Little Delaware (only Rhode Island is smaller) was the first State to ratify the Constitution. That was in December 1787.

There is another thing about Delaware that is not generally realized. Maryland's shore points sound nearer. After all, the District was carved out of Maryland.

But draw a line from the eastern corner of the District—right along East Capitol street. The first shore point (across Chesapeake Bay) will be Lewes, Del., on Delaware Bay, just inside the breakwater.

The nearest ocean beach resort is Rehoboth, Del.—120 miles. Ocean City, Md., is 150 miles.

There is a great deal of interest in Washington in the fate of Assateague Island, 18 miles of sandy beach south of Ocean City.

The Department of the Interior wants it for recreational purposes. Those who purchased lots from a real estate promoter after the war oppose this.

There has been much less publicity in the Nation's Capital about a much nearer ocean-front property available for recreational purposes.

This is Fort Miles, about 1,000 acres on Henlopen Point, the southern shoulder of the confluence of the Delaware River and the Atlantic.

In this case it is the State of Delaware which wants to utilize it for public recreation.

Long after the strategic importance of Fort McHenry, at the juncture of the Patuxent River and Chesapeake Bay, had declined (that's where Francis Scott Key's Star Spangled Banner is still waving), Henlopen Point was considered important to national defense.

But intercontinental ballistic missiles ended that. Some time ago the Army declared some 600 acres surplus property.

These 600 acres, a rectangular tract, are bordered by two and three-quarters miles of sandy ocean beach, ideal for surf bathing, and one and three-quarters miles of bay front—ideal for those who fear the undertow.

As I understand the situation after talking to Jesse Gundry of Rehoboth Beach and John Biven, Jr., of Dover, both members of the Governor's Planning Board, there is a little tug of war going on as to whether the property will go to the General Services Administration of the Federal Government or to the State of Delaware.

Delaware has been an advanced State in the matter of public recreation. About 20 years ago Delaware acquired several miles of ocean beach south of Rehoboth and made it available for camping at a nominal rate.

Many of the campers occupied tents only during their vacations and summer weekends. When they went back to work they merely tied the strings. In summers past I remember talking to these fortunate happy people. There was no instance of vandalism or thievery.

But the big storm of March 6, 1962, washed away the dunes and since then the State has prohibited camping in the interest of safety.

Delaware's Representative in the House, HARRIS B. McDOWELL, has been making a fight to obtain this property for the State of Delaware for recreational purposes. He has sponsored a House bill to that effect.

Delaware's two Senators, JOHN WILLIAMS and CALEB BOGGS, have introduced an identical bill in the Senate.

This marvelous beach property is no more than 110 miles from the White House.

Delaware is ready to make it immediately available to the public.

Now that the new Route 50, the magic carpet to the beaches, has at long last been completed, this beach can be reached in less than 3 hours from anywhere in the Washington area.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCHENCK (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the balance of this week, on account of death in family.

Mr. JOHANSEN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today, on account of death in family.

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. PATMAN, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. HÉBERT, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. TUPPER), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GIAIMO (at the request of Mr. WAGGONNER), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. WAGGONNER), for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. GILBERT in two instances.

Mr. WYDLER.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 812. An act to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the United States of America; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution granting consent for an extension of 4 years of the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution

of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

- H.R. 1518. An act for the relief of Barbara Theresa Lazarus; and
 H.J. Res. 324. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

- S. 130. An act to change the name of Fort Randall Reservoir in the State of South Dakota to Lake Francis Case;
 S. 131. An act to change the name of the Big Bend Reservoir in the State of South Dakota to Lake Sharpe;
 S. 192. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Benjamin A. Canini, U.S. Army;
 S. 219. An act for the relief of Bernard W. Flynn, Jr.;
 S. 280. An act for the relief of Etsuko Matsuo McClellan;
 S. 752. An act for the relief of Janos Kardos;
 S. 850. An act to change the name of the Bruce Eddy Dam and Reservoir in the State of Idaho to the Dworshak Dam and Reservoir;
 S. 1003. An act for the relief of the Middlesex Concrete Products & Excavating Corp.;
 S. 1326. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in property in South Carolina to the record owners of the surface of that property;
 S. 1652. An act to amend the National Cultural Center Act to extend the termination date contained therein, and to enlarge the Board of Trustees; and
 S. 1643. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of Gregory J. Kessenich," approved October 2, 1962 (76 Stat. 1368).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 8, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1113. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that no claims were paid by the Office of Emergency Planning during fiscal year 1963, pursuant to section 2673 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
 1114. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "a bill to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the Government of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Report on conditions in the lead-zinc mining industries (Rept. No. 640). 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. BROYHILL of Virginia:
 H.R. 7975. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to extend the benefits of such act to a child who is in legal custody of an employee or annuitant under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.
 By Mr. FOGARTY:
 H.R. 7976. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
 By Mr. HALPERN:
 H.R. 7977. A bill to amend section 17 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and to amend section 5 of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HORTON:
 H.R. 7978. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring Frederick Douglass; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOELSON:
 H.R. 7979. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the definition of commuter fare revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:
 H.R. 7980. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:
 H.R. 7981. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Delaware among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
 By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7982. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to the loss of U.S. citizenship by naturalized citizens through residence in a foreign country, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:
 H.R. 7983. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:
 H.R. 7984. A bill to amend section 302 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the establishment of an Aircraft Noise Abatement Service within the Federal Aviation Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SISK:
 H.R. 7985. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide for the use of counterparty funds for international agricultural conferences; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHARTON:
 H.R. 7986. A bill to authorize an appropriation of a sum not to exceed \$50,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed national parkway in the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York from the vicinity of Stroudsburg, Pa., northeast to Kingston, N.Y.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:
 H.R. 7987. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7988. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 7989. A bill to limit financial assistance under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, after July 1, 1965, to projects which cannot be self-liquidating under applicable State law, to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to prevent unnecessary or excessive demolition of buildings in urban renewal projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 7990. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by stabilizing the domestic lead and zinc industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.J. Res. 635. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of \$250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.J. Res. 636. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.J. Res. 637. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H. Res. 478. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate expenditures for research programs conducted by or sponsored by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. Res. 479. Resolution providing for an investigation of the formulation, contents, and appropriateness of the initial report of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces entitled "Equality of Treatment and Opportunity for Negro Military Personnel Stationed Within the United States"; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Res. 480. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate expenditures for research programs conducted by or sponsored by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 7991. A bill for the relief of Marianna Stefanska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7992. A bill for the relief of Antonio Lamonaca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 7993. A bill for the relief of Kevork Agopoglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 7994. A bill for the relief of Col. Ralph H. Wade, U.S. Air Force, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 7995. A bill for the relief of La Driere, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 7996. A bill for the relief of Nai-chi Wang and Amy Fang Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 7997. A bill for the relief of Nicola Di Lorenzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 7, 1963

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

The Reverend Norton Scrimshire, minister, First Methodist Church, Laverne, Okla., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, strong to save, who art the author and giver of law, and from whom alone all just designs and righteous judgments come:

We confess how easy it is to yield to the temptation of feeding and serving our own prejudices and unworthy motives. Forgive us the sin of yielding to the devices and desires of our hearts, and enable us to seek and follow Thy good and perfect will. We acknowledge our weakness, and pray for Thy strength, that we may be courageous for Thee in the face of opposition. Increase our wisdom, that we may know Thy truth and uphold it in all legislation. Thou who art the source of all love, allow us to rise to the task of fulfilling our duties and responsibilities with love and charity for all and with malice toward none.

It is our earnest plea that we may be a part of the healing waters that flow throughout our world, and never a part of the raging turmoil of hatred and bitterness that destroys fellowship and understanding.

We pray for peace, a peace that is sustained by Thee. We ask this, our prayer, in the name of the Prince of Peace, Christ, the Lord of Life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 6, 1963, 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in

which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1201. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eurina P. Richards;

H.R. 1280. An act for the relief of Jan Koss;

H.R. 1532. An act for the relief of Herbert R. Schaff;

H.R. 1545. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members and former enlisted members of the Air Force;

H.R. 1761. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of R. Gordon Finney, Jr.;

H.R. 1861. An act for the relief of the children of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Dombrowski;

H.R. 2238. An act for the relief of Erwin A. Suehs;

H.R. 2256. An act for the relief of Jose Domenech;

H.R. 2260. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rozsi Neuman;

H.R. 2303. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Kolloian Izmirian;

H.R. 2724. An act for the relief of Davey Ellen Snider Slegel;

H.R. 2756. An act for the relief of George R. Lore;

H.R. 2770. An act for the relief of Mrs. Justine M. Dubendorf;

H.R. 2790. An act for the relief of Owen L. Green;

H.R. 3648. An act for the relief of Fiore Luigi Biasiotta;

H.R. 3762. An act for the relief of Anna C. Chmielewski;

H.R. 3843. An act for the relief of Wallace J. Knerr;

H.R. 4075. An act for the relief of Noriyuki Miyata;

H.R. 4141. An act for the relief of Smith L. Parratt and Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Parratt, his parents;

H.R. 4145. An act for the relief of certain individuals;

H.R. 4288. An act for the relief of Mrs. M. Orta Worden;

H.R. 4955. An act to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation;

H.R. 5307. An act for the relief of Edward T. Hughes;

H.R. 5703. An act granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy;

H.R. 5811. An act for the relief of L. C. Atkins and Son;

H.R. 5812. An act for the relief of Quality Seafood, Inc.;

H.R. 5814. An act for the relief of Norman R. Tharp;

H.R. 5822. An act for the relief of Theodore Zissu;

H.R. 6091. An act for the relief of Chief M. Sgt. Samuel W. Smith, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 6180. An act for the relief of Maj. Warren G. Ward, Capt. Paul H. Beck, and 1st Lt. Russell K. Hansen, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 6373. An act for the relief of Robert L. Nolan;

H.R. 6443. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret L. Moore;

H.R. 6628. An act for the relief of Dr. Henry H. Cohan;

H.R. 6663. An act for the relief of Louis C. Wheeler;

H.R. 6808. An act for the relief of the Shelburne Harbor Ship & Marine Construction Co., Inc.;

H.R. 7019. An act to provide further compensation to Mrs. Johnson Bradley for certain land and improvements in the village of Odanah, Wis., taken by the Federal Government; and

H.R. 7022. An act for the relief of Marguerite Lefebvre Broughton.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 1518. An act for the relief of Barbara Theresa Lazarus; and

H.J. Res. 324. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H.R. 1201. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eurina P. Richards;

H.R. 1280. An act for the relief of Jan Koss;

H.R. 1532. An act for the relief of Herbert R. Schaff;

H.R. 1545. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members and former enlisted members of the Air Force;

H.R. 1761. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of R. Gordon Finney, Jr.;

H.R. 1861. An act for the relief of the children of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Dombrowski;

H.R. 2238. An act for the relief of Erwin A. Suehs;

H.R. 2256. An act for the relief of Jose Domenech;

H.R. 2260. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rozsi Neuman;

H.R. 2303. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Kolloian Izmirian;

H.R. 2724. An act for the relief of Davey Ellen Snider Slegel;

H.R. 2756. An act for the relief of George R. Lore;

H.R. 2770. An act for the relief of Mrs. Justine M. Dubendorf;

H.R. 2790. An act for the relief of Owen L. Green;

H.R. 3648. An act for the relief of Fiore Luigi Biasiotta;

H.R. 3762. An act for the relief of Anna C. Chmielewski;

H.R. 3843. An act for the relief of Wallace J. Knerr;

H.R. 4075. An act for the relief of Noriyuki Miyata;

H.R. 4141. An act for the relief of Smith L. Parratt and Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Parratt, his parents;

H.R. 4145. An act for the relief of certain individuals;

H.R. 4288. An act for the relief of Mrs. M. Orta Worden;

H.R. 5307. An act for the relief of Edward T. Hughes;

H.R. 5703. An act granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy;

H.R. 5811. An act for the relief of L. C. Atkins and son;

H.R. 5812. An act for the relief of Quality Seafood, Inc.;

H.R. 5814. An act for the relief of Norman R. Tharp;

H.R. 5822. An act for the relief of Theodore Zissu;

H.R. 6091. An act for the relief of Chief M. Sgt. Samuel W. Smith, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 6180. An act for the relief of Maj. Warren G. Ward, Capt. Paul H. Beck, and 1st Lt. Russell K. Hansen, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 6373. An act for the relief of Robert L. Nolan;